

York Planning Board Workshop
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 22, 2021; 7:00 P.M.
York Public Library

Call to Order; Roll Call; Determination of Quorum; Appointment of Alternates

Chair Kathleen Kluger called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. A quorum was determined with five people voting: Kathleen Kluger, Vice-chair Wayne Boardman, Board Secretary Gerry Runte, Al Cotton, and Pete Smith. Alternate Ian Shaw was present, but did not vote. Alternate Kenny Churchill was not present. Chris Di Matteo, principal of Longmeadow Planning and Landscape Architecture, served as peer reviewer. (He determines completeness and prepares applications for Board review.) Planning Director Dylan Smith represented staff. Patience Horton was the recording secretary. Votes were tallied via roll call.

Field Changes

**York Beach Surf Club, 780 York Street
Tax Map 0038, Lots 0059-0069
Tim DeCoteau, Project Manager**

A field change request had been received from York Beach Surf Club. The field change requested nine items change. Only two, Nos. 1 and 9, were acceptable to discharge as field changes.

- Motion: Pete Smith moved to consider Nos. 1 and 9 as field changes from the York Beach Surf Club, Tax Map 0038, Lots 0059-0069. Gerry Runte seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

For Item 9, he explained that a buffer that was changed in the approved plan was not agreeable to the abutters. They wanted it kept the way it was but with a few trees added.

- Motion: Pete Smith moved to approve the field change requests from York Beach Surf Club, 780 York Street, York Tax Map 0038, Lots 0059 and 0069. The request No. 1, modular water closet, is to be removed. Per Request No. 9, the existing landscape buffer on the western side of Lot 0069 is to remain as is with supplemental bushes. Wayne Boardman seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed 5-0.

Public Forum

Torbert Macdonald, Fernald Avenue: One of main rights of the people is to petition their government for redress of grievances. "If they don't like a piece of legislation, they have every right in the world to tell you that even though it is the law of the land, it stinks."

Secondly, he said the key thing with the elderly housing application is the intrusion on the Fernald Avenue neighborhood, which the Comprehensive Plan describes as one of the last

single-family neighborhoods left in the town. The current ordinance is a threat to that. The elderly housing development will proceed because it is legal to do so.

Duplexes are fine. If done correctly, every house in our neighborhood should be able to have a duplex. This is at least six-times as potent in density as anything else that could be put there.

Section 7.1 of the Site Plan Subdivision Regs, specifically Section 1.2.9, authorizes the Planning Board to interpret ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan. The Town Attorney has ruled that you cannot deny the application on the grounds that it doesn't meet the Comprehensive Plan. I hope you will see fit to plan to remove it from its application to 1.b and 1.a. It is too much.

Torbert referred to and agreed with Chris di Matteo's review of the landscaping, where it is indicated that more plantings are needed because of the changes that suddenly appeared. Twice Torbert recommended the Board visit the site before giving final approval so that members can re-envision what is on that land in terms of plantings, with special attention to the abutters' side where understory plantings are especially needed. Because of the acoustical impact the buildings will bring, an eight-foot fence should be mandated.

He gave his thoughts about stormwater performance. The applicant has asked for a waiver of the high intensity soil survey, but I do not see how it is possible to make a rational judgement about the nature of any of the drainage and stormwater apparatus without truly understanding the complete nature of the soils and their relation to the bedrock, he said, urging the Board to mandate a high intensity soil survey in order to understand the stormwater management plan. Is what is presented adequate to the task in the modern era of storms? I think not. Imagine such storms in March, when the ground is frozen. The notion that it is going to perform just fine is misled. It is a genuine threat to public health and safety in terms of the downward slope onto Long Sands Avenue.

Chair Kathleen Kluger closed the public forum.

Application Reviews

Pinks Lobster Rolls, 1021 U.S. Route 1

Map/Lot 0030-A-0030 owned by Toby Gardner

The intent of this application is to amend a previously approved site plan to include a food truck on site.

Gardner Tobey, Jr., Applicant

Chris Di Matteo said the application is complete. The applicant is adding the accessory use of a food truck to a preexisting business, Southern Maine Lobster. Code Enforcement has reviewed the plan and found that it is an acceptable use. The Fire Department and Public Works have provided comments without objection. The elements of the application are minimal.

