Town of Rockport Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 25, 2026

Meeting held in the Opera House GCPR.

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

Meeting recording link:

https://youtube.com/live/3oVIFXuMH0k?feature=share

Agenda

**Site Visit has been scheduled for Agenda Item 4 – Site Plan Application Review for 3 Cross St located at parcel identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 023 for 5pm.

1. **[HH:MM:SS] Call meeting to order**
2. **[HH:MM:SS] Elect a Chair and a Vice Chair**
3. **[HH:MM:SS] Public comments on non-agenda items**
4. **[HH:MM:SS] Approve minutes**
    a. **May 28, 2026**
5. **[HH:MM:SS] Site Plan Application Review for two multi-family residential buildings with twelve-units in each, located at 3 Cross Street. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 023, which is under contract by Lake City Holdings, LLC. This application is being represented by Gartley & Dorsky.**
6. **[HH:MM:SS] Subdivision Final 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 Caleb Lincoln ~~Gartley & Dorsky~~.**
7. **[HH:MM:SS] Other Business**
8. **[HH:MM:SS] Adjourn**

DRAFT

Agenda Item #1: Call Meeting to order

[00:00:00]

Meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm and a quorum was established.

Agenda Item #2: Elect a Chair and a Vice Chair

[00:00:35]

Nominations were accepted for Chair and Vice-Chair of the Town of Rockport Planning Board. Their term will start at the end of the meeting.

- Chair - Mr. Laurent nominated Jeff Leclair. There were no other nominations. All voted in favor. 4-0-0
- Vice-Chair - Mr. Laurent nominated Jan Rosenbaum. There were no other nominations. All voted in favor. 3-0-0

Agenda Item #3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

[00:01:48]

No Comments received for non-agenda items.

Agenda Item #4: Approval of minutes May 28, 2026

[00:02:04]

Mr. Laurent suggested to use "explained" or "said" instead of the word "mentioned", which sounds like an afterthought. Chair Leclair also made a request to remove the discussion of adjournment from the minutes.

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to approve the May 28, 2026 minutes as noted.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

Agenda Item #5: Site Plan Application Review for two multi-family residential buildings with twelve-units in each, located at 3 Cross Street. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 023, which is under contract by Lake City Holdings, LLC. This application is being represented by Gartley & Dorsky.

[00:03:29]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: none

Chair Leclair stated that a site walk was done prior to the meeting with members of the Planning Board and public. No official notes were taken.

DRAFT

PRESENTATION:

The applicants - Caleb Lincoln and Ed Libby (from Lake City Holdings [LCH]) and Will Gartley and Staci (from Gartley & Dorski) – are presenting the site plan application review for 3 Cross Street. LCH recently finished another workforce housing project at Madelyn Lane. LCH is working with the Lesher Family Foundation and the Bringham Family for the housing project at 3 Cross Street.

Mr. Lincoln stated that there are minimal changes from their pre-application submission. Those included changes to the building façade and efforts to preserve the artesian well on site. Mr. Gartley continued with additional site details: use of existing parking lot with landscaping, public water and sewer service, underground power, sprinkling the buildings, 36 parking spaces (1.5 spaces/unit), drainage improvements, erosion control measures, architectural plans, civil engineering plans, and landscaping plans. Mr. Gartley also consulted the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual and noted that the DOT does not require a traffic study until the section reaches 100 trips during a peak hour, which they calculated 12-17 trips during peak hour.

The big change in the final submission compared to the pre-application is additional materials submitted to address the site plan review in the ordinance. They have included architectural plans, civil engineering plans, construction details, erosion control details and landscaping plans.

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

There were no clarification questions from the Planning Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: **[00:10:05]**

Chair Leclair opened the floor to public comment at 6:11pm. There were written comments received, and the Planning Board has reviewed them.

Steve Bowen, 117 Cross St.: Mr. Bowen submitted a written comment, but wanted to reinforce his concerns about the traffic. He wanted to remind the Planning Board that there is another development underway across the street, adding nine (9) housing units and combined these two developments are doubling the number of housing units on Cross Street. He noted that Cross Street. already experiences significant traffic due to nearby schools and existing neighborhood activity, and that traffic has steadily increased over the past 25 years.

