



# Town of Eddington

906 Main Road Eddington, Maine 04428

## PLANNING BOARD

July 26, 2016

6:00 pm

MINUTES

**CALL TO ORDER:** Susan called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

**ROLL CALL:** Members present were David McCluskey, Susan Dunham-Shane, Craig Knight, David Peppard, Mark Perry, Pam Chapman, alternate and Charles Norburg, CEO. Susan welcomed Mark P as a full Board member and Pam C as the new alternate. Susan explained the job of an alternate Board member. Jim White arrived at 6:30 pm.

**MINUTES:** Motion that we accept the minutes of July 12, 2016 as printed.

**By Mark P/David P 2nd. Vote 5-0**

Motion to change the order of the agenda to go to New Business and then go back to Unfinished Business.

**By David M/Mark P 2nd. Vote 5-0**

**NEW BUSINESS:** Motion to nominate David McCluskey as Vice Chair.

**By David P/Craig K 2nd. Vote 4-1, Mark P opposed.**

David M accepted the position and Susan welcomed him as Vice Chair.

The Board waited for Janet Hughes to arrive to work on the comparison documents. Susan said she had reviewed her minutes and they had started the review of the Hughes application on March 27 and April 3, 2014. David P needs copies of the Planning Board Minutes since October 24, 2013. (Denise checked and no one else needed copies) Susan reviewed that the first Hughes application was denied on October 24, 2013 and they started review of the 2nd Hughes application on November 14, 2013

Denise let everyone know that the Town Reports arrived at the Town Office after we closed today, so if anyone would like to take a copy home tonight, they are available.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** Janet Hughes arrived at 6:27 pm. Susan asked the Board if they were ok with allowing Janet H to discuss the comparisons and the Board agreed. Susan suggested that they work from Janet H.'s comment sheet in the comparison with the Boards document to make a to-do sheet for the Hughes Application. Everyone agreed. The items were reviewed and determined if it needed to be reviewed, if a revised submittal was needed or if a new submittal was needed for each item. The following is a list of those decisions for each section:

2002.2.1 - Revised submittal

2002.2.2 – No change

2002.2.2.3 b) – Review for anticipated depth and height of final excavation. c) – review, d) – revised submittal

2002.2.2.4 – Ok

2002.2.2.5 – New submittal

2002.2.2.6 – Review

2002.2.2.7 – Review

2002.2.2.8 – included in 402.8

2.2.9 – Ok

2.2.10 – Review

2.2.11 – Check application

2.2.12 – Review

2.2.13 – Review

2.2.14 a) – Revised Submittal, b) review c) review, d) revised submittal, e) f) and g) review

2.2.15 – Additional Submittal, add narrative

2.2.16 - Revised Submission. They should include what they are proposing for a performance guarantee.

710.2.5 - Review and write directions

2.2.17 – OK

2.2.18 - a) Review, b) old 402.10, Review, c) new submittal

2.2.19 - Review

2003 through 2007 were skipped in Janet H comparison, Review Each as applicant should be aware of each

2008.1 through 2008.1.6 – were skipped in Janet H comparison, Review

2008.2.1 – Review

2008.2.2 – OK

2008.2.3 – Check submission

2008.2.3.1 – Review

2.3.2 – Add to Narrative

Mark P said that whichever way this application goes, it will probably go to court, so when the Board approves or disapproves this section, the Board will have to say they based the finding and fact on and then specify the item or particular submission that satisfied a section. (note on the plan, etc.)

2008.2.3.3 – New Submission

2.3.4 – Narrative

2.3.5 - Review

2.3.6 – OK

2.3.7 - Review

2.3.8 – OK

2.3.9 – Review

2.3.10. a) and b)- Review, Mark P said they should present a letter from an expert stating that these standards apply to Public drinking water and that a rock quarrying does not increase the levels stated. Janet H said they cannot meet this requirement. Susan asked Janet to provide the Board with the paperwork showing what MDEP tests for in contaminants. Susan will research where this section came from and they will revisit it. c) OK

2008.2.4 – Revised Site Plan Submittal

2.5 – Review, Janet H said there is no difference between a seasonal and permanent wetland. Include a note on the plan the distance to wetlands. Susan said when they did the site visit, there was water runoff. Janet said that wetlands have to meet certain criteria.

2.6 – Review

2.7.1 – Submittal

2.7.2, .3, .4, Review

2.7.5 – OK

2.7.6 – Review

2.7.7 - Needs Narrative, Submittal

2.7.8 – Review

- 2.7.9 – Review, check drawing
- 2.7.10 – Ok
- 2008.2.8.1 and 2.8.2 – Review
- 2.8.3 – Submittal
- 2.8.4, .5, .6 – Review
- 2.8.7 – Review and Drawing

Jim W had to leave the meeting at this time, 8:05. Susan asked what the other Board members wanted to do: Mark P said to plow ahead, Craig K said to work until 8:15 as they had all agreed previously to end meetings at 8:00 and working to 8:15 takes into account waiting for Janet H to start the review. David M said to stop at 2008.2.10 which will put them half way.

- 2.9.1 – Review storm water plan for access roads
- 2.9.2, .3, .4 – Review
- 2.9.5 – Susan will review the wording of this
- 2.9.6 - Review, Susan asked if detention ponds were externally drained and someone answered no.
- 2.9.7, .8 – Review
- 2.9.9 – Ok
- 2.9.10 – Submittal, Janet said this was not applicable because the DEP standards for quarry and gravel pits are not subject to site development law and are exempt to those rules.
- 2008.2.10 – Will start at this section at the next meeting.
- Janet will send the rehabilitation plan out tomorrow.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**STAFF REPORTS:**

**PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS:** David P said there are 19 adults in this room and they just spent 2 hours and he thinks maybe 4 of the 19 adults have a possible understanding of what is going on here. He said this thing is so complicated it is unbelievable. He is willing to work his way through this, but it is frustrating that this has to be so complicated. He knows it is for the good of the abutters and he is not taking sides, but he does not think it is workable. Pam C agreed.

**PUBLIC ACCESS:** Joan Brooks asked what “Review” means in this case tonight. Susan DS explained that as she said at the beginning of the meeting, the Board members did not receive the Blue Binders until Sunday night so they did not have time to review them. So “review” references the Board members needing to review that particular section of the ordinance. “Submittal” referenced items Janet needed to start working on. Joan said, in reference to David P’s comment about it being complicated, the only reason it is complicated is because the Ordinance was written to be complicated.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Motion that we adjourn at 8:21 pm.      **By David M/Craig K 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in favor.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Denise M. Knowles