

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 09-14-2015

Standish Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

September 14, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Carol Billington at 7:02pm. Present were Mike Willette, newly appointed Planning Board member Amanda Martin, Brian Libby, Alta Harding, Adam Higgins, Cindy Beckwith, Town Planner Bud Benson and Jackie Dyer, Secretary to the Planning Board.

Carol welcomed Amanda Martin, our newly appointed Planning Board member aboard. Amanda said she is a Planning and Policy major in her senior year at USM and she has worked both in the City of Portland and the City of Westbrook on various issues.

First item on the agenda was the approval of the meeting minutes from the August 03, 2105 meeting. Mr. Libby made a motion seconded by Mrs. Harding to accept the minutes as written. All in favor.

The next item on the agenda was the Approval of the Finding of Fact:

- Pompeo Gravel Pit, Fort Hill Road, Map 14, Lot 54-1-5 year gravel pit renewal

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

- Butler Castings, 234 NE Road, Map 10, Lot 48- Site Plan Rev.-change in use

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

Old Business:

- Acres of Wildlife, Pequawket Trail, Map 11, Lots 1-4- Site Plan Review

There was a site walk done last month. This application, per the applicant, was asked to be tabled until the October 5, 2015 meeting, as they are working to gather more information. Mr. Libby made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Harding to table the application. All in favor.

- Maietta Gravel Pit, Richville Road, Map 16, Lots 11 & 12- 5 year gravel pit renewal

Mr. Benson said a site walk was done at the pit. He said there are some comments in his memo about dwelling units nearby and the shooting. Mrs. Harding asked if this application was tabled from last month to this month and what was the reason. Mr. Benson said they were waiting for more information as to the reclamation and also the estimate about how much loam was actually there. He said the issue was how much loam was on site. Mrs. Harding asked if this pit was going to start the reclamation process. Mr. Benson said that there is about 12 acres of the pit open and the reclamation would have to start before any more of the pit could be opened up. He said he has some suggested conditions of approval in his memo. Mrs. Billington said she felt that the Board had all of the information they needed to make a decision. She said they would start going through the standards to see if they are all met. Mrs. Billington said they will go standard by standard as there is only one set of standards for this application. She asked if the Board had any concerns, to please stop her, and they would discuss it. Mrs. Harding said there are some things they can skip over and some they can't overlook at this time. Mrs. Harding asked if there is a reclamation plan and Mr. Benson said they do have it on file. It's also part of the big plan they have in front of them.

Vincent Maietta was present to represent himself. He said he was here to seek the five year approval of his gravel pit. He said that they have had a business in the town for over 30 years and they have had a \$69,000.00 bond since the beginning and this bond has always been left in place. He said there are no seedlings on the plan, just the grass that is on top of the loam, this he said is something he wanted to clarify.

He said there is loam on the site already and nothing has been removed. He said this is his third meeting trying to get this approval. He said they have not really hauled very much from this pit in the past, due to lack of work. He said they have reduced the size of the pit compared to what it was. He said it is essentially a hundred acre flat field. He went on to say the bond was the same, but the open pit is about half of what they had. He hopes to gain approval tonight and not have to come back. He said he has spent about \$15,000.00 on this application between engineering firms and reports that were requested. He said he had two engineers measuring the loam and finally this was accepted.

He said a lot of what he has been asked to do has been unnecessary and expensive. He said he doesn't know why certain things keep coming up in Bud's report and he felt this was very frustrating. Mrs. Harding said some of the earlier concerns are now in the past. She is concerned about the environmental impacts with this pit. She wanted to know if he was planning on opening more acres of the pit. Mr. Maietta said at some point, they were hoping to create a pond and then create a subdivision around it. He said this would be at some point down the road. He feels this would be over the next 10-15 years and not just leave it as a gravel pit. He said they are required at some point to completely close the pit out and are allowed to have up to 20 acres of the pit open at any one time.

