Town of Rockport Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.

Rockport Opera House
Geoffrey C. Parker Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22
Streamed on Livestream.com

Chair Joe Sternowski, Vice Chair John Viehman, Clark Doran, Louis Laquaglia, Thomas Laurent, Ted Skowronski, Joe Sternowski, Alt. Victoria Condon, Jim Ostheimer

Planner and Community Development Director William Najpauer, Videographer Bruce Hilsmeyer, and Town Attorney Phillip Saucier

Chair Sternowski called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Sternowski asked the Board if they would like to limit the time of individual public comments at the meeting. Mr.Laquaglia suggested three minutes. No further comments or suggestions from the Board.

Motion: Mr. Viehman moved that public comments be limited to 3 minutes. Mr. Laquaglia seconded. Chair Sternowski added that the motion should state "per speaker".
speaker.

Ms. Condon (Alt) was seated as a full voting member.

Item # 1 Consideration of a subdivision amendment submitted by Rockport Property Holdings LLC located at the Spring Mountain Highlands Subdivision. the subdivision amendment is to combine lots 55- 5 and 55-6 and to alter the property line between lot 55-4 and the lot shown as Tax Map 34 Lot 43.

The applicant, Greg Haining of Rockport Property Holdings, explained that the landowners that he represents own two adjoining but separate lots and would like to combine them into one lot. Mr. Haining is proposing to move the lot lines between lots 15 and 55-4, both of which he owns making lot 15 slightly larger.
Mr. Viehman asked why Mr. Haining was proposing the lot line changes. He answered that he has a house and a site plan for lot 15 and he feels the driveway is too close to the existing line and would like to see it moved to give the driveway a buffer. Chair Sternowski asked the applicant about the current lot sizes of lot 15 and lot 55-4, and what the size of each lot be as a result of this change Mr. Haining answered that 55-4 would be 3.78 acres in size.

Chair Sternowski asked Mr. Najpauer to confirm that the minimum lot size for the 908 district 130,000 square feet. Mr. Najpauer confirmed that it is 130,000, but that in these subdivisions, lot sizes are reduced, and land is set aside. The applicant stated that he has marked the land on the lot to be set aside. The existing street frontage has been retained through the reconfiguration of the lots.

Chair Sternowski opened the floor for public comments, but none were offered, and the public comment section was closed.

: Mr. Viehman moved as a finding of fact, that the proposed amendment conforms to the
application requirements. Mr. Doran seconded. No discussion.

: Mr. Laquaglia, moved as a finding of fact, that the proposed amendment meets both the
subdivision and the Section 900 requirements in the land use ordinance. Mr. Viehman seconded. No discussion.

Item # 2 Consideration of a subdivision submitted by Tom Fowlers representing Goose River Holdings LLC located at 50 Park Street Map 35 Lot 69 (908 district) to create a 3-lot subdivision.

Mr. Doran stated that he has a potential conflict as he lives across the street. He does not personally know the applicant and feels there is no conflict but would like to put it to the Board.

Motion: Mr. Laurent moved that Mr. Doran recuse himself from this application [no second]

Tom Fowler introduced himself as a civil engineer from Belfast, representing Project Director Mark Lorraine of Lorraine Construction. With him to present is Mark Ingraham of Ingraham Land Consulting who is contracted to survey the project. They are representing Goose River Holdings LLC, who owns the lot on which the proposed subdivision is to be located, and the Goose River Golf course.

They presented to the Board the final subdivision plan for a proposed three lot, minor residential subdivision on Park Street. The applicant touched on the high points of their submittal requirements as follows:
Three residential lots are proposed. A map was shown to the Board showing the proposed layout of the lots. All the lots are in excess of the minimum lot size of 130,000 sq. ft. for this district. The smallest is 138,000. The largest is in excess of 170,000 sq.ft. One distinction that the applicant has made is that they have further defined lot area as defined by Rockport's Land Use Ordinance and the overall land area calculations, as not all of the land area can be included in the lot size as dictated by the ordinance.

No new common infrastructure is proposed for this project. All new lots will be served by private wells and private septic and will be connected directly to the electrical utilities located on Park Street. Supporting documentation was presented to show the location of the proposed septic systems to show that the lots can support them. An existing septic plan was provided for lot #3 which is currently under construction. The septic plan provided was part of the permitting process for that lot.

Two areas of wetlands are located on the property. These have been surveyed and included in the plan provided to the Board.

