

**TOWN OF YORK PLANNING BOARD
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001— 7:00 P.M.
GRANT HOUSE**

PRESENT AT THE MEETING WERE ALBERT BIBB, CHAIRMAN, GLENN FARRELL, DAVID MARSHALL, BARRIE MUNRO, AND ALTERNATE RICHARD ARNOLD. STEVE BURNS, TOWN PLANNER, REPRESENTED STAFF. VALLANA PRATT-DECKER, ASSISTANT CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER JOINED THE PANEL. PATIENCE HORTON WAS THE RECORDING SECRETARY. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00. MR. ARNOLD WAS ASKED TO VOTE IN TORBERT MACDONALD'S ABSENCE. THE MEETING WAS TELEVISED.

MIKE PALUMBO, TOWN SELECTMAN, ANNOUNCED THAT DURING THE VOLUNTEERS APPRECIATION NIGHT, HELD THE PRIOR WEEK, MR. BIBB WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO RECEIVE A PLAQUE COMMEMORATING HIS SELECTION FOR THE OUTSTANDING SERVICE AWARD FOR 2001, WHICH RECOGNIZED AMONG OTHER ACTS, HIS SERVICE AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE ROUTE ONE COMMITTEE, AND THE PLANNING BOARD, WHICH HE THEN AWARDED MR. BIBB.

MINUTES

MR. MUNRO MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 27, 2001 MEETING, WHICH MR. MARSHALL SECONDED. THEY WERE APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

THE OCTOBER 11, 2001 MINUTES MET OBJECTION FROM MR. MUNRO, WHO REQUESTED THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN CHANGES.

"Page 3, last paragraph before "When Pigs fly" first two lines;

"MR. MUNRO SAID THE PLANNING BOARD IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR CORRECTING EXISTING PROBLEMS, SUCH AS DRAINAGE PROBLEMS. ITS RESPONSIBILITY IS TO ENSURE THAT THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DOES NOT CAUSE NEW DRAINAGE PROBLEMS OR WORSEN EXISTING PROBLEMS.

"Page 5, Next to last line in 4th paragraph,

"MR. MUNRO EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THE SAFETY OF MERGING DRIVEWAY TRAFFIC AT THE ENTRANCE. ENTERING TRAFFIC AND DEPARTING TRAFFIC, OR, DEPARTING TRAFFIC LEAVING AT THE SAME TIME WILL SOMETIMES HAVE TO CROSS LANES AT THE ENTRANCE. MR. MUNRO ASKED THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO CORRECT THIS POSSIBLE PROBLEM.

"Page 6, first paragraph, line 5;

"HE SAID THAT THE ORDINANCE (6.3.33) IN THIS CASE DOESN'T QUESTION WHETHER OR NOR ROUTE 1 HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO HANDLE 400 ADDITIONAL VEHICLE TRIPS PER DAY, WHAT IS BEING QUESTIONED IS A SAFE DESIGN FOR ENTERING AND EXITING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. SINCE IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO INVOLVE THE DOT, MR. MUNRO THOUGHT A TRAFFIC STUDY COULD BE DEFERRED MAKING IT A CONDITION OF APPROVAL FOR AN OCCUPANCY PERMIT.

Page 6, second paragraph, 10th line,

"MR. MUNRO OBSERVED THAT THE APPLICANT WOULD HAVE TO INVOLVE THE MDOT IN ORDER THE SATISFY THE TRAFFIC STUDY REQUIREMENT.

"NEXT PARAGRAPH MCGEARY IS SPELLED MCGARRY.

"Page 6, second paragraph, 3rd line

"MR. MUNRO SUGGESTED THAT THE ENTRANCE STRUCTURE DOES NOT SATISFY RT 1 DESIGN ORDINANCE 6.13.3. MR. MUNRO DID NOT AGREE WITH MR. BURNS THAT THE 50 FOOT SETBACK AUTOMATICALLY WAIVED 6.13.3.

"Page 6, 4th paragraph, 2nd line,

"MR. MUNRO ASKED IF THE RETENTION POND WOULD SLOW THE DRAINAGE DOWN BEFORE IT GOES INTO THE WETLAND AT THE REAR OF THE LOT.