Mr. Maietta said they did have 30 acres open at one time, but that was a long time ago. He said they have a small area in the pit that has sand and the rest of it has been dug out. He said that sometime, hopefully, within the next five years, they hope to come in with a new plan that will create the pond and the someday subdivision. He said that is a long ways away and they do not plan on expanding the pit. They will eventually close out the pit and whatever areas they are not using. Mrs. Billington said this comes up every year for a CEO inspection and report. Mr. Maietta said he feels it's not fair to him to start restricting him any further as he already has a bond in place and has had for quite some time. He said if Bud wants to recommend that he doesn't dig out anymore, he wants to dispute that. He said they have closed a lot of the pit and his calculations and Mr. Benson's do not match.

Mr. Maietta said he doesn't want any dispute with the town and being told he has done something illegal. Mrs. Harding asked about the 4-5 years and Mr. Maietta said it may happen and it may not. He said if the economy picks up, it might happen sooner. He said they haven't pulled anything out lately. He said they seem to not be able to do anything without spending a huge amount of money every time. Mrs. Harding said if Bud has any concerns, she is going to question what it is and why. Bud said the bond is an important thing and also that there is adequate loam on site for reclamation when needed. Mr. Benson said the real issue is that the pit is nearing the end of its life and needed funds are needed for reclamation. He said there are some areas of loam, but there are also some areas where there are none and he considers them inadequate.

Mr. Libby said he feels that the suggested conditions of approval need to be done as this pit has been approved for many years past. Mrs. Billington agreed and asked Mr. Maietta if he had any problems with any of them. He said he had not seen a copy of the memo and Mr. Benson gave him one. Mr. Benson told him that he had sent a copy to Shawn Frank. He asked if they were different from any of the previous conditions in the past. Mrs. Billington mentioned about the installation of additional monitoring wells. Mr. Benson said the biggest concern and an important one, is the location in the pit of where they are digging at the present. Mr. Benson said the plan does not represent all of the contours of the pit. He said some of the ledge shows up, but some of it doesn't.

Mr. Benson said the contour lines on a plan are just an estimation of where there might be water. The monitoring well he is asking to be installed is in the westerly corner of the pit. Mr. Maietta said he has had this pit for many years and he has complied with the Town always and done everything that's ever been asked for him. He said that every time he comes in for renewal, he is asked to spend more and more money to meet what the Town is asking for. He said it's hard in this economy to do anything and especially since they are really doing nothing with this pit at the present time. He said monitoring the water table is also done by the Town when they have their yearly inspection and they can also go in 365 days a year if they want. He says they have never had any water in them and have always been dry. He said he feels that Mr. Benson wants to fight every year about the water table and he feels that this is very unfair. He said that he has no problem putting in monitoring wells, but he said the Town needs to be fair to everyone and he doesn't feel he is being treated fairly. He said he felt that Mr. Benson didn't like him and wasn't doing the bond issues with all of the other pit owners, just him. He said there are many other pits in Town that have never had to prove what they have for a quantity of loam, why should he be asked for this every time? He said he would put more wells in, rather he is digging in there or not. He would have to move a whole crew in and equipment to do these and he said maybe in the spring, but not now.

Mr. Benson told Mr. Maietta that he is acting as though he is picking on him and Mr. Maietta said that he always has. Mr.

Benson told him that there are no other gravel pits in Town that he can think of that have wetlands in the bottom of them. He said wetlands grow wetland vegetation and this is a wetland that is more than just a small puddle. There are cat o nine tails growing now. Mr. Maietta said this is a detention pond and he has talked about to Mr. Benson for the last 15 years. Mr. Maietta said this is fine and silty soil that hold water longer than any place in the pit, because this is a low spot in the pit. He said he feels like the Board is being misled and he is being treated unfairly. He said he doesn't appreciate when people are not upfront. He said the wetland has been there for many, many years.

Mrs. Billington said they needed to move on and what are the wishes of the Board. She said she would hate to see this going to another workshop and Mr. Libby agreed. He said when they start to extract more gravel, then the monitoring wells should be put in. Mrs. Harding agreed with this. She said also prior to starting any excavation and Mr. Maietta agreed. He said he always has to hire inspections by an engineering firm and this will cost a lot of money. He said he is taxed enough on this and he still feels like he is being treated unfairly.

