

Shapleigh Planning Board

Minutes

Tuesday, June 9, 2020

This evening's meeting was conducted via Zoom due to Covid-19. This is the first meeting held since March 10, 2020.

Members in attendance: Roger Allaire (Chairman), Steve Foglio (Vice Chairman), Madge Baker, Ann Harris, Maggie Moody and Roland Legere. Code Enforcement Officer Mike Demers was also in attendance.

Ann Harris was a regular member this evening for the election of officers, whereby Roger Allaire did not want to nominate or vote being the existing Chairman.

Minutes are not verbatim, unless in quotes "" – If the name of a citizen making a comment was not requested by the Planning Board Chairman, the reference to their name will be known as 'Citizen' or 'Abutter' depending on whom is speaking.

Public Hearing began at 7:05 pm

Minor 4-Lot Subdivision – Name 'Shapleigh Heights' – Map 8, Lot 61 (Gulf Road) – North Country Land / Robert Libby, Property Owner; James Logan, Representing

Mr. Logan was present via Zoom for the review of the application.

Roger A. opened the Zoom meeting and asked if there were any comments from members for Mr. Logan? Roland L. began by stating he thought a question was raised as to whether or not there was a wetland on the property during the first meeting? Or was it a misunderstanding on his part? Steve F. noted that information was given to board members by Barbara F. that indicated there may be a wetland on the property.

Mr. Logan stated that when he met with the Code Officer it was noted on the Town overlay that there was a wetland showing on the map, along the right-hand sideline, that was predominately off the lot. He asked if CEO Demers wanted to weigh in on this? Mr. Logan stated it was nowhere near where someone would build, it was predominately in the setback area, so he and the CEO didn't feel it was germane to anywhere on this lot where people would build, near the Gulf Road were the logical building sites are.

CEO Demers stated that he believed there was plenty of room for building on site. Mr. Logan wasn't sure if that addressed the comment. He stated he didn't hear a comment on this at the earlier meeting that was held on February 25th. Roger A. stated that it wasn't brought up to the board on that date, neither the wetland or the brook that is showing on the map was mentioned. Roger said during the preliminary, he thought Mr. Logan mentioned the wetland and the stream and stated both were on the remaining piece and

not on lots 1 thru 3. Roger asked if that was true? Mr. Logan stated there was no remaining piece, this is an entire lot split into four lots. Roger agreed. Mr. Logan said the wetland they may be referring to is a wetland on the largest lot at the back of the lot, down the right-hand sideline. He said CEO Demers found it on the lot on the Town map. Mr. Logan stated he had test pits halfway back on the lot and there is nothing evident in that area on the front half of the property. He said again there may be something only on the right-hand property line near the stone wall in the side setback area.

Roland L. said he raised the question because it was brought to the attention of the board. He said he wasn't suggesting the subdivision should not proceed, he just wanted clarification about that point. This is the reason he brought it up. Mr. Logan stated, referring back to his original notes he made on February 25th, where he stated to the board that no significant wetlands of any kind were found in any of the areas where building would be likely to occur and he had nothing that was obvious or evident from air photography, other than the isolated thing that was noted off on the right-hand edge of the lot. He said that was how he presented it on the 25th and it was to the best of his knowledge the way it is now.

Steve F. asked CEO Demers if he felt the mapping overlay doesn't quite line up with the lot. CEO Demers stated that he would rely on someone like Mr. Logan to delineate it on the lot and present it to him, he felt it wasn't up to him to determine where these lines are. Mr. Logan said he could speak to how the wetland lines are originating to get onto the Town map. He said that often there is some irregularity in the lines. He said many times they are polygon shapes that were derived from air photos. He said that they are generally not spot checked in the field. He said the scale of the overlays probably came off of what is known as the national wetlands inventory map or the NWI Map, they generally prepare those at 1" + 1000 feet or something like that. He believed it was possible to have an aberration in the line. He said if there is serious concern, he can head back out to the site. He admitted he hated to go to the rear of a 50-acre lot when no one is going to build down over a deep slope. He said if you look at the topo map that was supplied to the board for review, many of those back slopes are quite steep and he didn't think anyone was going to go over the top of the hill to find a buildable site. He said at Test Pit #10, you are back 1100 feet or so. He said if it pleases the board, he can go back and confirm the validity, but added that he had no doubts with multiple sites on each lot and separation between the sites, with the nearest ones 200 feet or so apart, the farthest ones apart of probably 4 or 500 feet. He has a strong sense of the buildable area on these lots. If there is an isolated wetland pocket, he can go out, find it, and locate it, if that is what pleases the board.

Roger A. stated that he noticed on the map provided to the board in February, that the designation is on the rear of lot 4, on the righthand back corner. He said at this time he was only looking at whether or not to grant lots 1, 2 & 3, realizing lot 4 is the mother lot, and it will continue to exist as the mother lot; so tomorrow when someone wants to build on 4, he presumes but does not guarantee, that they would come off the Gulf Road and stay close to Gulf Road and not go to the back of the property. Mr. Logan said they were making it lot #4, because the board required it to be the fourth lot, it is the mother lot and the remaining land, and it is intended to function as a functional building lot, as the fourth lot in this minor subdivision. Mr. Logan stated to Roger, that as we have learned, that if anyone should want to further divide these lots, they have to have a private access and need to create a road and that they will have to go back in front of the board, and it will need another entire review. Roger agreed. Mr. Logan stated that was a point that was brought to him early on, which is why he felt this plan was adequate for review and possible approval at this time.

Mr. Logan wanted to clarify for the board that between February and now, they did add several protective notes to the plan. He said one that was requested was that no further lots would be allowed, or no further divisions would be allowed, without board review. He said that is now on the plan as Note #10. He said this indicated that anyone that wanted to do anything more than what the plan indicated would have to come back before the board. He said the other thing he added was a note about fire suppression and the requested waivers.