The spokesperson for the application said that she originally opened the food truck in Kittery but had to shut down in 2020 due to the pandemic. They are moving from a commercial spot in Kittery to a spot that is more community-oriented in York.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to accept the application for Pinks Lobster Rolls, Map/Lot 0030-A-0030 as complete. Wayne Boardman seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed 5-0.
- Motion: Al Cotton moved to open the public hearing for Pinks Food Truck, Map/Lot 0030-A-0030. Gerry Runte seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

No one came forward to speak. The Chair closed the public hearing.

The applicant explained that next to the main business, there is a former parking lot that has grown over to create a grassy knoll where the food truck will be. There is parking along the front and side. Southern Maine Lobster will be the source of electricity. Bottles of drinking water will be brought in. Gray water will be pumped into a tank and taken back to the State-approved, commercial kitchen they own, where they will discharge the water. There are propane tanks bolted to the trailer for boiling lobster water.

Kathleen Kluger: Chris Di Matteo has recommended the Board discuss this application as an amendment to a previously-approved site plan, instead of a revised site plan. He said there are four items for conditions of approval that could be incorporated in the Findings of Fact, avoiding the requirement of a new site plan.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to approve the application for Pinks Lobster Rolls Food Truck at 1021 U.S. Route 1, Map/Lot 0030-A-0030.

In discussion, Kathleen Kluger asked the Board if the four items Chris Di Matteo referred to shall be addressed in the Findings of Fact. There was no discussion. The board members agreed to the action.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion passed 5-0.

**York River Landscaping, 272 U.S. Route 1
Map/Lot 0059-0004 owned by 18 York Street Realty LLC
The intent of this project is to provide a sketch plan of a potential landscaping
business/garden center.**

**Jim Fischer, Northeast Civil Solutions
Edward Campbell, York River Landscaping**

Jim Fischer: The applicant is proposing improvement of the site with a stormwater detention area and better parking. There is a small wetland area. A culvert on the property is a drainage swale that fills during 100-year storms. It is not a stream.

This is an established business that moved to the current address about a year-and-a-half ago. There is a two-family house with a garage on the parcel, which is one-acre in size. This is a seasonal business. The company of about 25 people and 15 vehicles takes care of residential and commercial landscaping, lawn care, plantings, and gardens. In the winter season, they do some snowplowing. Snow is not dumped on the property.

Customers do not come onto the site. It is not a garden center. In the unlikely event that they do come in, they park in front. There is plenty of room for the commercial vehicles in the back. They go out in the morning and come back in the evening. About half-a-dozen cars are on the site during the day. Workers go directly to the work sites and park there. The house is reserved for employees under a provision that they cannot keep cars there.

It is a narrow lot with 100 feet of Route 1 frontage. From Route 1, the only area that can be seen is the façade of the house and the plantings in front of it. There are no signs out there advertising the business, and a sign is not proposed. The abutters do not see anything that is going on in the back, including bins of stocked materials. In one part, there is a 6-foot stockade fence.

There is a gravel road being used that leads to the back of the property. It is not clear who owns it. It provides a dynamic flow for vehicles and equipment to get to the back of the property. An attorney is looking into the Right Title and Interest for using it.

- Motion: Pete Smith moved to open the public hearing for the application from York River Landscaping, 272 U.S. Route 1, Tax Map 0059, Lot 0019. Al Cotton seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed 5-0.

Tim Cole is an abutter at 254 Route 1, where he has lived for 40 years. The noise from the property has been a huge problem. For a residential property, he said, the allowable maximum daytime noise-level is 60 decibels. Measured from my deck, the noise level reaches 70 decibels.

The biggest culprits are frontend loaders, but large commercial blowers are used to blow debris off the trucks and trailers. Small engines and vehicle motors are often left running. We can hear this noise in our house even with the windows closed, he said.

Article 7 of the ordinance states our zone is intended to be primarily residential. Small businesses are permitted if they fit into the quality of the neighborhood. York River Landscaping has become a big business and is out of character of the mom-and-pop businesses intended to operate in the zone. The business started as a home occupation that has grown into a large business with a large storage and maintenance area, a dozen trucks, 10-or-more vehicles, and more than a dozen small-engine machines.

Over a year ago, Tim Cole continued, Edward Campbell, told me there is a nine-acre property out toward the weigh station that is owned by Mike Lee. Apparently, Mr. Lee offered Mr. Campbell to lease the acreage to move his business there. That would be an excellent way to eliminate all the noise.

