

Town of Rockport Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 26, 2025

Meeting held in the Opera House GCPR.

Board Present: Jeff Leclair, Sam Clark, Tom Laurent, Peter Sarno, Jan Rosenbaum

Board Absent: Scott Gazelle, Robert Dybas

Staff Present: Orion Thomas, Director of Planning and Development
Geoff Parker, Audio and Visual Technician

Absent: John Viehman, Select Board liaison

Meeting recording link:

<https://youtube.com/live/-GjkiK16YVY?feature=share>

Agenda

1. [00:00:25] **Call meeting to order**
2. [00:01:26] **Public comments on non-agenda items**
3. [00:05:05] **Approve minutes**
 - a. 05.22.25
4. [00:05:53] **Subdivision Review – Minor – application for the parcel located at 1113 Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 002 Lot 157, which is owned by Chelsea Market Realty LLC and is represented by Chuck Campbell of Chuck Campbell Architect PLLC.**
5. [00:45:14] **Subdivision Review – Major – application for the parcel located at Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 163-001, which is owned by Mid-Coast Habitat for Humanity and is represented by Michael Sabatini of Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers.**
6. [02:50:36] **Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law for the Site Plan Review application for the parcel located at 242 Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 159, which is under contract by Rock Harbor Management. This application was represented by Ben Todd of Rock Harbor Management at the May 22, 2025 meeting.**

7. [03:04:10] **Land Use Ordinance Amendment work for**
 - a. **Chapter 300**
 - b. **Chapter 900**
8. [03:43:22] **Other Business**
 - a. **Comprehensive Plan**
9. [03:44:59] **Adjournment**

Agenda Item #1: Call Meeting to order at 5:31pm
[00:00:25]

Agenda Item #2: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items
[00:01:26]

Mary Orear presented concerns where businesses did not care how their properties looked to the abutting properties. She wanted to thank the board for addressing those concerns and noticed that on November 5 amendments were signed making changes. Moving forward, she wanted to know the process for new businesses occupying areas when other businesses leave. Are they grandfathered in? Director Thomas stated that the new business would need to go through the application process, and the board would review and decide if any parts would be grandfathered.

Agenda Item #3: Approval of minutes May 22, 2025
[00:05:05]

Approval of the minutes from the meeting on May 22, 2025, were deferred until the next meeting, allowing the members additional time to review/edit.

Agenda Item #4: Subdivision Review – Minor – application for the parcel located at 1113 Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 002 Lot 157, which is owned by Chelsea Market Realty LLC and is represented by Chuck Campbell of Chuck Campbell Architect PLLC.
[00:05:53]

Mr. Campbell presented the information for the subdivision. When they first came in front of the board, they were requesting to add four (4) units, making it a major subdivision. However, they have cut it back to only add two (2) units, making it four (4) units total, allowing them to fall under a minor subdivision. This reduction reduces some requirements from DOT. They no longer need a new entrance permit, and they don't need the storm water plan that was required to get the new entrance permit from DOT. Roof water will be collected and put into a rain garden, which is similar to a retention pond. The actual impervious area to be added is minimal (numbers are on the plans) and a few waivers are being requested, which are permitted by the ordinance.

Waivers being requested:

1. Storm water management plan – they are not in the watershed of a great pond and the impervious area is less than 5% of the overall subdivision

2. Article 6, Section D – because the project is not in the watershed or a great pond and best management practices will be followed during construction.
3. Article 12, Section 6 requires subdivision utilities to be underground. They are requesting a waiver because the other buildings on the property already have existing overhead utilities.
4. Article 13 – performance guarantees – we are not putting in any infrastructure, just building a duplex.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: none

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD:

Members of the board inquired about the overhead connection of utilities. The survey was referenced which shows two (2) lines – one to the house and one to the mobile home. The plan is to add a third line to the same pole for the new dwelling.

PUBLIC COMMENT [00:12:09]

In person public comment - none

Written public comment was received and added to the record. The concerns mentioned will be addressed later in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

DELIBERATION [00:12:45]

The board began the review of the application consulting the Minor Subdivision Ordinance, particularly Section 6.1 and Article 11.

The Board started the review with Section 6.1. Upon review it was noted that the name of the subdivision did not meet the requirements of Section 6.3.D31.

