

**Town of Mount Desert Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
6:00 PM, September 9, 2020**

This meeting was held virtually and was recorded.

Public Present:

Allan Kleinman, Noel Musson, Lauri Fernald, Sandra Swinburne, Jane Skelton, Sharon ???, Kathleen Miller, Mike MacDonald, Mark ???, Mollie Seyfer, Katrina Clark, Willie Granston, Rob Frank, Jasmine, Matthew Tonello, Nick Jenei, Tom Savage, Mike MacDonald, Jane MacDonald, Don, Mike, Tom Savage, Abbie Savage.

Board Members Present:

Chair Bill Hanley, Tracy Loftus Keller, Dave Ashmore, Meredith Randolph, Joanne Eaton, Christie Anastasia

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

Chair Hanley called the Meeting to order. Board Members were noted. Tracy Loftus Keller is an Alternate, Non-voting Member.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of August 26, 2020:

MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 26, 2020 MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

VOTE:

JOANNE EATON: AYE

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

III. Conditional Use Approval Application(s):

A. Conditional Use Approval Application #009-2020

OWNER NAME(S): Brookside Cemetery Association - C/O Jordan Fernald Funeral Home

APPLICANT: Lauri Fernald, Jordan Funeral Home

AGENT: Noel Musson, The Musson Group

LOCATION: Off Brookside Road, Somesville

TAX MAP: 010 **LOT:** 094 **ZONE(S):** Stream Protection & Shoreland Residential 3

PURPOSE: Sections 3.4 & 6C.5.2 – Other Essential Services. Installation of an underground electrical service and meter to an existing pump house within cemetery.

SITE INSPECTION: 5:00PM Masks Required During Site Inspection.

CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

Ms. Anastasia reported on the Site Inspection. Brookside Cemetery is located off Main Street in Somesville. The road into the cemetery runs East to West. There is a pump by a creek that

1 supplies water to the cemetery for watering purposes. Currently the powersource is a conduit
2 that cuts across the creek, almost going through the water to an adjacent property. The
3 Applicant is proposing to have an electrical line connected directly to the pump and metered to
4 the cemetery. There is an existing pole for power on the North side of the road. A trench will
5 need to cross the road and then follow the road between the creek and the road for a short
6 distance to reach the pump.

7
8 Agent Noel Musson clarified that Lauri Fernald is the Clerk for Brookside Cemetery. Jordan
9 Fernald Funeral Home is not connected to the Application.

10
11 The work proposed will allow the electrical to the cemetery to be formally metered. A variety of
12 options were discussed, but using a trench appeared to be best, and will not change the visual
13 impact to the area. A solar option was explored and found not to be a viable option due to the
14 location.

15
16 Chair Hanley requested public comment. There was none.

17
18 No Conflict of Interest was found.

19
20 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

21 VOTE:

22 JOANNE EATON: AYE

23 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

24 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

25 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

26 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

27 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

28
29 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT FORM.

30 VOTE:

31 JOANNE EATON: AYE

32 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

33 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

34 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

35 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

36 MOTION APPROVED 5-0

37
38 MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION.

39
40 A review of the Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

41
42 VOTE:

43 JOANNE EATON: AYE

44 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

45 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

46 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

47 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

48 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

1
2 **B. Conditional Use Approval Application #012-2020**

3 **OWNER(S):** The Community School of Mount Desert

4 **AGENT(S):** Nick Jenei & Jasmine W. Smith

5 **LOCATION:** 585 Sound Drive, Mount Desert

6 **TAX MAP:** 010 **LOT(S):** 161 **ZONE(S):** Shoreland Residential Three (SR3), Rural or Woodland
7 Three (RW3) and Resource Protection (RP)

8 **PURPOSE:** Section- 5.6 – Amendment to a previously approved Conditional Use Approval -
9 Independent School. (CUA#010-2016)

10 **SITE INSPECTION:** 4:30PM Masks Required During Site Inspection.