Mrs. Billington asked Mr. Benson about the wells. He said during the dry months they are dry and he said there was one time when he went out and the floor of the pit was flooded. He said there is a berm at the lower end of the pit and that will hold water. He said a ground study might need to be done before they could dig any pond in the future. Mr. Maietta asked why he was so concerned about water and flooding. He said even when there have been any water or flooding in the pit, the monitoring wells have always been dried, this was even with 8 to 12 inches of water, and sometimes more. He said if a rock was dropped in all you could hear was a thud, with no water. Mr. Benson said when he said standing water, it was much more than just a small amount of water. Mr. Maietta said a water study is very expensive and he feels he shouldn't have to do an engineering study every time he turns around.

Mr. Maietta asked about changing the open area of the pit to 12 acres instead of the 10 that Mr. Benson said it is. He said his engineers and Mr. Benson do not agree on the size of the open area. Mr. Maietta said he understands but he feels he has more bond than he needs. The engineers say he needs 10 acres and he is asking for the 12. Mr. Libby said he didn't think the Board would quibble over an acre. Mr. Maietta said his engineering firm said the \$69,000.00 bond is more than adequate for what's open in the pit at the present. Mr. Benson recommended that they keep the bond amount as it is and Mr. Maietta agreed. If the Board wants to increase the open pit to 13 acres, Mr. Benson said that would be fine. Mr. Maietta said he is not going to run away from the property and he said he fully intends to develop it in the future. The conditions of approval are as follows:

1. This approval is for mineral extraction only as shown on the reclamation Plan made for Maietta Enterprises, Inc. as revised 6/15/15. The limit of extraction is the same as the reclamation plan, however, the approval is for excavation five feet above seasonal high water table only. Once seasonal high water is determined, the reclamation plan will be modified and pit floor elevations must remain five feet above the high water table. In no case shall the total area needing reclamation exceed 13 acres. This includes the working pit and associated on site non-vegetated storage areas roads and stockpiles.
2. Install 1 new monitoring well, with lockable caps, located within the expansion area and along the expansion of the northwestern toe of the slope. Wells to be installed prior to any gravel extraction.
3. A surety bond in the amount of \$69,000 for reclamation of 13 acres will be maintained. Adequate loam material shall be retained on site to reclaim pit to grades shown on reclamation plan. Topsoil shall not be removed from the site but shall be retained on site for reclamation. Adequate loam to cover all reclamation needs shall be retained on site for the purpose of reclamation.
4. No blasting for mineral extraction within the pit without a town approved blasting permit.
5. 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. Also, all previous conditions are in effect and should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Libby made a motion seconded by Mrs. Beckwith to approve the application. Five in favor and one against.

New Business:

- Steven and Jay, Inc., 11 School Street, Map 15, Lot 53- 5 year gravel pit renewal

Steve Bushey was present to represent the applicant. He gave a brief overview of the application and said he is representing Mike White, who no longer lives in the area. He said the pit has not had much activity in the past few years and a lot of it has to do with the slowing down of the economy. He said there isn't much activity, but they still want to keep the pit open and active. He said Mr. White still foresees the value of the property and is hopeful, that down the road, they will be doing some gravel and mineral extractions again.

He said there is a pond on the property and it still seems to be about the same size as it has been. He said the plan shows the amount of the pit that still could be excavated and hopefully will be one day. He said that on occasion, there has been some mixing or marketable material for roads and such, but over the past 4 to 5 years, there has been very little material removed. He said there are some stockpiles of different materials, rocks and other than can still be sold on demand. He said they are just looking for the 5 year renewal, there have been no problems with abutters that they know of. There have been several people collecting bait from the pond and as far as they know, there are no issues other than people pulling the wrong bait traps. Mr. Bushey has noted that ATV's have been riding through, but didn't feel that there was any kind of issue.

Mrs. Harding asked if there was a bond in place and Mr. Bushey told her yes. Mrs. Harding said she felt it would be very interesting to see what the State requires with this pit, as in the impact on peoples wells and the groundwater. He said a very intense study had been done because of the lake and other water supplies. Mr. Bushey said they had little requirements, but have done anything they asked. He feels that this pit has been run exactly like it should be and the Board decided they would like a site walk and it was scheduled for Monday, September 21st, 2015 @ 5:30pm, with a possible workshop after. Mr. Benson said there are very few changes and this is a unique pit because of its elevation, the location to Sebago Lake Village and also because of its water table, and the drainage and where the aquifers are.

