

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**TOWN OF MOUNT DESERT
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

February 23, 2022

**Town Hall Meeting Room,
21 Sea Street, Northeast Harbor and via Zoom**

Board Members Present: Vice Chair Christie Anastasia, Tracy Loftus Keller, Meredith Randolph,
David Ashmore

Chair William Hanley was not in attendance.

Public Present: Michael Cuttita, Aldo Adriazola, David Sweet, Michael Sweet, Tom Lawrence,
Justin Bennett, Margaret Jeffrey, Beth Ingrebritsen, Tim Brochu, Anne Tilney, Roger Huber,
Joshua Burhoe, Felicity Taubman

This meeting was a hybrid of in-person attendance and on-line attendance via Zoom and was recorded.

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

Vice Chair Anastasia called the meeting to order at 6:00PM.

Board Members present were noted.

MR. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, MAKING MS. ANASTASIA
ACTING CHAIR FOR THIS MEETING IN CHAIR WILLIAM HANLEY'S ABSENCE.

VOTE:

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

II. Approval of Minutes

January 12, 2022:

MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, APPROVAL OF THE
JANUARY 12, 2022 MINUTES, AS PRESENTED.

VOTE:

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

III. Continued from January 26, 2022.

1 *Land Use Zoning Ordinance* **Section 6B.11 Lots § (2) Access** - No lot may be built
2 upon or otherwise developed unless it has a private road or driveway for access to a
3 public way by a valid right of way benefiting the lot (or a combination of driveway
4 and/or one of more private roads) or by ownership of land abutting the public way.
5 **If more than 2 lots are accessed by the same private road, then it must meet the**
6 **Street Design and Construction Standards of Section 5.14 of the Subdivision**
7 **Ordinance.** If no more than 2 lots are accessed by the same private road or
8 driveway, then it must meet either the said Street Design and Construction
9 Standards or the Driveway Construction standards of Section 6B.6 of this Ordinance.
10 A preexisting primary access drive that serves up to 2 existing lots need not meet the
11 requirements of Section 6B.6. All lots must maintain safe access for fire, police, and
12 emergency vehicles, as determined by the Fire Chief.

13
14 *Subdivision Ordinance* **Section 6. Waiver and Modifications of this Ordinance**
15 **§ 6.1.1** Where the Board finds that a private road providing access to a lot or lots
16 cannot meet the Street Design and Construction standards of Section 5.14
17 because (a) the application of land use restrictions would prevent the work required
18 to bring an existing road into compliance or (b) physical conditions of the site
19 render strict compliance impossible, then the Board may waive such standards.

20
21 However, in all such cases, the Board must find that (a) the proposed plan brings
22 the road into compliance as much as is feasible, (b) the proposed plan will provide
23 safe access to and from the property, and (c) the proposed plan will allow for
24 access to the site for emergency vehicles.

25
26 **A. PROPERTY OWNER(S):** Robert Lamar Hardy, Jr.
27 **APPLICANT(S):** Aldo Adriazola
28 **AGENT(S):** Margaret T. Jeffery, Esq.
29 **PROPERTY LOCATION:** Off Harborside Road, Northeast Harbor
30 **TAX MAP:** 026 **Lot:** 025-002 **Zone(s):** Residential One (R1)
31 **PURPOSE:** Request a waiver of the Street Design and Construction Standards
32 of Section 5.14 of the Subdivision Ordinance for an existing private
33 road.

34
35 Planning Board requirements from the January 26, 2022 included:

- 36 - A stamped survey plan
37 - Boundaries of the 20-foot ROW, or at least the centerline of the ROW.
38 - The hammerhead shown pulled solely onto the property or, alternatively, proof
39 that the hammerhead has a legal right to overhang onto the Whitman property.
40

41 The survey was shared. Surveyor Tim Brochu reported that the 20-foot ROW leading
42 up to the lot is included. Additionally, an additional survey was shared showing
43 proposed road improvements requested by the Fire Chief. Both surveys are
44 stamped.

1
2 The existing road and proposed expansion areas along the road and on the property
3 were shown on the survey. The entrance to the road was shown, as well as how the
4 Applicant intends to widen and better define the entrance without disturbing the
5 existing rock wall or changing drainage patterns in the area.