11 CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

12
13 Ms. Randolph reported on the Site Inspection. The School has three platforms with tents on
14 them. The platforms are spread out on the field. Students' belongings are in enclosed
15 containers at the locations. Toward the creek there are picnic tables. The tables will be
16 relocated and a shelter for them will be added.

17
18 Agent Jasmine Smith reported that school started September 8, 2020. There are thirty students
19 attending and they are utilizing the platform areas. The picnic tables will be moved to outside
20 the Shoreland Resource area. The School intends to use the platforms through the fall while
21 the school is undergoing air quality assessments and duct work. Ms. Smith noted the School
22 was likely to use the platforms in the spring as well during the Covid pandemic.

23
24 CEO Keene inquired about a discrepancy in the proposal. The Proposal is for four platforms, and
25 she believed there are now five planned. Ms. Smith corrected her; the Proposal is for four
26 platforms, but the actual number planned is three. There are no plans for building a fourth
27 platform. There is a Site Plan showing where the picnic tables and canopy are proposed to be
28 located.

29
30 CEO Keene stated that typically no development can occur within the Resource Protection area,
31 unless all other locations are unfeasible.

32
33 Ms. Smith stated the tables are being moved slightly to pull them out of the Resource Protection
34 Zone. They are currently out of the Shoreland Zone. The tables will remain in the same general
35 area.

36
37 Chair Hanley noted this was an after-the-fact Amendment to a previously approved Conditional
38 Use Permit Application. The changes were a Covid-19 accommodation to ensure the School
39 could open on time and in a safe manner. Other projects under similar circumstances have
40 been reviewed by the Planning Board.

41
42 Chair Hanley asked for Public Comment. There was none.

43
44 No Conflict of Interest was found.

45
46 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.
47 VOTE:

48 JOANNE EATON: AYE

1 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
2 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE
3 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
4 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE
5 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
6

7 A review of the Amendment Checklist began.
8

9 Chair Hanley noted the Project is before the Board because the tents are sitting on three
10 permanent platform structures, and also the two canopies over the picnic tables are intended to
11 be permanent structures.
12

13 CEO Keene understood the tent platforms would be temporary. Ms. Keene read from the
14 Application: "proposed location of four (*now three*) planned temporary tent platforms."
15

16 Ms. Smith stated that due to the engineering requirements and restrictions dictating how the
17 platforms had to be built, they are more permanent structures than had been originally
18 intended. The tents will not be on the platforms permanently. Chair Hanley described them as
19 framed decks with frostproof sonor tubes. Ms. Smith noted the platforms will be used for
20 theater performances and continued outdoor classroom space once the Covid pandemic has
21 subsided. The platforms would be incorporated into the School's outdoor curriculum.
22

23 CEO Keene asked if the State Fire Marshal has seen the plans and approved them. She has not
24 seen their report. Ms. Smith noted the Fire Marshal requested two staircases on each end of
25 each platform.
26

27 Ms. Randolph asked whether the School would have to revisit the request if they put the tents
28 back up in the Spring. Or, are tents allowed to be used every year? CEO Keene said it was the
29 Planning Board's decision. The Applicant should tell the Board this is a recurring annual use if it
30 is planned as such.
31

32 Agent Nick Jenei asked if the Planning Board has jurisdiction over temporary structures like
33 tents. CEO Keene stated the Board has jurisdiction over structures whether temporary or
34 permanent. The Planning Board has jurisdiction to review the use. The use has now expanded
35 outside the footprint of the existing house reviewed and approved in 2016. This is why the issue
36 requires Planning Board review. Mr. Jenei added that while the platform construction is up to
37 code, no concrete was poured for them. They used eight-inch deep by eighteen-inch wide sonor
38 tubes. Ms. Smith noted this was the second day of school, and so far the platforms have worked
39 well. If it continues to work, the School would like to have the option to continue to use the
40 platforms seasonally.
41

