

**Town of Rockport Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, March 9, 2011 – 5:30 p.m.
Rockport Opera House Downstairs Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22**

Present: Kerry Leichtman, Chairman
John Alexander
Terry Mackenzie
Thomas Murphy
Sarah Price

Also Present: Thomas M. Ford, Planning Director
Nancy Ninnis, Recording Secretary

AGENDA

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Village at Rockport, LLC**, 689 Commercial Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Subdivision final plan review to create nine housing units through the reconfiguration of existing motel units at the former Spruce Ridge Inn (continued from the 1/19/11 and 2/09/11 meetings). Represented by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying.
Property: 689 Commercial Street – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

2. **John M. Bryant**, 305 Washington Street, Camden, ME 04843
Request: Site plan review to construct a 3,120 sq. ft. tradesman’s shop (continued from the 2/09/11 meeting). Represented by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers.
Property: 423 West Street – Tax Map 26, Lot 221-001
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

OTHER BUSINESS

3. Review and Approval of Minutes

SITE WALK

5:10 P.M. John M. Bryant’s proposed Tradesman’s Shop – 423 West Street

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

I. VILLAGE AT ROCKPORT, LLC

Representation: Andrew Heddericg
Gartley & Dorsky Surveying & Engineering
59B Union Street, P.O. Box 1031, Camden, ME 04843

Tel: 207-236-4365; Fax: 207-236-3055

Property: 689 Commercial Street – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Subdivision final plan approval to create nine housing units through the reconfiguration of existing motel units at the former Spruce Ridge Inn (continued from the 1/19/11 and 2/09/11 meetings).

Chairman Leichtman: We held the preapplication meeting on January 19, 2011 and took a site walk and completed preliminary plan approval on February 9, 2011.

Andrew Heddericg: I am here with owner Tony Casella and John Richardson for final approval. The project is a 9-unit residential condominium development with private wells and septic systems. We have done a lot of research on the existing septic situation and provided a packet of information. We have also provided responses to Articles 8 and 11, as well as a trip generation summary showing that there will be a reduction in the number of overall daily trips. We have submitted a revised plan and included blowups of the widened exit and entrance radii. Otherwise, there are no further changes.

There were no Board questions on the presentation.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to completeness, I found no deficiencies in the subdivision plan or written statement. When I refer to problems with the application, I refer only to the materials submitted.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To accept as complete the final plan of The Village at Rockport for the creation of nine housing units through the reconfiguration of existing motel units at the former Spruce Ridge Inn as shown on Final Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1 prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated March 9, 2011 on property at 689 Commercial Street located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in Districts #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Ms. Price: I did not understand the response to Article 8.2.R regarding the cost of construction. Has a performance guarantee been submitted and is that different from 8.2.R?

Chairman Leichtman: We will not need a performance guarantee because the application is not adding any infrastructure. Article 8.3.B requires the delivery of a performance guarantee. Typically a performance guarantee is about infrastructure and road construction, neither of which are a factor in this application.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To waive the Article 8.3.B requirement of a performance guarantee.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes

Thomas Murphy	Yes
Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Ms. Mackenzie: I understand that the performance guarantee applies only to infrastructure, but this says the completed condominium units will be offered for sale. However, they can't until the units are complete. Does this waiver have any bearing on this issue?

Chairman Leichtman: No.

Ms. Price: Article 8.2.R states: "A list of construction items, with cost estimates, that will be completed by the applicant prior to the sale of lots, and evidence that the applicant has financial commitments or resources to cover these costs."

Planning Director Ford: The Subdivision Ordinance was written primarily for traditional homes and a roadway being brought onto an undeveloped lot. In the past we have asked developers for a list of the detailed costs of creating a road and underground utilities. This development has none of those.

Chairman Leichtman: This is not a typical subdivision with roads and other infrastructure

Planning Director Ford: If the applicant had chosen to do a condominium development in the back of the 37-acre lot, it would be a different story.

Ms. Price: I didn't understand the applicant's response that the improvements are minimal.

Andrew Heddericg: We were trying to allude to the fact that there will be no significant improvements traditionally identified with a subdivision.

Chairman Leichtman: The responses to Article 8 are satisfactory. I will open up the discussion to general comments on issues not addressed by the application.

Mr. Murphy: I would like a little more assurance on the septic plans.

Chairman Leichtman: That was my issue as well.

Ms. Price: Article 11.10 addresses the same issues of financial capacity. Will that be waived for the same reason?

