

Town of Mount Desert Planning Board Minutes October 12, 2022

Board Members Present: Meredith Randolph, Tracy Loftus Keller, Christie Anastasia, Gloria Kunje

Chair William Hanley and Member David Ashmore were not in attendance.

Members of the Public Present: Judy McPherson, Todd Mydland, Michael Hewes, Zachary F. Jordan, Rene Courtemanche, Paul Slack, Joe Schmitt, Jim Fuchs, Emily Fuchs, Lee White, Stanford Whitehouse, Jesse Stone, Michael Strawbridge

I. Call to order 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Randolph called the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Board Members were identified.

Gloria Kunje is an Alternate, non-voting member.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDDING, TO NAME MEREDITH RANDOLPH AS ACTING CHAIR FOR THE MEETING.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDDING, MAKING ALTERNATE MEMBER GLORIA KUNJE A VOTING MEMBER FOR THE MEETING.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

II. Approval of Minutes

September 14, 2022:

Approval of Minutes was tabled due to lack of a quorum.

III. Conditional Use Approval Application(s):

A. Conditional Use Approval Application # 011-2022

OWNER(S) NAME(S): George and Hillery Ballantyne

(George C. Ballantyne Trust)

APPLICANT: Zachary Jordan, Hewes Co.

AGENT: Rene Courtemanche, Hedefine Engineering & Design, Inc.

LOCATION: 40 Steamboat Wharf Road, Seal Harbor

TAX MAP: 029 **LOT:** 016 **ZONE(S):** Shoreland Residential Two (SR2)

PURPOSE: Section 3.4 & 6C.5 Essential Services. The Installation of a year-round water line and underground electric and communication lines.

SITE INSPECTION: 3:35PM

No Conflict of Interest was found among the Board.

CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

Ms. Loftus Keller reported on the Site Visit. Representatives from Hewes Co. and Hedefine Engineering & Design, Inc. were on site. The current utilities were observed. The utility lines currently overhead in front of the owner's house will be moved underground along the line the current above-ground lines run. There was discussion regarding which trees would be removed for the work.

Ms. Randolph reported on concerns from the neighbors regarding the project's impact on them. Those at the Site Visit discussed alternatives and other options.

Agent Rene Courtemanche added that the project includes a utility installation to provide year-round water service to the Owner's home. A municipal water main under Steamboat Wharf Road stops short of the owner's property. The Owners are proposing an approximate 90-foot extension to connect to the municipal water main, and a blowoff hydrant near the end of the line. The project has been coordinated with the Mount Desert Water District. Plans for the extension must be approved by the Water District before work can proceed.

On the north end of the Owner's property there is an existing utility pole. The Owner proposes to replace that pole with one that meets the standards required by Versant. From the new overhead utility pole, lines will go underground past the Owner's property, and then resurface to connect to another pole proposed for the south side of the Steamboat Wharf area. The proposed project has been discussed with the utility companies to determine what is and is not allowed and optimal pole locations.

The owners have applied for a sewer permit, road opening permit, and utility location permit.

Neighbor Judy McPherson stated that there is a Right of Way (ROW) that runs between the Owner's property and hers. Ms. McPherson is concerned about the aesthetic of the poles. The new pole will be higher than the current pole, making the visual impact worse. One possibility is to bring the pole closer to Steamboat Wharf Road. It was her understanding that such a proposal would involve restringing utility lines. She believed it to be a feasible option and would not require more tree removal than already planned. She requested that pricing be obtained for the option of rewiring, and further exploration of this option occur before any decision is made.

The ROW easement between the two properties is old; no historic record has been found regarding who gave the easement or when. Mr. Courtemanche has found no documentation confirming the ROW is an official recorded easement. The utilities were installed at a time when such records were not kept.

Mr. Courtemanche noted that moving the pole closer to the road has been considered. The route of the utility lines is required by the utility company to stay within the pathway of the current utility lines.

Ms. McPherson reported that she was told some of the lines on the pole are now obsolete. There's an opportunity to remove some of the excess, reducing the eyesore.