Lot #3 has an existing driveway up to Park Street that was also permitted and constructed as part of the building permit process. Sight distance was measured along the frontage along lots #1 and lots #2 using MDOT procedures, and it was found that the sight distance in both locations exceeds the MDOT standard of 350 feet sight distance. There was a minor update from initial plans submitted that the applicant wished to discuss. The initial plans had placed the pinset locations adjacent to the Goose River about 75 feet back from the river; however those locations were not feasible due to tree issues and were relocated by the surveyor and are now reflected in the latest plans.

Chair Sternowski asked if there were any changes in lot area with the pinset changes. Mr. Fowler explained that the changes in lot area are insignificant after the pinset change.

Mr. Laurent wanted clarification regarding the FEMA flood elevation being a loop and asked if it is illustrated in that way due to elevation, and dictated by the fact that the Goose River would only flood on the lower part, with the rest of the wetlands being too high.

Mr. Fowler showed the elevation line. He explained that the river has what is called a Base Flood Elevation which is graduated as the river is close to the ocean. The first contour shows it at 64’ and that goes for a certain distance which goes to 60’ which follows the rest of the property. The shaded area shows a two percent chance of flooding as mapped out on the FEMA flood elevation, explaining the two lines. In any one year there is a two percent chance that the area will flood.

Mr. Doran asked for clarification on the slope of the land and how the developer proposes to handle the steep slopes during development. The slope ranges from five to thirty percent, but down by the river it is flatter. There are some areas in excess of twenty percent on the lots, as shown on the plans, in which Mr. Doran stated that he is concerned about the clearing of those locations. Mr. Najpauer stated that the current restrictions on clearing properties with over twenty percent slope applies to the Shoreland zone. The applicant showed where the Shoreland zone runs through the proposed property and how it is buffered. Mr. Najpauer further explained that there are DEP restrictions on clearing of wetlands but that is not at local ordinance level.

Chair Sternowski opened the floor for Public comments

Ray Dresen introduced himself as representing Merry Spring Nature Center as an abutter stated that Merry Spring has had an archaeological dig going on there for the last three or four years and have uncovered frames of old houses that have been there since pre-revolutionary times. The old Warren Road goes through the Merry Spring property, through the Goose River Property, and up to Park Street. Merry Spring would like to know what will happen in the applicant unearth historical artifacts during their development. They are not objecting to anything, but would instead like the applicant to be made aware.

Mr. Najpauer stated that a property abutter did come in and have concerns about the sight distance related to the driveway on lot 1, and also had a question about cutting and the impact it would have on the existing wetlands and Goose River. Mr. Doran reiterated the concern that the driveway is located on the crest of a hill and it is difficult to see traffic coming from both directions. The applicant stated that there is an existing problem with speeding in that area, and that the proposed driveways be mapped out using careful measurements.

Chair Sternowski closed the public comment section

Mr. Laurent stated that he was looking at the test pits for the SSWD system and it looks like they only have 25- 30 inches of soil before hitting ledge and wanted like to know how this would affect the installation. Mr. Fowler explained that the minimum depth in the state of Maine is 9 inches of soil and there is 24 inches at the site. Bedrock will not be an issue and the project exceed the state standards.

The Board reviewed regarding preparation of the lots. Mr. Najpauer explained that any clearing in relation to erosion is handled during permitting, and the overall cutting is reviewed by the Planning Board to ensure that cutting is not planned for restricted areas.

The applicant assured the Board that they have best practices in place and will follow all applicable laws.

Mr. Najpauer explained to the Board how erosion control practices have been handled between former proposals and the town and how it is typically handled when the applicant applies for a building permit; however the Planning Board can put erosion control stipulations into its site plan review approval.

The applicant has requested a waiver from the required erosion plan based on the development pattern established on lot #3. Total impervious area of the final proposal will amount to three and a half percent of the total area of the subdivision. The applicant explained that, according to Rockport's Land Use Ordinance, one can request a waiver if the total proposed area of a project is less than five percent due to the size of the impervious area the applicant felt that it was appropriate to file a waiver. Erosion

and storm water control practices are currently covered under state law for construction sites, and it would be in the applicant's best interest to handle erosion control appropriately. The Code Enforcement Officer will oversee best practices on the job site.

Mr. Najpauer confirmed that there are currently no erosion control issues on the presently cleared lot.