Citing Paragraph 3.7, Mr. Cole asked the Planning Board to help bring the noise level and other aspects of York River Landscaping's business in compliance with the ordinance or else revoke their permit.

Wayne Boardman asked Mr. Cole to submit his written remarks to the Chair.

Kathleen Kluger closed the public hearing.

Engineer Jim Fischer described York River Landscaping as a relatively benign business. He will address the noise problem with Mr. Campbell. He said he would discuss expansion into the nine-acre parcel owned by Mike Lee with Mr. Campbell. "You can only cram so many vehicles into a particular area," said Jim Fischer. "The threshold has been reached."

Chris Di Matteo said the applicant should explore the Right Title and Interest in the use of the driveway. The applicant should also define the nature of the residential use. Is it going to be traditional residential use or part of the business? Code Enforcement should review the intended use before the applicant returns to the Planning Board with a preliminary plan.

Garrett Homes, LLC—Mic Mac Motel, 317 U.S. Route 1

Map/Lot 0059-0004, Owned by Kittery Indian LLC—Mark Dellapasqua

The intent of this application is to amend a previously approved site plan by changing the architectural appearance of one of the proposed retail business buildings.

Doug Grunert, TKR Architects

Gary Eucalitto, Garrett Homes

Matt Eucalitto, Garrett Homes

Greg Orso, Attorney of Record

Greg Orso: I am pinch hitting for the brains behind the operation, engineer Rick Lundborn. We are looking at an aesthetic amendment of the O'Reilly business. The changes are requirements of the O'Reilly business. They are asking for modification of the building colors, roofline, and building materials. The Sherwin Williams side that is opposite on the site remains the same. We believe this design meets the ordinance.

Architect Doug Grunert: With the amended design, the entry location and fenestration around the building remain the same. The building color has changed to a light tan. The construction materials are a brick base with Hardee Board trim and clapboard. The façade facing Route 1 shows the roofline and façade, which has eight-inch bump-out articulations. The roofline is articulated by dormers and secondary gables. The hip roof has architectural shingles. The

roofline is accentuated on the entry side by a secondary hip roof. The roof is flat for the rooftop equipment, which will not be seen from Route 1.

The doorway has the red proprietary trademark of the O'Reilly brand. Every corner has a 45-degree hip roof. The Route 1 side has traditional fenestration of various sizes. We stuck to the Greek Revival element, which is traditionally found in New England coastal architecture.

Chris Di Matteo: This is a limited amendment. The appropriate documents have been submitted. The application is complete.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to accept the application for a previously-approved plan for Garrett Homes, LLC, Map/Lot 0059-0004 as complete for the purpose of review. Wayne Boardman seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

Gary Eucalitto, 55 Proprietors Lane; Torrington, Connecticut: Last February, we sent O'Reilly the Planning Board-approved elevation with a 10-day turnaround period for their approval. There was no response. We moved forward. They didn't get back to us until this month, July. They replied that they are not going along with the elevation plans the Planning Board approved. They are not walking away from the lease—not now.

O'Reilly balked at the original blue color, he added. They said it was a NAPA color.

My situation with them has created a battle for me, Mr. Eucalitto continued. We have already suggested new changes, but what we are presenting tonight is what they approved. Otherwise, they will not come here. They say they can live with the gable, though it is not part of their branding. If they have to make other changes, they say they will walk away from it.

Al Cotton: I went through 50 years of corporate branding, and I understand what you are going through. O'Reilly has a certain look, and they are updating that look now. I hope we can live with it, too.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to open the public hearing for Garrett Homes, Map/Lot 0059-0004. Wayne Boardman seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

No one came forward to speak. Chair Kathleen Kluger closed the public hearing.

Al Cotton: Defining the New England look has been the most difficult thing I've had to deal with in the 10 years I've been on the Planning Board. If we want O'Reilly here, we are going to have to do what they want. I am agreeable that we can go in the direction you have here.

Wayne Boardman: I don't see anything egregious about it. I think the old design looked New England-y with the gable roof, rather than a hip roof. This is a commercial building, and I don't see anything wrong with it—just yet, anyway.