6
7 CEO Keene asked about current drainage problems at the end of the road. Mr.
8 Brochu believed that regrading and raising the area would help facilitate drainage.

9
10 The width at the entrance of the road is 30 feet between the utility pole and the
11 stone wall and is within the DOT ROW.

12
13 Mr. Ashmore asked whether the Applicant had title to the triangular portion of the
14 ROW on the Whitman property. Mr. Brochu reported that portion was sectioned off
15 of the Whitman lot in the 1970s. The written description conveys a 20-foot ROW to
16 Harborside Road. It was Mr. Brochu's opinion that it was a blanket easement
17 covering the easement across that triangle.

18
19 Attorney for Mr. Whitman Justin Bennett referred to the 1976 survey plan showing
20 the ROW further away from the Whitman property. This is a discrepancy from the
21 overlap seen on the survey. Mr. Brochu could not offer an opinion without seeing
22 the plan. His survey represents extensive research into the boundaries of the
23 property and it shows where the easement is now. The shaded portions on his
24 survey are visible as existing gravel roadway or pathway evident on the ground. The
25 existing ways were survey-located in the field.

26
27 CEO Keene noted the lot in question once housed a garage for the Whitman lot. This
28 could be the reason the gravel roadway is in the location it is in.

29
30 Attorney Jeffrey referred to a 1952 survey plan showing the roadway in the same
31 location shown on the new survey. The garage is on the survey; the foundation still
32 exists. A western boundary line is only slightly different than the line as it exists
33 today. Mr. Whitman's lot once included the Applicant's lot. The boundary line
34 changed slightly when the lot was conveyed. It appears the roadway did go into the
35 Whitman property.

36
37 Attorney Bennett objected; the survey referenced by Attorney Jeffrey was never
38 shared with other interested parties. Attorney Jeffrey clarified that the survey being
39 shown was only recently found.

40
41 Neighbor Anne Tilney agreed it would be fair if all parties were given the
42 opportunity to see surveys such as the one presented. She asked about the
43 expansion of the curves on the driveways and who was responsible for making those
44 changes. Attorney Jeffrey stated it would be the responsibility of the owner of the

1 Hardy Lot.

2
3 With regard to submissions, it was clarified that no submission deadline schedule
4 was established for materials. It's unfair to abutters when materials are presented
5 the day of the meeting, but last-minute submissions have been accepted before.
6 CEO Keene confirmed the survey referenced was not in the record.

7
8 Attorney Jeffrey contended that the survey is being presented in response to a
9 question regarding the location of the ROW. This survey shows that in 1953 the
10 roadway in the location it currently is. When the conveyance in 1973 occurred, the
11 wording used was "together with the ROW in common with others, over a 20-foot
12 ROW from the above-described premises to Harborside Road." The road has not
13 moved. Additionally, discussion from the last meeting seemed to infer the roadway
14 has not moved.

15
16 Vice Chair Anastasia reminded those attending that the Applicant is seeking a waiver
17 for the subdivision construction standards. To obtain that, the plan must bring the
18 road into compliance as much as feasible, provide safe access to and from the
19 property, and allow access to the site for emergency vehicles.

20
21 Mr. Brochu explained that when creating a survey, past surveys and deeds are
22 collected. Plans are created using located monumentation descriptions and old
23 plans. Mr. Brochu had the benefit of older surveys when drafting his survey. Mr.
24 Ashmore pointed out that Mr. Brochu is a licensed surveyor confirming this ROW
25 location. There has been no evidence presented contradicting the location.

26
27 Attorney Bennett inquired whether the 1950s plan, noted as recently found, was a
28 part of Mr. Brochu's research. Mr. Brochu could not confirm whether that exact
29 plan was used in the survey research. He believed the majority of the plans for the
30 area were available to him at the time the survey was drafted. Every survey is not
31 necessarily needed if the information found concurs with located evidence.

32
33 Attorney Bennett asserted the 1976 survey places the Road elsewhere on the land,
34 which indicates there is conflicting survey evidence. Mr. Brochu did not have the
35 1976 plan for immediate review. He did not believe there was any information of
36 substance conflicting with his survey.