"PAGE 6, ANY PARAGRAPH, PLEASE ADD FOLLOWING REFERENCE;

"MR. MUNRO ASKED THAT THE APPLICANT REVIEW THE LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR SCREEN THE PARKING AREA FROM THE ADJOINING LOT. HE CITED FOUR ORDINANCES IN SUPPORT OF THIS REQUEST, 6.3.9.1, 6.3.9.3, 6.3.10, AND 6.3.11. MR. MUNRO SPECIFICALLY REQUESTED THAT THE PLANNING BE CONTINUED TO INCLUDE THE UPPER PARKING AREA."

MR. ARNOLD MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED. MR. MARSHALL SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION.

PUBLIC HEARINGS— SHORELAND APPLICATIONS

STAN MOODY, CHAIRMAN OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION WAS ASKED TO JOIN THE PANEL AT THE TABLE FOR THE SHORELANDS MATTERS.

KITTERY WATER DISTRICT, SCOTLAND BRODGE ROAD, MAP 81/NEAR LOT 7A.

REQUEST FOR SHORELAND/WETLAND PERMIT TO AUTHORIZE INSTALLATION OF A NEW WATER MAIN UNDER THE YORK RIVER ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF SCOTLAND BRIDGE. VALLANA PRATT-DECKER INTRODUCED THE FINDINGS OF FACT, STATING THAT THE KITTERY WATER DISTRICT HAD ASKED FOR EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION. TWO OLD CAST IRON WATER MAINS ON PIPE BRIDGE WERE DELIVERING DISCOLORED, RUSTY WATER TO RESIDENTS OF BOTH KITTERY AND YORK. THE APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL UNDER LAND USE ZONING REVIEW SECTION 8.3.14, THAT SERVICES SHOULD BE LIMITED TO ESSENTIAL SERVICES INCLUDES AN EMPHASIS FOR STRICT MITIGATION OF EROSION AND AVOIDANCE OF SPILLAGE OF DIESEL OR OTHER CHEMICALS IN THE USE OF EQUIPMENT USED IN REPLACING THE PIPES. SHE RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE PACKET THAT HAD BEEN PREPARED.

MIKE ROGERS OF THE KITTERY WATER DISTRICT STATED HIS GROUP HAD RECEIVED APPROVAL FROM THE MAINE DEP AND MAINE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION. WHEN ASKED, HE EXPLAINED THAT ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE WOULD BE AVOIDED BY USE OF A CRANE. MR. FARRELL MOTIONED FOR OPENING PUBLIC

HEARING, WHICH MR. MARSHALL SECONDED. NO ONE CAME FORWARD. MR. MARSHALL AND MR. ARNOLD MOTIONED AND SECONDED CLOSING THE PUBLIC HEARING. THERE WERE BOARD DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS ABOUT PORTIONS OF THE BRIDGE OR ABUTMENTS THAT MIGHT REMAIN, WHICH MS. PRATT-DECKER SAID WAS BEST LEFT TO THE ENGINEERS. MR. MARSHALL MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST OF THE KITTERY WATER DISTRICT, TO DRILL AND REPLACE THE LINE AS PROPOSED, AND FOR THE KITTERY WATER DISTRICT TO COME BACK TO THE STAFF ABOUT REMOVAL OF THE REMAINING STRUCTURE. MR. ARNOLD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

PAUL/SHARON GROSS, 181 BIRCH HILL ROAD, MAP 85/LOT 5C

REQUEST FOR A SHORELAND/WETLAND PERMIT TO DIVIDE PARCEL INTO TWO AND ESTABLISH A 50' RIGHT-OF-WAY IN BETWEEN. MR. PRATT-DECKER INTRODUCED THE DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT AS A COMPLEX MATTER WITH THREE SEPARATE ISSUES ON PROPERTY WITHIN A RESOURCE PROTECTION DISTRICT. THE APPLICANT WISHED TO PARCEL LOT 5C INTO TWO LOTS, THE SECOND BEING CALLED LOT 5C-1. THEY ALSO WISHED FOR A 50 FT. RIGHT-OF-WAY CONNECTING THE PROPERTY TO WOODS ROAD. THEY ALSO WANTED TO REDUCE A SETBACK DISTANCE, PERMITTED SEPTEMBER 13, 1999, FROM 140 FT. TO 110 FT. SHE RECOMMENDED THAT THE SETBACK BE DENIED, AND THE RIGHT OF WAY APPROVED. SHE SAID THAT ARTICLE 8.2.7.1 ALLOWED FOR ONLY ONE SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSE ON THE PROPERTY. THE THREE CEOs HAD STUDIED THE VARIANCE THAT ESTABLISHED THE ORIGINAL SETBACK, WHICH THE APPLICANTS FELT THEY CANNOT WORK WITH. SHE DISCUSSED THE PROPERTY'S PROXIMITY TO THE YORK RIVER, WATER QUALITY, VEGETATION, AND WILDLIFE IMPACT, AS WELL AS COMPLIANCE STATUS, AS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE FINDINGS.