- Clifford Strumph, 129 Ossipee Trail West, Map 17, Lot 10-Site Plan Application for an auto repair garage-change in use.

Clifford Strumph was present to represent himself. He gave a brief over view of what he is trying to do. He said that he would like to open and operate an auto repair garage.

Mrs. Billington said she wanted to make everyone aware of Mr. Benson's memo. There has been an addition of two large garage doors on the front of the building and the ordinance we have in place now, does not allow those. There is a process that has been started through the ordinance committee that would change it, so that these doors would be allowed. It has to go through three readings and if it passes, there is also a 90 day wait. Mr. Strumph said he is aware of this. Mrs. Billington said she knows there is a legal issue involved and asked the applicant if he was aware of this. Mr. Strumph said no he was not.

Mrs. Billington said if this application is approved, there will be a stipulation that they are operating at their own risk. She said the Town Attorney told Mr. Benson that the applicant would have to assume all responsibility for everything until the ordinance goes into effect. Mr. Benson said that if the ordinance does not pass, they would have to remove the doors. He said the existing building has some parking out front that would not typically be allowed. He said that when the original building was done, it was also used as a vehicle repair garage. Mrs. Billington said this building was grandfathered, but now they are asking for a change of use.

Mrs. Billington said the change isn't grandfathered, but the building is. She also said if they were just coming for a change of use, they wouldn't have to come before the Board at all, as they are changing the front of the building, which the change has already been done and this has to come before the Board. Mrs. Harding asked if they were only in front of the Board because of the change of use and having already made some changes to the building that are not covered under the existing ordinance. Mrs. Billington said the code is written by men and can be changed by men. Mr. Libby said that codes written, are meant to be changed, due to unforeseen circumstances.

Mrs. Harding asked why they have asked for the code to be changed. Mr. Strumph said that there are doors in the back, but he would have to raise the pavement a lot and this would be very costly. He also said if they did doors in the rear, there was an additional cost of \$15,000.00. He feels that the building is enhanced with the doors, and Mrs. Harding said she disagreed. She said there is a nice little café trying to get a start next door and they are going to have to smell the fumes from the vehicles coming into their parking lot. She said these two bay doors never should have gone there and the reason we had the ordinance we had, was because of esthetics. Mike Whitely, owner of the building, said that all parking would be out back. He said they would keep some parking out front, but very little. He said two parking spaces would be enough. He said if you go either side of a building, any garage doors are on the front. Mrs. Harding asked about them being hooked to an exhaust system. Mr. Strumph said they will be if the doors are closed. Mrs. Harding questioned again about the exhaust fumes going towards the café and Mr. Whitely said he smells the cooking from that bakery every day! He felt that the exhaust fumes would not affect the bakery at all as they would be going in the other direction.

Mrs. Billington said that there are no abutters here, so looks like the abutters are not concerned. Mrs. Billington said the big picture is that they are charged with making a ordinance change for one applicant and this change would be for the entire zoning area within this district. Mr. Benson said this would be for only existing buildings and garage uses within the Town Gateway. Mr. Benson said not just anyone can go into the ordinance committee and change an ordinance. They came to the Ordinance Committee and under the direction of the Ordinance Committee, this went to the Council. Now, it just needs to go through the process of being changed and if it is, they will be all set. The Town and the Board are really trying to be business friendly and all of the surrounding businesses as well. The applicant felt that the doors were needed on the front to make it friendlier to the public. The doors were already ordered, the applicant took a gamble and if the ordinance goes through, than he will be all set. If not, he would need to take them off. Mr. Benson said that routinely for existing building doing a use change, they usually do not have to come to the Planning Board every time.

Mrs. Billington said she always worries about precedence and consistency and how will that effect what we are doing now? She said it's not that they are just approving this for this applicant, it's what they can't foresee what's to come. Mr. Libby said this is only on existing property and not any others. Mrs. Billington said that the Board could limit this to this property only. Mr. Benson said the Board is not approving the Ordinance change as they do not have the authority to do so. He said the door are on the front at the applicant's risk. If the ordinance does not go through, they are going to have to come back before the Board and get a new approval. He said the Board should address the parking on the front and if there are any other changes that should be made by going through the Standards of Approval.

