Town of Rockport Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 28, 2026

Meeting held in the Opera House GCPR.

Board Present:	Jeffrey Leclair, Tom Laurent, Jan Rosenbaum, Rob Dybas, Peter Sarno, Clark Skemp
Board Absent:	Sam Clark
Staff Present:	Orion Thomas, Director of Planning and Development John Viehman, Select Board Liaison Geoff Parker, Audio and Visual Technician

Meeting recording link:

https://youtube.com/live/2zuK1xuvOH8?feature=share

Agenda

1. **[00:00:00] Call meeting to order**
2. **[00:00:15] Public comments on non-agenda items**
3. **[00:00:22] Approve minutes**
    a. **April 30, 2026**
4. **[00:01:29] Subdivision Pre-Application for the parcel located at *6 Madelyn Ln*. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 75-001, which is owned by 6 Madelyn Ln LCH, LLC. This application is being represented by Ed Libby and Gartley & Dorsky.**
5. **[00:46:35] Other Business**
6. **[01:17:36] Adjourn**

Agenda Item #1: Call Meeting to order

[00:00:00]

Meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm and a quorum was established.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

[00:00:15]

No Comments received for non-agenda items.

Agenda Item #3: Approval of minutes from April 30, 2026.

[00:00:22]

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to approve the April 30, 2026 minutes.

Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-1

Abstention: Mr. Dybas was absent from the April meeting.

Agenda Item #4: Subdivision Pre-Application for the parcel located at *6 Madelyn Ln*. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 10 Lot 75-001, which is owned by 6 Madelyn Ln LCH, LLC. This application is being represented by Ed Libby and Gartley & Dorsky.

[00:01:29]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: none

PRESENTATION:

Mr. Libby provided a printed version of the plan that has more information. He provided a brief history. The property development goes back approximately 25 years. The 1st building was a hearing a speech medical office and the 2nd building was larger and housed medical offices. At that time, both buildings were on a single lot. Approximately 6-7 years ago, the Physician Offices moved to Pen Bay, vacating the buildings. The property was then purchased by a developer to convert the buildings into affordable housing. The previous developer had site plan approval for the project across both buildings but did not pursue. Mr. Libby and Mr. Lincoln inherited the property with those approvals. They divided the property and converted the larger building into 18 workforce housing apartments through a Maine housing program for rural rental. It is currently fully occupied.

Currently the smaller building is under contract to be purchased. Because the building already has utilities and parking, the buyer is not interested in the excess land. Therefore, Mr. Libby would like to divide the lot and keep the excess land for development in the future. At this time, it is unknown what the development would be, but when decided a site plan will come before the Planning Board.

Mr. Libby stated that all infrastructure typically subject to review - including roads, utilities, drainage, and parking - is already in place and has been previously reviewed and approved. He has had discussions with Director Thomas regarding the road and after categorizing it according to the ordinance, the road will be a private way and *will not* be maintained by the Town of Rockport. He has also had discussions with Fire Chief Peasley regarding the use of the existing parking area to be used as a potential large vehicle turnaround.

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD: **[00:09:22]**

Mr. Laurent asked whether using the parking lot to meet the large vehicle turnaround requirement would create any issues for developing the back lot. Mr. Libby responded that the dead-end road is what triggers the requirement for a turnaround. Regarding developing the back lot, there is no knowledge of what will be developed there at this time, and it would come before the Planning Board for review in the future.

Mr. Skemp asked about the divisions of the lots. Mr. Libby said that the property was originally 6 acres. The first division was separating the 2 acres for the workforce housing. With this project, they are looking to divide the remaining 4 acres into 2 lots, one with a building at 1.11 acres and the back lot area at approximately 3.5 acres. Mr. Laurent asked if they were retaining ownership of back lot and Mr. Libby said they were.

Chair Leclair asked if they had already discussed with Fire Chief Peasley about the turnaround. Mr. Libby responded that they have and that they will have a letter from both Fire Chief Peasley and the Public Works Director, Mike Young, included in their final submission. The existing buildings have excess parking, and it is not anticipated for the parking lot on the back lot to be used, making it available to be used for a large vehicle turnaround.

Mr. Libby requested to review step-by-step for what's required. Chair Leclair mentioned to the Planning Board that they were not on record for any of the items because this is not a formal application review, but it is an opportunity for them to see it. Director Thomas also mentioned that the June meeting might fall under the new ordinance, but it does the same thing they are doing now. So, if an item is too much for a subdivision of this nature, they would request a waiver.

The applicant then reviewed the minor subdivision application requirements item by item. The Planning Board indicated general agreement with the applicant's approach and discussed several anticipated waiver requests, including materials related to future sewer and water capacity for the undeveloped back lot, stormwater management documentation, and erosion and sedimentation control materials where no new ground disturbance or new impervious area is proposed. The Planning Board generally indicated that these issues would be more appropriately addressed when a specific future development is proposed for the retained lot.

The Planning Board also discussed required easements, maintenance obligations, and private-way documentation. It was clarified that the final application should include updated easement language, maintenance provisions, and a separate private way plan for the roadway, together with review by the Public Works Director. The Planning Board indicated that a site walk was not necessary for this application at this stage.

No formal action was taken on the pre-application. The discussion was advisory in nature and intended to assist the applicant in preparing a final submission.

Agenda Item #5: Other Business

[00:46:35]

a. Land Use Ordinance amendment discussion

The Planning Board discussed a question raised through the Planning Office concerning interpretation of the ordinance language governing building height and roof pitch for a separate proposed 24-unit multifamily housing project on Cross Street. The applicant explained that the proposed structure would be below 42 feet in height and would include multiple roof slopes greater than 8:12, but also some lower-pitched roof areas. The Planning Board reviewed the current ordinance language and discussed whether the footnote allowing additional height for certain roof slopes could reasonably be interpreted to apply to the project.

Mr. Parker offered a semi-public comment that approximately 25-30 years ago the Zoning Board had a similar discussion. The roof pitch was entirely aesthetics.

Planning Board members noted that the language is ambiguous and likely rooted in older aesthetic standards rather than current housing goals. They generally expressed that the ordinance should be interpreted considering the town's comprehensive plan and that the ambiguity should not be used to block the housing proposal. They also noted that the ordinance may need future revision for clarity.

b. AI Summary [01:10:55]

Director Thomas discussed the potential use of AI tools within municipal operations. It was noted that AI can be beneficial for a variety of administrative tasks, particularly in summarizing meeting recordings and generating concise overviews of meeting discussions. An AI-generated summary can be used as a high-level overview of key discussion points. If one wants to know more, they may review the full meeting minutes, watch the recorded meeting, or consult the official Findings of Facts, and Conclusions of Law. The AI summary is intended as a supplemental informational tool and does not replace the official meeting record.

Mr. Rosenbaum likes the idea but suggested that there should be a disclaimer on the AI Summary about potential mistakes.

c. Turn-around Diagrams [01:15:03]

Director Thomas discussed the recently found turn-around diagrams that had been referenced in the ordinance but omitted from more recent versions. The matter was left for administrative follow-up, with the understanding that the diagrams may be reinserted if the pending ordinance amendments continue to reference them.

Agenda Item #6: Adjournment

[01:17:36]

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded: Mr. Skemp seconded.

Vote: 6-0-0

Meeting was adjourned at 7:02 pm.

Approved by the Planning Board: June 25, 2026