THE APPLICANT WAS REPRESENTED BY RALPH AUSTIN, WHO SAID THAT THE 140 FT. DISTANCE WAS DECIDED IN 1999 WITHOUT KNOWING WHERE THE HOUSE WOULD BE, WHICH PROVED TO BE TOO FAR FROM THE SEPTIC SYSTEM. AS NOW PERMITTED, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO FILL IN SHORELAND AREA TO ACCOMMODATE THE SEPTIC SYSTEM. MODIFICATION OF THE DISTANCE TO 110 FT. WOULD MOVE THE HOUSE AND DECREASES THE FILL.

MR. AUSTIN SAID THAT THE 50 FT. RIGHT-OF-WAY IS FOR ACCESS FROM THE ROAD TO THE BACK LAND. HE SAID HE DISAGREES WITH THE STAFF'S INTERPRETATION OF 8.3.8.2, AND FEELS THAT STAFF'S APPROVAL HAS CONDITIONS THAT AREN'T NECESSARY. THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE, BECAUSE THERE IS A BRIDGE NEARBY AND YOU CAN'T HAVE A SETBACK FROM A WATER CROSSING, HE SAID.

MR. AUSTIN SAID THAT AS FOR THE SPLITTING OF THE LOT, THE APPLICANT KNOWS IT CAN'T BUILD IN THE NEW AREA, BUT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SPLIT IT OFF NOW IN THE EVENT THAT ZONING SHOULD CHANGE OR OTHER CHANGES MIGHT OCCUR THAT WILL ALLOW THEM TO BUILD ON THE AREA IN THE FUTURE. MR. AUSTIN CLARIFIED CONFUSION OVER THE LOCATION OF THE NEW LOT BY SHOWING A SURVEY PLAN. HE SHOWED THE BUILDABLE AND UN-BUILDABLE AREAS AND THE LIMITS OF THE SHORELANDS ZONE.

HE SAID THAT THE APPLICANTS UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY ARE IN THE RESOURCE PROTECTION ZONE, BUT QUESTIONED IF THEY WERE IN THE LIMITED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONE, INSTEAD.

MR. MOODY ANSWERED THAT ANYTHING WITHIN 200 FEET OF THE SHORELANDS ZONE CANNOT BE LIMITED RESIDENTIAL ZONE, WHICH MR. MUNRO CONFIRMED. MR. AUSTIN ESTABLISHED THAT THE APPLICANT DID NOT WANT TO BUILD IN THE SHORELANDS ZONE.

APPLICANT DAVE GROSS STATED HE HAD BOUGHT 4 PARCELS OVER MANY YEARS, TOTALING 43 ACRES. HIS CONCERN WAS TO GET HIS CHILDREN SITUATED ON PROPERTY, AS HIS FATHER HAD DONE FOR HIM. ON A PIECE OF PAPER, HE DREW THE BASIC OUTLINES OF HIS PROPERTY, AS WELL THE SEPTIC SYSTEM FOR THE HOUSE BEING DISCUSSED. HE SHOWED THE 140 FT SETBACK, WHERE THE HOUSE WOULD BE, AND WHERE THE FILL WILL HAVE TO BE DUMPED. MR. BIBB WAS CONCERNED IF THE SKETCH IN THE PACKET WAS ACCURATE, ESPECIALLY WHERE THE 140 FT LOCATION WAS INACCRATELY DRAWN. MR. AUSTIN LEFT A SURVEY PLOT, WITH DIFFERENT COLORS SHOWING THE DIFFERENT LOTS, WITH THE BOARD.