37
38 Roger Huber, representing the Mr. Nitze, asked about the ROW as it extends toward
39 the property to the north. Its presence seems to appear and disappear based on the
40 survey. Mr. Brochu confirmed finding a Deed recorded in Book 747, Page 361
41 relinquishing the rights of the easement across the property to the neighbors to the
42 north. His survey makes note of the relinquished ROW. Mr. Brochu tries to
43 represent on a survey all improvements on the property. There is a gravel pathway
44 on the property. That pathway was researched to determine whether or not it

1 constituted a ROW. Research shows that at one time it was a ROW that has since
2 been relinquished. Mr. Huber asked whether the condition of the gravel pathway
3 heading north of the hammerhead was the same condition as below the
4 hammerhead. Mr. Brochu asserted the pathways' condition was rougher above the
5 hammerhead.

6
7 Neighbor David Sweet did not believe it was a road going up to the Nitze property; it
8 is a pathway to the trails.

9
10 Attorney Jeffrey asserted survey plans show an existing drive going north on the
11 Hardy parcel. South of that parcel it's noted as a 20-foot ROW. The area is never
12 referred to as a 20-foot ROW, as it is referred to further south. Mr. Ashmore
13 pointed out that what evidence exists on the property is required to be shown, but it
14 does not imply legal right to what is shown.

15
16 Mr. Sweet noted the area where the first turn on the road is located is moss-covered
17 ledge. Ledge is showing and the area is open and can be used as turning area. The
18 next turn up needs to be increased on the right side slightly, but there is a stonewall
19 at the top of the turn that runs the rest of the length up. Expansion cannot occur
20 where the stone wall is. That area is 12 feet. All other areas are 14 to 15 feet in
21 width. Safety vehicle access requirements are 14.5-foot width both vertical and
22 horizontal.

23
24 The widths on the 1976 survey vary between 9'4" and 16'. What is being proposed
25 is a 12-foot-wide road, with a buffer on either side. At the entrance to Harborside
26 Road the width is 30 feet. There is ditching on the left side as one enters the road.
27 CEO Keene believed the Fire Chief wanted the entrance to the road a 30-foot width.

28
29 Mr. Sweet warned that putting gravel on the end of the road as fill will result in
30 erosion of the stone into the road. CEO Keene stated the Applicant would have to
31 make sure any fill does not end up in the road. The work would perhaps require an
32 engineer.

33
34 Vice Chair Anastasia summarized that no one appeared to be in favor of widening
35 the road to the Subdivision Ordinance standards. There are, however, areas that
36 need to be widened for safety, and due to the Fire Chief's requirements.
37 Conversation has centered around road location and the hammerhead. The
38 Applicant has provided the materials the Board requested. The next step is a review
39 of Section 6.1.1, sections (a), (b), and (c), create Findings of Fact, and vote on them.

40
41 Vice Chair Anastasia read Section 6.1.1:

42 *Subdivision Ordinance Section 6. Waiver and Modifications of this*
43 *Ordinance § 6.1.1 Where the Board finds that a private road providing*
44 *access to a lot or lots cannot meet the Street Design and Construction*

1 standards of Section 5.14 because (a) the application of land use
2 restrictions would prevent the work required to bring an existing road into
3 compliance or (b) physical conditions of the site render strict compliance
4 impossible, then the Board may waive such standards.

5
6 However, in all such cases, the Board must find that (a) the proposed plan
7 brings the road into compliance as much as is feasible, (b) the proposed
8 plan will provide safe access to and from the property, and (c) the
9 proposed plan will allow for access to the site for emergency vehicles.

10
11 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, THE PHYSICAL
12 CONDITIONS OF THE SITE RENDER STRICT COMPLIANCE IMPOSSIBLE, AND
13 THEREFORE THE BOARD HAS JURISDICTION TO REVIEW POSSIBLE WAIVER AND
14 MODIFICATION OF THE ROAD.

15 VOTE:

16 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

17 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

18 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

19 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

20 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

21
22 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, THE PROPOSED PLAN
23 BRINGS THE ROAD INTO COMPLIANCE AS MUCH AS IS FEASIBLE WITHIN THE
24 EXISTING 20-FOOT ROW, WIDENING THE TURN AREAS, AND IMPROVING THE
25 ENTRANCE FROM HARBORSIDE ROAD.

