

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 01-05-2015

Standish Planning Board January 05, 2015 Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by Acting Chair, Carol Billington. Present were Alberta Byrnes, Lester Ordway, Alta Harding, Mike Willette, Bud Benson, Town Planner and Jackie Dyer, Secretary to the Planning Board. Absent were Brian Libby and Cindy Beckwith.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the December 08, 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Ordway made a motion to approve with a correction as to a statement (page 4, 4th paragraph) he made saying that it was not about the application before us on a Shoreland Zoning application, it was a different application on Richville Road. Mrs. Harding seconded the motion, with all in favor. Mr. Ordway made a motion to approve the minutes seconded by Mrs. Byrnes. All in favor.

Approval of Finding of Fact :

Bruce Coulombe, Map 16, Lot 11A, 961 Richville Road, Site Plan Application-Business

Tradesman: Proposed Insect Control

Mr. Ordway made a motion seconded by Mrs. Harding to waive the reading. All in favor. Mrs. Harding made a motion seconded by Mr. Ordway to approve the Finding of Fact. All in favor.

Old Business:

- Bruce & Ruth Stevens, Map 47 Lot 5-134 134 Sucker Brook Road Shoreland Zoning Application

Dennis Harmon was present to represent the applicant. Mrs. Billington said a site walk had been done on December 13, 2014. She was unable to attend but has been to all of the shoreland properties. She said there were some things in the memo that seemed unclear. Mr. Harmon said he hadn't received the memo and he didn't remember there was a meeting until a short time ago.

Mr. Benson said that the water line was not shown on the plan when Mr. Harris did it. On the survey, it was not clear. The plan does not reflect the normal high water line. Mr. Benson said there was a stone wall on the property and that might represent the high water line. This was built on the edge of the lawn and the lake. Mr. Benson said DEP would have to approve any work done within 25 feet from the lake. He said there are height restrictions and they wouldn't be able to go above the 25 feet.

The Stevens would like to leave the cottage the same height as it is now and not make it any higher, than maybe 3-4 feet. Mr. Harmon said it would be 3 feet different than it is now. Mr. Benson said there were not any elevations on the plan at all. Mr. Harmon said that he had spoken to Troy MacDonald from NE Civil Solutions and he is ready to come in at any time and do what needs to be done as far as elevations, etc. He uses a GPS system to get the bearings.

Mr. Benson said that the other issue is that they may not be able to do a full foundation around the cottage and Mr. Harmon said that is not what they are looking for, just a slab underneath and be able to provide stability to the cottage. He said they are looking for maybe 3-4 feet for storage and crawl space. He said it can also be less if that is what the Board

wants.

Mr. Ordway said he feels that this is a good plan and doesn't seem to disturb much of anything around it. Mrs. Billington said that she feels the cottage couldn't move any further away from the water, maybe 3 or 4 inches and the Board members all agreed. She said that when Mr. MacDonald engineered the plan, Mr. Harmon could submit his findings. He said he will do this when the plan has been completed by Mr. MacDonald.

Mrs. Billington asked for an approval of the application and send back to the CEO what can be done by him. Mr. Ordway made a motion seconded by Mrs. Harding. Mrs. Harding said that it should be approved with all of the conditions that Mr. Benson had in the memo. Mr. Harmon said he knows they have to do a vegetation plan and get some permits by rule from the DEP. He will submit to the DEP before he comes back to the CEO. Mr. Benson said they do not know now what the setback is from the water, so that will be left blank in the Finding of Fact until the report from Mr. MacDonald comes through. All in favor and the application is approved with the following conditions of approval :