THE WAS DISCUSSION ABOUT SEPTIC SYSTEMS AND WHETHER THE BOARD HAS THE RIGHT TO CREATE AN UN-BUILD-ABLE LOT WITHOUT ONE, IF THEY CAN SPLIT IT. MS. PRATT-DECKER SAID THAT A SECOND LOT COULDN'T EXIST INSIDE THE RESOURCE PROTECTION DISTRICT. THE PROPOSED SECOND BUILDING ENVELOPE WOULD BE OUTSIDE OF THAT, WHICH THEY COULD NOT BUILD ON. MR. BURNS SAID THAT IF IT WERE A SUBDIVISION, A DEVELOPER COULD NOT SPLIT OFF AN UN-BUILDABLE LOT.

MR. MARSHALL MOTIONED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING, WHICH MR. FARRELL SECONDED. PAUL HAZZARD, OF 193 BIRCH HILL ROAD SAID THAT MR. GROSS IS TRYING TO HELP OUT HIS DAUGHTER. HE THOUGHT MR. GROSS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROCEED, IN THAT HE WAS NOT HURTING ANYTHING ON HIS PROPERTY.

AMANDA GROSS, DAVID GROSS'S DAUGHTER, OF 181 BIRCH HILL ROAD, SAID THAT THEY HAD BEEN CLEARING THE LAND FOR 2 YEARS, HOPING TO BUILD A HOUSE. SHE DIDN'T KNOW WHERE THE HOUSE COULD GO, BUT IT MEANT A LOT TO HER FATHER, AND SHE HOPED THE BOARD COULD HELP.

DOREEN GROSS, MOTHER OF DAVID GROSS, WHO HAD SPENT 52 YEARS IN THAT AREA, SAID SHE WANTED TO SEE DAVE GET THIS PARCEL GO THROUGH FOR THE FAMILY. HE LOVES THE RIVER AND MARSH. THERE WAS NOT ONE ELSE TO SPEAK, SO THE PUBIC HEARING WAS CLOSED, AND BOARD DISCUSSION OPENED.

MR. FARRELL SAID THAT WHILE BRINGING THE SEPTIC SYSTEM FROM 140 FT. TO 110 FT., AND THE LEACH FIELD TO 100, THERE WOULD BE NO OTHER DISTURBANCE THAN YOU ALREADY HAVE. HE THOUGHT THE NEW LOT NEEDED TO BE RE-CONTOURED, SO THAT SOME PIECE OF THE LAND PERKS. THERE ARE POSSIBLY OTHER SEWER SYSTEMS IN THE FUTURE THAT WILL WORK. HE SAID THAT IF THE GROSSES HAVE A BRIDGE THAT CROSSES THE RIVER, THEN THEY HAVE A SET-BACK OF ZERO. THEY MIGHT HAVE AN ALREADY EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY.

MS. PRATT-DECKER SAID THAT STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF 50 FT. RIGHT OF WAY, WHICH WAS FOLLOWED BY DISCUSSION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY RIGHT NEXT TO THE BRIDGE. MR. MOODY STATED THE APPROACH TO THE WETLAND WAS NEXT TO THE BRIDGE. MR. BIBB SUGGESTED THAT THEY COULD STOP THE RIGHT-OF-WAY SHORT OF THE RIVER CROSSING AND COME BACK BEFORE THE BOARD LATER.

THE BOARD DISCUSSED ITS POWER, OR LACK OF POWER, TO CHANGE THE SETBACK DISTANCE. MS. PRATT-DECKER SAID THEY COULD POSSIBLY CHANGE IT, BUT THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SEPTIC VIOLATION. MR. FARRELL MOTIONED TO ALLOW THE SETBACK CHANGE FROM 140 TO 110, WHICH MR. MUNRO SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

THE BOARD DISCUSSION WENT TO THE CREATION OF AN UN-BUILDABLE LOT. MR. FARRELL MOTIONED TO ALLOW THE 50 FT. RIGHT-OF-WAY THAT STOPS AT THE FIRST BRIDGE, AND TO APPROVE THE DIVISION OF LOTS 5C AND 5C-1, IF IT IS PROVEN THAT THE LAND PERKS. HE SUGGESTED SOME LAND COULD BE BORROWED FROM THE DAVID GROSS PROPERTY TO MAKE A BUILDABLE LOT. HE STATED HE DIDN'T THINK AN UN-BUILDABLE LOT SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED (THE MOTION WAS NOT SECONDED). MR. BIBB PROPOSED THE BOARD GRANT A 50 FT RIGHT-OF-WAY UP TO 50 FT. OF THE CROSSING, BUT NOT DIVIDE THE LOT. HE SAID THAT THAT ACTION WOULD NOT PROHIBIT THE POSSIBILITY OF DIVIDING THE LOT AT A LATER TIME.