26 VOTE:

27 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

28 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

29 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

30 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

31 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

32
33 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, THAT THE
34 PROPOSED PLAN WILL PROVIDE SAFE ACCESS TO AND FROM THE PROPERTY ON THE
35 BASIS THAT THE EXISTING CONDITIONS HAVE EXISTED FOR YEARS AND BEEN
36 SATISFACTORILY SAFE TO THE RESIDENTS.

37 VOTE:

38 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

39 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

40 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

41 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

42 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

43
44 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, THE PROPOSED PLAN

1 WILL ALLOW FOR ACCESS TO THE SITE FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLES, AS THE PLAN
2 PROPOSES TO WIDEN THE ENTRY AND CURVES TO SATISFY CONCERNS EXPRESSED
3 BY THE FIRE CHIEF IN HIS EMAIL SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 16, 2021.

4 VOTE:

5 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

6 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

7 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

8 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

9 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

10
11 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, TO GRANT THE WAIVER.

12 VOTE:

13 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

14 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

15 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

16 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

17 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

18
19 **IV. Conditional Use Approval Application(s):**

20
21 **A. Conditional Use Approval Application #002-2022**

22 **OWNER(S) NAME(S):** Sheryl C. & H. James Gilmore

23 **AGENT:** Tom Lawrence

24 **LOCATION:** 9 Lower Dunbar Road, Seal Harbor

25 **TAX MAP:** 031 **LOT:** 091-002 **ZONE(S):** Village Residential One

26 **PURPOSE:** Section 3.4 - Public - School. Erect/Install (4) 20' X 10' canopies to allow
27 students to be outdoors.

28 **SITE INSPECTION:** 4:00PM

29 Ms. Loftus Keller confirmed adequate public notice. Abutters were notified.

30
31 No Conflict of Interest was found among the Board.

32
33 Ms. Loftus Keller reported on the Site Visit. There is a large grassy area behind the
34 school. The area where the tents will be located was marked. The tents will be up
35 during the summer months; the request is to have the tents in place every summer.

36
37 Applicant Tom Lawrence had no comments to add.

38
39 Vice Chair Anastasia asked for Public Comment. There was none.

40
41 Vice Chair Anastasia closed the Public Comment.

42
43 MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT
44 FORM.

1 VOTE:
2 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
3 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
4 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
5 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
6 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

7
8 MS. LOFTUS KELLER MOVED, WITH MS. RANDOLPH SECONDING, TO FIND THE
9 APPLICATION COMPLETE.

10 VOTE:
11 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
12 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
13 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
14 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
15 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

16
17 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE
18 APPLICATION.

19
20 A review of the Application Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

21
22 VOTE:
23 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
24 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
25 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
26 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
27 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

28
29 **B. Conditional Use Approval Application #003-2022**

30 **OWNER(S) NAME(S):** Sheryl C. & H. James Gilmore

31 **AGENT:** Tom Lawrence

32 **LOCATION:** 9 Lower Dunbar Road, Seal Harbor

33 **TAX MAP:** 031 **LOT:** 091-002 **ZONE(S):** Village Residential One (VR1)

34 **PURPOSE:** Section 3.4 - Public - School. Install an RV "Temporarily" on site to be used
35 as an incubation area, during the COVID Pandemic. 2022 Year.

36 **SITE INSPECTION:** 4:05PM

37 Ms. Loftus Keller confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

38
39 No conflict of interest was found among the Board.

40
41 Ms. Loftus Keller reported on the Site Visit. The area was near the location of the
42 previous Site Visit. The trailer will be slightly smaller than the trailer used last year
43 and will be in the same location as last year's trailer. The trailer will be on site just
44 for the Summer of 2022.

1
2 Applicant Tom Lawrence had nothing to add.
3
4 Vice Chair Anastasia opened the Public Comment. There was none.
5
6 Vice Chair Anastasia closed the Public Comment.

7
8 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, TO USE THE SHORT
9 FORM.

10 VOTE:
11 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
12 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
13 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
14 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
15 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

16
17 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, TO FIND THE
18 APPLICATION COMPLETE.

19 VOTE:
20 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
21 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
22 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
23 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
24 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

25
26 MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE
27 APPLICATION.