- Per standards found in 237-12 C (1) b the Planning Board approval of this site plan is limited to structure setbacks to the maximum practical extent. Existing structure, with approximate setback from apparent normal high water line of ____ft. to be demolished and a replacement structure with proposed structure scaled setback of ____ft. built on a new foundation.
- The following plans and calculations must be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Code Enforcement Officer before permits are issued:
 - Structure expansion is permitted per §~237-12 C and §~237-15 B, principal and accessory structures
 - Maximum percent impervious lot coverage not to exceed existing per standards found in §~237-15 B.(5)(d),
 - Stormwater design to reduce runoff and encourage infiltration per standards found in §~237-15 J,
 - Erosion & sediment control plan per standards found in §~237-15 Q.
 - Clearing and a re-vegetation plan (include plantings on the lake side of the property) per §~237-15 P. (2) (a)
- Per standards found in §~237-15 B (5)c , the applicant's proposed new structure may be within the FEMA delineated 100-year flood plain and will, at minimum, need an (Elevation Certificate) to prove to the Code Enforcement Officer that the lowest floor is at least 1 ft above the 100-year flood elevation. The site plan shows a proposed building footprint. The lowest floor elevation or openings of this building, including basement floor must be more than one foot above the FEMA 100 year flood elevation.
- This approval and any permits issued under this approval shall lapse and become void unless the start of construction or operation as defined in 237-16. Administration. F "Expiration of permit." A permit of the Zoning Ordinance begins within one year from the date of the CEO approval. If a substantial start is made within one year of the issuance of the permit, the applicant shall have one additional year to complete the project, at which time the permit shall expire.
- Plans approved by the Town CEO for expansions under this subsection §~237-15 B must be filed in the registry of deeds of the county in which the property is located within 90 days of approval.
- The approval is dependent on and limited to the plan and proposals submitted by the applicant either orally or in writing. Any variation from the plans or proposals is subject to review and approval from the Planning Board, in writing, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve.

- **Dennis & Mary Doherty, Map 59, Lot 1, 106 Stuart Shores Road**
Application

Shoreland Zoning

Jim Fisher from NE Civil Solutions was present to represent the Doherty's. He gave a brief over view of the project and said they are hoping for approval tonight. He said that a site walk was done last month. He said they are looking to add onto an existing house and a garage later on.

He said they have acted upon the suggestions from the Board at the site walk and they have also looked closely at the right of way and hoping to be able to contact the abutters (the McDermotts) and have that resolved and gone. He said they have looked at the overhead power lines and feel what they will now present will be up for approval. He said they have

eliminated the garage and that should take care of any required setbacks from the right of way.

He went on to say that the setbacks from the water have been met with moving the master bedroom a bit forward, with the garage being removed. They are 84 feet from the high water mark and can add a small porch to the side. They are now about 92 feet away from the high water mark. He feels they have done what the Board asked and are pleased with the result. They have also been in contact with CMP about the set back from the power lines, but are a bit unsure (they have nothing from CMP in writing) if the set back is 3 feet or 6 feet. They will make sure they are no where near the lines. They will come back at a later date for the garage.

Troy MacDonald with NE Civil Solutions came to speak. He said that he does not understand the set back as to what he calls a right of way. He had looked at the 1961 subdivision plan for Stuart Shores and said this lot was created before the subdivision was, 1958. He said that he feels that this right of way looks to him to be more of an access easement rather than a right of way. He said he struggles to see how the setbacks apply. He was with a telephone company for years and there were no setbacks and you could build right up to the property lines. He asks why a set back would apply to a lot that was created pre-subdivision.

Mr. Benson said the set backs are required, rather it be a public road or a right of way. He also said that adding the garage at a later date will not require them to come back before the Planning Board, but to go to the CEO instead. He said he believes that they might be able to find another location outside of that 20 foot easement and be able to fit the garage outside that 20 foot set back from the right of way and 100 foot high water mark. Mr. MacDonald said he is still a bit confused and Mr. Benson said he will send him the code explaining this.

Mrs. Harding asked if anyone had seen the neighbor's deed and Mrs. Byrnes said she had a copy and a copy of the subdivision plan. She had asked for this at the site walk and she said she understands the right of way to the McDermott lot goes in, turns right and then goes back in again. She said it looks like the right of way abuts the property line but doesn't go over it. She also said it looks like the property next to it should have the same right of way, but she is not sure. Mr. McDonald said that those lots have never been described as lots 1-3 as they were sold before the subdivision was made. He said the Stuarts were the ones that sold those lots and there is no deed of record saying Lot 1, 2 or 3. He said there is not any lot numbers on the subdivision plan.

Mr. Benson said that the deck will need to be removed and he is asking for them to work with the CEO in the possibility of adding a new deck. Mr. Fisher said that they will deal with the CEO on the garage and the possibility of a new deck at a later date and he is okay with the conditions of approval including the removal of the deck. He said they are way beyond the high water line and they are just looking at approval on what they have, minus the deck.