Mr. Logan said there was one other thing he would like to discuss with the board at this time, which is a little bit of a departure from the first application. He stated they first considered a 10-lot subdivision, prior to the road requirement, so they backed down to four lots. When they were considering sprinkler systems, they were parceling out the expense of sprinklers over a 10-lot division. He said they were wondering what the board's consideration might be for getting one more possible waiver for sprinkler systems. He said he didn't know if the board for a minor subdivision would grant a waiver of fire suppression all together or not? He also wondered if the Fire Chief would be willing to handle these houses like any other house on the Gulf Road. He said he only mentioned this, and he noted it had nothing to do with cost, that it had to do with practical matters. He said he wasn't aware that when someone has a fire suppression system, that system must be maintained through all seasons; thus, it becomes difficult to put a seasonal residence on one of these lots. He said this is because you cannot leave the house unprotected through the winter. He said he had at least two clients since he came before the board that have changed residences because they desire to go to Florida for the winter and shut their house down here in Maine. He said because they had sprinkled houses, they could not do that, so they sold the house they had that was sprinkled to be able to buy a different house, perhaps a non-subdivision lot, that wasn't required to have a sprinkler system. He said he was bringing it to the board as a consideration and a possible matter for discussion in this public hearing. He said it was just a four-lot minor subdivision, so he was wondering if the board would consider or if they have in the past, considered a waiver, for a cistern. He thought fire suppression cisterns were about a dollar a gallon, and here a 30- or 40,000-gallon cistern, could be up in the \$40,000 price range, which is more than his client would like to consider. He said if the board did not consider waiving the fire suppression for a cistern, they would likely fall back to sprinklers but that might limit the type of market this subdivision becomes. He believed there would be less likelihood of people putting in a seasonal home.

Roger A. stated that this will be discussed during the regular meeting. Mr. Logan stated he just wanted to present it here at the public hearing in the event the board could address it officially and they could still proceed. Roger said at this time, the board was looking for public input to see if there were any concerns from the public, so that once the board goes into deliberations on the criteria, all the information will be presented to be able to approve or make recommendations for any changes. Mr. Logan stated that he understood and thanked the board.

Mr. Logan asked if there were any other questions?

Mr. Corey Normand – Abutter Map 6, Lot 39A-2 – Mr. Normand stated his concern was in the last six years there were four logging operations in the area. He said it was cutting away at the road, and he noted that he was the one that paid for the road. He stated that he paid for 1800 feet of the road 20 years ago, and he has built the road twice in order for the Town to agree to maintain it. He said his concern was more traffic, more construction. He said he understood things change and he didn't have an issue with the subdivision, but his concern was the road.

Mr. Normand stated that the Town has been very lax at maintaining the road since day one. He said it was kept up when Mr. Ridley was Road Commissioner, the last time decent work was done was when Mr. Winchell was Road Commissioner, and since then it is horrible. He said every time the logging trucks come through; it started past Fleming's property, the Scamman's, the Thomas's and this property just got logged again. He said his concern was the road, and right now it is sunken in and no one has followed up or taken care of the damage, bringing it back to what it once was; whereas, now the road has sunk and the ditches are higher than the road. He said every rainstorm the road gets washed out, the logging at the bottom they filled the ditch in with stone and he called the Road Commissioner several times but nothing was ever addressed, so now the road washes out every single storm.

Mr. Logan asked if the portion of the road that was blocked was due to Mr. Libby?

Mr. Normand said that it was not.

Mr. Logan said he wanted it to be clear it was not Mr. Libby.

Mr. Normand stated that there was actually five logging operations, including Mr. Libby.

Mr. Logan stated that he can only speak to Mr. Libby, he did not know about the other ones.

Mr. Normand realized that, he was just trying to lay out how the deterioration has taken place and nothing is ever done. He said that he lived at the end of the road, so he has to drive the road the most, therefore, it is his problem. He said he has called regarding the road, as have the other people on the road. He stated that Mr. Libby was the last one to log and use the road, and he wasn't saying it was his fault, but he wanted to voice his concern with traffic on the road in the future. He felt before we move forward, the board needs to look back at all the work that has been done on the road and lack of responsibility. He stated that when logging was taking place before, he spoke with the Town and they said they would work it out with the logger at the end when the job was done, the Town would handle it. He stated that nothing was ever handled, and that it was hard to see. He said he put out \$20,000 for the road, which he knew wasn't much now, but it was a lot of money in 1998. He said again that he had to do it twice because there were requirements for culverts and ditching, and the road had to be so wide. He said now they have lost 2 feet of roadway. He said in spots you can barely pass two cars. He concluded that was his concern and he hoped the board made note of it.

Mr. John Caramihalis – Abutter Map 6, Lot 39A-1 (Jo Jo Enterprises) - Mr. Caramihalis said the comments that were discussed earlier about no further subdivision, he didn't see anything on the plan he had in relation to notes that he received from Barbara F. on Friday. (Barbara sent John the latest stormwater plan as he was concerned about the wetland on site, along with the original 8 ½ x 11 plan on file, which did not contain Note #10.) He said he hasn't seen the latest plan.

Roger A. stated that the board had the plan on file which the board recently received from Mr. Logan. Mr. Caramihalis asked if Roger would read Note #10. Roger stated there were now 12 notes, and that Note #10 did state that there would be no further division of lots allowed without additional Planning Board review. Roger said that this was actually a State standard for any town or city in the State of Maine, that any change to a subdivision plan had to come back to the board to be amended. He said the board wants to be sure that whomever buys a lot knows by looking at the plan, knows about this fact, so they cannot

divide the lot saying they never knew they had to come to the board. Roger said that is why the board wanted it as a note on the plan.

Mr. Caramihalis stated the other thing is the plan shows Overbey as the owner of an abutting lot, but he now actually owned the lot under Jo Jo Enterprises LLC.

Mr. Caramihalis stated there was a seasonal stream that was on the property and it was fairly defined before they logged it. He realized this was typical of logging. He said his concern was that now it affects the abutters because now the water just goes down the path of least resistance. He said that would be the reason he would want to know where the wetlands are; what the flow of the water was on site. The water comes from Elayne Anderson's lot southeast through the property and drifts down toward the people on the Garland Road. He said there is a wetland area on Ouellette's property but he wasn't sure if it stretched into this property or not. Roger A. thought that was the wetland they were talking about earlier, that just came a little bit onto this property. Mr. Normand stated that this wetland / swamp was probably about 50 feet from the property line at the most. Mr. Caramihalis wasn't sure if it was a vernal pool or not.