42 Ms. Eaton noted that the Planning Board has granted other temporary accommodations due to
43 Covid. This Application has transitioned from a Covid accommodation to a permanent
44 expansion. Mr. Jenei agreed; the process has been unfolding for the School. The situation
45 changes day to day. At the time they submitted the Application it was the intent to have very
46 minimal, simple platforms that would be temporary. However, in working with the engineering
47 for the platforms, they discovered there really is no "temporary" platform they can build that is
48 up to code, and the capital investment in the platforms has grown. Ms. Smith added that the

1 school is not trying to expand their space. The School is currently at capacity and has no
2 intention to grow further. This is a way to make use of structures the Covid situation has made
3 necessary. Because of the cost involved, it would be a shame to tear them down after a year, if
4 the School can continue to make practical use out of them.

5
6 Ms. Randolph felt the Board has approved Covid-related changes with little formal application
7 process. And she recalled that other Applicants finding they'd like to continue using the changes
8 created were simply required to come back to re-apply for permanent use. Chair Hanley felt
9 that in this situation, the Applicant is already asking for the temporary accommodation to
10 become permanent. He felt this situation had more content to consider than other
11 accommodation requests.

12
13 Ms. Smith noted the outdoor accommodations were necessary because appropriate air filtration
14 systems were not yet in place inside the School. Ms. Smith would be happy to resubmit, after
15 the Covid pandemic has passed, for permanence. Chair Hanley felt the Application was
16 essentially already at the point of being a request for a permanent change. Ms. Smith reiterated
17 that at the time the Application was submitted, it was the intent that these be temporary
18 structures. Since then that has changed.

19
20 Ms. Randolph felt the Board should review the Application as if for permanent structures, as
21 that is now the intent. Chair Hanley noted review of Sections 6A, B, and C are included, Section
22 5.9 is included, diagrams of the platforms and the canopies over the picnic tables are included.

23
24 CEO Keene noted that she'd met with an abutter who inquired about the work planned. At that
25 time it was Ms. Keene's understanding they would be temporary and that is what she told the
26 abutter. CEO Keene agreed that there was no problem with the School applying for the
27 permanent structures, provided they didn't exceed the 5000sf cap they were given. Mr. Jenei
28 thought this addition brings the School to 3400sf. That number includes the fourth platform
29 that will not be built.

30
31 Ms. Eaton was concerned that the cover letter states the platforms are temporary. CEO Keene
32 suggested the Applicant resubmit a cover letter updated to reflect permanence and include a
33 current site plan showing the structures proposed. Chair Hanley noted that in terms of
34 permanent structures, there is an incongruity between what was submitted, and what is now
35 intended. He felt it would be wise to request the Applicant resubmit the Application with the
36 intent of permanence clearly stated. Such a delay would not affect the School's ability to
37 operate. Conversely, the Board can review the Application, with the statement clearly made
38 that the requested additions are permanent structures. He cautioned that what was submitted
39 does not agree with what is intended. If it were his project, Chair Hanley would want it as
40 consistently worded as possible in the record to avoid future confusion. Any Application and
41 decision will stand with the property. Ms. Eaton voiced concern that the Application could set
42 precedence for other Covid-related accommodations to slide into permanence.

43
44 Ms. Randolph disagreed. There is a full Application before the Board. The Board can include
45 wording that indicates the request is intended for permanent use. Chair Hanley felt that the
46 cover letter clearly stating temporary use would stand in the permanent file. It could
47 theoretically cause confusion at a future time. Ms. Randolph argued that things get changed in
48 Applications frequently. This is not unusual. An Applicant simply initials changes made. Chair

1 Hanley pointed out that the cover letter wording is specific and clearly contrary to what the
2 Planning Board is considering, even if a permit condition were set. Further, there's no penalty
3 or impact to the School to wait until a revised Application and cover letter can be reviewed. It
4 was agreed to resubmit the Application and cover letter. CEO Keene requested an amended
5 description, site plan, and fire marshal approval.
6

7 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, CONTINUING THE COMMUNITY
8 SCHOOL OF MOUNT DESERT REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED
9 CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO THE SEPTEMBER 23, 2020 MEETING.