The board discussed the concerns that were raised through written comments about the proper amount of open space/lot coverage being captured. The board agreed that lot coverage is based on the total lot size and not just the buildable portion of the lot.

Another issue raised through written concern was an enforcement issue and the other was regarding the intentions of the planning board. Because of LD2003, the planning board needs to act differently with housing compared to previous planning boards.

The applicant is requesting the following waivers for Article 6.

1. Professional engineers plan for storm water management
2. Underground utilities not being provided
3. Article 6, Section D, 25 – Erosion sedimentation control plan
4. Performance Guarantee

ARTICLE 11 – Performance Standards

Mr. Campbell addressed many of the items in the submission. Chair Leclair asked the board if there were any parts they wanted to discuss further. The board, having reviewed Article 11, feels that the submission materials are sufficient.

ARTICLE 12 – General Guidelines for Subdivisions

The board, having reviewed Article 12, feels that the submission materials are sufficient.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Name the subdivision, add name to the drawing, and provide a fresh copy to the Town Office
2. Amount of impervious soil
3. Run-off control
4. Underground utilities
5. Performance Guarantee

Numbers 3-5 were requests for waivers, which the board discussed and granted.

Further discussion on the waivers:

- Run-off control – waiver is to not have the study done.
- Impervious soil waiver – most of the lot is untouched, and impervious soil is a lot coverage issue. Best practice for silt control (which is outlined in the application) is enough.
- Underground utilities vs Overhead wires?
Since this is not a new subdivision and existing buildings already have overhead utilities, this is a good case to waive the requirement.
- Performance Guarantee – members agree to waive the requirement

[00:39:29] With all the waivers being discussed, the board voted as follows:

Motion: Mr. Clark moved to approve a waiver for Article 6, Section D, Number 24 for storm water management.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve a waiver for Article 6, Section D, Number 25 because the project is not in the watershed of a great pond and best practice managements for run-off management will be applied.

Seconded: Mr. Clark seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Clark moved to approve a waiver for Article 12, Section 6 requiring a subdivision utility to be underground.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve a waiver for Article 13 performance guarantees.
Seconded: Mr. Clark seconded.
Discussion: No further discussion.
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved that the application meets the requirements of Article 6, Section D.
Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.
Discussion: No further discussion.
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Clark moved that the application meets the requirements of Article 11 in the subdivision ordinance.
Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.
Discussion: No further discussion.
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved that the application meets the requirements of Article 12 in the subdivision ordinance.
Seconded: Mr. Laurent seconded.
Discussion: No further discussion.
Vote: 5-0-0

[00:44:19] Final Motion

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved that the project meets the requirements of the Town of Rockport subdivision ordinance with the conditions that it be properly named on the final sheet in the application and that the waivers are applied to the exceptions to the ordinance.
Seconded: Mr. Clark seconded.
Discussion: No further discussion.
Vote: 5-0-0

Agenda Item #5: Subdivision Review – Major – application for the parcel located at Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 163-001, which is owned by Mid-Coast Habitat for Humanity and is represented by Michael Sabatini of Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers and Tia Anderson, the property owner.

[00:45:14]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: none

Mr. Sabatini provided an overview of the project, mentioning items included in the packet. The property has been divided into 2 lots, with lot 1 containing units with a

condominium form of ownership. Lot 2 will house a daycare center sometime in the near future.

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

The board had questions for the applicant regarding additional traffic devices at the entrances, location of fire hydrants, and condo owners bill of rights.

The applicant responded that they had applied and received the DOT entrance permit, and the entrance is aligned with the business across the street. Regarding fire hydrants, there is one on the property and another located on Pascal Ave. He will follow up with the Fire Chief to see if those are adequate for both lots or if upon development of lot 2 another is needed. The applicant further elaborated that they do have a condo owners' bill of rights because it is required for certain funding that was received from the state.

PUBLIC COMMENT [00:58:31]

Stephany and Robert Long – 262 Commercial St.

Submitted a written comment and at the meeting presented photos.

Ms. Long mentioned that they came to express some concerns regarding their home and privacy with the new development. They feel that Habitat is a good organization, has good intentions and agree that Rockport needs additional housing and childcare. However, they feel that the proposed community is too big for the acreage, and that the impact on the surrounding area and abutting neighbors is underestimated. They are concerned about their privacy and trespassing as the development will surround their property. Other concerns include noise and light pollution, disturbance of the wetlands and deforestation.