Mr. Caramihalis asked if there were any defined curb cuts or can they put the curb cuts wherever they feel like it? Roger A. stated the curb cut will be determined with the Road Commissioner. Mr. Caramihalis thought that was fair. Mr. Normand asked if they were talking about where the driveway goes? Roger A. said, yes.

Mr. Caramihalis said with respect to fire suppression, and he wouldn't necessarily want it on his house, but having sat on the Planning Board for quite awhile, he thought the determination of fire suppression was up to the Fire Chief to determine what they would use for fire suppression. He said in relation to the seasonal comment by Mr. Logan, glycol can be used and is used fairly regularly because the attic areas tend to get cold and they put glycol in the system to be sure it doesn't freeze in the attic in case a piece of insulation gets pushed out of the way by a mouse or something.

Mr. Caramihalis felt it was a straight forward subdivision and wasn't sure if it was a minor subdivision, it might be based on the Town's ordinance. He said if you put in a road you can put in more than four lots but if you don't put in a road you can only do up to four lots. He felt it was a Town restriction and not minor in nature. Roger A. stated it is minor based on the number of lots, if it went to a fifth lot, the fifth lot creates a major subdivision.

Mr. Caramihalis said the main concern was the drainage because some does drain onto his property. He said his property is just a wood lot, so he wasn't overly concerned, but he did believe there was a fairly defined seasonal stream before the logging. He said about every tree got cut, and he wasn't blaming the logger, but he would like to see the seasonal stream be defined in some manner, so it doesn't get filled in or diverted anymore and cause issues for the abutters.

Roger A. asked Mr. Normand if he had any additional questions? Mr. Normand said he did not, he said the road was his concern.

Roger A. stated that the board received a memo stating that the Road Commissioner, John Burnell wanted to have a drainage easement on Lot #1. Roger asked Mr. Logan to note this, and that RC Burnell wanted this to get rid of the water in the ditch line coming off the property.

Mr. Neil Cormier – Abutter Map 8, Lot 62A-1 - Mr. Neil Cormier stated that this area was a problem area. He said that he owned the property across the road in this area, and it was where the water runs to and also washes the bottom of his driveway out.

Mr. Logan stated that he wanted a clarification of where this easement wants to be, and more specifics based on the Road Commissioners request. He said he would not have an issue providing for it, he needed to have a clear notion of what it needs to be for the surveyors, so it can be put on the plan and documented adequately. He said he needed some definition from the Road Commissioner. Roger said, OK. Steve F. wanted to know what RC Burnell wanted to have there. Roger said it was not noted on the memo and RC Burnell wasn't able to attend this evening. Roger said they will have to check to see exactly what he wants on the plan. Mr. Caramihalis said that what he believed he was looking for, was when the water comes down the hill on that ditch line, its going to turn and go down the road. He thinks he wants the ability to keep the water flowing, so it doesn't build up in that location. Mr. Caramihalis noted that it has been a problem area for awhile. Steve F. thought an onsite meeting would be best. Mr. Logan said he was amenable to that.

Mr. Logan stated that with respect to Mr. Caramihalis's concern with stormwater runoff, he did provide the board with a stormwater narrative from a professional engineer and it did discuss the potential for negative impacts to abutters. He said the general opinion of that report was that there was no adverse effect to abutters. Mr. Logan said he would be happy to provide Mr. Caramihalis with a copy of the report. Mr. Caramihalis stated that he did receive a copy of the report (Barbara mailed it to him prior to this evenings meeting). He felt it was standard boiler plate drainage on existing topo. He said his point was that there was a defined area where the water flowed and that has been altered. He stated that that water needs a place to go and now it is just going to go to the path of least resistance, which could be onto abutters property. He did not see the before and after, meaning he didn't see what it was like before they cut the trees and then after they cut it.

Mr. Normand stated that there was never a ditch in the past, it always flowed into the property where the landing is. He thought what RC Burnell was stating was there should be a ditch going by there to get it past that property into a ditch that goes beyond the property. He wasn't sure it changed with the logging, it just made it a little soupier. He said it has always been a big mud pit off that side of the road.

Mr. Logan stated that he looked at the lot before it was cut and he concurred that the ditch line was not well established there. Mr. Normand stated that they just kind of dug a trench into the woods to divert it. Mr. Logan stated that was called a ditch turnout. Mr. Normand thought a few more were needed. He felt before anymore construction happened, the water and ditching needs to be addressed.

Roger A. asked if there were any additional comments? There were none.

The public hearing closed at 7:32 p.m.

The minutes from Tuesday, March 10, 2020 were accepted as read.

The Planning Board meeting started at 7:32 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Maggie Moody nominated Roger Allaire as Chairman of the Planning Board.
Ann Harris 2nd the motion.

Roger Allaire accepted the nomination.
All members were in favor. **Roger Allaire will remain Chairman of the Planning Board.**

Madge Baker nominated Steve Foglio as Vice Chairman of the Planning Board.
Ann Harris 2nd the motion.

Steve Foglio accepted the nomination.
All members were in favor. **Steve Foglio will remain Vice Chairman of the Planning Board.**

Barbara Felong will remain Secretary of the Planning Board.
Note: This position is hired by the Selectmen

Minor 4-Lot Subdivision – Name ‘Shapleigh Heights’ – Map 8, Lot 61 (Gulf Road) – North Country Land / Robert Libby, Property Owner; James Logan, Representing

Mr. Logan was present via Zoom for the review of the application.