Chairman Leichtman: We used to require applicants to provide a letter from a bank stating that they had the financial capacity to complete a project, but we no longer do so, which makes the answer to the question a little less direct. I have a question on the septic system. You gave us a lot of information, but is there any way to test to know that what we are hearing and assuming is correct?

Andrew Heddericg: Yes, but it can't be done until the Spring by a licensed septic evaluator. We believe there is a stone bed, but we don't know the exact size. But we can work with the calculations backwards to come up with the size.

Chairman Leichtman: If the septic malfunctions, we won't know that until the Spring?

Andrew Heddericg: Yes. We haven't seen any evidence yet, but we made sure we have provided two alternative septic locations with adequate soils. If the issue comes up in the Spring, we will repair the system or move the location.

Tony Casella: Charles Dolham indicated that there are two existing septic systems located on the site and the Board of Health approval also showed that both were acceptable. The property has been licensed every year, and permits to open a hotel or motel are not granted without approval of a septic system.

Ms. Price: The existing septic system summary says the applicant will coordinate with the Code Enforcement Officer. Do we need to make this a contingency, or will it be handled by the Planning Office?

Planning Director Ford: There has to be a certificate of occupancy for each unit sold and occupied, and the Code Enforcement Officer is responsible to ensure that we know where the septic systems are located and determining the number of gallons flowing into the systems with each unit sold. We have had a discussion with Andrew Heddericg about this.

Tony Casella: We also had a discussion with the Code Enforcement Officer and he also recommended that we contact Charles Dolham. He feels very confident with four units because we are adding kitchens and laundry units. We originally talked about thirteen units. Charles Dolham thought it could cover nine units, but the Code Enforcement Officer said four.

Chairman Leichtman: By the time that becomes a concern, you will be able to test it?

Andrew Heddericg: Yes.

Chairman Leichtman: The Code Enforcement Officer won't issue an occupancy permit until he is satisfied with the septic systems.

Ms. Price: I understand we are reviewing only what is before us now, but there is also a master plan.

Chairman Leichtman: Which we don't care about. The applicant is only here for approval of these nine units. They have generally told us where they plan to go in the future, but we are not dealing with that.

Tony Casella: The reason we haven't is because that could change. Everyone we are talking to about purchasing units is downsizing, but also wants two bedrooms, so we are changing Phase II from fifteen units to ten units.

Ms. Price: I asked because people are signing onto the Declaration of Condominium knowing that there will be more construction.

Tony Casella: That is correct, and it even refers to 55 units. We are still testing the waters of the market and will custom build units for future buyers.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to the condominium documents, I have never seen such clear and complete documents. These are unusually well done.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

Chairman Leichtman: I will now review the criteria listed under the Subdivision Ordinance Article 11 Performance Standards concurrently with the State standards under the subdivision statute of Title 30-A M.R.S.A. Section 4404, taking any comment from Board members as I go through the list: “The performance standards in this article are intended to clarify and expand upon the criteria for approval found within the subdivision statute – 30-A M.R.S.A., §4404. In reviewing a proposed subdivision, the Board shall review the application for conformance with the following performance standards and make findings that each has been met prior to the approval of a final plan. Compliance with the design guidelines of Article 12 shall be considered to be evidence of meeting the appropriate performance standards. Proposed subdivisions not in compliance with the design guidelines of Article 12 may be considered, but the applicant shall provide clear and convincing evidence that the proposed design will meet the performance standard(s) and the statutory criteria. In all instances the burden of proof shall be upon the applicant to present adequate information to indicate all performance standards and statutory criteria for approval have been or will be met.” Per Article 8.1.H – Final Plan for Major Subdivision/Procedure, “If the Board finds that all the criteria of the Statute and the standards of Article 11 have been met, they shall approve the final plan. If the Board finds that any of the criteria of the statute or the standards of Article 11 has not been met, the Board shall either deny the application or approve the application with conditions to ensure all of the criteria and standards will be met by the subdivision.” Any Board member who votes against the application must disagree with the Findings of Fact and state why. How the applicant has responded to the performance standards will dictate how we vote.

11.1 The proposed subdivision will not result in undue air or water pollution.

A. The proposed subdivision shall not discharge wastewater to a water body without a license from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection. Wastewater will be handled with subsurface wastewater systems. Copies of the subsurface wastewater results from David Marceau along with the soil classification and description sheets for each test pit were submitted and included with the preliminary application.