Mr. Fisher said that he had not read the memo, but he knew what the general conditions of approval are and if he had any questions. Mr. Ordway said he was concerned about the garage. He said the reason why they looked at the setbacks, and now the removal of the garage, would they be able to move the structure back now. He said when the garage was on the plan, that garage was the reason for not being able to move the structure back, along with the septic system. Mr. Fisher said that the garage would have to be under the power line if they had to push it back and that is not legal. Mr. Ordway said his main concern is that they had a garage and now they don't, so they could set it back further from the water.

Mr. Fisher said they would be held to a 20 foot set back if the McDermott's wanted to keep the right of way. The garage would have to come back and they would be impacting a closer proximity to the water then they have now. Their hope is a garage in the future, but they need to know about the right of way before that can be moved on. Mrs. Billington said that this is one of the lake properties that doesn't have much open space around it and one of the few that is a quite a distance from the water. She said they are only talking a few feet towards the right of way and she feels the plan is well done and shouldn't be held back because of this. She said she also feels that a garage would be a great addition down the road.

Mrs. Harding said that this building should be back behind the 100 feet and the right of way will eventually go away. She said that CMP is the real reason why they can't move back and also the septic system. She said she doesn't think the cottage can move back any further and she said that if they didn't approve them for some reason, the deck that was built would still have to be removed. Mr. Benson said he feels they could do the garage at a bit more of an angle and still stay away from the twenty foot set back from the right of way and be okay. The garage could be slid down towards the other garage and they would be fine. Mr. Fisher agreed and said that is what they intend to do.

Mrs. Byrnes asked about the garage not being on the plan and Mr. Benson talking about approving the garage. He told her that the garage had originally been on the plan and was now removed. He said that the garage can be built down the road and they would have to come to the CEO. The garage is completely out of the 100 foot set back and they should look at

angles where it can be built, but they are not approving a garage tonight. They want the garage attached to the house and need to look at all angles. Mr. Ordway said that the charge for tonight was to make sure they had moved back to the maximum practical extent and to him the garage on the plan didn't allow that to happen. He said that with the garage now gone from the plan, it appears that the cottage can now be moved back.

Mr. Fisher said they are caught in a catch 22 situation because of the right of way and not being able to speak with the abutters, the McDermotts. He said they can't infringe on the right of way if they have the garage. He said if the access or right away goes away then there is not a problem, other than with the power lines. He said the right of way dictates a lot of what they will be doing. He would like to do the garage at a later date and not be restricted as to where they can do it. Mrs. Byrnes asked about being allowed to move the power line and Mr. Fisher said anything is possible. If the power line was moved, then the building can be moved back further. He said that is very expensive, but possible.

Mrs. Harding asked Mr. Benson if the Board has the power to grant a side line set back and Mr. Benson told her they do. She said she would rather grant a waiver for the set back from the not used right of way. She said she would rather have the waiver than have the garage moved any closer to the water. Mrs. Billington said that would be after the fact because of the ordinances on the books and the Board has no say in that what so ever. She said that if the garage is not a consideration and then can the building be moved back? Mr. Benson said there is an existing foundation and they are proposing to add to that foundation. The existing will stay, but an addition to it will be done.

Mrs. Harding said last month there was a garage on the plan, but now there is not because of the abutting owner and not being able to get in contact with them. Mrs. Harding said she would rather see the garage on the plan. Mr. Ordway said the sticking point with him is the right of way and does the Board have the right to make a decision encroaching on it? Both Mrs. Billington and Mrs. Harding said that the waiver would not encroach on the right of way at all. They would be encroaching only on the set back, not on the right of way. Mr. Ordway said that until the Board has something in writing before them, he is still against doing anything that involves the right of way.

Mrs. Billington said that in the past, when they have granted waivers into a setback, they have not needed the abutter's permission to do so. Mr. Benson said that was right, but he remembers from the sitewalk that they had discussed the addition of the deck and it being removed and also on the garage, if it wasn't shown, they wouldn't have to approve it anyways and they could go to the CEO for that. He said in regards to the right of way, they can resolve that later. He said he understood what Mr. Ordway was saying and it was an agreement at the sitewalk that the garage would be removed.