The preliminary application for the 4-lot subdivision contained the following information:

Name of Property Owner: North Country Land, c/o Robert Libby, RW Libby & Sons, 483 Old Meetinghouse Road, Porter, Maine 04068

Name of Authorized Agent: James Logan, Longview Partners, LLC, 6 Second Street, Buxton, Maine 04093

Name of Land Surveyor: Isaiah Plante, PLS, Kimball Survey & Design, Inc., 30 Frost Hill Road, York, Maine 03909

Land Information:

Location of Property: YCRD Book 17858, Page 716
Shapleigh Tax Map 8, Lot 61

Current Zoning: General Purpose
No part of the property lies within 250 of the high-water mark of a pond or river.

Acreage to be Developed: 65± Acres
Property is not part of a prior subdivision.
There have been no divisions within 5 years.

Restrictive Covenants: No Mobile Homes Allowed

Existing Use: Wood Lot Selectively Cut
The parcel does not include a waterbody.
The parcel is not within a special flood hazard area.

Proposed Name of Development: Shapleigh Heights

Number of Lots: (4) Four

Date of Construction: Spring 2020 (no internal road)

Date of Completion: TBD, as lots sell.

Infrastructure Required: No
The property currently has road access on Gulf Road.

Method of Water Supply: Individual Wells

Method of Sewer Disposal: Individual Septic Systems

Method of Fire Protection: Sprinklers in home.

There are no Proposed: Streets
Recreation Areas
Common Land

Requested Waiver(s): To be submitted with final plan.

Also provided with the application was a Preliminary plan of the proposed four lot division.

Total Area Containing All Lots per the Surveyed Plan = 67.67 Acres; Proposed Lot Areas are as follows: Lot #1 = 6.02 Acres with 410.74 feet of road frontage; Lot #2 – 6.00 Acres with 410 feet of road frontage; Lot #3 – 6 Acres with 410 feet of road frontage and Lot #4 has 49.65 acres with 533.25 feet of road frontage. Also, on the plan are a total of 10 Test Pits; TP 1 & 2 on Lot #1, TP 3 & 4 on Lot #2, TP 5 & 6 on Lot #3 and TP 7 thru 10 on Lot 4. Gulf Road is depicted as having a 50’ wide public easement. The contours on the map are based on NAVD88 Datum and list elevation changes every 2 feet.

In addition, provided by the applicant is an ‘Authorization to Act as Agent’ signed by Robert Libby stating Mr. Logan can represent him before the Planning Board and to obtain municipal permits from the Town of Shapleigh; a deed description of the property, referencing the recorded deed located at the YCRD in Book 17858, Page 716 (a copy of the actual conveyance was obtained by the Planning Board from YCRD); the soils reports for each of the test pit done by James Logan, SE #237-CCS #213 dated 8/22/19 & 9/5/19; a copy of the USGS depicting the site location on the map; a copy of the Soil Map for the area and description of the soils noted, which appear to be LnB (Lyman loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, rocky), LyB (Lyman – Rock outcrop complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes) & SrC (Skerry fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes, very stony).

For this evenings review, provided was a Stormwater Management Narrative drafted by Atlantic Resource Consultants, written by Jason A. Vafiades, PE #12661, which concluded the project will use long-term and short-term erosion control measures that will mitigate environmental impacts from stormwater; a typical Erosion & Sediment Control Plan provided by Longview Partners, LLC for individual home

construction; and a revised subdivision plan entitled ‘Subdivision Plan, Map 8, Parcel 61, Gulf Road, Shapleigh, Maine’ drafted by Isaiah E. Plante, PLS, which added Notes #10, #11 & #12. These notes read as follows:

- 10) No further division of lots allowed without additional Planning Board review.
- 11) Fire suppression for lots will be through approved sprinkler systems.
- 12) Waivers were provided for the following:
 - Capped iron pins at subdivision corners instead of stone monuments
 - Sidewalks (There are none on Gulf Road to connect with)
 - Underground Utilities

Roger A. opened the review up by telling Mr. Logan he believed it would be a good idea to contact Road Commissioner Burnell and meet with him on site to see where he wants the easement and then get it depicted on the final plan. Mr. Logan agreed a face to face meeting would be best. Mr. Logan said he could flag it in the field and then get the surveyor out. He asked if Barbara F. could connect him with RC Burnell. She said absolutely. Mr. Logan asked if any members of the board wanted to be there when he met with RC Burnell? Roger said he could meet on site at a time that was convenient for Mr. Logan and RC Burnell. Barbara will notify the members of the time of the meeting, so they can join if they are able to.

Roland L. stated with respect to fire suppression, where the Town of Shapleigh has a new Fire Chief, the board might want his input in order to make the decision. Roger A. agreed, and stated the board can contact him to let him know that this is before the board. Roger said he was still in favor of any residential building that goes in to be required to have sprinklers. He said in subdivision, if the board grants a waiver there has to be a reason why it would not be warranted. He did not believe the fact that the home might be a seasonal residence is a warranted reason. He believed the board had to provide a way for fire protection for the residents. Mr. Logan stated that at this point he will state that they are going to leave in sprinklers and be done with fire protection. He said he did not want to belabor the discussion. Mr. Logan said, “OK, let’s take that out of the mix”. Roger A. said, “Fine”. Roger nodded in agreement.

Madge B. asked if there was a site visit? Roger A. stated that he had done one. Steve F. stated that the plan was the board would do them individually. Mr. Logan agreed, he said that is what his notes reflected from the February meeting. Roland L. said he went in March. Maggie M. said she went over the weekend. Madge said she had driven by it but she wondered about the intermittent stream. She asked if it was the one on the Town overlay map? Mr. Logan was not sure, but if it was on the towns overlay, that is probably what they were speaking about. Madge said she could go back and look on her own if everyone else is satisfied that they have seen it well enough.

Steve F. stated that as a matter of procedure he thought the stream and wetlands should be shown on the plan but those wetland and streams will be dealt with at the Code Enforcement level. Madge B. agreed. Steve felt the board can go back and look at it but the CEO has his own set of rules for wetlands and streams. He thought if the board were identifying a building site on the plan it would be one thing, such as a building envelope that would be representative, but barring that, he thought the top lot was huge. He said there might be a 75-foot setback if anything on that seasonal stream. Mr. Logan was willing to say Test Pits #7, 8 & 9 were the building area and anything is outside of that has to come back to the board. He felt that is the area that will be targeted for construction but he can add protective measures if the board would like. He said the two items that were recently described are nowhere near these test pits.