B. Discharges of storm water shall be treated to remove oil, grease, and sediment prior to discharge into surface water bodies. When the subdivision is within the watershed of a great pond, the storm water shall be treated in order to remove excess nutrients. The proposed improvements will not create an increase in stormwater runoff.

C. Applicable State and local health and water resource rules and regulations shall be adhered to. All state and local health and water resource rules will be adhered to.

11.2 The proposed subdivision has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the subdivision. The proposed units will be served by the existing private wells located on the property. There are two functioning wells located on the property, which served the previous development.

11.3 The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used. The proposed lots will utilize the existing wells and will not affect the existing water supply.

11.4 The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land’s capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results. Very minimal soil disturbance is proposed. Any soil disturbance or areas susceptible to erosion will be controlled in

accordance with the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Construction: Best Management Practices.

11.5 The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed. The proposed use will reduce the overall trips generated when compared to the previous use. See the ITE Trip Generation Summary provided as part of the application.

11.6 The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services if they are to be used. Sewage disposal will be by private subsurface wastewater disposal systems. See the Existing Septic System Summary provided by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying and supporting information provided as part of the application. Also see a letter from David L. Marceau, LSE indicating that there are two areas where subsurface wastewater systems can be installed to handle wastewater produced by the proposed units. A copy of the soil classification and description sheets for each test pit is included with the preliminary application from David Marceau.

11.7 The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be used. The residents of this subdivision will utilize the Midcoast Solid Waste Corporation to dispose of solid waste. The proposed nine residential units will not place an unreasonable burden on the MSWC facility.

11.8 The proposed subdivision will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.

A. Preservation of natural beauty and aesthetics. The project will not negatively affect the natural beauty or aesthetics. There are no new roads proposed and the existing buildings are being improved.

B. Retention of open spaces and natural or historic features. The proposed subdivision is not located in an area designated by the comprehensive plan as open space or greenbelt. The proposed subdivision is not located within an area designated as a unique natural area by the Comprehensive Plan or the Maine Natural Areas Program. The proposed subdivision is not located within an area designated as a site of historic or prehistoric importance by the Comprehensive Plan or the Maine Historic Preservation Commission. There is no land designated as public open space. However, the majority of the 36-acre parcel remains undeveloped (approximately 29 acres), which accounts for 80% of the parcel. There is no land area proposed to be dedicated to the municipality.

C. Protection of significant wildlife habitats. The subdivision is not in an area identified and mapped by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the Comprehensive Plan as significant wildlife habitat.

D. Existing public rights of way to the shoreline of a water body. There are no existing public rights of access to shoreline on this subdivision. Therefore, this standard does not apply.

11.9 The proposed subdivision conforms with the duly adopted Subdivision Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Ordinance of the Town of Rockport. It is the intent of this

application to provide a subdivision design that is consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Ordinance of the Town of Rockport.

11.10 The subdivider as adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards. A.

Financial Ability: The applicant proposes to make all improvements as shown on the plans. The proposed improvements are very minimal. Completed condominium units will be offered for sale. As such, a potential condominium owner will not be at risk since they will be buying a completed condo. The applicant does not anticipate the necessity of providing a performance guarantee.

B. Technical Ability. The applicant will retain qualified contractors and consultants to supervise, construct and inspect the required improvements in the proposed subdivision. There are no existing violations or previous approvals granted to this applicant.

11.11 Whenever situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 of any wetland, great pond or river, the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of that body of water. The proposed site is located within the watershed of the ocean and will not adversely affect the water quality.

11.12 The proposed subdivision will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.

A. Ground Water Quality. The test pits shown on the preliminary subdivision plan and the final design of each specific system are determined and will be designed according to the State of Maine Subsurface Sewage Disposal Rules (114A, CMR241)..

B. Ground Water Quantity. The proposed nine units will utilize an existing well and will not adversely affect the ground water elevation beyond the property boundaries.

11.13 If the subdivision, or any part of it, is in a flood prone area, the subdivider shall determine the 100-year flood elevation and flood hazard boundaries within the subdivision. The proposed subdivision plan must include a condition of plan approval requiring that principal structures in the subdivision will be constructed with their lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation. Included in this application is a copy of the Flood Insurance Rate Map with the location of the subdivision shown on the map. The property is not within a flood prone area.

11.14 All freshwater wetlands in the proposed subdivision shall be identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands. The wetland locations are shown on the Final Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1 as located by David L. Marceau, Certified Soil Scientist and Licensed Site Evaluator.

11.15 Any river, stream or brook within or abutting the proposed subdivision shall be identified on any maps submitted as part of the application. There is one stream as shown on Sheet C-1 crossing the property.