10 VOTE:

11 JOANNE EATON: AYE

12 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

13 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

14 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

15 CHAIR BILL HALEY: AYE

16 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
17

18 **C. Conditional Use Approval Application #013-2020**

19 **OWNER NAME(S):** Ledgewood 7, LLC – Allan & Joan Kleinman

20 **LOCATION:** 7 Jordan Pond Road, Seal Harbor

21 **TAX MAP:** 031 **LOT:** 070 **ZONE(S):** Village Residential One

22 **PURPOSE:** Section 6B.8 - Fences and walls, exceeding CEO Authority.

23 **SITE INSPECTION:** - 3:00PM Masks Required During Site Inspection.

24 CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.
25

26 Ms. Eaton reported on the Site Inspection. She attended with Chair Hanley. The area is behind
27 the Kleinman's house along the line of the abutting neighbor's property. The area is well
28 landscaped, leading uphill to a stone wall. The neighbors have cut limbs on their property. This
29 opened up the viewshed, affecting the ambience the Applicant has cultivated with their
30 landscaping. The Applicant proposes to build a fence between the properties. Due to the
31 uneven terrain, there are areas where the fence will be well over six feet in height on their side
32 of the property. The neighbors have submitted a letter endorsing the proposed fence.
33

34 Owner Allan Kleinman noted his intent was to keep his gardens peaceful and serene. The house
35 near his property conflicts with that. Additionally, both property owners have picnic tables;
36 each on their own property, but close in proximity. The fence will be to the mutual benefit of
37 both properties.
38

39 Chair Hanley asked for Public Comment. There was none.
40

41 No Conflict of Interest was found.
42

43 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT FORM.

44 VOTE:

45 JOANNE EATON: AYE

46 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

47 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

48 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

1 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE
2 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

3
4 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.
5 VOTE:

6 JOANNE EATON: AYE
7 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
8 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
9 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE
10 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE
11 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

12
13 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION.

14
15 A review of the Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

16
17 VOTE:
18 JOANNE EATON: AYE
19 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
20 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
21 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE
22 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE
23 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.

24
25 **D. Conditional Use Approval Application #014-2020**

26 **OWNER NAME(S):** Mount Desert 365

27 **AGENT:** Kathy Miller, Executive Director

28 **LOCATION:** 6 Old Firehouse Lane, Northeast Harbor

29 **TAX MAP:** 024 **LOT:** 105 **ZONE(S):** Village Commercial

30 **PURPOSE:** Section 6B.16 - Sign Regulations - (7) Restrictions and Sign Limitations on Signs. (2)
31 Size Limit.

32 **SITE INSPECTION:** - 4:00PM Masks Required During Site Inspection.

33 CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

34
35 Ms. Eaton reported on the Site Inspection. She attended with Chair Hanley and Ms. Randolph.
36 Samples of the sign were shared and those in attendance were shown where the signs would
37 go. Some construction is still ongoing at the site. Temporary signs were erected to provide an
38 idea of how it would look. Square footage of the signs has been reduced to 69sf, from 80sf.

39
40 Agent Kathy Miller shared some images with the Board. The building is at 6 Old Firehouse Lane.
41 The Maine Seacoast Mission will use the entirety of the first floor of the building. Mount Desert
42 365 offices will be on the western façade of the building. Entryway on the Western façade will
43 be the main entrance for Mount Desert 365 as well as for apartments on the second floor.
44 Additionally, there is a backdoor entrance there for the Maine Seacoast Mission.