THE IDEA OF TABLING THE SPLITTING OF THE LAND WAS DISCUSSED, WITH CONCERNS, PARTICULARLY BETWEEN MR. MOODY AND MR. FARRELL, INCLUDING LOSS OF PLACEMENT ON THE PLANNING BOARD LIST AND THE UNCERTAIN COMBINATION OF ALLOWING FOR THE RIGHT-OF-WAY, WHEN THE LAND WOULD NOT BE SPLIT. MR. PRATT-DECKER DEFINED THE POSSIBLE SOLUTION SUGGESTED BY ALL 3 CEOs, WHO AGREE THAT THE PLANNING BOARD COULD ALLOW A PERMIT FOR ONE HOUSE IN THE RESOURCE ZONE THROUGH ARTICLE 18.2.7.1 (B) AND (C)— BUT CAUTIONED THEM NOT TO GRANT THE SECOND LOT DIVISION BASED ON THIS REQUIREMENT. GO TO THE TOWN ATTORNEY, SHE SAID, IF YOU WANT TO PURSUE IT. MORE DISCUSSION EVOLVED AROUND THE POSSIBILITY OF TABLING THE LOT SPLIT AND GRANTING THE 50 FT RIGHT-OF-WAY UP TO 50 FEET FROM THE BRIDGE. MR. FARRELL THEN ASKED THE APPLICANT IF THEY WANTED THE BOARD TO DENY IT, SO THE MATTER COULD BE TAKEN TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS.

FIRST, MR. AUSTIN ANSWERED THAT HE WANTED IT TABLED, BUT THEN ASKED FOR A SHORT BREAK TO DISCUSS THE POSSIBILITIES WITH THE APPLICANT. WHEN HE RETURNED, HE ASKED THE BOARD TO MAKE THE DECISION DURING THAT MEETING. HE EXPLAINED THAT THE APPLICANTS' ISSUE WAS NOT WITH PERK TESTS AD WASTE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS, BUT THAT THEY MIGHT WANT A BUILDING, LIKE A BARN, WITH NO WATER SYSTEM, ON THE LOT.

CHAIRMAN BIBB STATED THAT THE MR. FARRELL'S PROPOSED MOTION NEEDED TO BE WITHDRAWN. MR. BURNS SAID THAT FROM LOOKING AT ZONING, ONE COULD SEE THAT THE GROSSES ARE NOT ESTABLISHING A SUBDIVISION, AND THAT DIFFERENT BASIC REQUIREMENTS SURROUND THE UN-BUILDABLE LOT CIRCUMSTANCE THAN THE BOARD IS ACCUSTOMED TO.

MR. MARSHALL MADE THE MOTION THAT THEY APPROVE THE 50 FT RIGHT-OF-WAY STOPPING 50 FT. SHORT OF THE FIRST IDENTIFIED BRIDGE. MR. MUNRO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

MR. MARSHALL THEN MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE PROPOSED DIVISION OF THE LAND BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE NEW LOT WOULD NOT BE A BUILDABLE LOT. MR. FARRELL SECONDED THE MOTION. IN DISCUSSION, MR. FARR SAID HE WOULD RATHER APPROVE IT AND HAVE THE APPLICANT GO TO THE STATE FOR A

SYSTEM VARIANCE. HE SAID THAT THERE COULD BE A PROVISION THAT THERE BE NO STATE OR LOCAL VARIANCES WITH REGARD TO SEPTIC. MR. MARSHALL AND MR. FARRELL WITHDREW THE MOTION. MR. FARR THEN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE DIVISION OF THE LOT AS SHOWN ON SITE PLAN, WITH THE STIPULATION ON THE DEED AND THE PLAN THAT THE LOT IS BEING CREATED IN A WAY THAT IT DOES NOT PASS THE PERK TEST. MR. ARNOLD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

OTHER MATTERS

GARY LAMB AND BARBARA CHARRY, OF THE MAINE AUDUBON SOCIETY GAVE A PRESENTATION ABOUT HABITAT PLANNING. THIS INCLUDED A SLIDE SHOW SUMMARIZING CONCEPTS OF HABITAT LOCATIONS, SIZE, IMPACTS OF ROADS, AND BUILDING DEVELOPMENTS, AS WELL AS VALUES IN KEEPING LARGE UNDEVELOPED BLOCKS OF LAND. THEY COMPLIMENTED THE TOWN OF YORK FOR CONSERVATION PRACTICES AND FOR MAINTAINING LARGE BLOCKS OF UNDEVELOPED LAND.

