

City of Ellsworth
Planning Board Meeting
Minutes — Thursday, February 8, 2018

Chairman John Fink, Vice Chairman Darrell Wilson, member Jim Barkhouse, member Roger Lessard and alternate member John DeLeo were present. Secretary Mike Howie was absent. The seventh seat on the board (second alternate member) is currently vacant. With Howie absent, DeLeo served as a voting member during tonight's meeting.

City Planner Michele Gagnon, Code Enforcement Officer Dwight Tilton, Fire Inspector Mike Hangge, Drinking Water Superintendent Reggie Winslow and Assistant City Planner Steve Fuller attended the meeting. City Manager David Cole was in the audience for part of the meeting, and City Attorney Ed Bearor sat at the head table with the Planning Board.

Note: This meeting was rescheduled from its original date, Wednesday, February 7, due to inclement weather.

1.) Call to Order

Chairman John Fink called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. The start of the meeting was delayed briefly while a gavel was obtained for the use of the chairman, as Assistant City Planner Fuller forgot to place a gavel on the table prior to the meeting. This failure did not go unnoticed or unremarked upon by members of the Planning Board and city staff members. By contrast, City Planner Gagnon presented each member of the Planning Board with a bag of homemade chocolate chip cookies prior to the start of the meeting, which were appreciated.

2.) Adoption of Minutes from the January 10, 2018 meeting
Darrell Wilson made a motion to approve the minutes as written and John DeLeo seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion then passed unanimously, 5-0.

3.) Final Plan for a Major Use Site Development titled Woodlawn Museum Visitor Center for the Hancock County Trustees of Public Reservations — The Black House, Woodlawn. The proposal, with approximate square footages, is to remove the existing carriage barn (2,500 SF) and caretaker's house (1,325 SF) and construct a visitor center (8,000 SF) and expand the workshop (700 SF) on a 155-acre parcel (as listed in city records) at 19 Black House Drive off of Route 172/Surry Road (Tax Map/Lot: 26/57), in the Neighborhood Zone.

a.) PUBLIC HEARING, DELIBERATION, FINDING OF FACTS AND CONCLUSION.

Planning Board member attendance

City staff members, city's legal counsel in attendance

Note that this was rescheduled from original date due to inclement weather

Meeting called to order at 7:04 PM

Start of meeting delayed briefly due to lack of a gavel

Board members get bags of cookies from the city planner

Adoption of minutes from Jan. 10, 2018 regular meeting: APPROVED (5-0)

Agenda item #3 was removed, at the request of applicant, from the agenda prior to the meeting

Note: Agenda item #3 for Woodlawn was removed, at the request of the applicant, from the agenda prior to the meeting. It was not heard or reviewed at this meeting.

4.) Preliminary Plan for a Major Use Site Development Plan and Major Subdivision Plan titled Atlantic Storage for Atlantic Landscape Construction. The proposal is to build 11 self-storage buildings and four residential duplexes (total of eight units) at 124 Bangor Road (formerly New Land Nursery & Landscaping) located on two parcels totaling 9.5 acres (Tax Map/Lot: 50/68 and 41/79), in the Urban Zone.

a. PUBLIC HEARING AND DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION COMPLETENESS.

a. PUBLIC HEARING AND DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION COMPLETENESS.

Steve Salsbury, land surveyor with Herrick & Salsbury, and Greg Johnston, project engineer from G.F. Johnston & Associates, were present to represent the applicant (Atlantic Landscape Construction).

Salsbury spoke about the existing conditions at the site. Salsbury said the only existing physical feature that will remain on the site is the existing office building, close to the Bangor Road. Salsbury noted there is 950 feet of frontage on that road with four entrances presently and said the plan calls for discontinuing use of two of those entrances.

Salsbury said there is a “significant amount” of impervious area on the site presently. There is a small amount of wetlands next to the Bangor Road which this project will impact a piece of, with other wetlands by Gilpatrick Brook (sometimes referred to as Dunham Brook, on the western side of property) and a small amount at the northern tip of the property. Neither of those latter two wetland pieces will be affected by the project, Salsbury said. Salsbury said the project is “well outside” the flood plain of Gilpatrick/Dunham Brook.

Johnston spoke and explained how the project had changed since the board last saw it, during a sketch plan review at its November 1, 2017 meeting and a subsequent site visit on November 29, 2017, and why those changes were made. He talked about subjects including the alignment of the buildings and runoff, and “minimizing the massing” of both the storage and residential units.