45
46 Signage for the Maine Seacoast Mission is proposed for right above their main door, between
47 the door and the windows. The Mount Desert 365 sign will be over the western door, which is
48 the MD365 main entrance. Maine Seacoast Mission has requested a sign on the western façade

1 as well, as the entryway there leads to a backdoor into their space. Additionally, it was thought
2 that two signposts might be useful. This would be helpful to visitors coming from the opposite
3 direction. The intent was that the signs would be the approximate size of a real estate sign.
4

5 Ms. Miller noted there are also lights for the signposts. They are solar, they sit atop the post
6 and light up both sides of the sign. The light can be set to stay on all night, or to go off after four
7 hours. The lights go on automatically at dark.
8

9 Chair Hanley asked for Public Comment.

10
11 Adjacent property owner Willie Granston asked for confirmation on the sizing of the signpost
12 signs. He noted a real estate sign is 24 inches by 18 inches. Ms. Miller affirmed the signpost
13 signs will be 2 feet by 1 foot. Attached to that sign is a 24-inch by six-inch sign. The two signs
14 together total 24 inches by 18 inches.
15

16 Mr. Granston noted that the sign regulations note the proposed signs are compatible with the
17 building and the surrounding commercial character of the village. This seems to imply that a
18 larger building is able to use larger scale signs. Mr. Granston went across the harbor to see the
19 visual impact of the sign. He noted it was readily visible, and almost legible. The proposed sign
20 seems quite large.
21

22 Chair Hanley thought the Application was before the Planning Board because it exceeds the
23 allowed size. CEO Keene confirmed that was the reason. Each business is limited to 32 square
24 feet in signage. The Planning Board has the authority, with a Conditional Use Permit, to allow
25 signage to exceed the 32 square feet.
26

27 Ms. Miller asked for clarification on whether the allowed signage was per building or per
28 business. CEO Keene confirmed the rule was per business. Additionally, she noted that a single
29 two-sided sign counts as one sign when counting square footage. Ms. Miller noted that Mount
30 Desert 365's total signage is 22sf. Maine Seacoast Mission is 47sf. If the two businesses applied
31 separately, CEO Keene could sign off on MD365 signage, and Maine Seacoast Mission could
32 either apply for the larger amount of signage or modify their signs so that they met the 32sf, as
33 they saw fit.
34

35 In reading the LUZO, CEO Keene was not convinced that ADA signs would be included in
36 business signage.
37

38 Ms. Miller felt in light of this new information that she would withdraw the application for
39 review and revision.
40

41 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, ACCEPTANCE OF THE WITHDRAWAL OF
42 CUA#014-2020, SECTION 6B.16 - SIGN REGULATIONS - (7) RESTRICTIONS AND SIGN LIMITATIONS
43 ON SIGNS. (2) SIZE LIMIT, AS REQUESTED.

44 VOTE:

45 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

46 JOANNE EATON: AYE

47 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

48 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

1 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE
2 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
3

4 **E. Conditional Use Approval Application #015-2020**

5 **OWNER NAME(S):** Asti Kim Corporation

6 **AGENT:** Robert Frank, P.E. WBRC

7 **LOCATION:** 15 Peabody Drive, Northeast Harbor

8 **TAX MAP:** 005 **LOT:** 014-001& 014-004 **ZONE(S):** Village Residential 3 & Shoreland Residential 2

9 **PURPOSE:** Sections 3.4 & 6B.22 - Hotel/Motels. Asticou Inn - Renovations/Expansion.

10 **SITE INSPECTION:** - 3:30PM Masks Required During Site Inspection.

11 CEO Keene confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.
12

13 Ms. Randolph stated that Tom Savage reported to her that he is an abutter to the property. He
14 did not receive notice, nor is he on the abutter list. CEO Keene explained that abutters include
15 those immediately next to the property and directly across the street. She did not believe Mr.
16 Savage was an abutter per the definition.
17

18 Ms. Randolph reported on the Site Inspection. The Inspection started in the parking lot of the
19 Asticou. Building elevations were reviewed. It appeared staircases were one of the major
20 additions to the construction. The building's interior redesign was discussed as well. Despite
21 the redesign, the number of guest accommodations will remain the same. The location of the
22 elevator shaft will be relocated. Enclosed staircases for fire safety will be constructed. It was
23 noted there are sewer lines that cross the property that are not mapped that will need to be
24 addressed by the Board.
25