Pete Smith: This design is for anywhere in the United States. I don't want to see that on Route 1. We have worked so hard with our ordinances and meetings trying to keep everything on Route 1 as much to the theme of the town as possible. A lower roofline, a cupola taken off as a decoration, a flat, long, straight roofline—that's not what the ordinance calls for. These changes are attacking what we believe. I don't like it. I won't vote for it.

Gerry Runte: I am not concerned about the New England side of things. When you look at what's across the road on Route 1, the storage place and the motel, it will be hard to say everything there has a New England look to it.

Kathleen Kluger: Maybe "resent" is too strong a word. I don't appreciate the amount of work the Board undertook with the applicant for the original design. I resent that O'Reilly missed their deadline and now they are telling us how to do this. That is not the appropriate use of our ordinances or the relationship between the Planning Board and the applicant. The reality of the situation that they might go away if they don't get their way distresses me on several different levels. I don't want York to miss out. I hope we can make a compromise.

Dylan Smith: When the Planning Board had previously gone through the process with this site plan, you looked at the collective whole, the two buildings together. There has been significant conversation about "best faces forward," and what that meant. There was a lot of work done to get to that design and approval for those two buildings together. It captured the New England feel. The original design looked great and it fit in. This does not.

Greg Orso: If this was the first plan, we wouldn't have a lot of resentment with this. We have to determine if they are getting a fair review under the ordinance. How does an applicant know what "New England" is?

Pete Smith: This does not meet 6.3.13.

Wayne Boardman: I think we should send it back and ask the applicant to try and negotiate a more compatible design. We have had several of buildings with flat rooflines approved in the last couple of years, like the marine building on Route 1.

Dylan: We changed the ordinance after the marine approval so now roofs have to be peaked.

Greg Orso: My client is doing his best to try to accommodate a difficult situation here.

Al Cotton: I don't think sending it back for a redesign is necessary. I think we can live with this.

Chair Kathleen Kluger: Is there a motion to either approve, deny, or continue the application as an amendment to a previously-approved plan?

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to approve the application for Garrett Homes, Map/Lot 0059-0004 site plan review. There was no second.

Chair Kathleen Kluger said that the motion to approve has failed.

- Motion: Wayne Board moved to continue the application for Retail Shopping Center, Garrett Homes, 317 U.S. Route 1, Tax Map 0059, Lot 0004 with feedback given to the applicant. Pete Smith seconded.

In discussion, Greg Orso said the Board is asking the applicant to negotiate something that does not have any parameters. We need exact direction of what the bottom line of this is, he said. We have not been given any ideas about what we are going to negotiate with the tenant.

Kathleen Kluger: You have two choices, a motion to continue or a motion to deny. I don't know what else we can offer you.

Greg Orso: The applicant has to know what it has to do other than identifying with Chris di Matteo's letter. That does not give us any ideas of how we are going to negotiate with the tenant who has basically said we are unable to modify things even a little bit.

Kathleen Kluger: What we are saying, and it is your opportunity to take it or not, is to refer to the review and see if there is anything else to come to it. This is due process. Take it back to the client. If the client says we don't care what the review says and this is what we want—then that's what you will tell us next time. The Board interpreted it one way. They applicant has interpreted it another way. This review is bringing up points that need to be discussed with your client.

Greg Orso: To be fair to the applicant, you have to be able to tell the applicant what they have to do to meet the ordinance. We believe we have met the ordinance.

Pete Smith: Mr. Orso insists he wants to know the criteria. I would like to read 6.3.13.5.

1. *"All the construction shall have pitched roofs, which may include a gable roof, hip roof, and a type of a gamble roof."* I agree, said Pete, that this has one of those.
2. *"Long continuous roofs that are uniform in height shall not be permitted."* Bang, said Pete. There is one right there because that is what you have, a long, continuous roof.
3. *"Roof design for linear buildings shall use variations in pitch and height and utilize architectural elements to add visual interest, especially when that portion of the building is visible to the street."* I don't see that in this design.

4. *“Variations of roofline are recommended at least every twenty-five linear feet.”*
No, said Pete, not with this design.
5. *“Use of cupolas, dormers, chimneys, and other projections are not required, but encouraged.”* It is right there in the ordinance. That is what we want to see.

Dylan Smith: The plan also has to show how it fits in with the other building on the site.