With regard to the water line also being dug, Ms. Randolph inquired whether anyone's considered leaving the pole in place and continue the proposed water trench to the south side to connect to the utility trench. Versant has confirmed they cannot trench a utility line to cross under the road. Mr. Hewes reported that moving the pole down the hill was discussed with Versant. Versant confirmed it can be done; however, a number of large trees would have to be cut. Versant requires 20 feet cleared on either side of the line.

Ms. McPherson believed the pole could be moved with minimal additional tree removal. Mr. Courtemanche explained that if the pole is relocated any further than 2 to 3 feet, it will affect the lines coming from that pole. The lines will have to be restrung. Restrunging requires new wires, new poles, and a new cleared area all the way up the length of the line. It would involve ensuring a 20-foot clearance for the pole's new location running all the way up hill. Clearing would be necessary to allow Versant access to the poles for installation and maintenance. The owners do not want to make a change that affects the length of the line, and they don't want to lose the trees on their property that such a pole relocation would necessitate.

Mr. Courtemanche confirmed that the extensive relocation required, as well as cost, were factors in the owners' preferences. Ms. McPherson asserted that she was told relocation was feasible with no tree removal. Ms. Randolph confirmed the 20-foot clearance required for pole relocation was discussed at the site visit; discussion of the cost of such a relocation was focused upon.

Ms. Randolph opened the discussion to the public.

Resident Todd Mydland voiced concern about the water main changes proposed, and the blowoffs.

Mr. Courtemanche reported an extension of the water main in that area was made last year. The end of last year's extension is where the currently proposed water main will start. It will extend uphill 90 feet to the owners' property. The owners can then connect their service to the water line. A blow off pipe is proposed for that location. There is a ditched area there the Water Company agreed was an acceptable site for the blowoff.

Water District representative Paul Slack confirmed that approximately 1000 feet of line is scheduled to be installed in the public way. 300 feet of that extension is already installed and active. A portion of the water main is installed on the private property of Ringing Point. The rest of the line is intended to be finished this fall/winter.

Mr. Mydland stated his concern that the Planning Board is prematurely approving an application to install water when there is no water line to connect to. There is no way to know the effects of installing water to the property. The year-round water ends at Mr. Mydland's 19 Steamboat Wharf Road property. Mr. Mydland noted the line may never be installed, or it could be installed incorrectly. Mr. Mydland requested the water portion of the application be kept separate from the rest of the application and delayed until such time that the new water line is in place. The line can then be evaluated by the Water District, and Mr. Mydland can evaluate the effect the extension is having on the blowoff on his property.

Ms. Randolph noted that the Ringing Point application is approved and moving forward. Mr. Mydland believed the Ringing Point project was supposed to be complete by now. The answers Mr. Mydland's received from the project consultant regarding the blowoff valves were not satisfactory.

Mr. Slack reiterated that there is a 300-foot active water main in place now that can be extended to satisfy this proposed extension. Mr. Slack believed Mr. Mydland's concerns lie with the blowoff. Mr. Mydland purchased his properties in the early 2000s; one of those houses had a blowoff that has been there for approximately 40 years. The Mydlands extended the water main to get year-round water to their 19 Steamboat Wharf Road property. To do that a blowoff was required to be installed to allow seasonal water mains a point at which to drain. The Water District advised Mr. Mydland that the blowoffs would be reviewed for water quality issues. Mr. Slack stated that there have been no blowoffs from Mr. Mydland's property running since April.

The water main project is on schedule. There are narrow windows of time for this type of work to be done. The reconstruction done around the fountain was in preparation for the water main project, to streamline the water main work. The water supplying the main is being backfed around the hill.

Mr. Mydland reiterated that there is no year-round water system in place and the Planning Board is approving an extension to a line that may or may not work. He does not know if water testing has been done, or the location of the proposed blowoffs. He worried the water may be drained to the nearby creek. Mr. Slack stated the water is tested daily. The water is draining to the Ringing Point property. When the water main work is complete, it will extend from Steamboat Wharf to the library. Once this occurs the Water District can then assess the situation and make further decisions on how to proceed.