Article 6 of Rockport's Subdivision Ordinance, Minor Subdivision on page 6-7, article 25 supports the Board in making its determination to grant the waiver due to the project having less than five percent impervious surfaces and the fact that the minor subdivision is not located in the watershed of a great pond, and will not require grading which changes any existing drainage patterns.

There are no documented concerns from the Fire Department regarding this proposal, and no other concerns from the Board.

FINDING John Viehman moved that the application submitted for the Goose River Subdivision plan is complete. Tom Laurent seconded.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING John Viehman moved that the application is in compliance with Section 900 of Rockport's Land Use Ordinance. Louis Laquaglia seconded.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING John Viehman moved to approve the final application Louis Laquaglia seconded.
Carried 7-0-0

Item#3 Continuation of an application review submitted by Gartley & Dorsky for the property owned by 20 Central Street LLC located at 20 Central Street, Map 029 Lot 293 (913 district) to construct a new hotel. (Application revised to consist of 26 rooms)

Representing the applicant before the Board was Mark Corsi from Camden, who is an attorney for the applicant, Tyler Smith from 20 Central LLC/ Bayview Management , and Mathew Levian who is Employee of Bayview management and currently works overseeing its hotels in Camden.

Mr. Smith introduced himself as being there to represent 20 Central St. LLC. He stated that the original site plan was reviewed at the November 21, 2019 meeting and was continued at the December 19, 2019. The Applicant went in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals to request a parking waiver on January 22, 2020, and is now continuing its revised application with the Planning Board tonight.

The applicant reviewed public comments submitted about the project and used that information to make revisions on the final plans. Mr. Smith indicated that he would walk the board through the amendments.

Mr. Smith presented a draft of the exterior building plans and explained that they have decided to reduce the hotel's size and remove a whole story from the building, bringing the building down to four stories from the five originally proposed. The overall room count was reduced by twenty five percent, nine rooms bringing the new room count to twenty-six total rooms in the hotel. The back of the building will see a visual reflection in this reduction.

The new plans reflect a building that lines up, floor to ceiling, to the Shepard Building.

The large iron posts that were on the original plans had resulted in design concerns from residents. The iron posts that supported the two stories of deck have now been partially replaced with brick arches to better compliment the Shepard's Building.
Mr. Smith listed the changes to the front façade of the proposed building. He explained that the decks have gotten smaller, brick has been added between windows and doors to break up the mulling of the window/door combination, and that the elimination of the floor allowed for greater architectural details throughout the exterior design to better match the existing block of buildings.

The backside of the building is now six stories as viewed from behind rather than the seven stories as shown on previously submitted plans. There are two stories located below Central Street. The number of overall fixtures has been reduced by about twenty five percent. Most rooms have an accent light on the exterior walls with a timer that goes off at 10 or 11 PM. John Viehman clarified that they are low wattage and primarily for accents. The fixture on the deck above each door provides primary lighting.

Mr. Laurent wanted clarification as to the height of the new fixtures located on the gables and challenged that any lighting fixtures that are not street lights are prohibited above 25 feet, which would put the applicant's lighting plans in nonconformance of the ordinance. He referenced Section 800, page 8-3, 801.7.4- C, Lighting Standards of Rockport's Land Use Ordinance. The Board asked the applicant if the project could continue with the removal of these fixtures. Mr. Smith stated that it would be a hardship, and no exterior lighting on exits could pose a hazard/safety code issue. There was ensuing discussion among the board as to the context of the surrounding paragraphs. The ordinance intent was clarified to be applicable to freestanding light fixtures.

FINDING Clark Doran moved as a finding of fact that the lighting plan complies with Section 801.7 of Rockport's Land Use Ordinance. John Viehman seconded. No further discussion.
Carried 5-0-2 - Louis Laquaglia and Thomas Laurent opposed.

The backside lighting plan was shown and the applicant clarified that the wall mounted fixtures are there more for aesthetics than for safety and are timed to go off at 11 PM at night but can be overridden by guests using a control inside of the hotel room.
The Central Street elevation was shown to the Board, and some of the architectural details were discussed. The curved rails originally proposed are now straight because of public input.

An image of the common wall between 20 Central and 22 Central was shown and discussed.

Mr. Viehman asked the applicant to clarify how many windows will be eliminated from the 18 Central side of the building. The applicant responded that there would be zero windows eliminated from the common wall as it has zero proposed total windows. There would be approximately 6 windows, in total, eliminated from the 18 Central side, or about 2 per floor.