The Longs made comparisons of this community development to what Philbrook Commons and Firefly have and feel for the acreage available that the proposed community should be reduced.

They also have concerns about the increase in traffic with this development and the similar community next door, especially with the addition of a daycare facility. Though a traffic study was previously denied, they would like it to be reconsidered.

If the project is approved, they would like to request a solid fence to surround the community on the property line for both lots and screening vegetation to provide privacy for them and for the units.

Susan Morrissey, 270 Commercial St [01:12:27]

Submitted written comment

Ms. Morrissey is in support of the Habitat development to provide affordable housing but is concerned that the plan may be too ambitious. Her main concern is with drainage, as some of her property is flooded most of the time, and the saturation lasts for several months. She would like to request that the drainage be mitigated. Ms. Morrissey also has concerns regarding the traffic and privacy of her tenants.

Joe Sternowski, Beech Hill Road [01:17:12]

Mr. Sternowski is supportive of the project and believes that more affordable housing is needed in Rockport. He believes that the Philbrick community is a model for this project and hopes it is just as successful. However, he does have some concerns with sewer access since it is not currently there, and he cannot find any information about it going to the area. He is also concerned with traffic, an issue he brought up at the pre-application process in February, and he has not heard any updates.

Ben Leoni, Beech Hill Rd [01:21:39]

Submitted written comment

Mr. Leoni supports the Habitat for Humanity affordable housing project on Route 1. Young families are not moving into the area due to the expense. Projects like these welcome individuals from all demographics, not just the wealthy. His only concern is related to sewer connection as it is not there currently. He also feels that the project complies with the recently passed comprehensive plan. He feels that it meets the applicable subdivision standards, and he encourages the board to approve.

Amanda Dwelley, Beech Hill Rd [01:32:08]

Ms. Dwelley is in support of the Habitat project regarding the size, storm water management, addressing neighbor concerns, and the idea of providing affordable housing to the workforce. Regarding the daycare facility impacting traffic, she agrees that there are growing concerns. However, other commercial entities in the 906 zone have heavier use and traffic in comparison. The development itself might not have a significant impact on traffic in this area, but it is a growing concern, especially around Pascal Avenue where safety is an issue.

Ms. Dwelley also referenced comments from Mr. Leoni, and the importance of bringing in a younger workforce.

Blythe Castellucci, Simonton Corners off Seaport Dr [01:38:15]

Submitted written comment

Ms. Castellucci is here to support Habitat for Humanity. She is a millennial and a public interest lawyer. She and her husband just became new homeowners, and they were able to afford their home because of intergenerational wealth from both sides of their family. They would not have this house without this financial stability. Ms. Castellucci wants to live in a town that is full of young families and not empty summer cottages. There might be risks, but this is a small step that Rockport can take to help make this community better.

Ms. Castellucci also submitted written comments and asked the board to review them later.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED at 7:12pm

DELIBERATION [01:43:09]

Mr. Sabatini provided clarification on the dimensions of the lots. The application stated that Lot 1 is 3.2 acres, and the daycare lot is .6 acres, making total lot size 3.8 acres.

Ms. Anderson also clarified that Philbrick Commons is 2.5 acres and houses 12 homes with 13 lots. One lot is a drainage lot with a common green space area. There is additional vegetation and gardens, and trees are gradually being added. Firefly Field is a 10-acre parcel that includes about 5 acres of wetlands. The impact of the project was minimal and well received by neighbors. There are natural buffers in some areas, additional plantings, and grass. She believes in natural buffers and not fencing.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PLANNING BOARD [01:46:14]

Mr. Rosenbaum had a question on the non-existence of a sewer for this development. Director Thomas discussed the Sewer Infill Project, which is a grant awarded to the town and the town voted to match the funds, fully funding the project. The process has started with the hopes that the sewer lines up in time with the development. The proposed timeline is within the next year, but an exact timeline won't be provided until the survey is completed.

Mr. Sarno discussed the possibility of a traffic study and what would be done with the results. Mr. Sabatini mentioned that there is not much that could be done because the numbers do not warrant additional measures.