Kathleen Kluger: With the ordinance description that Mr. Smith just read, and with the review by Mr. Di Matteo, does this fit in terms of the most opportunity for your client, Mr. Orso? I think it does. I think it would circumvent due process if we just made a decision now and didn't give another opportunity to know the outcome of our discussion.

Gary Eucalitto: You are saying to back to them and get a response.

Pete Smith: The motion to approve failed. That is an important piece to bring back to them. There are two other options, one to continue to a date certain, or the other to deny.

Kathleen Kluger: The opportunity to continue to a date certain has probably been offered about 10 times.

Greg Orso: We have an architect that says the plan meets that section of the ordinance. If the Town wants to rely on an additional expert, as Mr. Di Matteo recommends, it would make sense to do that.

Dylan Smith: If the Board wants, I will seek the opinion of a third-party, certified architect.

The Chair called for the original motion to be amended.

- Motion: Wayne Boardman moved to amend the motion for Garrett Homes, Map/Lot 0059-0004, to the date certain of August 26. Al Cotton seconded the amended motion. There was no further discussion. The motion passed 5-0.

**Long Sands Village—Elderly Housing Development, 122 Long Sands Road
Map/Lot 0044-0038 owned by James Paolini
The intent of this project is to create a 10-unit elderly housing development.
Geoff Aleva, Civil Consultants**

**Jeff Paolini, Long Sands Village--York Harbor Builders
Greg Orso, Attorney of Record**

This review is continued from February 25, 2021.

Chris Di Matteo: The Board has already accepted the preliminary review. Comments have been put in order.

Geoff Aleva: Because the applicant did not realize that improvements were not allowed while the project is being reviewed, trees on the property were cut. They were cut in the perimeter, where the buildings will be built, and where the access roads will go. Since then, surveyors came in and located and marked every stump. They measured the diameter of the stump at the cut and labeled the species of the trees. Some cut areas will be supplemented with additional vegetation. Most trees that were cut were where buildings will be placed.

The Public Works Director has no additional comments about the project. Geoff said.

Initially the driveway came up from Long Sands Road. That has been changed to Fernald Avenue, and the Sewer District is okay with making the sewer connection there. The manhole and main line go through our property's parking lot. A small, residential pump station will pump sewage from the existing house, and its septic system will be eliminated.

We have met with the Water District. There is a looped water main that comes off Fernald Avenue and goes around the property. Water meters will be in the foyer areas that join each pair of buildings. That is also where the tote-style trash receptacles will also go. The details of the changes are included on the plan.

The landscape plan shows buffering, screening, and fencing of varying heights along the neighbors' boundaries and throughout the property. It includes headlight protections. Plantings will be added along the Long Sands side of the existing building. Plantings exceed the requirement of the ordinance. The location of the buildings has not changed. The changes are in the landscaping and the utilities.

Kathleen Kluger: Seeing that the original iteration and site alteration have changed this redesign, how does the Board feel about having another site visit?

Geoff Aleva: The changes wouldn't warrant another site visit. There are no major changes to the development. The buildings and the pavement stay the same. Only the utilities and the landscaping have changed.

Chris Di Matteo: I disagree with the way Geoff Aleva is describing the veg-line. The actual veg-line is not as depicted on the plan. Normal practice is that if you are going to do any type of earth work, the likelihood is that the roots are going to be damaged. Six inches of fill has a big impact on the vegetation. In doing the work, specific trees should be pinpointed and preserved. To avoid certain impact, manual tools should be used in place of heavy equipment.

Kathleen Kluger: The Board always requests a review of the Home Owners' Association documents for special applications such as this housing for people over 62. The documents have been supplied and are in good shape. A requirement is missing. The purchaser and at least one person residing on the property have to be over age 62 or older. That is also true for a leasee. Those rules have to be included in the HOA documents. In 4.3.2, Parking Areas, I encourage the HOA documents to prohibit overflow parking on Fernald, because it is a narrow street.

Dylan Smith: On the current plan note, it says that an encroachment of 524 square feet is to be removed. Elsewhere, an encroachment of 255 square feet is brought up, but it does not say it is to be removed.

Geoff Aleva: That is a patio area. We did not have that section removed. It does not impact the calculations.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to open the public hearing for Long Sands Village—Elderly Housing, Map/Lot 0044-0038. Pete Smith seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

Kevin O'Shaughnessy said that the application should be denied. Over 100 people have seen the plan, and no one found it reasonable. Even if the two units closest to Fernald Avenue were removed, it would still have twice the density of a commercial project—six units instead of three.