Mr. Viehman also had a question about the placement of the exhaust duct- in which the applicant explained it would be located going through the roof rather than the side of the building. Mr. Smith explained that the heat pumps will be relocated. Other than minor architectural details, most of the changes have occurred due to the removal of the fifth floor.
Chair Sternowski summarized that the outside dimensions of the building have not changed, but that there are interior details and dimensions that have changed. The envelope of the building has remained effectively untouched. The applicant confirmed this.
Mr. Smith addressed parking and explained that it is the only other item from the November meeting that has been revised since the November meeting. With the reduction in hotel rooms reduced from 35 to 26, the parking requirements will also be reduced according to Rockport's Land Use Ordinance. The new calculated required spaces are 56, 28 for hotel and 28 for the restaurant space. The applicant stated that they are proposing to keep the 57 space requirements which will be met with 21 onsite spaces and 35 off site space. No shared or joint use parking will be utilized to meet the requirements. The offsite spaces will be located at 310 Commercial Street. These were approved by Rockport's Zoning Board of Appeals on January 22nd, 2020.

Mr. Viehman stated that the old requirement was 65 spaces, and the new requirement is 56. The applicant confirmed and explained that the new calculation is based on the 26 hotel room count with two parking spaces, plus one parking space for each sleeping room, and that the two restaurant spaces will feature 84 seats total which is one space for each three seats. By their calculations 84 divided by 3 comes out to the 28 parking space requirement for the restaurant portion.

Chair Sternowski opened the floor for Public comments.

Kristin Collins, attorney representing Kimberly and Rex Rehmeyer, who are abutters to the project. Ms. Collins stated that she objected to the fact that the board made a finding

without opening the motion to public comment. She referenced the lighting standard that the Board had discussed earlier. She stated that all the issues that were previously raised, remain. The applicant did not take the opportunity to reduce the size of the building to allow some view sheds around the building, despite removing a whole floor of rooms.

She went on to state that parking and traffic issues still exist. Offsite parking is insufficient to meet the practical needs of the hotel guests and the town cannot be sure that it will always be used. The applicant admitted that they intend not to use it when the load is light. At the very least, the Planning Board must mandate that the offsite parking spaces be used for the hotel. The spaces in the back may be useful for the restaurant, but they are not practical for the hotel, and she feels that it should be included in the conditions of approval.

Traffic and safety problems will arise as guests hover and pull over and unload bags. The lot has shared uses, not not only from the previously approved Planning Board uses, but for a whole bunch of uses that did not come before the Board, such as the coffee shop. Guests of those businesses and the hotel guests will all be using the back-parking lot making it a shared parking lot that should meet the standards of the shared lot parking standards section 1004 of the ordinance. Those onsite parking spaces were previously allocated to other uses. It is unreasonable to suggest that there were applicants before you in prior cases that were agreeing to provide 20 plus parking spaces, and to assume that the Planning Board agreed to have waived those down to zero. If anything, the Planning Board was waiving those standards down to anything that the applicant could provide. Which means that those spaces are already been allocated. They are taken and it is a shared lot.

The applicant has provided no data or expert information to help the Board in determining if there is a undue traffic impact. The Board can, and should under its authority, require that the applicant provide a traffic study. Attorney Collins stated that in all of her 15-20 years doing this that she has never seen a hotel approved without a traffic or parking study. So, in conclusion, the Planning Board can and should require that, especially considering the unknown impact of the library.

Shaun Ram, a resident at 38 Spear St., began by saying that he is not anti-hotel but does have questions. He is concerned with runoff as the parcel is currently grass, and he believes a traffic study should be done in 2020 as the town has changed from the time of the previous study in 2015. His third concern is the pumping station for the waste because the plan shows 70,000 flushes a year, and he is concerned that in the future taxes will be raised if the pump station needs an upgrade. He told the Board that he did not need answers tonight but would like them to consider his concerns in their review.