26 Agent for the project, Robert Frank, P.E. WBRC, reported that the project is for expansion-
27 related activities due to interior renovation. This work includes life, safety and code updates to
28 the current layout at the inn.
29

30 Mr. Frank shared a site plan of the project. The Asticou Inn currently has 31 guest rooms, with
31 an additional 19 rooms that historically served as staff space. The 19-room area will be
32 renovated. Renovations and expansions to the rooms will maintain the 31-guest room count,
33 the resulting guest rooms being larger. Additionally, a new elevator is proposed to be added
34 next to the existing lobby. Mr. Frank showed where a new stair tower will be added. This will
35 be a new exterior stair, as shown on the plan. There is an existing open fire egress stair which
36 will be removed. This results in a new expansion of net 74sf. The property is located within the
37 newly created VR3 District.
38

39 A new underground primary utility run into the building is planned and was pointed out on the
40 plan. Mr. Savage shared a plan showing a previously unknown sewer line which is not currently
41 shown on the Applicant's survey plan. Mr. Frank hoped Mr. Savage would share the plan with
42 him. DOT drawings of the area also show a potential conflict. These can be used in concert to
43 try to determine the exact location of the line to ensure there is no conflict.
44

45 The proposed new utility run will be accompanied by silt fencing and haybales to offset any
46 potential disturbance on that side.
47

48 Mr. Frank showed the proposed interior drawings showing the room count from 50 down to 31.

1
2 He showed the ground level plans and where the exterior stairway will land. First Floor existing
3 conditions drawings were shared. A current stairwell will be removed, and the location of the
4 proposed new egress stair was shown. This stairwell is designed for second- and third-floor
5 guest use with a common egress corridor. There is a single suite on the third floor, accessing
6 one stair. Other floors have two stair points of egress. A fourth floor also has access to both
7 points of egress stairs. All of these changes are interior.

8
9 Mr. Frank shared views of the building from several angles. Two elevations referenced in the
10 Site Inspection show the extent of any new exterior elements to the building. One wall will be
11 pulled out approximately two feet, allowing it to be in vertical alignment with the new egress
12 stair. There is a proposed elevator overrun, similar to the current elevator overrun in the center
13 of the building. All roof profiles will match. Every effort was made to match the historic look of
14 the building. An additional small bumpout of a wall is planned. It will not extend beyond the
15 roofline that extends another 30 inches from the face of the building. The new stair tower is
16 proposed for the right-hand side of the building and will be in front of what has been commonly
17 called the servants' quarters. Currently there is an exterior steel fire escape.

18
19 Mr. Frank noted he shared the DOT plan with CEO Keene. He pointed out a red line with an
20 arrow on the DOT plan that references potential sewer conflict. He noted he received a call
21 from Abutter Mr. Baldwin who shared that he'd done some upgrades to his system that might
22 allow the Applicant to find some inlet information on the line. Mr. Frank shared his thoughts on
23 where the sewer line might be. He suggested TV'ing the line and using ground sensing
24 equipment might provide assistance in locating the line. One other sewer line has been shown
25 on the property, confirmed by CES Engineering and in conjunction with original surveys.

26
27 In summary, the application is proposing a 74sf expansion due to exterior enclosed egress stair
28 on the northwest corner of the building, and the removal of an open fire egress stair on the east
29 side of the building.

30
31 Mr. Savage appreciated the effort in addressing the issue. His site plan comes from some CES
32 preliminary TV'ing of the sewer line. The end of the line was not determined at that time
33 because the camera could not travel the entire length of the line. Mr. Savage assured those
34 attending the meeting that he wanted to see the improvements proposed for the Inn. However,
35 he hoped the infrastructure impact on the community would also be acknowledged, including
36 the sewer line and traffic crossing the road. He wondered how the Asticou was acknowledging
37 impact on the neighborhood. He wondered about parking being used, and the dormitory
38 buildings.