While the applicant discussed projected vehicle trips, Mr. Bowen said he had not heard of any meaningful traffic mitigation plan. He stressed that Cross Street is already difficult and, at times, unsafe for pedestrians, including children and people walking dogs. He described the road as a major route to the schools, with speeding traffic during the morning commute.

Mr. Bowen acknowledged the community's need for additional housing but questioned why Cross Street appeared to be accommodating such a large share of new residential development. He urged the Planning Board to carefully consider the cumulative traffic impacts of both developments and the need for traffic safety improvements before moving forward. He concluded by thanking the Planning Board for its consideration.

DRAFT

Linda Clancy, Rockport Resident and Co-Chair of Rockport Pathways Committee:

Linda Clancy, a Rockport resident and co-chair of the Rockport Pathways Committee, read into the record a letter submitted on behalf of the committee. She explained that the committee's 2026 priority is advancing the design and construction of a Route 90 multi-use pathway, initially connecting Rockport Village to Camden Hills Regional High School.

Ms. Clancy cited recommendations from the 2024 Rockport Transportation Infrastructure Study, which calls for a 10-foot-wide multi-use trail along the north side of Route 90, separated from the roadway where it is feasible to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

She noted that two proposed housing developments at the Route 90/Cross Street intersection present an important opportunity for coordinated planning. She urged the Planning Board to require a cohesive, collaborative design for the intersection and surrounding corridor that incorporates a multi-use pathway while preserving Rockport's rural character.

Ms. Clancy encouraged the Planning Board to include the Pathways Committee in discussions regarding the design of the intersection and Route 90 corridor, emphasizing the importance of long-term planning for public safety, public health, recreation, and transportation.

She also referenced goals and policies from the 2025 Rockport Comprehensive Plan, highlighting the need to balance housing growth with preservation of the town's character, promote public health, improve transportation efficiency, and reduce reliance on vehicle travel. She concluded by expressing the Pathways Committee's willingness to collaborate with the Town and Planning Board to create a transportation corridor that safely and effectively serves pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists while supporting the community's long-term vision.

Devon Salisbury, 29 Cross St.: Ms. Salisbury expressed concerns regarding the proposed development at 3 Cross Street. She stated that, while opponents of the project may be characterized as opposing development, her concerns were not about whether housing should be built but rather about the scale and pace of development on Cross Street. She noted that she and her neighbors supported the nearby Homestead development and recognized the community's need for more affordable and workforce housing.

Ms. Salisbury described existing traffic safety concerns on Cross Street, stating that during her 16 years living there, her mailbox had been struck seven times, with six incidents involving high school students or parents transporting children to school, all due to driver error and distraction.

She urged the Planning Board to allow the neighborhood time to absorb the traffic impacts of the recently approved Homestead development before approving additional housing that would substantially increase the number of residential units on the street. She emphasized the importance of maintaining Cross Street as a safe environment for pedestrians, families, and student drivers, and advocated for gradual, measured growth rather than rapid development. She concluded that slower, incremental development would better support a safe and sustainable community.

DRAFT

Jonathan Goss, MidCoast Regional Housing Trust: Mr. Goss is the President of the MidCoast Regional Housing Trust. He stated that the organization owns property adjacent to the intersection and supports both the proposed housing development at 3 Cross Street and the creation of pedestrian pathways in the area.

Mr. Goss explained that the concentration of residential development at the Route 90/Cross Street intersection warrants careful planning and echoed the earlier comments made by the Rockport Pathways Committee regarding the need for a coordinated design of the intersection. He noted that the existing utility infrastructure, much of which is concentrated at the corner due to the historic development pattern, presents design challenges that should be addressed.

He encouraged the Planning Board and the Town to work collaboratively with Central Maine Power (CMP) to improve the intersection's layout and utility configuration in order to create a safer, more pedestrian-friendly, and residentially appropriate gateway for the neighborhood.