Mrs. Billington said change of use usually doesn't come to the Planning Board. She said that she didn't feel they needed to do a site walk and Mr. Libby agreed. Mrs. Harding said she disagreed as this was the first time she had seen this and thought they needed to look at the building. Mr. Strumph said this building is no different than it was five years ago. Mrs. Harding said she knew that, but they were already going through with work that had not been approved by the Planning Board yet. She said the ordinance was still in effect and hadn't been changed. Mr. Strumph said that one of the approved uses for this building is a mechanical repair garage. He said he already had things in place and he had also hired two mechanics to work that had both left their jobs to come and work for him. He said that one of the approved uses was that this could be used for a mechanics garage and that is why he took the chance and went forward with it.

Mr. Libby said this is an approved use for this area and he sees no problem with it. Mr. Strumph said he doesn't think any of the abutters or anyone else have a problem with it. He said he ran a garage for five years near some restaurants and never had any problems with anyone. Mrs. Harding asked if any of the restaurants he was near had outside seating areas and Mr. Strumph said he

wasn't sure, but never got any complaints from anyone. Mrs. Billington said that if the ordinance had already been changed then this application would not be before them. Mrs. Harding said she is not prepared to give this application an approval tonight as this is the first time the Board has seen this and they also do site walks. She said with the doors already there, this does not meet the standards under the ordinance in effect now. Mrs. Harding said this can be a real issue for the Board, approving something before it even meets the standards. She said she feels that the Board approval would open a whole new can of worms. Mr. Strumph said that everyone in Town knows where the building is located and doesn't think anyone has a problem with it.

Mr. Strumph said he doesn't feel that the Board needs a site walk. Mr. Whitely said that when the Board did a site walk before, the building is the same as it is now. He said the only change is that there are the garage doors now on the front and they were done because they were scheduled to be. If they had cancelled the installation of the doors, they would have waited at least 3 months until they could be installed again. He also said they were never told that this would be an issue until Mr. Benson found some things in the ordinance. He said they were told that there would be no problems with this application and everything would be a go. He said they can't start a business having to wait and also they would have to wait at least two months or more, before they could get the doors installed or possibly approval from the Planning Board.

Mr. Libby said that the Board had been given legal advice from the Town Attorney that said they could go ahead with the approval, but the applicant would have to take full responsibility and if the ordinance did not gain approval, they would have to remove the doors and come back to the Planning Board. Mrs. Billington said that they need to make sure that if this approval is granted, they are not locking themselves into any precedent for future businesses. She said they could go ahead as long as they handle the conditions perfectly. Mr. Libby made a motion seconded by Mr. Higgins to find the application complete. All in favor.

Mrs. Billington started through the Standards of Approval 181-73:

A. The provisions for vehicular loading, unloading and parking and for vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets and ways will not create hazards to safety nor will impose a significant burden upon public facilities

She said the Town has a requirement of 33 and the applicant has provided 34. Mr. Benson said one of the issues is the parking in front of the building and he asked the applicant if they were going to eliminate most of that. Mr. Whitely said there is some on the left side in the front for customers to stop. He said they have two spaces for that. Mr. Benson said in the current standard, no parking is allowed on the front. Mr. Strumph asked if the parking is grandfathered. Mr. Benson said yes, but this is a new code. Mr. Libby said when someone comes to your facility, they are going to want to park in front as that's where they enter the building.

Mr. Whitely said they share the same driveway and they wouldn't need to park anywhere but out back, also they would block people from coming into his business. Mrs. Billington said if they can limit the parking out front, they can go from 8 spaces to 2. Mrs. Harding said if they move to the 2 spaces, the other parking spots being taken away will no longer be grandfathered. She asked if they could put up some customer parking only signs and Mrs. Billing said they could, but how do you police that. Mr. Strumph said that employees would be parking on the back of the building.

B. The bulk location and height of proposed buildings and structures and the proposed uses thereof will not be detrimental or will impose undue burdens on the public facilities. (Not Applicable)

C. The provisions of on-site landscaping and screening do provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development.

Mr. Benson said this is grandfathered and feels it meets the standard. The Board agreed.

D. The site plan adequately provides for the soil and drainage problems that the development will create. (Not Applicable)

E. The provisions for exterior lighting will not create undue hazards to motorists traveling on adjacent public streets nor are inadequate for the safety of occupants or users of the site nor will such lighting damage the value and diminish the usability of adjacent properties. All lighting must be concealed source.