Ann H. said that if there were a seasonal stream there, then CEO Demers would set the actual setbacks for the structure when the permit is pulled. She asked if this was correct? Mr. Logan stated that this would be determined by the proximity of the stream to what was being proposed. He said if it was 1000 feet away, CEO Demers wouldn't request any additional information. Ann said that was her thought. CEO Demers stated, "Correct".

Mr. Logan asked if at this time the board would be satisfied with a particular building window or location for only Lot #4 because lots 1 thru 3 having nothing but beautiful upland through the entire parcel. He asked if that would satisfy the board? Steve F. did not feel the need for any restrictive building envelope, as long as we note on the plan where the stream is, that would satisfy him. Mr. Logan stated that he will go back and map the location, isolate it, and put it on the plan. He said if it is a stream and meets the definition, then it will have a setback. He said if it is runoff and is not a stream, it won't have a setback. He said again he would map it.

Ann H. said that he could do a condition for the road easement after he speaks with the road commissioner. Madge B. said that would work for her; if there is a streambed and it can be noted on the plan, that would be good. Madge did not think the board needed to require a building envelope. Steve F. agreed.

Roger A stated that Barbara F. will get in touch with the Road Commissioner and set up a meeting on site with Mr. Logan and any board member that would like to attend. Roger said he would be there.

Roger A. asked if any of the members had any issues with the waivers requested? Mr. Logan stated, "I thought they were already granted". Barbara F. stated, "No, they have not been voted on yet". Roger agreed.

Roger A. asked if anyone wanted to make a motion on the request to use capped iron pins instead of stone monuments?

Roland L. made the motion to waive the requirement, Article 89-30.A, "stone monuments shall be set at all street intersections and at all corner and angle points" and instead they will use capped rebar. Ann 2nd the motion. All members were in favor. By a vote of 5 – 0, the motion passed unanimously.

Roland L. made the motion to waive the requirement, Article 89-36.M, "sidewalks shall be installed within all subdivisions within the urban compact area" due to the fact this subdivision will not have an internal road, it is in a rural area, and does not fall within an Urban Compact Zone. Madge B. 2nd the motion. All members were in favor. By a vote of 5 – 0, the motion passed unanimously.

Roland L. made the motion to waive the requirement, Article 89-29.A, "Utilities shall be installed underground except as otherwise approved by the Board.". All parcels have access to the Gulf Road where there are already overhead utilities running adjacent to the property. Madge B. 2nd the motion. All members were in favor. By a vote of 5 – 0, the motion passed unanimously.

Roger A. stated the waivers have been approved. Roger said now they will meet with RC Burnell, so the easement can be put on the plan.

Mr. Logan stated that he was no longer going to deliberate sprinklers, they would go forward and require sprinklers in the new homes for fire suppression. Mr. Logan stated that Mr. Caramihalis had concern over the stream and at least one board member brought it up as well. He said that then Steve F. started a discussion about mapping it or not and having the CEO deal with the required setbacks. Mr. Logan was not sure if he was going to map the intermittent stream on the map or not. Roger A. stated he would like it delineated on the plan. Mr. Logan said he got the impression that he was to go and find it and put it on the map. Roger stated, “Yes”. Mr. Logan stated, “OK”.

Nothing further was discussed.

Amendment to the Subdivision known as Hidden Cove – Extend Subdivision Improvements Deadline from 2020 to 2023 – Map 9, Part of Lot 1B, 1C & 1D (Apple Road & West Shore Drive) – James Chadbourne, Applicant; Hidden Cove, LLC Property Owner; Robert Reinken, ReinCorp Development, Representative

Mr. Reinken was present via Zoom for the review of the application.

Hidden Cove Subdivision

Property

Owner:	Hidden Cove, LLC 173 Butternut Trail Wells, Maine 04090	Applicant:	James Chadbourne 173 Butternut Trail Wells, Maine 04090
--------	---	------------	---

Surveyor:	Joseph Stanley, PLS #2453 455 Main Street Springvale, ME 04083	Representative:	Robert Reinken 469 Main Street Springvale, ME 04083 207.490.1878, ext. 3
-----------	--	-----------------	---

Land Information

Location: YCRD Book 395, Page 20
Tax Map 9, Lot(s) 1A

Zoning: General Purpose
Part of the property lies within 250 feet of the high-water mark of Square Pond.

Acreage to be Developed: 8.6 Acres

General Information

No. of Lots: 3

Water Supply: Individual Wells

Sewage Disposal: Individual Septic Tanks

Fire Protection: Private Sprinklers There Are

No Proposed: Recreation Areas
Common Land

Waiver(s): See Plan & Findings

Along with the application, provided was a letter from Robert Reinken, dated February 28, 2020, which stated: It is our request, on behalf of James Chadbourne, that Planning Board Action #4 of the Finding of Facts be amended to allow all subdivision improvements, including construction of the private way, to be completed within five years of the date of approval. The date of approval is May 8, 2018.

In addition, received was a copy of the approved subdivision plan, dated May 8, 2018, recorded at the YCRD on May 31, 2018, as Book 395, Page 20; and a copy of the Findings of Fact signed and dated by Planning Board members on May 8, 2018.

Provided to board members prior to this evenings meeting was a copy of the Irrevocable Letter of Credit from Partners Bank of New England, 900 Main Street, Sanford, ME 04073, Letter of Credit Number 05012020, Date of Issue May 1, 2020, in the amount of \$58, 914.00 with an expiration date of May 1, 2022. The purpose of the Letter of Credit is for the construction of the private way to access proposed plan Lots #1 and #2 engineered by Craig A Burgess, PE #12638 of Sebago Technics and providing electricity to proposed plan Lots #1 and #2.