Johnston said the residential units that are part of this project have been moved up to higher ground to create a larger buffer between them and the wetlands near the brook. He said a berm is also planned

Woodlawn proposal not reviewed tonight

ATLANTIC STORAGE for Atlantic Landscape Construction

Steve Salsbury and Greg Johnston represent applicant

Salsbury explains existing conditions of the site

Discussion of wetlands at the site

Johnston explains changes to plan since board’s last review

Larger buffer for wetlands, berm for better plants and better screening

along the Bangor Road to allow for better root depth of plantings and, as a result, better screening from passing traffic.

Wilson asked about space for snow storage. Johnston spoke to where it is on the plan, between the emergency turnarounds for the storage and residential projects respectively. DeLeo asked if that was enough space. Salsbury said the applicant has front-end loaders that can pile snow higher than it would be if it was just plowed. Johnston said other space could be used for snow storage as needed.

DeLeo said he appreciated that the project would reduce the existing four entrances down to two, but noted that the application on page 15 (under the Section 607.2 header, bullet point i) still referred to a “middle entrance.” Salsbury said that would be corrected.

Wilson asked about woodland buffer in relation to wetlands and asked for that information to be included on the final plan. Wilson also asked questions about lighting fixtures and the cutoffs. Johnston answered and spoke about the fixtures and said the bulbs will all be recessed and are full-cutoff.

Wilson asked about lighting at the office building and adjacent parking. Johnston said because it is an existing residential use the applicant believed that portion was exempt from lighting requirements. Fink suggested the lighting standards apply because there is a change of use: the building is no longer going to be used for residential but rather as office space. Johnston said the information could be added to the plan.

Wilson asked about hours of operation for the storage business and when the lights would be on at the storage buildings, and what lighting at the site would look like over a 24-hour period. Johnston said the office will generally be 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., perhaps later at times, while the storage units will be on timers so they come on after dark. Wilson suggested lighting for the office building and associated parking is a good idea for the evening hours especially.

Wilson asked about lighting in relation to the eastern boundary of the site. Johnston answered, noting that the lights on the storage building are mounted approximately 4 feet above the ground and “don’t spread [light] very far.”

Jim Barkhouse asked for more information about wetlands. Johnston spoke on the subject. He said a culvert crossing underneath the Bangor Road which drains into wetlands will be extended in order to reclaim an area that is presently washed out. In response to a question from

**Discussion of space for snow storage
Salsbury, Johnston address snow storage concerns**

DeLeo notes correction regarding number of entrances to site

Wilson asks about wetlands, lighting

Discussion of lighting for the office building

Hours of operation and how those affect lighting at the site

Discussion of lighting on storage buildings

More discussion on wetlands, specifically those along Bangor Road

Wilson, Johnston said the existing pipe will be extended, and that the new pipe will be covered. That is what is impacting the wetland area there, Johnston said.

Gagnon said city staff had only small items and “technicalities” which could wait and be addressed at a later meeting when the project comes back for final review.

DeLeo referenced an anonymous note written on an abutter’s notice which was received at the Planning Office prior to the meeting. The note asked that Planning Board members and/or city staff “kindly check on wetland encroachment before approving” the project. Salsbury said he had seen the note but did not know what it meant. Discussion ensued on who might have written/sent the note, and about a man who attended the site visit last fall and voice concern about wetlands at the time. Barkhouse said the concern was about the residential units being too close to the wetlands along Gilpatrick/Dunham Brook. He said that appeared to have been resolved with the revised plan.

Gagnon said city staff have requested that the woodland buffer be marked on the plan and with physical markers on site so that people know the area is a buffer and not to be disturbed.

Fink opened a public hearing at 7:25 PM. No one came forward to speak, and the public hearing was closed almost as soon as it was opened, also at 7:25 PM.

Wilson made a motion that with regard to the preliminary plan for the major use site development plan and major subdivision plan titled Atlantic Storage for Atlantic Landscape Construction that the project is an allowed use in the zone, that the application is complete in terms of submission materials under the applicable sections of the city’s Unified Development Ordinance (Chapter 56, sections 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11) and the city’s Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 28). The motion was seconded by Lessard. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Following the vote Gagnon announced, for the benefit of those in attendance and in response to an inquiry from an audience member, that the agenda item for Woodlawn was removed from the agenda at the applicant’s request prior to the meeting (but after notices had been mailed out to abutters). Fink repeated the announcement to ensure that everyone heard it.