F. The applicant has provided reasonable evidence of his financial capabilities to complete the development as planned and approved.

G. The proposed development will not create undue fire safety hazards by not providing adequate access to the site or the buildings on the site for emergency vehicles or by failure to meet other fire safety ordinances or laws. The Fire Department shall file a written report with the Planning Board prior to the hearing. (Fire Dept. report provided)

Mrs. Harding asked about a sprinkler and the building is not large enough for that.

H. The proposed development has made adequate provision for sewage disposal.

I. The proposed site plan will not alter the existing character of the surrounding zoning district or division to the extent that it will become a detriment or potential nuisance to said zoning division or district. (No change)

J. The proposed development has made adequate provision for water supply, including an adequate supply of water for fire-

protection purposes. (There is a hydrant 1800 feet away)

K. No plan shall be approved by the Planning Board as long as the applicant is in default on a previously approved plan.

L. Architectural drawings showing exteriors of proposed new nonresidential/commercial buildings in the Village Center District shall be compatible with a Colonial New England design. Such design can be achieved by incorporating features such as, but not limited to, broken rooflines, clapboard siding, steeply pitched roofs, roof overhangs, small pane windows, dormers, window shutters. (Not Applicable)

M. Within the Standish Corner District, the plan must meet all of the following additional standards:

(1) The proposed development complies with the regulating plan and the applicable SCD street frontage type standards within the Standish Corner District.

(2) The proposed development, both public and/or private buildings and landscaping, contributes to the physical definition of rights-of-way as civic spaces within the Standish Corner District.

(3) The proposed development adequately accommodates automobiles, while respecting the pedestrian and spatial form of public areas within the Standish Corner District.

(4) If the lot to be developed shall be divided from a greater parcel, access to the parcel, or the "Pioneer Lot" (See conceptual Connectivity Master Plan in § 181-7.1.), shall be from an allowable SCD street frontage type perpendicular to the existing SCD street or arterial. Existing curb cuts are allowed to be continued to be used by existing uses. For new use(s) where the closure of the curb cut is triggered by the conditions of approval, standards contained within Chapter 252 (Streets and Sidewalks) or by Planning Board supplemental review, the perpendicular SCD street shall be built to the minimum block length and other SCD street frontage type standards and serve both as access to the parking area for the development as well as for parking for the development. The applicant shall build the perpendicular SCD Street to the required standards and provide for maintenance of the same until such time that the road is accepted by the Town as a street.

Mrs. Billington asked if the new garage doors constitute new development. It does not, per Mr. Benson.

Mrs. Harding asked again about the cars that will be there in January and the exhaust. Mr. Libby said that those cars will maybe be run for a period of five minutes, put on the computer to find the problem and then shut off. She said she knows the exhaust will be going out but does it come out through the doors. Mr. Strumph told her there is a pipe that the exhaust is hooked up to. Mrs. Billington said there is no ordinance about emissions and this is out of the Board's authority. She said that someone can go to the ordinance committee if they have a concern about this.

The conditions of approval are as follows:.

1). All parking lot lighting shall be concealed source.

2.) The approval granted for application only, as submitted and approved by, the Planning Board with rear-facing garage doors; PROVIDED, applicant may at his own business risk install forward-facing garage doors, consistent with, and subject to, the pending zoning ordinance amendment allowing same, PROVIDED, FURTHER, the applicant will have to seek further Town approval(s) for same if the subject zoning ordinance amendment fails to be enacted by June 30, 2016. There will only be two parking spaces provided at the front of the building and these will be marked with signs "Customer Parking Only." If there is any future change of use, the parking as stated on this plan will be eliminated.

3.) 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 is subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve.

Mr. Libby made a motion seconded by Mr. Higgins that all of the Standards of Approval have been met. Six in favor and one opposed.

Mrs. Billington said the Ordinance Committee meets tomorrow night with a couple of different issues. She also said on October 7th, 2015, the Board will have legal training with one of the Town's attorneys and feels this will greatly help the Board. This will be presented by Sally Daggett.

Mr. Libby made a motion seconded by Mr. Higgins to adjourn the meeting. All in favor.