LEWIS STOWE GAVE AN UPDATE OF THE PLANNING & ORDINANCE COMMITTEE, SAYING THAT THEY ARE ON SCHEDULE. MOST GROUP MEETINGS ARE FINISHED, INCLUDING B&B, HOME OCCUPATIONS, HISTORICAL HOUSING, RURAL, AND CAMPGROUNDS. THERE WERE STILL TO BE 2 MEETINGS INVOLVING THE PLANNING BOARD ON NOVEMBER 1 AND NOVEMBER 14. DRAFT 8 IS SLATED FOR COMPLETING IN NOVEMBER, AND DRAFT 9 WILL BE FINISHED AROUND CHRISTMAS, HE SAID. A MEETING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING WAS BEING DELAYED, WHILE WAITING FOR STATISTICS ABOUT WHAT CONSTITUTES AFFORDABLE HOUSING. THE HOSPITAL MEETING HAD NOT YET OCCURRED EITHER. FINAL COMMENTS WOULD SOON BE GATHERED FOR DRAFT 8, AND THE FINAL 2002 COMP PLAN WAS SCHEDULED FOR FINAL DEVELOPMENT LATER.

BARRIE MUNRO DISCUSSED CAPITAL PLANNING AND HIS WORK ON IT WITH STEVE BURNS. THEIR PLAN IS TO IMPROVE ON YORK'S CAPITAL PLAN, INCLUDING MINIMIZING THE ATMOSPHERE OF ARGUMENT BY RECOMMENDING THE RESURFACING OF A PERCENTAGE OF THE ROADS, ANNUALLY, E.G., RATHER THAN ESTABLISHING AN ARBITRARY COST TO PAY FOR IT. THE QUALIFICATION AND THE QUANTIFICATION OF FUNDING WERE BEING ELIMINATED, LEAVING DISPUTE TO THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE TO DEAL WITH THE WORK. MR. BIBB SAID THAT HE THOUGHT THE APPROACH WAS ON THE RIGHT TRACK.

MR. BURNS SAID THAT THE AMERICAN LEGION HAD GOTTEN A PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO BUILD NEXT THE STOP AND SAVE, AND HAD REQUESTED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME. MR. ARNOLD AND MR. MARSHALL MOTIONED AND SECONDED TO GRANT THE EXTENSION, WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, 5-0.

THERE WAS DISCUSSION ABOUT THE AGENDA FOR THE NEXT PLANNING BOARD MEETING, INCLUDING MATTERS CONCERNING PAUL HOLLIS AND YORK SPORTS. MS. PRATT-DECKER REPORTED ON THE SHORELANDS COMMITTEE'S PROGRESS WITH THE QUANTITY OF PERMITS, WHICH WERE ORIGINALLY 55, WENT DOWN BY 22 THAT WERE PROCESSED, LEAVING 33. HOWEVER, IN THE SAME TIME SHE HAS RECEIVED 25 MORE. SHE HAS BEEN TOLD TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY TO ONE A DAY.

THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT ADVANCE RECEIPT AND REVIEW OF SHORELANDS APPLICATION PACKETS, AND MR. MOODY'S CONSERVATION COMMISSION'S

ACCESSIBILITY OF AND REVIEW OF PACKETS IN TIME FOR HEARINGS. FOR EXAMPLE, HE DIDN'T GET THE TWO PACKETS FOR THAT EVENING'S REVIEW UNTIL MOMENTS BEFORE THE MEETING. HE SAID THAT HE HOPED THE PACKETS COULD BE COMPLETE AND UP TO SNUFF. HE SAID THAT THE TRIAGE PROCESS THAT WAS SET BY ORDINANCE SLOWED THE PROCESS UP, AS WELL. THE BOARD DECIDED TO INCLUDE 5 APPLICATIONS ON THE AGENDA AT THE NEXT PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

MR. FARRELL AND MR. ARNOLD MOTIONED AND SECONDED THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING. ALL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO END THE MEETING, 5-0. THE TIME WAS 10:35 P.M.