MJ Young, Lesher Family Foundation: Ms. Young thanked the Planning Board for its work reviewing the application and expressed the Foundation's support for the proposed development. She stated that the Foundation views the project as part of a broader effort to ensure that Rockport provides housing opportunities for residents across a range of income levels, which she said is essential to maintaining a thriving community.

Ms. Young noted that this is the third affordable housing project in Rockport supported by the Foundation. She referenced previous support for Compass Point, developed with Habitat for Humanity and serving households earning approximately 30–80% of Area Median Income (AMI), and Madelyn Lane, developed with Lake City Holdings and serving households earning up to 80% of AMI. She explained that the proposed Cross Street development would serve households earning up to 100% of AMI, addressing the "missing middle" segment of the housing market where public funding is often limited. She concluded by reaffirming the Foundation's support for the project and thanking the Board.

Aaron Englander, Maine Coast Heritage Trust: Ms. Clancy read an additional written comment submitted by Aaron Englander of the Maine Coast Heritage Trust for inclusion in the record. Mr. Englander stated that, while he appreciated revisions to the site plan that relocated the proposed building away from the artesian spring's wellhead, he remained concerned about protecting the artesian spring on the property.

His comments urged the Planning Board and the applicant to ensure that the site's hydrology and high groundwater conditions are fully considered in the project's design and engineering. He also suggested that the artesian spring could become a unique feature of the development if it is appropriately protected and incorporated into the site design, emphasizing that respecting the site's natural water resources would strengthen the project.

Jack Swim, Cross St resident: Mr. Swim expressed concerns about the proposed development's traffic impacts, particularly the planned access onto Cross Street rather than directly onto Route 90. He stated that Cross Street already experiences significant traffic during school drop-off and pick-up times, as well as increased traffic on Sundays associated with the nearby church.

Mr. Swim also questioned the proposed parking waiver, noting that the reduced parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit did not reflect the reality that most residents in Rockport require a vehicle for daily transportation. He expressed concern that the reduced parking supply could create additional parking and traffic issues.

While emphasizing his support for affordable housing and noting that residents had not opposed the nearby Homestead development, Mr. Swim stated that his concern was the concentration of multiple housing projects in the same area within a short period of time. He urged the Planning Board to allow time to evaluate the impacts of existing and recently approved developments before approving additional residential projects, concluding that a more measured pace of development would benefit both the neighborhood and the community.

Public comment was closed at 6:23 pm.

DELIBERATION: **[00:22:19]**

Chair Leclair asked the Planning Board if they had any additional questions before they began their deliberation process.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked whether the Planning Board has the authority or responsibility to coordinate with other Town committees that have an interest in related issues and asked whether there is precedent in Rockport for addressing multiple concurrent developments in a coordinated manner while remaining consistent with the Planning Board's rules, bylaws, and review process.

Chair Leclair responded that the Planning Board currently has only one application before it for review and must evaluate that application based on the information in the record. While another potential development has been discussed publicly, no application for that project has been submitted to the Planning Board. As a result, the Board cannot evaluate or base its decision on a proposal that is not formally before it and noted that doing so could be inappropriate.

Chair Leclair also explained that the Planning Board's role in the site plan review process is to evaluate the application under the applicable ordinances and review standards, rather than engage in broader land use planning or speculate about future development. He noted that longer-range planning and coordination with developers on community planning issues are generally functions of the Town's planning staff and planning processes rather than the Planning Board during review of an individual application.

Director Thomas explained that, when a development application is submitted, it is circulated to the appropriate Town department heads for review. For the current application, the relevant municipal departments, including Public Works, have completed

DRAFT

their review based on the proposal before the Board. He also noted that, although there have been discussions about a potential future development nearby, no formal application has been submitted. If it becomes a concern in the future, it will be addressed.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked if a working group or task force should be established to have conversations before multiple projects are under review simultaneously. He also acknowledged that the current application was not the appropriate venue for resolving those broader issues.

Director Thomas said that the process starts in the planning office. Currently there is no precedent in how the Planning Board collaborates with other committees other than a public comment.