Rockport property owner Clare Tully approached the Board and addressed the applicant directly, stating that she appreciates the revisions to the application, but the footprint of the hotel remains the same. Ms. Tully has concerns about the infilling that is

going to occur between the two buildings with the planned building wall to wall. In fact, this will block an historic harbor viewshed that dates back to the 1800's, and that the land use ordinance favors the protection of these scenic views from development. She said that she believes approving this application without preserving the historic viewshed violate the Land Use Ordinance which the Planning Board is obliged to uphold. She believes that the plan understates how many windows are going to be blocked off in the Shepard Building which was the subject of a national park service restoration by the previous owner. Not only do many citizens have concerns about the bricking over of windows, but the Maine Historical Preservation Commission in Augusta does as well. She urged the Planning Board to closely examine the issue and what this will do to the Shepard Block Building which is nationally renowned. The hotel was originally presented by Stuart Smith as a 20 room, 26 suite hotel, and the current proposal goes well beyond that. She believes that 20 rooms would allow the Smith family to turn a profit, would add to the tax base, and yet would not irreparably alter the historic downtown which is really only one block. Clare would like to add to the citizen voices that have asked repeatedly for an independent study that is often required by other municipalities. Rockport should do the same. She expressed her concern that the board has not seen a plan for the remote valet parking at Main St. Meats (309 Commercial St.) and that the remote valet parking remains very unpopular with residents. She said that even though it was approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals, she believes that it takes commercial activity and spreads it across three quarters of a mile. She concluded with hope that the Planning Board continues to work for the citizens of the town to uphold the ordinances and with that she thanked the board and Tyler Smith.

Resident John Priestley asked the Board if they have read the letter he authored on January 23rd, 2020. He noted that it is supported by Nine individuals, two of whom were present at the meeting and seven others who could not be there. He proceeded to read the letter attached to this record.

Rockport resident Mark Schwarzmann commended 20 Central LLC for modifying the design to accommodate the comments of others before him. He wanted to address two things. First, the ZBA stated at the time of their approval of the remote parking and stated at the time that it was not in their purview to require a parking study, and that it was up to the planning board only. He encouraged the Board to require that. The other is that the board overstepped their bounds when reviewing 801.7 and the 25-foot rule and encouraged the Board to check with town legal counsel.

Town Attorney Phil Saucier addressed Mr. Schwarzmann's concerns with the ordinance. He stated that what the Board decided earlier was reasonable. He addressed Ms. Collin's concerns about not having a public hearing on the standard – he recommended that when the Board goes through their findings later that they provide that opportunity. Mr. Schwarzman concluded by asking Attorney Saucier to address the parking study.

Mr. Smith responded to some of the questions from the public. The site plan for remote parking was part of the ZBA application and does exist. Regarding storm water runoff, he shared that there will be roof drains, and there is an existing storm water system put onto this site so all of the water from the rooftop of the new building will flow into that system rather than over the parking lot like it does now.

The pumping station capacity has been addressed by submitting letters from the utility companies. By dropping 25 percent of the hotel rooms, it helped with the reduction in required services, and the proposed usage of the pumping station for 26 hotel rooms is projected to be about the equivalent usage of 13 houses.

He acknowledged that there have been a lot of discussions about the traffic study. He explained that there is MDOT data that is done from that road every year. The average daily number of trips for vehicles past the proposed site is 4,700. The ZBA had determined that the proposed valet parking would have minimal impact on that number based on existing data which is available publicly. He concluded that it was determined that there would be a less than two percent impact on traffic in that area.

FINDING Clark Doran moved that site plan application as revised meets the requirements of section 1304 site plan content, seconded Louis Laquaglia. No discussion.
Carried 7-0-0

Chair Sternowski clarified the intent of Section 1305 with Mr. Najpauer. The Board briefly reviewed the applicant's submission of materials pertaining to 1305.

Ms. Condon had a question about loading areas. The applicant responded stating that there are plans to manage the delivery trucks. Mr. Laurent asked if trucks would double park, the applicant stated that there would be no change in downtown delivery patterns as 18 Central and 20 Central will use many of the same vendors. Ms. Condon stated that she still has issues with the loading standards but did not have any further comments to offer the applicants.

It was determined that it was beyond the scope of the Planning Board, and that any traffic flow issues are under the purview of the Police Department to enforce or direct traffic.

Chair Sternowski reviewed the parking lot allocations prieviously approved by other planning boards for the parking behind the Shepards Block building. Mr. Laquaglia had questions regarding how the applicant has handled shared parking in Camden where it currently runs a hotel. The applicant explained that the valet position is a full time job and that the valet employees are tasked with oversite of the usage of the parking lots they will have full control over the leased 21 spaces.