11.16 The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate stormwater management. This project will comply with the Rockport Land Use Ordinance. The minimal increase in impervious area does not require that the project obtain a Stormwater Management Permit from the Department of Environmental Protection.

11.17 If any lots in the proposed subdivision have shore frontage on a river, stream, brook, great pond or coastal wetland, none of the lots created within the subdivision shall have a lot depth to shore frontage ratio greater than 4:1. There are no shore frontage lots within this subdivision.

11.18 The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will not unreasonably increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision. This project is not located within a watershed susceptible to increased concentrations of phosphorus.

11.19 For any proposed subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of existing public ways in an adjoining municipality in which part of the subdivision is located. The proposed subdivision lies wholly within the Town of Rockport.

Chairman Leichtman: Is there anything further to be discussed?

Tony Casella: We will be using 30-year architectural shingles on the roofs.

Mr. Alexander: The Fire Chief didn't mention the swimming pool as a water source.

Chairman Leichtman: I spoke to him about it today and he said it was too far away.

Ms. Price: The Fire Chief, Police Chief and Public Works Director always say a project is okay, but the Fire Chief's letter is pretty grey.

Chairman Leichtman: For years I have tried to get him to be more definitive, but in fact the Ordinance asks for exactly what he does, so he is fulfilling the Ordinance requirement and also not stopping a project.

Mr. Murphy: Will any of the buildings be sprinklered?

Tony Casella: I called Northeast Sprinkler Corporation and he agreed that the buildings have not been modified enough to require it. Accordingly, they are grandfathered and do not need to be sprinklered. However, the new buildings in Phases 2 and 3 will have to be sprinklered. Buildings that are more than half reconstructed are considered to be new construction.

Mr. Murphy: I anticipated that answer and know that we cannot require sprinklering. However, in the best interests of the occupants and as good insurance practice, having them sprinklered would be a good idea.

Tony Casella: We won't be doing that in Phase 1, but I talked to the Fire Chief about that issue as well about what fire prevention measures to take and have implemented them, such as overbuilding the walls.

Planning Director Ford: The Fire Chief will accompany the Code Enforcement Officer on a walk-through before any certificates of occupancy are issued.

Chairman Leichtman: I have been on walk-throughs with the Fire Chief and he is very thorough.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the final plan of The Village at Rockport for the creation of nine housing units through the reconfiguration of existing motel

units at the former Spruce Ridge Inn as shown on Final Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1 prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated March 9, 2011 on property at 689 Commercial Street located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in Districts #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0 and the Mylar and four copies of the plan were signed.

Tony Casella: The Board asked us to install directional signs and I have brought examples of the 16"x24" signs that we will review with the Code Enforcement Officer. We had about fifty people at our open house and a lot of them were from Rockport. Many of them are downsizing, but want the sense of community that comes with a clustered development.

II. JOHN M. BRYANT

Representation: **Thomas A. Fowler**
Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers
219 Meadow Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Tel: 207-236-6757; Fax: 207-470-7020
Property: 423 West Street – Tax Map 26, Lot 221-001
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Site plan review to construct a 3,120 sq. ft. tradesman's shop.

Chairman Leichtman: The preapplication meeting was held on February 9, 2011 and we took a site walk this afternoon. Tonight we will hear the applicant's presentation, take Board questions, determine whether the application is complete, hear Board discussion and comments, take public comment and vote.

PRESENTATION:

Thomas Fowler: I am here with Adam Bryant for an application to construct a tradesman's shop on the property for Frost & Bryant. Site plan review was triggered by the construction of a building over 1,000 sq. ft. When the applicants acquired the property it included a three-bedroom 1,480 sq. ft. residential structure and a yard full of debris. The applicants will retain and renovate the residence and further improve the property by the addition of a 3,120 sq. ft. tradesman's shop to be used for the storage of equipment and materials. There will be three full-time employees. A new septic system has been designed to be located southeast of the existing house. The use will be separated from neighboring properties by the buildings, fencing, existing trees and new landscaping. The buildings will be accessed by a gravel driveway that will be widened to 24 feet to accommodate trucks and trailers. The 24-foot wide travel lane will run between the shop and house. Parking will be provided with three formalized spaces in front of the house and a fourth parking spot that can be located in a multitude of locations. Regulation spaces are 9'x18' and there is plenty of room available. A landscaping plan has been prepared by Michael T. Farmer. We have filed the pertinent applications concurrent with site plan review for National Resource Protection Act Tier 1 wetland impact with the Department of

Environmental Protection and with the Army Corps of Engineers for a general permit for 14,980 sq. ft. for the same wetland impact. We have also filed an application with the Maine Department of Transportation for a driveway permit for change of use from single family to single family and commercial, which includes widening of the driveway. All three permits are pending.