Roger A. asked Mr. Reinken if he would like to explain to the board why he was here. Mr. Reinken stated that he was before the board to represent Mr. Chadbourne for Hidden Cove Subdivision located on Square Pond. He said they were coming back to the board with a request regarding Findings of the Facts; Item #4 had stated that if the improvements hadn't been completed within 2 years of the approval which was about 2 years prior to Covid. He said, "We are before the board with the renewed Irrevocable Letter of Credit, which the board has a copy, and we are asking to have the road improvement deadline stretch out for another two years". He said originally, he had said five years, but after a discussion with Barbara he believed the five years was from the approval date and not from the expired date. He said sales have been slow and they have not built the road because of that; they hope to build the road in the near future but as required in the Findings of Fact they had to come back before the board.

Roger A. asked if the pins had been set for the lots? Mr. Reinken stated that all the pins had been set. Mr. Reinken stated the only improvements not done are the private way. Roger added, "And the power". Mr. Reinken said, "Yes, and the power".

Roger A. asked for any comments. Steve F. stated he had no concerns. Roger said the only comment he had was they were only looking at dropping 500 feet of road and just to bring power in, he thought another two years was a long period of time. He said to ask for 2 more years, he thought was excessive. He noted this was just his opinion. He didn't know why this shouldn't be null and void.

Ann H. asked how fast a power company is getting out there? She said many times the power companies are taking forever to get out. She wondered if there was a time frame for that. Roger A. said, "Actually power is underground and is by applicant, it's not the power company".

Steve F. said he thought that it doesn't make sense to do the road until such time that one of the lots are sold. He believed this was the applicant's stance, he asked if he was correct? Mr. Reinken stated that he was correct. Steve said there were no adverse changes to the property, so he had no problem with the amendment. Ann H. said nothing was being hurt by amending it, she just wasn't sure if the power company was part of the issue. Steve didn't believe it was due to the power company, he thought it was a matter of trying to do the road as the lots got sold.

Roger A. said that the board already relaxed the standard by not requiring that the road be paved, and he hoped the road will stand up to the adverse weather. He said there was an engineered plan. His thought

was the sooner it is completed the better off we are. Roger added that he didn't want to use the Letter of Credit to get it done, he would rather go null and void.

Roland L. asked what would be accomplished by going null and void and what would that require of the applicant if that was the direction that the board takes. Roger A. said if the approval went null and void the subdivision would no longer exist. He said you are entitled to sell a lot every five years, which they could have the lot on Town Farm Road, which is fine. He stated that access from Acton may not possibly be allowed.

Roger A. said with respect to the Town, we would prefer not to have to grab money to do improvements to the lots in order to get the subdivision in as approved by the board. He said that was the reason he would choose null and void. They would get their letter of credit back, all the monies except for the legal issues of going null and void.

Ann H. asked if this would give them the money to get everything done in a timely manner. Roger said, no, not with null and void, they no longer have a subdivision. Ann said, "Gotcha, ok".

Roland L. said he didn't think that was the applicant's preference or they wouldn't have come back before the board. He asked Mr. Reinken if he was correct in assuming this? Mr. Reinken said, "That is correct, I am just following Finding of the Facts, 4, that required us to come back to the board for reconsideration. The letter of credit, the irrevocable letter of credit is placed to protect Shapleigh from the applicant selling the lots and never building the road. That's why it is in place. If the road hadn't been built and lot had been sold, then the Town of Shapleigh would have been in a position to call the letter and build the road themselves or have the road built. That's not the case. We are not here for that reason. We've taken it upon ourselves to renew the letter without the request of Shapleigh, which is in your hands, and our intention is exactly that, we were not trying to build the road prior to selling lot 1 or 2." Mr. Reinken said he thought in the subdivision ordinance it actually refers to five years for improvements to be completed. He said number 4 of the Findings of Facts was something that was added by the Planning Board which isn't typical of a subdivision approval. He said they were before the board to continue moving forward, marketing the lots and planning on building the road according to the engineered plans. He believed nothing has changed since the approval, just time has gone by.

Roland L. stated that he supported the idea of the two-year extension. He added that if they are unable to sell a lot and get the road completed, then the Town will have no choice but to exercise the option of borrowing from the line of credit and getting the job done. He said he would rather see this route than putting them back through the process of filing a new application, and then holding public hearings and everything else. This has already been done. The application has been approved, unfortunately, they didn't get to the point where a lot was sold and build the road but he supported the idea of a two-year extension. Mr. Reinken stated, "Thank you".

Madge B. stated that she agreed and seconded that motion. The board voted to accept the extension. Barbara F. stated that she understood the members wanted to extend the applicants date of approval, but she pointed out that this is typically a two-meeting process when you amend a subdivision, a public hearing is held and a notice goes out to abutters. She asked the board if they were not going to do that? She wanted to be clear as to the fact the board was not going to hold the second meeting, which they usually do for an amendment to a subdivision.

Steve F. stated that he felt the last thing the board should do is violate any type of protocol, so he felt that is what the board had to do, then they should motion to do it. Roland L. stated that he wasn't aware they needed an additional meeting and he agreed with Steve that they need to do what is typical. He

did not want to do anything that would call this action into question. Barbara said that was her concern, she felt the board needed to do it, as they normally do it. The other board members agreed.

Mr. Reinken asked Barbara F. if she considered this an amendment to the subdivision or just following what the findings of facts state. Barbara stated, “Any change at all to the subdivision approval, this is a change to the ‘conditions of approval’, those findings are the conditions of approval. So, if we are changing a condition, then that is an amendment.” She said even if it is not on the plan it is still part of the approval. She added that typically we notify the public of any change we make to a subdivision approval. Ann H. noted that it said, ‘Finding of Facts to be amended’.

Roland L. said he withdrew his motion. Barbara F. stated he could bring it up at the next meeting.

Roger A. stated the board will bring it up at the next meeting. A public hearing will be held at 7 p.m. and a notice to abutters will go out.

Nothing further was discussed.

Amendment to Best Possible Location – Replace Existing Structure – Change Date of Completion – Map 29, Lot 29 (43 Hickory Street) – Ronald Cote Revocable Trust, Applicant

Mr. Cote was present via Zoom for the review of the application.