Ms. Randolph noted that blowoff valves are used to drain seasonal lines when winter approaches. Increasing year-round lines should reduce the blowoff system due to fewer seasonal lines. Mr. Slack explained that blowoffs are also used for flushing lines, particularly for a new line. Mr. Slack added

that year-round water lines will mean year-round water for fire protection. A hydrant is proposed for the end of Steamboat Wharf Road, and one for Cooksey Drive.

Ms. Randolph noted that this application is for year-round water at this residence, meaning one less residence using the blowoff system. The risk that the project does not move forward is the Applicant's risk. The Planning Board can add a condition to any potential approval that there must be a water line for the residence to hook up to. The project the Applicant will be hooking up to is under way.

Mr. Mydland stated that blowoffs have occurred on his property every day all year long for years. He hoped the Planning Board would make connecting to a completed water main a condition of approval.

Mr. Courtemanche reported the same engineer and contractor are handling both projects. There are no concerns regarding the compatibility of the two projects.

Mr. Slack noted that Mr. Mydland reported on and shared pictures of water sheeting occurring at the end of Steamboat Wharf Road. Engineer Greg Johnston has been working with the Town to change the road grading in that area. This will accommodate the water draining in that area. It will be done at the same time as the installation of the water main extension.

Resident Stanford Whitehouse represents the Seal Harbor Yacht Club, which does not currently have year-round access to water. He asked if the Yacht Club could also connect to the new, year-round service. Mr. Slack noted year-round service for the Yacht Club will depend on how the Yacht Club's prefers to connect. The Yacht Club water line runs underneath the road; some of it is not buried properly. The project will be a complicated one, and up to the Yacht Club on how they want to proceed.

Mr. Whitehouse asked about the grading changes proposed. He hoped the Yacht Club would be included in that discussion. Such a change could potentially create runoff through the Yacht Club property. Mr. Slack clarified that the regrading will be done by the Steamboat Wharf driveway. Mr. Slack was unaware of any other grading changes proposed.

Ms. McPherson pointed out Mr. Slack's comment regarding underground lines crossing the road. She inquired whether it was Versant who refused to cross the road with utility lines, or the Owner of the property applying for the permit. Mr. Courtemanche reported that the option was not pursued because Versant removed the option at the beginning of the project discussions.

Mr. Hewes pointed out that the owners were going through considerable expense to improve the aesthetics for that portion of their property. There is a significant group of lines in that area that will be put out of sight underground. Further complications could put the project in jeopardy. Ms. McPherson believed it benefitted their property at the expense of hers.

Zack Jordan of Hewes Company believed that anything being put underground would be updated and superior to what is currently in place. If the pole were to break, Versant would replace it with exactly the type of pole being proposed. The project must meet what Versant's standards require.

There were no further public comments.

Ms. Randolph closed Public Comment.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT FORM.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION.

A review was made of the Section 6 Checklist and is attached to these Minutes.

Ms. McPherson reiterated her concern that exploration of all other possible solutions has not been fully exhausted. Ms. Randolph noted Mr. Courtemanche's testimony states that years of planning have gone into the project. Comments made during the meeting suggest that alternatives have been discussed. Ms. Loftus Keller pointed out that the subject pole is a junction point. This makes it hard to find another option or location. Additional avenues to pursue are difficult to identify.

Ms. McPherson asserted the argument has been that Versant is unwilling to change. She suggested perhaps Versant could be persuaded to do more, and the property owners could carry the cost of Versant's involvement. Mr. Courtemanche cited emails with Versant regarding this work dating back several years. Versant has been clear about the options. Mr. Jordan pointed out the numbers of different Versant personnel on site, confirming the history of discussion and the process of determining the best way to proceed. Mr. Hewes confirmed the pole at the north end of the property is too complicated a juncture to move without significant cost and environmental impact. What is being done will be an improvement to the neighborhood. Ms. McPherson disagreed. Mr.