28
29 A review of the Application Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

30
31 VOTE:
32 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE
33 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE
34 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE
35 VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE
36 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

37
38 **C. Conditional Use Approval Application #004-2022**

39 **NAME:** 10 Schoolhouse Ledge, LLC
40 **AGENT:** Joshua Burhoe
41 **LOCATION:** 10 Schoolhouse Ledge, Northeast Harbor
42 **TAX MAP:** 005 **LOT:** 031 **ZONE(S):** Village Residential Two (VR2)
43 **PURPOSE:** Section- 6B.8 Fences and Walls. Exceeding Code Enforcement Officer
44 Authority

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

SITE INSPECTION: 4:35PM

Ms. Loftus Keller confirmed adequate Public Notice. Abutters were notified.

No conflict of interest was found among the Board.

Ms. Loftus Keller reported on the Site Visit. One neighbor was in attendance. The fencing is along the road. Some fencing and metal posts for the fencing remain in place; the posts are sunk into ledge. Chain-link fencing was removed due to deterioration. The posts have been determined to be too close to the centerline of the road. Over the years trees have grown up around the fence. Moving the fence back would require the removal of the trees and extensive work to remove the posts from the ledge.

Agent Joshua Burhoe explained that moving the fencing back the 6 to 12 inches necessary would damage healthy trees and weaken the bank. The chain-link fence will be replaced with something more attractive.

Vice Chair Anastasia opened the Public Comment. It was confirmed for neighbor Felicity Taubman that the fence runs along the Mill Brook Road. It will be replaced with a 4.5- to 5-foot cedar fence.

Mr. Burhoe clarified the hardwood and softwood trees in the area are approximately 5 feet in height and 6 to 8 inches in diameter. Removing them would damage the bank. The posts currently in place will be reused.

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

VOTE:

DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

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

VOTE:

DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MR. ASHMORE SECONDING, TO APPROVE THE

1 APPLICATION.

2
3 A review of the Application Checklist was made and is attached to these Minutes.

4
5 VOTE:

6 DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

7 MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

8 TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

9 CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

10 MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

11

12 **V. Meet & Greet Potential Planning Board Alternate Member.**

13 Potential Planning Board member Gloria Kunje was not in attendance.

14

15 **VI. Other**

16 Update on Land Use Zoning Ordinance and Land Use Map Amendments for the
17 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

18

19 CEO Keene provided a summary of the Warrant Articles to be proposed for the May
20 3, 2022 Town Meeting. On March 9th the Planning will vote on them, and on March
21 10th, the Warrant Committee will discuss them.

22

23 The Articles include:

- 24 - Exception to allow an accessory dwelling unit on a property, provided the lot
25 meets the minimum lot area requirements. The words "per lot" will be added to
26 the wording in place. This will clarify that only a single accessory dwelling unit is
27 intended.
- 28 - A zoning change for a property on Long Pond. On the zoning map there is a
29 small piece of land that is zoned Shoreland Residential 5 and Resource
30 Protection, based on five criteria. This property does not meet the criteria and
31 will be removed from Resource Protection. The DEP has okayed the zoning
32 change. There are likely more properties in this situation.
- 33 - Within the Shoreland Zone pre-and post-construction photos will now be
34 required.
- 35 - Regarding non-conforming lots, the amendment will address an ambiguity in
36 that if a non-conforming lot increases in acreage, but not enough to make it
37 conforming, it will retain its grandfathered status, but this will only apply to lots
38 that are not fully or partially within the shoreland zone.

39

40 Discussion ensued regard consideration of a Noise Ordinance. Ms. Randolph
41 believed it might be a good idea to have one, should an issue arise where noise was
42 a problem. It would be an issue to go before the Selectboard, or perhaps the LUZO
43 Advisory Committee. Mr. Ashmore suggested the CEO bring the subject up with
44 Noel Musson.

1

2

VII. Adjournment

3

MS. RANDOLPH MOVED, WITH MS. LOFTUS KELLER SECONDING, THE MEETING BE

4

ADJOURNED.

5

VOTE:

6

DAVID ASHMORE: AYE

7

MEREDITH RANDOLPH: AYE

8

TRACY LOFTUS KELLER: AYE

9

VICE CHAIR CHRISTIE ANASTASIA: AYE

10

MOTION APPROVED 4-0.

11

12

The Meeting adjourned at 8:15PM.