Chair Leclair agreed that their responsibility is to review the application before it and determine whether it complies with applicable ordinances and review standards, rather than develop long-range planning policies or community plans. Director Thomas added that the Planning Board may communicate concerns to the Select Board through their liaison.

Mr. Laurent said he has heard many comments about projects being located near major intersections. He stated that locating housing where municipal infrastructure is available is an important planning consideration that supports efficient, sustainable, and cost-effective development. Chair Leclair agreed, noting that the locations for development are reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Leclair asked Director Thomas for an update on the proposed Route 90 pathway, noting that the issue was discussed during the pre-application review. Director Thomas reported that the Town is awaiting finalization of a grant agreement before issuing an RFP for engineering services. Director Thomas said that only conceptual plans currently exist, showing the pathway within the Route 90 public right-of-way, and clarified that only the property's Route 90 frontage could potentially be affected, as the corner lot is not part of the proposed development.

Mr. Rosenbaum asked when traffic improvements might be considered as development increases. Director Thomas responded that the Town has been working proactively with MaineDOT through the Transportation Infrastructure Study and that MaineDOT is aware of concerns at the Route 90/Cross Street intersection. He expressed hope that the upcoming Route 90 pathway engineering study will also evaluate potential intersection improvements in coordination with MaineDOT.

Chair Leclair also noted that the proposed development does not meet the thresholds under MaineDOT or the Town's ordinances for requiring a traffic study. While acknowledging concerns about traffic on Cross Street, he stated that the Planning Board does not have the authority under the current ordinances to require additional traffic analysis or traffic calming measures for this application.

There was a general discussion about the cost and what is included in a traffic study. Mr. Gartley explained that the scope and cost depend on the specific issues being evaluated. It was mentioned that traffic studies can assess existing conditions and estimate future impacts, but projections of traffic patterns involve assumptions about future driver behavior.

DRAFT

Additional Public Comment: Mr. Swim said that the traffic pattern changes during the school year with approximately 6 busses and high school students using Cross Street in the morning. There is also church traffic on Sunday. He is requesting to have 3 Cross Street exit onto Route 90.

Mr. Gartley responded that MaineDOT will not allow them to exit onto Route 90 if there is an option to access Cross Street. Also, the church is relocating.

Chair Leclair asked how many vehicles attend church on Sundays. A member of the public responded that there were 127 vehicles, and another stated that the rear parking lots were built because the church did not have sufficient parking.

Chair Leclair then asked the applicant to explain why the proposed number of parking spaces would be adequate, noting that the ordinance allows the Planning Board to approve fewer spaces if the applicant demonstrates they are sufficient.

Mr. Lincoln explained that the proposed parking ratio is based on experience with similar affordable housing developments, including Madelyn Lane, where actual vehicle ownership has averaged about one car per unit despite higher parking requirements. LD1829 and LD2003 have a requirement for 1.5 spaces per unit.

Mr. Sarno asked the Planning Board for clarification of the regulations for parking. Chair Leclair said that the parking ordinance includes both a standard parking table based on dwelling units and a provision allowing the Planning Board to approve fewer spaces if the applicant demonstrates they are sufficient. He explained that this is an application of the ordinance, not a waiver. Mr. Gartley stated that the proposed parking is supported by industry data showing that multifamily developments typically generate fewer vehicle trips than single-family housing.

The Planning Board also briefly discussed traffic calming. Director Thomas said that if residents were interested in a speed study, they need to contact the Town office.

Additional Public Comment: Ms. Clancy suggested that the Select Board consider establishing an ad hoc committee to evaluate long-term growth, transportation, and pedestrian safety in the area, by bringing together representatives from relevant Town committees, organizations, and development interests. She also acknowledged that these broader planning issues fall outside the Planning Board's role in reviewing the current application.

Mr. Rosenbaum noted that the concerns raised relate to the strategies and goals of the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Task Force and involve multiple Town committees. Director Thomas also said that he is working with the Pathways Committee on the Complete Streets Policy which addresses the transportation and pedestrian concerns.