There were no Board questions.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to completeness, I found no deficiencies in the site plan or written statement.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To accept as complete the final plan John M. Bryant for site plan review to construct a 3,120 sq. ft. tradesman’s shop as shown on the Site Plan prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated February 22, 2011 on property at 423 West Street located at Tax Map 26, Lot 221-1 in District #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: We will continue with review under Land Use Ordinance Sections 1305, 1000 and 800. With regard to landscaping, you mentioned landscaping between the house and workshop during the site walk.

Thomas Fowler: I guess I misspoke. There will be one shrub on the corner between the two, but the landscaping will be primarily in front.

Ms. Price: You mentioned a spruce tree, but it is not on the plan.

Thomas Fowler: I misspoke about that as well. There is a little spruce tree in the parking area, which is also outside the required 75-foot setback, so only the arbor vitae will stay.

Ms. Price: Does the landscaping have to adhere exactly to this plan?

Thomas Fowler: I didn’t locate all the trees on the plan because some are pretty insignificant. We only show those that are 24 inches or larger.

Chairman Leichtman: All existing trees within the 75-foot front yard setback that are going to stay are shown?

Thomas Fowler: The arbor vitae near the road may be in the way of the sign bed because the sign bed has to be behind the right-of-way frontage.

Planning Director Ford: The vast majority of signs in Town are in the State right-of-way. The Town Ordinance allows signs to be eight feet from the edge of the traveled way. We have never received a complaint from the State as long as there is no safety concern.

Chairman Leichtman: Of the vegetation in the front yard, the only thing you are guaranteeing is what is shown?

Thomas Fowler: Right.

Ms. Price: You show hawthorns to screen the shop. How tall do they get?

Thomas Fowler: We have to start at a 2-inch caliper.

Chairman Leichtman: Is the vegetation to screen the building or to provide a nice looking front yard?

Planning Director Ford: To make a nice looking front yard, and the Board has gone easy on landscaping in the past. The Board has discretion in this area and what has been presented represents a substantial improvement on this property and this stretch of Route 90.

Chairman Leichtman: Screening can serve multiple purposes, such as cutting down headlight glare or covering an ugly but utilitarian building, but in this case it is not really to screen the buildings.

Mr. Alexander: Should we be concerned about the vagueness of what is being done on the east side?

Chairman Leichtman: Maybe if the plan had been prepared by someone whose work we are not familiar with. In this area reputation means something. With regard to special features of development, how large is the backhoe to be stored behind the house?

Adam Bryant: It is small.

Mr. Murphy: Since this is a tradesman's shop, will there be any kind of exterior dust collection system that would make noise?

Adam Bryant: No, equipment and vehicles will be stored inside.

Mr. Alexander: With regard to exterior lighting, is there a concern about the roadway?

Chairman Leichtman: This is not a retail location.

Adam Bryant: The hours will be daytime use from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. with no customers visiting the site.

Chairman Leichtman: Are there any questions or comments about Section 1000?

Ms. Price: What type of siding will be used on the building?

Adam Bryant: Vinyl clapboards to match the house.

Mr. Alexander: Should the building be dressed up a bit?

Chairman Leichtman: It is not right on the road.

Ms. Price: What will the garage door be made of?

Adam Bryant: Lightweight fiberglass that will look just like a garage door.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to Section 800, an industrial use requires one parking space for each 400 sq. ft. of floor area. If the applicant needed to meet that requirement, which it does not, there is plenty of space. Accordingly, we will not require specifically lined parking spaces.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

MOTION – Terri Mackenzie/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the application of John M. Bryant for site plan review to construct a 3,120 sq. ft. tradesman’s shop as shown on the Site Plan prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated February 22, 2011 on property at 423 West Street located at Tax Map 26, Lot 221-1 in District #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0 and three copies of the plan were signed.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board reviewed the draft Findings of Fact for Maple Grove Subdivision. As there were no changes requested, it was signed by Chairman Leichtman.

Review of the minutes of the Planning Board meetings of January 19, 2011 and February 9, 2011 was postponed until the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Planning Board has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 6, 2011.

Nancy Ninnis
Recording Secretary