No major concerns from city staff

Discussion of an anonymous note expressing concern about “wetland encroachment”

Gagnon says that the woodland buffer needs to be marked

Public hearing held at 7:25 PM, no one speaks on project

Preliminary plan for Atlantic Storage (major use site development and major subdivision plans) for Atlantic Landscape Construction: COMPLETE (5-0)

Announcement that Woodlawn was taken off the agenda prior to the meeting

5.) Amendment to an October 4, 2017 approved Major Subdivision Plan and Major Use Site Development Plan titled 208 High Street Redevelopment (previously referred to as Commercial Development) for Ellsworth Retail Management, LLC (the project was previously approved for Ellsworth Associates, LLC). The approved plan consists of two commercial buildings totaling 16,881 SF with four total units (one in one building and three in the other), and the proposed amendment is for two commercial buildings totaling 15,061 SF with five total units (one in one building and four in the other). The project is located on a 1.8-acre parcel located at 208 High Street (Tax Map/Lot: 131/47), in the Urban Zone.

a. PUBLIC HEARING, DELIBERATION, FINDING OF FACTS, AND CONCLUSION.

a. PUBLIC HEARING, DELIBERATION, FINDING OF FACTS, AND CONCLUSION.

Doug Reynolds from Gorrill Palmer spoke on behalf of the applicant. He noted the previous owner (Ellsworth Associates, LLC) sold the project, which was previously approved by the Planning Board, to Ellsworth Retail Management, LLC and that the new owner was proposing the changes referenced in the plans before them tonight.

DeLeo asked about parking, noting the plan showed the project required 66 parking spaces and that 101 are proposed to be provided. DeLeo made reference to Section 1105.4 of Article 11 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), Section B of which is titled "Limits on Excessive Parking." DeLeo said he did not understand why this development needed so many parking spaces.

Gagnon said that article in the ordinance was written at a time when the city was seeing projects proposing large amounts of parking which they might only fully utilize once a year or less frequently. She noted parking lots are impervious areas and create stormwater runoff which then needs to be addressed. Gagnon said the idea was that if developers wanted to exceed what the ordinance requires by more than 25 percent that excess amount would need to have a pervious surface. She said the idea was to give an "incentive for people to be a bit more serious about what they need" for parking. She said the standards can be waived, however, and that this is a small lot where the applicant proposes to treat stormwater runoff before releasing it.

Reynolds said tenants have been lined up for two of the five units but that tenants still need to be secured for the other three units. He said providing the maximum amount of parking offers flexibility for what could occupy those spaces. He reiterated that stormwater is being treated as part of this project. Discussion on the subject continued.

208 HIGH STREET REDEVELOPMENT for Ellsworth Retail Management, LLC

Doug Reynolds from Gorrill Palmer speaks on behalf of the applicant, notes changes made to the proposed project

DeLeo asks about parking spaces and why the project has so many of them

Gagnon explains history behind city's ordinance relating to parking spaces

Reynolds: More parking allows for flexibility for future tenants of buildings

Gagnon referred to the ordinance and said only the spaces included in the 25 to 38 percent range over the minimum amount would need to be pervious surface to comply with the ordinance as written. That would be 18 spaces in this case (101 spaces proposed minus 83 spaces at 25 percent beyond minimum). DeLeo noted that the 35 parking spaces beyond the minimum requirement (101 proposed, minus 66 required by ordinance equals 35 over) represented an excess of 53 percent above the minimum required by ordinance. It was noted that six of the spaces are proposed to be used for seasonal snow storage.

**Discussion on parking continues
How spaces above the minimum number required should be treated**

Gagnon said an excess of 18 spaces is not the same as a huge parking lot with 200 extra spaces. DeLeo said all developers should be treated equally, and that percentages should be applied in the same way.

Number vs. percent

Discussion continued on location of parking spaces, pervious versus impervious surfaces and the current condition of the lot ("It's all pavement," said Reynolds). Reynolds said this project will actually reduce the amount of impervious surface on the lot by approximately 18,000 square feet. DeLeo noted that a parking lot of the type proposed by the developer is not out of the ordinary for High Street.

Reynolds notes the project will actually reduce amount of impervious surface

Fink asked if the board could consider granting an exception, and Gagnon said it could so long as it was noted on the plan above the signature block. Wilson said his personal preference would be for the applicant to put landscaping in that could be converted to parking if the need arose in the future. Discussion continued on this idea. Lessard said he thought the developer had done a good job taking care of stormwater, and did not think they needed to be required to do anything else. Gagnon explained why stormwater is important.