Courtemanche noted the pole will be in the same place, only slightly taller, with less wires. The pole will be 45 feet tall. The height of the pole is a regulation of Versant; there is no way to defy such a regulation. There is no way to prohibit the changing out of a utility pole.

Mr. Mydland asked for a condition of approval to be that the system cannot be installed until the Water District takes control of the system and improves it and is maintaining it. Ms. Randolph noted the line can be attached to the seasonal water line currently in place. The line can be a seasonal water line until such time as it changes. Mr. Slack restated that the year-round water line installed so far has been tested and is approved and in use.

Mr. Courtemanche referred to a letter dated September 13, 2022 from the Water District and included in the Permit Application packet. It notes the condition that before the line can be installed the Water District must approve design plans for the proposed water main. Such a required approval may address Mr. Mydland's concern. Mr. Mydland requested a copy of the letter.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AS AMENDED TO REQUIRE AS A CONDITION OF APPROVAL THAT, PER A LETTER FROM THE WATER DISTRICT DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2022, PRIOR TO INSTALLATION THE WATER DISTRICT MUST APPROVE DESIGN PLANS FOR THE PROPOSED WATER MAIN.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

B. Conditional Use Approval Application #012-2022

OWNER(S) NAME(S): Mount Desert Water District

AGENT: Paul Slack, General Manager

LOCATION: Starting at fountain in Route 3 running down Steamboat Wharf Road to Seal Harbor Library, Seal Harbor

ZONE(S): Conservation (C), Resource Protection (RP), Shoreland One (SR1) & Shoreland Two (SR2) zoning districts.

PURPOSE: Public Utilities. Replacement of an existing 6" year-round water main line with a 10" year-round water main line.

SITE INSPECTION: 3:15PM

No Conflicts of Interest were found among the Board.

CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

Ms. Loftus Keller reported on the Site Visit. Water District Representative Paul Slack was on site and explained the underground water main is proposed to be replaced, starting at the water

fountain on Route 3, extending the length of the road along the edge of the road for approximately 700 feet. The water main will be expanded from a six-inch diameter to a 10-inch diameter pipe. This will allow for more water volume and more water pressure, ultimately supplying fire hydrants further uphill.

Ms. Randolph added that discussion ensued at the Site Visit regarding a previous project at the fountain that was done several years ago in preparation for this project. Mr. Slack confirmed the infrastructure at the fountain was completed in preparation for this work. The work is intended to improve a resident's water situation, and also improve water quality and fire suppression capabilities along the 700-foot stretch. The size of the pipe is required for fire suppression capability necessary further down the road, once already-approved water line work is complete. Mr. Slack hoped the project could be approved and done this fall.

Ms. Randolph opened the discussion to public comment.

Mr. Mydland stated that the 2021 application presented by Mr. Slack included nothing about fire suppression; the work was solely focused on water service to Ringing Point. While the news of extra fire hydrants is good news, Mr. Mydland was unsure where the water line ends, and what will be done with that water at the end. He pointed out that the 2021 project included engineering drawings and detail on the work planned and how it would occur. No engineering drawings were submitted for this application. A sketch is all that was provided. Mr. Mydland is concerned with the lack of technical detail offered on this Application. He noted there are other lines and utilities in that road. Additionally, Mr. Mydland is concerned regarding the blowoffs. There is no easement in place. He requested the application be deferred until technical detail has been submitted.

Mr. Slack believed engineer drawings were not necessary as this is not a new main with new construction. This water main will be replaced in the same location as the current water main, and with everything attached as it is with the current water main. Mr. Slack reported that Public Works Director Smith approved the project. Mr. Slack stated the Board received a visual map showing the location of the current water main. No sewer mains, storm drains, or topography will be affected. Blowoff valves will remain the same. The increased diameter will increase flow. The new pipe will allow for more water. The current pipe is approximately 75 years old. Additionally, a hydrant is being replaced on this line. On Cooksey Drive one hydrant is being replaced, and a second one will be installed. The hydrants are not a part of this application.