39
40 Mr. Frank noted the Application states that the Inn will maintain a 31-guestroom count. And in
41 that process, it eliminates 19 additional rooms traditionally housing staff. He perceives no
42 change in intensity of use due to this change. Mr. Frank felt the parking that currently exists will
43 continue. There is no change proposed. The Applicant is willing to endeavor to discover the
44 location and destination of the sewer line crossing the property. Once located, it can be better
45 determined whether the Applicant needs to amend the line.

46
47 Ms. Randolph noted that a number of the proposed rooms are suites or larger capacity. Will this
48 affect occupancy?

1
2 Mr. Frank agreed that a suite was considered one occupied space, despite having two rooms.
3 An occupied space is considered to be a room with beds, whether it be two beds, a Queen-, or a
4 King-sized bed. Whether a single room, or a two-bedroom suite, it is deemed a single occupied
5 space. Mr. Frank shared where each suite was.
6

7 Mr. Savage clarified his concerns about the infrastructure include the accessory buildings and
8 where staff lives and the traffic that runs through Asticou Way and parks adjacent to his
9 property. He hoped these impacts would be addressed during the improvements planned.
10

11 Mr. Frank stated he was only tasked with addressing the physical operational changes to the Inn
12 itself. He can't respond to concerns about other properties owned by the Corporation or
13 associated with the Inn. His focus is only on the Application before the Board.
14

15 Chair Hanley felt it would be a key consideration for the Board to note, and possibly set a permit
16 condition with regard to the sewer line. Particularly if it is serving multiple properties. The
17 residential concentration in the area was clear.
18

19 Mr. Frank hoped to get a copy of Mr. Savage's survey. He would be able to overlay it with the
20 DOT plans, as a beginning to locating the sewer line. He agreed the continued use of the sewer
21 line must be paramount.
22

23 There was no further Public Comment.
24

25 No Conflict of Interest was found.
26

27 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.
28

29 VOTE:

30 JOANNE EATON: AYE

31 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

32 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

33 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

34 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

35 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
36

37 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. EATON SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT FORM.
38

39 VOTE:

40 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

41 JOANNE EATON: AYE

42 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

43 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

44 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

45 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
46

47 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION.
48

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

1 With regarding to visual impact, Chair Hanley noted the current stair speaks to the architectural
2 history of the building. A windowless stair tower will erase that. While the Planning Board is
3 not there to judge aesthetics, there will be some visual impact.
4

5 Mr. Frank clarified that the elevations provided do show windows on the stair tower. More
6 thought is being given with regard to how to preserve both safety requirements and aesthetic
7 close or equal to the original. He added that the stair is an expansion of the original plan. Final
8 details are still in the planning stages.
9

10 VOTE TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH CONDITIONS:

11 JOANNE EATON: AYE

12 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

13 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

14 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

15 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

16 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
17

18 **III. Other**

19 CEO Keene informed the Board that the next meeting is scheduled for November 11, 2020. That
20 date is, however, Veteran's day. It is also the only Planning Board meeting scheduled for the
21 month of November. An alternative date must be scheduled.
22

23 MS. EATON MOVED, WITH MS. ANASTASIA SECONDDING TO RESCHEDULE THE NOVEMBER
24 PLANNING BOARD MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 18, 2020.

25 VOTE:

26 JOANNE EATON: AYE

27 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

28 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

29 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

30 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

31 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
32

33 **IV. Adjournment**

34 MS. ANASTASIA MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDDING, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

35 VOTE:

36 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

37 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

38 DAVE ASHMORE: AYE

39 JOANNE EATON: AYE

40 CHAIR BILL HANLEY: AYE

41 MOTION APPROVED 5-0.
42

43 The meeting adjourned at 8:53PM.
44
45