Discussion of granting a waiver or exception with regard to excess quantity of parking spaces

Barkhouse asked if parking spaces could be made wider to reduce the number of spaces. Reynolds noted this would not change the amount of impervious surface. Discussion ensued on the driving habits of groups including teenagers and college students.

Idea of wider parking spaces floated, rejected

Wilson asked a question about the proposed 2.5-inch water service line to the project which Reynolds answered.

Water line question asked and answered

Fink opened a public hearing at 7:47 PM. No one came forward to speak, and the public hearing was closed almost as soon as it was opened, also at 7:47 PM.

Public hearing held at 7:47 PM, no one speaks on project

Wilson noted the board was considering revisions to a previously approved plan, and that the notable revision was the addition of

Wilson notes board being asked to OK

another unit in one of the buildings. Gagnon noted DeLeo's observation about the number of parking spaces should be addressed.

Wilson made a motion that with regard to the amendment to the October 4, 2017 major subdivision plan and major use site development plan titled 208 High Street Redevelopment (previously referred to as Commercial Development) that it meets the standards and criteria governing site development, including street design, stormwater and parking standards, and that the board additionally allow the minimum parking space requirement to be exceeded beyond the 25 percent threshold and that that additional parking may be required based on future use of the site and to accommodate that future use. Wilson went on to state in his motion that the amended plan meets the Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 28). Wilson said the waiver for the parking should be included on the plan, and concluded his motion by stating the board approve the project. The motion was seconded by Barkhouse. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Following the vote, Lessard inquired ("for his own clarification," he said) about the difference between the terms "amendment" and "modification," used in agenda items 5 and 6, respectively. Gagnon gracefully deferred to City Attorney Ed Bearor, who inquired if the terms came from the ordinance or if they were applied by Gagnon to the agenda items. He went on to say he did not think the terms mattered so much as to whether the board approved or disapproved the applications and stated their reasons for doing so. Gagnon said she believed there were different terms used in the subdivision ordinance and under site plan review but also said the city would "gain from aligning those words in the future."

6.) Modification to a September 5, 2012 approved and recorded Major Subdivision Plan and re-approval of a non-established/lapsed Major Use Site Development Plan titled Beckwith Pines for Down East Maine Property Management. The approved plan consists of two, four-unit apartment buildings and the proposed modification is for four, two-unit apartment buildings on a 2.3-acre parcel off Route 3/ High Street accessed via Beckwith Court (Tax Map/Lot: 16/47-3), in the Commercial Zone.

a. PUBLIC HEARING, DELIBERATION, FINDING OF FACTS AND CONCLUSION.

Mac Harriman, land surveyor, and Alina Watt, professional engineer with Hedefine Engineering & Design, represented the applicant (Mike Wight of Down East Maine Property Management).

revisions to a plan approved previously

Amendment to a previously approved plan for 208 High Street — previously referred to as Commercial Development — (major use site development and major subdivision plans) for Ellsworth Retail Management, LLC: **APPROVED, with parking waiver (5-0)**

Discussion about difference between "amendment" and "modification"

Consensus: no major division, but use/alignment should be reviewed

BECKWITH PINES for Down East Maine Property Management

Mac Harriman and Alina Watt present, represent applicant

Harriman recounted the project's review at the previous Planning Board meeting on January 10, 2018, and how at that meeting the board had asked for three things from the applicant: a) screening around the Dumpster, b) a note on the plan relating to the sewer system (limiting future expansion) and c) water line ownership noted on the plan. Harriman said notes 22, 23 and 24 on the revised plan being reviewed tonight addressed those issues.

Harriman reviews requirements board outlined at its last meeting

Wilson asked for clarification about what the city would be taking over with regard to the water line. Water Superintendent Reggie Winslow explained the city was proposing to take over the first couple hundred feet of the water line, from High Street to where it would split to serve the existing Beckwith Woods development and the proposed Beckwith Pines project.

Clarification sought on what will happen with the water line

DeLeo asked about the special exception for sewer, and the stipulation calling for an executed maintenance agreement to be in place before that exception is granted. He asked if that agreement was in place and had been executed. If it was not, he asked if that would prevent the board from approving the project. Gagnon deferred to City Manager David Cole. Cole said such an agreement was not necessarily in place but rather in progress, but said he didn't believe that would keep the Planning Board from approving the proposal.