Mr. Slack stated that no sewer or other underground utilities are in the trench to be dug for the replacement of this water line. Mr. Mydland asked how the Water District is able to determine there's room for a larger water line. Mr. Slack explained the road was already disturbed when the line was put in. There is usually adequate room for such an enlargement. The trench could be dug as wide as four feet in width

Mr. Mydland asked if the project is bonded, and whether it's wise to do this project when the other project is not yet complete. Mr. Slack explained that water quality and hydrant flow capability in

the existing system will be improved by this project. This particular project has been in the works for years.

No blasting for the project is anticipated. CEO Keene inquired how the need to replace water connections would be determined. Mr. Slack reported they would be inspected as the work progresses. Connections will be replaced at that time as deemed necessary. The Water District will not come in a second time to replace connections.

Ms. Randolph asked for other public comment. There was none.

Ms. Randolph closed the public comment.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

Ms. Loftus Keller wondered if the sketch presented sufficed. Ms. Randolph believed the cost of engineering drawings was expensive for what is essentially a line replacement. CEO Keene reminded the Board that project cost is not an issue the Board needs to consider.

Mr. Slack reiterated that the Public Works Director approved of the project. Ms. Randolph explained that a letter from the Public Works Director does not equate to engineer drawings. The Board must have a firm understanding of what is being proposed through the review of engineer drawings.

Mr. Slack argued that engineer's drawings would not add to the Board's review. CEO Keene disagreed; engineer drawings would provide detail of the system to be replaced, details regarding hydrant replacement, existing lines and water boxes, culvert and storm drain crossings. Mr. Slack stated that a GIS drawing including curb stops has been presented with the Application. The location of the main is shown, and its depth is five feet. Engineer drawings would change nothing.

CEO Keene believed the plan submitted shows very little information.

Ms. Randolph pointed out that without engineer drawings, the Planning Board is essentially being asked to take Mr. Slack's word of what is planned. Engineer drawings provide a firm record of what is in place and what is being proposed.

Mr. Slack reiterated it's an existing main five feet in depth. The pipe will be taken out and replaced and the connections to the pipe will be reinstated. Nothing else is changing. Ms. Randolph pointed out that Mr. Slack has mentioned review and possible replacement of water boxes, and a hydrant will be replaced. Such things should be made clear on an engineer's plan. Mr. Slack asserted that a hydrant replacement is simple and only requires DigSafe. Engineer drawings are not required for such a replacement. If the Board prefers the hydrant not be replaced, he can delay the replacement.

Ms. Randolph reiterated that it is not a question of the hydrant. It is a question of evidence that the project proposed is clear to the Planning Board via the review of engineer drawings. The Planning Board must have facts before them as support for the decision they make. Mr. Slack maintained that there was no need for further information for the replacement of a water main as long as nothing else is being affected.

It was pointed out that the first phase of this project presented engineer drawings. Other projects with engineer drawings were noted. CEO Keene reminded the Board that in the event of an Appeal the Board must ask itself if there is enough documentation presented to show that a thorough review was made. Mr. Slack argued that presenting to the Public Works Director and the Director's approval should be adequate proof. He asked why such a project was required to go before the Planning Board in the first place. A Road Opening Permit should have sufficed. He reported the DOT was surprised that the project was required to go before the Planning Board.

CEO Keene reported that Planning Board Chair William Hanley deemed the project should go before the Board. Public Utilities require a conditional use permit when within the Shoreland Zone. Further, the project is not a simple replacement; the line is being expanded from six inches to ten inches. Mr. Slack disagreed that expanding the line from six to ten inches made it more than a simple replacement.

Ms. Randolph stated that with regard to whether or not the Application was complete, if the Board requires engineering drawings then the Application is not in fact complete.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDED THE MOTION TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: NAY

GLORIA KUNJE: NAY

CHRISTIA ANASTASIA: NAY

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: NAY

MOTION DEFEATED, 0-4 (LOFTUS KELLER, KUNJE, ANASTASIA, RANDOLPH OPPOSED)

Ms. Randolph stated that the project requires engineer drawings in order to be properly reviewed by the Board.