Mrs. Billington said that they have had a full discussion on it and did they want to take a vote. Mr. Fisher said they had moved the bedroom back and were now within the 100 foot setback. He said they have pushed everything as far as it can go and they have done all that was asked by the Board. Mrs. Billington said she feels they need a motion and whatever they do with the right of way is up to them and the abutters. She asked is the applicant moving back to the maximum extent possible, not practical. Mr. Ordway said they are not moving back, they have moved in. He said that his concern is that now that the garage has been removed, they have moved in, not back. Why are they adding in on the shoreland zoning and Mrs. Byrnes agrees.

Mr. Fisher said the original house built there has been there almost 50 years and it's in the same location as it has been. He said there are only few possibilities as to what they can do and the Doherty's are looking to retire here when the house is finished. This was once a cottage to them and now will be their permanent home. He said Lester is absolutely right about not showing the garage and they would like to do the garage at a later date. He said there is always room to tweak things somewhat, but moving them would be a huge issue. He said this is done from an architectural standpoint and has been done to accommodate CMP and also the septic.

Mr. Fisher said they respect the Board's opinion and are looking for approval tonight. Mrs. Billington said they have talked it out more than long enough. She asked if the Board wanted to go to a workshop, or what do they want to do? Mrs. Harding asked about placing the garage back on the plan. Mr. Ordway said if the garage was there, then there would be an issue with the set back. He said removing the garage changed the whole plan. Mrs. Harding said they could issue a variance. Mr. Fisher showed the original plan first submitted. He said if they had to go to workshop, they would. He said if they put the garage back on, then they have some issues. Eventually they would like the garage.

Mrs. Harding made a motion that the Board approve the application with the original plan with the change of the garage and that the master bedroom wing be moved back with the new plan, grant a variance to the encroachment of the set back from the right of way that is not in use, nor will it be and also including the conditions of approval per Mr. Benson in his memo. Mr. Fisher said that would be great and they would absolutely be happy to do that. She said she doesn't understand why anyone would block a right of way or block people from the use of something they own. She said she

doesn't understand why people can't build on their own property, right up to the setback line. Mrs. Billington seconded the motion and asked for further discussion.

Mr. Ordway said that maybe the Board should go to workshop because he feels that the applicant will not like the outcome of this meeting. He said if they could take care of the right of way or make it go away, it would be smooth sailing from him. And also add the garage back on. He said at this time he would not vote to approve the plan in front of them.

Mrs. Billington said she has never seen the Board split hairs like they have on this application. She said this application is well done and they are stuck on a point and she feels very sorry for it. She feels the Board is being unnecessarily harsh on the applicant. She said that she feels that the set back from the right of way is what they are split on. Mr. Benson said he spoke with the McDermott's and they told him they do use the right of way to launch boats and even though they don't use it often, they will not give up the right of way. He told Mr. Fisher they had been here and he had received an email from them that they will not relocate their right of way. He told Mr. Fisher he can provide them with a copy of the email.

Mrs. Harding said she felt this right of way was an access to the property and not the water. Mr. Benson said they use it for things that they cannot get up over the hill on occasion. It does not go to the lake, but does help them from time to time. Mrs. Harding said she would be mad if she owned the property but wasn't able to build because of a 20 foot right of way. Mrs. Billington asked for more discussion and a motion. She asked for a vote on the motion to approve the application. The vote was 2 for and 3 against. The approval failed and Mrs. Billington asked if they wanted to move to workshop. Mr. Benson said they may be able to work out a plan and come back for a continued meeting next week and possibly get approval then.

Mrs. Harding asked Mr. Ordway that if they went back to the plan and contacted the abutters and asked them if they had any problem with them doing a variance concerning the right of way, would that be okay? Mr. Fisher said that would work, but didn't feel the right of way was really an abutting issue. Mr. Ordway said the plan before them does not have a garage. He said if the garage was on the plan and they had some type of letter from the abutters about the right of way, he would have no problem. He said something from the McDermotts saying that they would be okay with an encroachment on the right of way would help. Mrs. Billington said that they needed to be very careful as far as landowner rights. She said that if they don't need a letter from the abutters, then they don't and this would infringe upon the land owner rights of the applicant. Mr. Ordway said that without the garage, he sees no reason why the building cannot be moved back.