Discussion of sewer line and associated maintenance agreement

In response to more questions from DeLeo, Wight came to the podium and spoke. Wight said he had options, including taking over the sewer line in full, if a shared maintenance agreement could not be executed. He said he could do that, if needed, because easement rights to the line come with the property he intends to purchase (he is currently under contract). He said his preference as developer is to reach a 50/50 agreement with Beckwith Woods.

Wight addresses sewer line subject

DeLeo directed similar questions to Bearor. The city's attorney said the best approach is to require minimal showing of right, title and interest. He recounted an incident in Ellsworth years ago when there was opposition to a plan to build multi-family housing units in Ellsworth and a question about whether the deed to the property in question allowed such a use. Bearor said the courts in that case affirmed the position of the city, which was that it was not the city's job to determine what deeds meant.

Questions of right, title and interest addressed by City Attorney Bearor

In summary, Bearor said the board need not concern itself with whether an applicant has a right to fully execute their plans or not. He acknowledged the board ran the risk of wasting its time by doing so, if it was later found the developer "does not have all of the sticks in his

bundle of rights that he needs.” He said if an applicant comes before the board with what appears to be sufficient right, title and interest in a parcel of land, the board need not explore the matter beyond that. Reading and interpreting deeds is a job beyond what the Planning Board does. Bearor said Planning Board approval of Wight’s project would not give him greater rights to his land than those he would otherwise get by virtue of his purchase and sale agreement.

Hearing no other immediate questions from board members, Chairman Fink opened a public hearing at 8:06 PM. Christopher Stanley, president of the Beckwith Woods Community Association, spoke. He referred to a letter from the Association dated February 2, a copy of which was previously provided to board members. He asked that the project not go forward tonight. Stanley said the association does not feel that its interests are being valued presently.

Stanley said the association’s concerns include Wight’s right to access and right to use the property. He said there is a concern about what the association sees as the commercial nature of Beckwith Pines: that Wight will be receiving income from tenants living there. Wight said the proposed Beckwith Pines units “don’t complement” the existing structures up there now. Stanley said he wanted board members to know the association’s concerns are serious ones.

Stanley said the association had received no information from the Water Department about what its plans were for taking over part of the line as a public line. Stanley said Wight’s explanation about why the city would take over part of the line but not all of the line did not make sense to him. Stanley said he felt the developer needs to adhere to the requirements of the deed and covenant restrictions as they were written 30 years ago. Stanley said the association is prepared to work with the developer but said that cannot be done except as provided under the terms of the covenant.

Wilson asked if Stanley could cite any ordinances that were not being met in order for the Planning Board to focus its review of the application. Stanley said he did not understand how the board could approve a plan in which the water and sewer line connections appeared to be “in question.” He said the association did not understand how the plan could be approved when there were still outstanding questions of water, sewer and access, from its perspective.

Fink and Stanley discussed the right-of-way and other matters. Stanley said the legal advice the association had received suggested there was a lot of “murkiness” and “unclear facts.” Fink said if the board approves the project and the developer does not have all necessary

Continued explanation from Bearor on what is germane to the board’s review and what is not

Public hearing opened at 8:06 PM

Christopher Stanley of Beckwith Woods Community Association shares concerns with board

Explanation of concerns by Stanley

Stanley has questions about proposed water line agreement with city

Stanley shares concerns about outstanding questions relating to water, sewer

Fink says board is limited to review within ordinances

rights, “he’s not going anywhere despite our approval.” Fink reiterated that unless there is a violation of a city ordinance, then the board has no valid reason to say no.

Barkhouse asked about Stanley’s assertion that this project is a commercial endeavor. Tilton said the city has never looked at residential development as a commercial endeavor. Stanley referred to language in the sewer ordinance, and Gagnon noted different city ordinances in some cases have different definitions. Gagnon said in this case, under the UDO, the definition of residential does not relate to how it is managed or how it is owned but rather how it is used. Discussion continued.

Fink noted that the definition of “commercial use” in the UDO (Chapter 56, Article 14) concludes by saying it is “exclusive of rental or residential buildings and/or dwelling units.” Stanley again referred to language he had seen in the sewer ordinance, and the fact the project is in a commercial zone and designed to be a source of income. Gagnon and Fink explained why that did not matter in this case, and Fink read the full definition of “commercial use” under the UDO. He also noted the project is an allowed use in the commercial zone.

DeLeo asked Bearor if any of the issues Stanley raised constituted a “red flag” for the board’s review of the project. In short, he said no.