Discussion regarding the scheduling of the next meeting and the question of continuing the discussion ensued.

Mr. Slack argued that the Planning Board just approved an application for a 90-foot water line extension with no engineer drawings. He reiterated he was replacing a line and reattaching in-place services; such work does not require engineer drawings. The Board reviewed the last Application and confirmed it included ground contour and soils information, cross-section drawings, documentation on trees, grades, manholes, detail on water and sewer lines with details, and the drawings are stamped and signed.

Engineering drawings must be presented to the Town November 2, 2022 to allow for the Planning Board to review for the November 9, 2022 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Slack inquired about the Zoning Board of Appeals process. An explanation of the Appeals process was given. An Appeals meeting could likely not be scheduled until December 2022.

MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO CONTINUE THE MEETING TO THE NOVEMBER 9, 2022 PLANNING BOARD MEETING.

VOTE:

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

C. Conditional Use Approval Application #013-2022

OWNER(S) NAME(S): A.C. Fernald Sons, Inc.

APPLICANT: Bar Harbor Banking & Trust

AGENT: Lee White, Bangor Neon

LOCATION: 1055 Main Street, Somesville

TAX MAP: 010 **LOT:** 146 **ZONE(S):** Village Commercial (VC) & Shoreland Commercial (SC)

PURPOSE: Section 6B.15 – Sign Regulations, subsection 6B.15.6.2 Size Limit. Conditional Use Approval for the aggregate of all signs on site pertaining to a business, exceeding 32 sq. ft.

SITE INSPECTION: 2:45PM

Ms. Loftus Keller disclosed that she had a Conflict of Interest. She is an employee of the Applicant. The Board concurred.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONDING, ACCEPTING MS. LOFTUS KELLER'S RECUSAL FROM THE DISCUSSION DUE TO HER STATED CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

VOTE:

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

Ms. Loftus Keller was recused.

CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

Ms. Randolph was at the Site Visit. The Applicant is replacing a sign already in place. Additionally, they are requesting two signs on the building. Neither sign proposed for the building will be lit. The

sign being replaced will have some solar lighting from a bar at the top shining down onto the sign. A 24-hour ATM sign will be below the sign being replaced.

Joe Schmitt was in attendance as a Bar Harbor Bank and Trust Representative. Lee White, agent for the project, was also in attendance.

Mr. Schmitt reported that an ATM is being added to the building. Signage is being added to better identify the building and the new ATM. The sign being replaced will be 29.5sf. A circular-shaped sign proposed for the front of the building will be 12.5sf. The horizontal sign proposed for the drive-up will be 9.6sf. This totals 51.5sf, exceeding the allowed 32sf.

Existing signage is 29.5sf.

Mr. Lee reported the DOT has provided a verbal approval. A DOT representative is required to be on site when the digging is done to ensure the sign is set 30 inches below grade and that metal conduit is used. Once that has been confirmed the DOT will provide written approval. Mr. Schmitt pointed out that an abutter in the area has been granted a variance to the 32sf. They have more signage than what the Applicant is asking.

Ms. Randolph asked for Public Comment. There was none.

Ms. Randolph closed Public Comment.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

VOTE:

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONING, TO USE THE SHORT FORM.

VOTE:

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION.

A review of the Section 6 Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

It was noted that a written approval from the Maine DOT must be submitted as part of the Application when the letter is provided.

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONDDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AS AMENDED TO REQUIRE AS CONDITION OF APPROVAL THE SUBMITTAL OF WRITTEN MAINE DOT APPROVAL AS PART OF THE APPLICATION WHEN THE LETTER IS PRESENTED.

VOTE:

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

V. Other

There was no Other Business.

VI. Adjournment

MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. KUNJE SECONDDING, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

VOTE:

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

GLORIA KUNJE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 3-0.

The Meeting adjourned at 9:12PM.