Received along with the application, was a letter from the applicant, Ron Cote, stating his reason for needing an extension was due to a delay in obtaining his building plans, which he did not receive until March 20, 2020, thus he would be unable to complete the project, including revegetation by April 30, 2020.

Also received was a copy of the Finding of Facts for the Planning Board approval of the original Best Possible Location application, which was approved on March 12, 2019; and a copy of the original plan which depicted the distance from the *existing structure* to the high water mark as 35.9 feet ±; the distance of the existing structure to the centerline of Hickory Street is 64.7 feet at the closest point; the distance to the lot line of Map 29, Lot 28 is 27.2 feet ±; and the distance to the lot line of Map 29, Lot 30 is 35 feet ±. The plan also depicted the distance from the *proposed new structure* to the high-water mark as 75.9 feet and the distance to the centerline of Hickory Street as 35.9 feet. The 30-foot minimum requirement for the side setbacks back is also indicated on the plan and the existing and proposed structure meets the requirement.

Roger A. stated this application was for Mr. Cote and it was for changing the date of completion.

Mr. Cote stated that he said the reason he was asking for an extension was they got approval for a best possible location and because the building envelop was funky, the architect working to get the building created was extremely slow. He said it took 10 months to get the drawings from him. He said when he went to get the building permits from the CEO, he realized it was best to get the completion date extended.

Roger A. asked Mr. Cote if the date of extension that he was asking for was 4/30/2021? Mr. Cote stated, “Yes”. Roger said with a best possible location he had no issue extending the date because most of it was due to the engineering being delayed, and the correct placement, which was beyond Mr. Cote’s control.

Steve F. stated, This case brings up a good point and it may be something the board should look at in the ordinance, functionally how this process all goes, many times we don't know exactly what they are going to try to build, based on they don't know what the board will approve". He thought it might be something at a workshop, that the board looks at the end user situation vs how the board feels it should go. Roger A. said he had no objection to that. He thought this might be the first time a BPL had to be adjusted but there is no reason why the board can't take a look at it and see if there is a better way help get the applicant going and remove any roadblocks. Roland L. asked CEO Demers if he saw any issues with the plan that Mr. Cote brought to him, other than the fact the time had lapsed? CEO Demers stated there were no other issues except for the time frame. Roland said, "Ok".

Roger A. asked if there was a motion for extending the date of completion?

Roland L. made the motion that the date of completion be extended until 4/30/2021. Madge B. 2nd the motion. All members voted in favor. By a vote of 5 – 0, the motion was unanimous.

Note: Steve F. abstained from the vote as he worked with the applicant. Ann H. voted as a regular member.