Cole returned to the podium to speak about the sewer line and maintenance agreement. He noted again that Wight could assume full responsibility for the sewer line if he is unable to reach an agreement with the Beckwith Woods Community Association. With regard to the water line, he said city staff had inspected the existing line and Cole said it was a “prudent course of action” for the city to take over the line from High Street to where it splits to the two projects. He said in terms of maintenance accessibility it did not make sense to go further.

Wight spoke and said that in the deed for the property he intends to purchase (he said he is under contract at this time), he is responsible for maintenance of the water line in the right-of-way. He said he was pleased with the city’s decision to take over the line up to the split.

Wilson asked about a letter from Richard Traub regarding a sewer easement. Wight said the matter had been looked into, and it was determined that the sewer easement did not cross Traub’s property.

Stanley returned to the podium and asked for an explanation of the Water Department’s decision to take over the line to the split because something different had been discussed previously. Winslow

Questions about whether this project is a commercial or residential endeavor

Fink and Gagnon explain this project not seen, under the ordinance, as a commercial one

Bearor sees no red flags with concerns shared by Stanley

Cole reiterates points on sewer line, says proposal for the water line a “prudent” one

Wight supports plan for city taking over water line

Question about sewer easement asked, addressed

Stanley asks why plan for water line has changed

described how the existing line serving the Beckwith Woods development is approximately 8 feet in front of the buildings, and that there are trees and decorative lighting in that area. Winslow said he felt it was too much of a liability for the city to accept responsibility for that portion of the line because of those factors. He provided photographs to the Planning Board, which were then entered into the record, to illustrate what he was talking about. Winslow said there are also some trees around the line in the section the city is proposing taking over, but he said his department could work around those trees.

Reggie Winslow explains why city is not taking over the full line, shares photos with board

Stanley said when a similar project was proposed five years ago by a different developer, the city water department had drafted an easement to take over the entire water line. He asked what had changed since then. He also referred to the section of line the city is preparing to accept responsibility for and said it passes under approximately 10, 40-50 foot tall pine trees. He questioned how the city could maintain the line under those trees. He said it was a change in what had previously been discussed with regard to this proposed project.

Stanley has additional questions about water line

Fink said the concern was not a Planning Board issue specifically. He noted the agreement from five years ago had not been executed. Stanley and Fink engaged in a discussion. Fink said the Planning Board must make its decisions based on the city's ordinances and cannot turn down a project without good reason for doing so. Fink said he has previously voted in favor of projects that he personally didn't care for but which ordinances allowed since the project met the standards.

Fink addresses Stanley's concern, shares general view on how board must operate

With no other audience members wishing to speak, Fink closed the public hearing at 8:31 PM.

Public hearing closed at 8:31 PM

Wilson said he believed the applicant had met all the requirements that had been put before him and had been responsive. He said there were still agreements that needed to be reached outside of the Planning Board process. He said there are appeals processes in place for abutters and other parties.

Wilson says Wight did all asked of him

Wilson made a motion that with regard to the modification to a September 5, 2012 approved and recorded Major Subdivision Plan and re-approval of a non-established/lapsed Major Use Site Development Plan titled Beckwith Pines that the Planning Board finds it meets Section 607 standards and criteria regarding site development plan review, including Performance, Street Design and Construction, Stormwater and Parking standards, without any waivers, and that the applicant met Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 28) requirements and that the Planning Board approve

**Modification to a previously approved subdivision plan and re-approval of a non-established /lapsed plan for Beckwith Pines for Down East Maine Property Management:
APPROVED (5-0)**

the project. DeLeo seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

7.) Signing of Mylars & Adjournment

After an initial inquiry whether there were any mylars to sign, and hearing there were none, Wilson made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Fink. A vote was called but not completed when it was discovered that there was, in fact, a set of mylars (Beckwith Pines) to sign. After discussion, Fink motioned to adjourn once the mylars were signed. That motion was seconded by Wilson, and without further discussion the vote in favor of the motion was unanimous (5-0). The meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m. Mylars and plans for Beckwith Pines were signed.

Minutes prepared by: Steve Fuller, Assistant City Planner

Minutes approved by Ellsworth Planning Board on March 7, 2018:

3-7-2018 
Date Mike Howie, Secretary
Ellsworth Planning Board

Meeting adjourned at 8:34 PM.

Mylars and plans for Beckwith Pines signed

Agendas and minutes posted on the city of Ellsworth's website: ellsworthmaine.gov