FINDING John Viehman moved that there are 56 off-street spaces required under the revised plan based on public input for the proposed hotel at 20 Central St, 28

parking spaces being allocated for the hotel and 28 parking spaces being allocated for the restaurant. Louis Laquaglia seconded

Discussion:
Mr. Skowronski stated that it's great that the applicant has a parking lot to use, but wanted to make sure that the applicant is held to using their proposed plan for off-street parking. Chair Sternowski stated that the applicant's parking plan will be held as a condition for approval.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING John Viehman moved that as a finding of fact that 56 spaces are required overall, and that 21 of those parking spaces can be satisfied with the on site parking behind the building, with the remainder satisfied by the 35 off site spaces served by valet parking.
Louis Laquaglia seconded.
Discussion:

Mr. Skowronski stated that he still wants assurance that 10 years from now, 20 years from now, the applicant will still be utilizing the valet parking as proposed. The applicant stated that there were conditions placed on the ZBA waiver that was approved that address this issue.
Chairman Joe Sternowski read the findings from the January 22, 2020 meeting in regards to the conditional uses placed onto the applicant as conditions for approval of the parking wavier granted by the ZBA. Attorney Saucier read the ZBA's final motion containing the conditions for approval.

Mr. Laurent expressed concerns about landscaping on the satellite lot. The applicant stated that they are simply leasing the parking lot and that any landscaping concerns should be brought up to the owner. Chair Sternowski stated that it's currently a parking lot and there is no change of use. He confirmed that any issues are on the owner and not on the applicant before them.
Mr. Skowronski stated that he would like to see the board have a little more control over the environment and aesthetics of the remote parking lot. The applicant stated that having the parking lot look nice is in their best interest.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING John Viehman moved that as a finding of fact that the Planning Board review is based on the original application and the subsequent revisions based on public input. Clark Doran seconded.
No discussion.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING John Viehman moved that the application satisfies section 800 general

performance standards including 801.7 and the performance standards have been met. Ted Skowronski seconded.

Discussion:
Mr. Laurent restated his concern with Section 801.7 and how it may apply to the application.

Mr. Laquaglia stated that he believes that the height restriction applies to all light fixtures that are not telephone poles. Attorney Saucier stated that it is reasonable and defensible to read the ordinance either way.
Carried 5-0-2 - Louis Laquaglia and Thomas Laurent opposed.

FINDING Louis Laquaglia moved that as a finding of fact that the application meets all the standards of the 913 Downtown District. Clark Doran seconded.
Discussion:
Mr. Laurent asked for clarification that chimney height is not restricted by the ordinance. This was confirmed.
Carried 7-0-0

FINDING Louis Laquaglia moved that as a finding of fact that the application meets all of the requirements of Section 1000 Performance Standards. Ted Skowronski seconded. No discussion.
Carried Thomas Laurent abstained.

FINDING Thomas Laurent moved to approve the application for 20 Central St. LLC with the conditions set forth by the Planning Board. Ted Skowronski seconded. No discussion.
Carried 7-0-0.

The Board moved on to solidify the following conditions of approval:

#1. A sewer test must be conducted to test the existing sewer pump station's capacity to see if it can handle the additional demands of the hotel and restaurant.

#2. Applicant shall be required to provide a minimum of 35 offsite parking spaces as approved by the ZBA on January 22nd, 2020, and the memorandum of the lease must be recorded in the Registry Of Deeds. A system of valet and shuttle parking services shall remain in operation as long as the hotel is in operation.

#3. The applicant shall provide an easement to the Town for the sewer line that runs through the parking lot behind the proposed hotel.

#4. Hotel and Restaurant employees are required to park off-street.

#5. All service traffic, as reasonably practical, is to be diverted to Sandy's Way.

The review was concluded with Mr. Najpauer stating that he will draft a Letter of Approval to be approved by the Planning Board at a later date.

Item #4 : Other Business:
Chair Sternowski stated that some minutes to previous Planning Board meetings are not approved the Planning Board will need to hold a separate meeting to review minutes and to review the Bylaws. The Bylaws will need to be reviewed in March.

In addition, a site walk is required for the proposed Solar farm, and a public hearing must be held for the ORC proposed changes to the Town's Land Use Ordinance. Chair Sternowski will send a Doodle pool to schedule the site walk and the minute/bylaws meeting. The Board decided to meet at 5:00 PM on March 26 for the ORC public hearing.

No other business.

Mr. Viehman thanked the board for its efforts during the long meeting.

Item #5: Adjournment.

Ted Skowronski motioned to adjourn at approx. 10:20 PM. Louis Laquaglia seconded.
Carried 7-0-0

Respectfully Submitted,

Mandy Marriner Everett