Chair Leclair recalled that this has been an issue that was also brought up in the pre-application and needs to go before the correct forum (planning board or select board) and perhaps a workshop offered as to what the town can do. In the past the town commissioned a traffic engineering report to address problems that exist at the intersections of Route 1, but there has not been any further discussion.

Mr. Clark mentioned that traffic is an enforcement issue, but urban planners work on the details.

Mr. Sarno discussed the importance of buffering and would like to see more within the plans.

ARTICLE 8 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR A MAJOR SUBDIVISION

Chair Leclair started the review of Article 8.1.C. Before approval of the final plan, the application should provide a list of state or federal approvals. He asked Mr. Sabatini what permits they have in hand and which are outstanding.

Mr. Sabatini stated that they have the DOT entrance permit. The RPA is not needed due to the low impact on wetlands. The only outstanding permit is the one for stormwater permit by rule.

Chair Leclair stated that approval is conditional upon obtaining the outstanding permit.

Noting that this review is for a preliminary plan, the board began to review Article 7.

ARTICLE 7 – PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR A MAJOR SUBDIVISION

Chair Leclair reviewed the requirements in 7.2.D and inquired about the forested cover on the recording plat plan and roadway and site development plan and requested that the

differences be described. Mr. Sabatini responded that the site development plans show all the grading, utility detail and tree lines, whereas the recording plat plan is more schematic. If you are looking for the forested cover, it would be in the site development plan. The contoured lines show the limit of disturbance where they connect.

Chair Leclair requested that the amount of screening to adjacent properties would be good to know and have reflected on the plans, since it was an area of concern.

Mr. Sabatini will add additional information to the plan with trees, sensitive areas near properties, and notations on what stays and what is being removed.

Chair Leclair asked if there was a buffer in place for the wetlands. Mr. Sabatini responded that the wetland area could be built on; it would just require a DP permit. But since they have no plans to build in the wetlands, a permit is not needed. The layout of the plan was done with the wetlands in mind.

Chair Leclair also inquired about hydrogeologic assessment. Mr. Sabatini stated that it is also not needed because the wetlands are not being disturbed, nor is there any subsurface wastewater or wet drilled wells. The buildings do not have full basements. They are on a frost wall and slab.

Chair Leclair inquired as to how many peak vehicle trips generated on a daily basis and at peak hours and how it was calculated. Mr. Sabatini estimated 25 trips based on the ITE traffic manual.

Chair Leclair asked about high value wildlife habitats. Mr. Sabatini said there were none in the vicinity.

Chair Leclair also noted that the plans have no great pond, but there is a stream with a setback of 75ft from Harkness Brook, and that they are not asking for a variance or exception according to the summary letter.

Chair Leclair continued looking at the application and public comments and wanted to address light and noise pollution. Mr. Sabatini stated that there is a noise ordinance to cover noise pollution. Regarding light pollution, there are 3 proposed streetlights, and they will comply with the ordinance.

Chair Leclair also commented that noise and light pollution is an enforcement issue, and it applies throughout the town to all parcels and developments. Mr. Clark agreed that most noise and light pollution falls under enforcement. The planning board further discussed that the types of lights on the outside of the homes will fall under the condo association, and the ordinance covers the noise.

Chair Leclair further discussed the roadway. Concerns were raised about runoff, ruts in the road during certain seasons, and whether the project was going to contribute more to that. Mr. Sabatini stated that the road would be a modern road with proper gravel, higher than it is currently with a ditch to carry water to a proposed storm drain system. Since this road is more like a driveway and is on a condo lot (not being turned over to the town), it does not need to meet the roadway standard like a subdivision road. The condo association would be maintaining the road.

Chair Leclair asked Director Thomas if there was a town engineer that reviewed road design other than what is in the ordinance. Director Thomas responded that roads are reviewed by Public Works, and they note any concerns. At any time, a request can be made by the Planning Board for a third-party engineer to review.

Chair Leclair also asked Director Thomas about town road acceptance. Director Thomas referenced a process that is followed which is within the Municipal Road Acceptance Ordinance.

No further deliberations on Article 7.