My attorneys question if the plan complies with the ordinance. Given Fernald Avenue's narrow width and blind curve, my attorneys recommend citing 7.6.3 to deny access to Fernald. During a previous Planning Board meeting, it was wrongly suggested that seniors do not have houseguests. Houseguest will overwhelm the overflow parking that is already overwhelmed.

The site will probably require blasting. We have no confidence in the builder's ability to do it safely or effectively. Our homes are in jeopardy. We urge the Board to use its discretion and reject the current proposal, said Kevin O'Shaughnessy.

Katherine Mulhern, 60 Fernald Avenue: It is an inappropriate site for elderly housing with two access roads. It is a very narrow road. It is a very quiet neighborhood. The project should be smaller and limited to six units. Instead, we have ten units in five structures.

After it was decided that there would be no traffic study, the entrance on Long Sands was removed. That means all the traffic will be going in and out along Fernald Avenue. If there are only four parking spaces on site, where will people park? Pedestrians and school children frequent Long Sands Road. Traffic from the Plaza already causes gridlock. I request that you hire a traffic and parking study.

Rebecca Boyle, 73 Fernald Avenue: I am concerned about drainage directly onto my property. I am also concerned about privacy and plantings. Screening has to be substantial, not

superficial. Who is going to maintain the fence? Is the adequacy of the level lip spreader properly used in this application? Permeable pavers should be used in the parking areas instead of pavement. The pavers allow the water to flow down and out instead of toward my property, which is what the plan shows now.

Deb Demmick, 62 Fernald Avenue: I have two concerns, tying the sewage line onto Fernald Avenue and blasting. Many homes have stone foundations. The initial blasting for the sewer line damaged my house. Could there be a blasting study to show what could happen to our homes?

Rebecca Boyle: Could you have the four buildings closest to my property staked out for your site walk? I want you to see how close the buildings are going to be to my house. You will also want to see the vegetation line, or lack thereof.

Chair Kathleen Kluger closed the public hearing.

Greg Orso: It is peculiar to have another site walk because vegetation is the only issue hanging.

Geoff Aleva:

- Police, Fire, and Public Works have reviewed the project with no comments or concerns respecting the proposed design.
- There is a fence along the common property line.
- Parking meets the ordinance for the use.
- We don't have waiver requests for this project.
- We have had peer review of the standards for the development of stormwater.
- We have provided landscape plans that meet and go above and beyond the ordinance.
- We are ready for preliminary approval tonight.

Chris Di Matteo: The application is complete for receiving preliminary approval tonight.

- Motion: Pete Smith moved to give preliminary approval to the application for Long Sands Village, Tax Map 0044, Lot 0038, as presented. Al Cotton seconded.

In discussion,

Wayne Boardman: If preliminary approval is granted, what changes can still be made?

Dylan Smith: The landscaping plan can change. When they hand in final plan approval, they are supposed to hand in a detailed landscaping plan. That is when the Board makes the crucial decisions about the landscaping.

The Chair called the vote. The motion to grant preliminary approval failed. Pete Smith and Al Cotton voted yes. Wayne Boardman, Gerry Runte, and Kathleen Kluger voted no.

Following Dylan Smith's advice to clarify the meaning of the denial, the decision was made to address preliminary approval after the site walk.

A site walk was Scheduled for August 5 @ 9:00.

- Motion: Pete Smith moved to continue the application for Long Sands Village, Tax Map 0044, Lot 0038, to August 26, to review for preliminary and final approval. Gerry Runte seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

Public Hearing on Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations

Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations (fees)

Copies of the proposed amendment are available with the Town clerk at the York Town Hall or on the Town's website at www.yorkmaine.org.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to open the public hearing for Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations (fees). Pete Smith seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

No one was present for the public hearing. The Chair closed the public hearing.

- Motion: Al Cotton moved to approve Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations (fees). Wayne Boardman seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed 5-0.

Minutes

- Motion: Wayne Boardman moved to approve the Minutes of Thursday, July 8, 2021, as amended. Gerry Runte seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

Other Business

CompFest! is next Thursday. The Board members who are coming to assist should be there at 5:15 P.M.

Adjourn

The time was 10:30.

Respectfully submitted,
Patience G. Horton
Recording Secretary