Mr. Fisher told Mr. Ordway that he didn't think he was being fair and was very discouraged with what was happening. He said at the site walk, the Board told them to take the garage off, move the bedroom back and they would be all set. Now he said that this was just the opposite and he was very frustrated and feels that it just is not right. He said they are now stuck and not happy with the decision. Mrs. Harding said she didn't realize that the garage was coming off the plan and Mr. Ordway agreed. Mr. Fisher said he understands but the Board needs to understand from his perspective, they did exactly what they were asked to do so as not to encroach on the right of way.

Mr. Fisher said it is also very frustrating for his clients as well and they are more than enough feet from the water without having to move back. Could they go with Alta's suggestion and approve his application. Mr. Ordway made a motion to reconsider the vote as he voted in the negative. Mrs. Billington seconded the motion. All in favor of reconsideration of the vote.

Mr. Ordway said he would like to see a plan with a garage, like the original plan was. He said it was a tough one for him as he feels that someone else will come before the Board and ask for special consideration. Mrs. Byrnes asked if a plan was changed mid-stream in the meeting, how would the abutters feel? Would the McDermott's have to come back and have a say? Mrs. Billington said this is land owner rights and not an abutter issue. Mr. Benson said we notify the abutters once and then it's up to them to stay informed. He said the McDermotts saw the original plan and they are aware of the garage. He said they are just not interested in relocating the right of way, and not concerned about the plan itself.

Mrs. Billington asked the applicant to draw accordingly what they are possibly approving and submit it for the record. Mrs. Harding made a motion that we approve the previous plan that everyone has seen with" the deck being removed and the master bedroom being moved back as indicated on the plan received on December 22, 2014. Also" a waiver would be granted from the set back to the right of way." Also the" conditions of approval" that Bud listed in the memo. Mr. Ordway seconded the motion. Mrs. Harding also asked for the applicant to resubmit the original plan. All in favor and the application was approved.

The following are the conditions of approval:

- Per standards found in 237-12 C (1) b the Planning Board approval of this site plan is limited to structure setbacks to the maximum practical extent. Existing deck on lake side of structure with shown Lake Setback of 59'-9" to be demolished as it appears that it was installed without permits. Applicant shall work with CEO to determine what if any deck was originally permitted and if such Lakeside deck could be rebuilt. Existing concrete foundation with 70 ft. scaled setback from normal high water to remain. Additions to this existing foundation on northern side of house with scaled setback from normal high water line of 88 ft. for new master bedroom and a second addition on southern side of house for a four season porch with scaled setback of 95 ft. built on a new foundation.

A waiver is being granted for the attached garage from the 20 foot front set back pertaining to an existing 20 foot right of way on the property, to a set back of four feet. Approval is being granted on the plan submitted and stamped with the date of December 22, 2014. The original plan must be resubmitted before any permits are issued and approved by the CEO.

- The following plans and calculations must be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Code Enforcement Officer before permits are issued:
 - Structure expansion calculations per §~237-12 C. (1) (a), reconstruction
 - Maximum percent impervious lot coverage not to exceed existing per standards found in §~237-15 B.(4),
 - Stormwater design to reduce runoff and encourage infiltration per standards found in §~237-15 J.(1),
 - Erosion & sediment control plan per standards found in §~237-15 Q.
 - Clearing and a re-vegetation plan (include plantings on the lake side of the property) per §~237-15 P. (2) (a)
- Per standards found in §~237-15 B (3) , the applicant's proposed new structure may be within the FEMA delineated 100-year flood plain and will, at minimum, need an (Elevation Certificate) to prove to the Code Enforcement Officer that the lowest floor is at least 1 ft above the 100-year flood elevation. The site plan shows a proposed building footprint. The lowest floor elevation or openings of this building, including basement floor must be more than one foot above the FEMA 100 year flood elevation.
- This approval and any permits issued under this approval shall lapse and become void unless the start of construction or operation as defined in 237-16. Administration. F "Expiration of permit." A permit of the Zoning Ordinance begins within one year from the date of the CEO approval. If a substantial start is made within one year of the issuance of the permit, the applicant shall have one additional year to complete the project, at which time the permit shall expire.
- Plans approved by the Town CEO for expansions under this subsection §~237-15 B must be filed in the registry of deeds of the county in which the property is located within 90 days of approval.
- The approval is dependent on and limited to the plan and proposals submitted by the applicant either orally or in writing. Any variation from the plans or proposals is subject to review and approval from the Planning Board, in writing, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve.