Chair Leclair asked the board if they felt that the density is under what is allowed in the 906 zone. Are there any concerns? Mr. Rosenbaum said that the town has changed, and additional housing needs to be addressed over the next few years as young people move in to replace the population that is retiring. LD2003 was eye opening to many communities regarding densities.

ARTICLE 11 – GENERAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS [02:21:41]

The project meets the standards regarding air/water pollution.

Maine Water has provided a letter regarding the availability of water, and it does not place an unreasonable burden on existing water supply.

Erosion was discussed during road mitigation and off the roofs. The plan calls for culverts under the road and into Harkness Brook, creating land improvements.

Regarding 11.5 where the property does not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to use of the highways, it was discussed that it was an extent condition not contributing too heavily to traffic.

Mr. Clark reminded the board that it was stated that the applicant would increase the sight lines to the best of their ability with their property and work with the neighboring properties.

Chair Leclair asked the board if they felt the need to request a traffic study.

Mr. Rosenbaum had some questions about the cost, how it is done, and who would conduct the study. Mr. Sabatini said the study would cost between \$5,000-\$10,000. Cars are counted and calculations are done according to the ITE manual. Traffic engineers conduct the study, but there are none locally. Chair Leclair inquired into the confidence Mr. Sabatini had in the result he provided earlier, and he is very confident.

Regarding 11.6 adequate sewage waste disposal, the applicant has provided a letter requesting sewage availability and it would be caveated with the sewer extension. Director Thomas discussed the sewer project and said that the applicant met with the sewer engineers. The extension line and pump station are being built to handle the flow in that area.

Regarding 11.7, causing a burden to solid waste, the units would utilize the yellow bags and go to the transfer station unless the condo association arranged for something different.

Regarding 11.8 the applicant will try to preserve some of the significant trees. Logistics through construction will determine what will be kept.

Regarding 11.9 the proposed subdivision conforms to the duly adopted subdivision ordinance comprehensive plan and land use ordinance for the Town of Rockport, and that will be in the final review.

Regarding 11.10 for financial and technical capacity, the applicant included a letter from Camden National representing their ability to do the project.

Regarding 11.11 the property is not located near a great pond or river.

Regarding 11.12 the subdivision will not adversely affect the quality and quantity of groundwater.

Regarding 11.13 the location is not directly in a flood prone area.

Regarding 11.14, the freshwater wetlands and stream were identified.

Regarding 11.16, stormwater management was discussed.

Regarding 11.17, there is no shoreline.

Regarding 11.18, there is no great pond proximity.

Regarding 11.19, it does not cross a municipal boundary.

The board has the following conditions to attach to the approval of the preliminary plans for major subdivision:

- Traffic Study – waived
- Buffering/screening – indicate on final plan through natural vegetation and what will remain, maybe include photographic views
- Sewer capacity – submit a contingent letter
- Sewer line – contingent on happening (certificate of occupancy would not be issued till the unit could discharge the waste)
- Stormwater DEP – contingent on receiving
- Sight line – work on something within their property to assist with visibility

Mr. Rosenbaum asked informally if Habitat and the contractors meet with the abutters to address concerns.

Mr. Laurent wanted to make sure that the motion mentions that the possible daycare center is not included in this plan, and that it is a future concern.

[02:42:59]

Motion: Mr. Rosenbaum moved to approve the preliminary plan for a major subdivision with the following conditions:

- Address the tree line and screening issue
- Contingent on sewer capacity letter from the municipal sewer department
- Obtains a storm water permit from DEP
- Address the sight line at Route 1 entrance

Seconded: Mr. Clark seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-0

Break taken at 8:15pm to reconvene at 8:22pm. [02:44:07]

Agenda Item #6: Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law for the Site Plan Review application for the parcel located at 242 Commercial St. Rockport, ME 04856. This parcel is identified as Tax Map 027 Lot 159, which is under contract by Rock Harbor Management. This application was represented by Ben Todd of Rock Harbor Management at the May 22, 2025 meeting.

[02:50:36]

This is for Rockport Suites on Commercial Street, moving forward as the Birches at Rockport. Chair Leclair has recused himself from the application, so Vice-chair Clark will conduct the review of the Finding of Fact. Mr. Rosenbaum was absent on May 22.