Chair Leclair redirected the meeting to the application review process. Director Thomas confirmed that the application is complete.

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to accept the Planning Office determination that the application is complete.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

DRAFT

Vote: 4-0-0

Chapter 900 – Zoning Districts [00:55:46]

Chair Leclair reviewed Chapter 900, finding that the parcel is located in Zone 907 and that multi-family dwelling use is permitted. The Planning Board reviewed dimensional standards, including frontage, setbacks, driveway setback, front yard setback and building height. They discussed the building height provision and agreed with the interpretation that the proposed residential structures may be reviewed under the 42-foot height standard based on roof slope language in the ordinance.

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved that the project meets the requirements of Chapter 900 of the Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

Chapter 800 – General Standards of Performance [01:01:54]

Chair Leclair went over the items that applied for this application.

The Planning Board reviewed section 801, Environmental, and found that the application met these requirements.

The Planning Board reviewed section 803, Parking, Loading and Driveway Standards, and found that the application met these requirements. They discussed the request to provide 36 parking spaces, or 1.5 spaces per unit, based on anticipated need and comparable housing projects. No waiver was needed for parking spaces. Chair Leclair also asked about overflow parking and shared access. Mr. Gartley said that temporary overflow parking could be accommodated on site if needed and confirmed that reciprocal access easements and utility easements would be established with the adjacent property. Director Thomas confirmed that the proposal meets emergency access requirements.

The Planning Board reviewed section 810, Service Drops and the applicant stated that service is underground.

The Planning Board determined that sections 802, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816 and 817 were not application for review.

A question was asked from the Public as to why this was not considered affordable housing. Chair Leclair responded that the applicant did not seek any affordable housing provisions (i.e. grants).

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved that the project meets the general standards of performance requirements of Chapter 800 of the Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

DRAFT

Vote: 4-0-0

Chapter 1000 – Performance Standards [01:13:26]

The Planning Board reviewed section 1002, Area Landscape Regulations. The applicant is adding two (2) trees to the existing landscaping in the parking lot and some perimeter landscaping. Their main focus is adding some vegetation and buffering at Cross Street and beautification of the front of the buildings. No changes are being made to the wetlands.

Mr. Laurent asked about the visibility as one exits onto Cross Street. Mr. Gartley said there is good visibility. The trees being added will not block the visibility.

Additional Public Comment: Mr. Bowen expressed his concern about visibility and traffic congestion at the Route 90/Cross Street intersection. He noted that the church had modified its traffic pattern to reduce conflicts at the intersection and that future residents would likely use Cross Street as a shortcut to avoid Route 90 traffic signals, potentially increasing neighborhood traffic.

Chair Leclair acknowledged that, although they cannot resolve the broader traffic issues, the public hearing provides an important forum for documenting those concerns so they can be heard and considered by Town staff and the Select Board.

The Planning Board reviewed section 1003, Architectural Review Standards. Mr. Lincoln stated that the building design will mirror the existing church building with a clapboard and board-and batten siding in a darker color theme to blend in with the tree line.

The Planning Board reviewed section 1004, Parking Lot Design and the applicant stated the parking lot contains parking spaces for cars.

Motion: Mr. Laurent moved that the project meets the general performance standard requirements of Chapter 1000 of the Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

Chapter 1300 – Site Plan Review
§1305 – Performance Standards [01:24:40]

The Planning Board found that the application met the applicable requirements related to landscaping, soils and erosion control, access, parking, drainage, utilities, lighting, emergency vehicle access, municipal services, water quality , air quality and water supply.

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved that the application meets the requirements of Section 1305 of the Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded: Mr. Sarno seconded.

Discussion: Mr. Laurent asked about sidewalk connectivity from the parking lot to the buildings and other common areas (like play areas). The applicants responded that there are some on the landscaping plans. They also noted

that potential connections to path on West Street would depend on the final pathway design.