- Robert Beedle, 185 Whites Pt. Road, Map 57, Lots 3 & 105, Shoreland

Zoning Application

Matt Eck from Sebago Technics was present to represent the applicant. A site walk was done on December 13, 2014. They had submitted applications to the DEP and did receive their approval last week.

They have revised their plans to show everything that was asked of them, including reducing the size of the deck on the guest cottage, as required from the DEP.

Mrs. Billington asked if he had received the memo with Bud's comments and the recommended conditions of approval. He was fine with them. Mrs. Harding said the plan was very well done and felt the cottage had been moved back as far as it could be. She said the guest cottage was being moved back and was fine with it. Mr. Ordway made a motion seconded by Mrs. Harding to approve the application with the conditions of approval as stated in the memo. All in favor.

The following are the conditions of approval :

- Per standards found in 237-12 C (1) b the Planning Board approval of this site plan is limited to structure setbacks to the maximum practical extent. Existing Main house stone/concrete foundation with 19.7 ft. scaled setback from normal high water to remain. Existing Guest house & deck with Normal high water setback of 1.3 ft to be demolished and replaced with a new structure setback of 25.2 ft. As shown on Grading and Utility Plan by Sebago Technics project # 08457 for Bob Beedle's property at 185 Whites Point Road revision C dated 12/29/14.
- The following plans and calculations must be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Code Enforcement Officer before permits are issued:
 - Structure expansion calculations per §-237-12 C. (1) (a), reconstruction
 - Maximum percent impervious lot coverage not to exceed existing per standards found in §-237-15 B.(4),
 - Stormwater design to reduce runoff and encourage infiltration per standards found in §-237-15 J.(1),
 - Erosion & sediment control plan per standards found in §-237-15 Q.
 - Clearing and a re-vegetation plan (include plantings on the lake side of the property) per §-237-15 P. (2) (a)
- Per standards found in §-237-15 B (3) , the applicant's proposed new structure may be within the FEMA delineated 100-year flood plain and will, at minimum, need an (Elevation Certificate) to prove to the Code Enforcement Officer that the lowest floor is at least 1 ft above the 100-year flood elevation. The site plan shows a proposed building footprint. The lowest floor elevation or openings of this building, including basement floor must be more than one foot above the FEMA 100 year flood elevation.
- This approval and any permits issued under this approval shall lapse and become void unless the start of construction or operation as defined in 237-16. Administration. F "Expiration of permit." A permit of the Zoning Ordinance begins within one year from the date of the CEO approval. If a substantial start is made within one year of the issuance of the permit, the applicant shall have one additional year to complete the project, at which time the permit shall expire.
- Plans approved by the Town CEO for expansions under this subsection §-237-15 B must be filed in the registry of deeds of the county in which the property is located within 90 days of approval.
- The approval is dependent on and limited to the plan and proposals submitted by the applicant either orally or in writing. Any variation from the plans or proposals is subject to review and approval from the Planning Board, in writing, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve.
- KJK Wireless for U S. Cellular, Map 9, Lot 38, Oak Hill Road Site Plan Amendment (addition of 3 antennas and 6 cables with associated items to existing tower)

Bob Gashlin from KJK Wireless was present to represent U.S. Cellular. He explained that they want to add 3 antennas and 6 cables to the tower off of Oak Hill Road. They did similar work on the tower here at Town Hall. They are proposing to simply do much of the same work. U.S. Cellular has equipment there already and a shelter.

He showed a document showing an overhead view of the tower and also showed a report on the structural analysis showing the tower could accommodate this extra equipment being installed. He also presented a report of radio emissions from the tower and it also says the radio frequency and emissions are regulated from the FCC.

Mrs. Harding said she is good with the application as it is so similar to the last one. She made a motion seconded by Mr. Ordway to approve the application with the standard condition of approval. All in favor.

The condition of approval is

- This approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed by the applicant (either orally or in writing) and that any variation from the plans, proposals, and supporting documents are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:20pm