Vice-Chair Clark asked if Mr. Sarno and Mr. Laurent had an opportunity to review. Chair Leclair reminded the board that there were 4 in attendance at the meeting satisfying quorum, therefore they only need 3 “yea” votes to approve the Findings.

The Findings were reviewed page-by-page to accept corrections.

[03:00:38]

Motion: Mr. Laurent moved to accept the Findings of Facts as amended.

Seconded: Mr. Sarno seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 3-0-2

Agenda Item #7: Land Use Ordinance Amendment work for

[03:04:10]

Chair Leclair would like the Planning Board to review Chapters 300 and 900 (particularly the tables) and have the definitions in Chapter 300 match the tables in 900, remembering to keep them simple so all can understand. These changes will go before the Select Board to be added to the November ballot.

For this process, Chair Leclair referenced Table 917 and compared it to Chapter 300.

a. Chapter 300 – suggested changes

* definitions were copied from another town

- *Golf courses – attractive land for playing golf improved with trees, greens, fairways and hazards which may include clubhouses and shelters. The term excludes miniature golf courses.
- *Golf range – a series of designated areas where individuals can hit golf balls for practice. This may include driving ranges, putting greens and associated amenities such as a clubhouse, restrooms and equipment rentals and sales.

Golf ranges are intended for recreational use and may be open to the public or restricted to members.

- Churches – change to Places of worship
- Ship chandlery – change to Boat storage/shipyard/sales
- Recreation Indoor – currently defined as Indoor Recreation Facility no changes, but will change on table
- Recreation Outdoor – currently defined as Outdoor Recreation no changes, but will change on table
- Resort – need to add to definitions and define as “See Hotel and Motel”, which already has a definition.
- Multi-Family 20 – there was a definition. Director Thomas will look into why it did not carry through after it was voted in. Basically, it is a multi-family development that is 20 units or more.
- Medical Clinics – needs to be defined and checked to make sure it lines up with the correct district.
- Commercial Parking Facilities – a lot or a portion of a lot used for parking motor vehicles where that is the primary use.
- Solid Use Facilities – a building, yard, field or other land area used to temporarily or permanently store discarded household or commercial waste.
- Storage Building - referenced note 7

There was additional discussion on mini storage facilities, and Director Thomas mentioned a design that might work for the community where it is kept within a building that could be climate controlled, and no one would know it exists. This would be different from the mini drive-up units that the community is not interested in.

b. Chapter 900

Edits to Table 917

- Recreation Indoor – change to Indoor Recreation Facility
- Recreation Outdoor – change to Outdoor Recreation
- Resort – add: See Motel and Hotel
- Add to notes: YMCA – change to CU in 901
- Add to notes: Bowling alley – change to CU in 907
- Change Residential to Dwelling (to match definitions) for single family, multi-family, multi-family 20
- Change Residential Dormitories to Dormitories (to match the definition)
- Change Animal Hospital/Veterinary to Veterinary Clinic Hospital (to match definition)
- Heavy Landscaping Business - change to Landscaping, Heavy (to match definition)

- Office/Professional – change to Professional Offices

There was discussion on the proper definition for Agricultural Product Processing vs manufacturing. The board was reminded that they are in charge of land use and to use that perspective. If items come in, then one is not using the land to create it.

Edits to Table 918 B – density for dwelling units

- Add columns for zone 913 and 916, even if they are empty
- Add numbers to zone 913 since we are now building in those areas
- Single Family Dwelling w/o public sewer – change 903, 904, 907, 909 and 913 to 20,000 sqft.
- Multi-family w/o public sewer – add 913 with 20,000 sqft
- Multi-family w public sewer – change 904 to 4,000 sqft

Edits to Table 918 B – minimum density for other uses

- Add 913 along with their allowances
- Add numbers for 902 for the last 3 items because they are allowed in that zone

Agenda Items #8: Other Business

a. Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan has been accepted, and it has been posted online. Director Thomas would like to start incorporating the plan with waiver requests, and eventually with the land use ordinance. Director Thomas requested that the board look at future land use and housing. He will send an email with some points to focus on.

Agenda Items #9: Adjournment

[03:44:59]

Motion: Mr. Clark moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded: Mr. Rosenbaum seconded.

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote: 5-0-0

Meeting was adjourned at 9:16 pm.

[03:45:08]