Additional Public Comment: Ms. Clancy suggested that someday either a sidewalk or walkway for pedestrians be available on Cross Street Chair Leclair stated that in the PUD section of the ordinance, a developer is encouraged to provide sidewalk connectivity. Director Thomas also said that the recent June amendments added number 14-Sidewalk Connectivity to §1305. The discussion emphasized the importance of planning safe pedestrian access for future residents, particularly children walking to school, while recognizing that any future improvements would require additional planning and coordination.

Vote: 4-0-0

FINAL APPROVAL **[01:32:26]**

Motion: Mr. Laurent moved to approve the 3 Cross Street site plan application as presented, finding that it meets the Land Use Ordinance with no additional conditions.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

Agenda Item #6: Subdivision Final 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 Caleb Lincoln.

[01:33:37]

This application was reviewed under the prior Subdivision Ordinance because the application had begun under that ordinance.

PRESENTATION:

Chair Leclair added that the pre-application review was completed at a previous meeting and the applicants identified any potential concerns. The applicant described the proposal as a minor subdivision involving no new development, but rather the division of the existing parcel into additional lots.

The applicants are requesting the following waivers because the infrastructure is already in place.

1. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.6.a – Requirement of written statement from sewer district stating that the district has the capacity to collect and treat the wastewater.
2. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.6.b – Requirement for test pit analysis by a licensed site evaluator.

DRAFT

3. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.7.a – Requirement of written statement from servicing water district indicating that there is adequate supply and pressure for the subdivision and that the district approves the plans for extension where necessary.
4. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.7.c – Requirement for evidence of adequate ground water supply and quality from a hydrogeologist.
5. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.24 – Requirement for a storm water management plan.
6. Subdivision Ordinance Article 6 – Section 6.3.D.25 – Requirement for an erosion and sedimentation control plan.
7. Land Use Ordinance Chapter 800 §805.3.b – Requirement for a street plan, cross section, and drainage plan for private way.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: none

PUBLIC COMMENT: **[01:37:19]**

Chair Leclair opened and closed the public comment at 7:38 pm. There was a written comment received and was reviewed by the Planning Board.

Written Public Comment: Tim Killoran, 600 Commercial St.

Mr. Killoran expressed his concern about possible driveway encroachment and concern that the approval of the subdivision does not adversely affect existing access rights. Mr. Libby noted that the possible encroachment had appeared on prior plans, that the applicant did not intend to disturb the area. He also said that the plan includes protections including a maintenance and repair easement and a 20-foot buffer.

DILERBRATION: **[01:47:59]**

The Planning Board reviewed the final plan and waiver requests, with a condition to obtain a letter from the Public Works Director in regard to the Subdivision Ordinance Article 6.3.D.28.

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to approve a waiver for the seven (7) items listed on the subdivision application.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to require a condition to obtain a letter from the Director of Public Works in regard to the Subdivision Ordinance Article 6.3.D.28.

Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

DRAFT

FINAL APPROVAL: **[01:57:33]**

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the minor subdivision application as presented with the granted waivers and condition of obtaining a letter for the Director of Public Works.

Seconded: Mr. Sarno seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 4-0-0

The Planning Board members will sign the site plan at the end of the meeting.

Agenda Item #7: Other Business

[01:58:36]

a. Land Use Ordinance amendment discussion

The Land Use Ordinance amendments voted in June 2026 are currently being updated and the document is being reformatted. Once complete, it will be uploaded to the website.

b. Workshop

There is a workshop prior to next month's meeting with the Select Board to discuss housing-related changes to the Land Use Ordinance. Topics mentioned included building height, parking standards, planned unit development provisions, turnaround standards, and the need for Planning Board members to bring specific proposed language for discussion. The goal is to approve the language at the next meeting after the workshop.

Mr. Sarno asked if the turnaround diagrams were located. Director Thomas said that his office did find them, but they are still unclear. He removed them since they have been missing from the ordinance for approximately 20 years. It was suggested to cite a standard, if they are put back in.

Data centers were also briefly discussed.

Agenda Item #8: Adjournment

[02:11:10]

Motion: Mr. Sarno moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.

Vote: 4-0-0

Meeting was adjourned at 8:13 pm.

Approved by the Planning Board: [insert date approved]

DRAFT