Nothing further was discussed.

~~~~~  
**The Findings of Facts**

1. The owners of Shapleigh Tax Map 29, Lot 29 (43 Hickory Street), are Ronald H. Cote Revocable Trust & Patricia A. Ellis Living Trust, of 5 Falls Lane, North Berwick, Maine 03906.
2. The property is located in the Shoreland District and according to the assessor contains 0.52 acres. According to Joseph Stanley of LinePro Land Surveying, PLS #2453, the property contains 23,297 ± square feet.
3. The applicant is before the board for an amendment to the Best Possible Location to replace the existing structure.
4. Received was a letter from the applicant, Ron Cote, stating his reason for needing an extension was due to a delay in obtaining his building plans, which he did not receive until March 20, 2020, thus he would be unable to complete the project, including revegetation by April 30, 2020.
5. Received was a copy of the Finding of Facts for the Planning Board approval of the original Best Possible Location application, which was approved on March 12, 2019.
6. Received was a copy of the original plan which depicted the distance from the *existing structure* to the high water mark as 35.9 feet ±; the distance of the existing structure to the centerline of Hickory Street is 64.7 feet at the closest point; the distance to the lot line of Map 29, Lot 28 is 27.2 feet ±; and the distance to the lot line of Map 29, Lot 30 is 35 feet ±. The plan also depicted the distance from the *proposed new structure* to the high-water mark as 75.9 feet and the distance to the centerline of Hickory Street as 35.9 feet. The 30-foot minimum requirement for the side setbacks back is also indicated on the plan and the existing and proposed structure meets the requirement.

7. **The Planning Board unanimously agreed to approve the amendment to the Best Possible Location to replace the existing structure per the plans presented, approved on March 12, 2019, amending Condition #1 as follows:**
- 1) **The date of completion for the project, including the revegetation of all disturbed areas, shall be April 30, 2021. If this date cannot be met, the applicant shall come back before the Planning Board to determine a new date of completion.**
8. The remaining conditions of the approval shall remain as originally stated, they are as follows:
- 2) Best Management Practices shall be kept in place until the project is completed. There must be a person certified by the DEP in erosion control practices on site during the project.
  - 3) All demolition material from the existing structure to be removed, shall be taken out of Shapleigh and disposed of properly.
  - 4) Placement of the new structure shall be per the plans provided, the new structure shall be 75.9 feet at the closest point from the high-water line and a minimum of 35.9 feet to centerline of Hickory Street.
  - 5) Per Zoning Ordinance §105-4, the approved plan shall be confirmed in writing by a licensed surveyor that the placement of the structure is correct per the specifications approved by the Planning Board.

**Motion:**

After careful consideration and a review of all material previously presented to the Board, a motion was made to approve the amendment to the Best Possible Location to replace and relocate the existing structure on Tax Map 29, Lot 29, per the plan provided by Joseph Stanley, PLS #2453, dated February 8, 2019, with an amendment to Condition #1 and with Conditions #2 thru #5 remaining the same.

**Vote:**

By a unanimous vote of 4 – 0, the motion to approve the amendment to the Best Possible Location to replace and relocate the existing structure on Tax Map 29, Lot 29, per the plan provided by Joseph Stanley, PLS #2453, dated February 8, 2019, with an amendment to Condition #1 and with Conditions #2 thru #5 remaining the same, was accepted.

**Decision:**

**The amendment to the Best Possible Location to replace and relocate the existing structure on Tax Map 29, Lot 29, per the plan provided by Joseph Stanley, PLS #2453, dated February 8, 2019, with an amendment to Condition #1 and with Conditions #2 thru #5 remaining the same, was approved.**

-----  
**Conditional Use Permit – Mineral Extraction (Original Approval in 2015 Expired) – Map 5, Lot 44A (Goose Pond Road) – Frank Clark II, Applicant**

Mr. Clark was present via Zoom for the review of his application.

Provided along with the application were the following:



- 1) Site Location Map
- 2) Map depicting Map 5, Lot 44A including lot dimensions, along proposed conditions as follows:
  - Hours of operation for gravel extraction shall be 7:00 am through 5:00 pm, Monday thru Friday; 7:00 am thru 12:30 pm on Saturday.
  - There shall be no trucks travelling over Goose Pond Road culvert, all gravel pit traffic shall exit left onto Goose Pond Road and travel on State Route 109.
  - No excavation shall be within the 50 ft buffer strip of property lines and the depth shall be no lower than 530 ft.
  - A stone apron shall be constructed to remove gravel and dust from the tires of the equipment used for hauling gravel.
  - Dust shall be maintained through use of water truck, watering the area as needed to prevent dust from going onto neighboring properties.
  - No more than 5 acres shall be excavated at one time or 10 acres cleared of trees.
  - Noise levels shall be obeyed per the Town of Shapleigh Zoning Ordinance.
  - A surety bond shall be established and maintained, payable to the Town of Shapleigh in the amount of \$16,000.00
- 3) Site Plan depicting where the entrance shall be located, that being 20' x 150', and the 5-acre area for extraction.
- 4) Maine Dept of Environmental Protection Notice of Intent to Comply, dated as signed off on 8/6/2015.
- 5) Maine Dept of Environmental Protection letter regarding Placard for Clark Pit, Shapleigh (GPID #860), dated August 6, 2015, stating that the gravel pit is licensed to the standards under the Performance Standards for Excavations, 38 M.R.S.A. §490-D.
- 6) State of ME, Dept of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife letter, dated March 20, 2105, stating that there are no locations of endangered, threatened, or special concern species within the project area.
- 7) Mineral Extraction Site Description – 20 Acres
- 8) Quitclaim Deed, dated recorded at YCRD on June 25, 2015, Book 17043, Page 765, Frank Clark to Frank W. Clark and Gloria S. Clark.
- 9) Proposed Gravel Extraction Site Closure Plan, dated March 2020.
- 10) Clark Parcel, Shapleigh Maine Test Pits, dated July 26, 2013, done by Civil Consultants – A total of 14 test pit sites indicating the type and depth of sand & gravel on site.
- 11) 2015 Findings of Facts from the Mineral Extraction Approval that was voted on September 22, 2015.

*Detailed Description of the Project: Materials on-site to be excavated to elevation of 530 and trucked off-site. This is to occur in 5-acre increments, so that no more than 5 acres are active.*

*Note: Roland L. recused himself from being a voting member. Ann H. will sit in his place as a regular member.*

Roger A. opened the review by asking Mr. Clark to let the board know what he wanted to do.

Mr. Clark began by stating he was before the board to try to get the mineral extraction approval again, it was approved in 2015. He stated at that time he did not have a lot of interest in the gravel but now the gas prices are down, and a lot of gravel has been taken from other areas. He said he was not looking to change anything from the original approval. He was looking for all the same conditions the board voted on the last time. He stated nothing that he is doing now has changed from that approval.

Mr. Clark stated that he realized the board would need an updated reclamation estimate and he said he could get that to the board by the next meeting. He said if there was anything else the board needed, he would provide it.

Roger A. stated that after receiving the information, he thought the board needed a new reclamation cost and letter of credit for that. He stated other than that, the board would need to hold a public hearing and notify all abutters. Roger stated that because it is a new application, they had to start over because the original application expired several years ago. Roger noted because it has expired it is a brand-new application.

Mr. Clark stated that he has kept up with his DEP permits, they have been paid every year. He stated he was waiting for his licenses to arrive. He was told the DEP mailed them twice but he has not received them, therefore, he is probably going to go to Augusta to get them.

Roger A. stated that he had spoken with Mr. Clark who said a logger had gone in and cleared some of the area. He asked members if they wanted to go on a site visit, he can set up a time for that. Mr. Clark stated that the loggers came in and cleared what the State allowed and he is ready to stump it if he gets approved by the board.

**The board agreed to hold the site visit prior to the next meeting, at 6:00 pm, a notice to abutters will be mailed and a Public Hearing held at 7:00 pm.** Madge B. reminded Roger that members would be going back to their homes after. Mr. Clark asked if he had to be there. Roger said he did not, but it would be good if he could answer questions. Mr. Clark stated that he may not be able to get there until 6:15. Roger said that would be fine.

Mr. Clark ask if the board wanted copies of emails from the DEP stating he is all set with them. Roger A. asked if Mr. Clark thought he would have the permits for the next meeting. Mr. Clark stated he would have to call them. Mr. Clark stated that he would have a new reclamation estimate and he will print the emails from the DEP for the board.

Ann H. asked when the board would get the surety bond. Mr. Clark thought the board needed it within 90 days of approval. Barbara F. agreed and before he starts operating. Mr. Clark stated that would not be a problem. Mr. Clark also stated that he believed he needed to provide the bond, not the person digging the gravel. Roger A. agreed, stating it comes from the landowner. Mr. Clark said that he understood.

Mr. Clark stated that he believed he did not need the bond for the next meeting. Roger A. stated it would be good to have the cost estimate for reclamation for the next meeting. Roger noted that there may be an inflation factor added to the bond for the three-year period and that would be the amount of the bond. Mr. Clark stated that he would work on having that figure for the next meeting.

Mr. Clark asked if the board members had the conditions from the last approval. He said those were what he was asking for and looking to do for this approval.

Mr. Clark stated at the last approval there were some questions regarding crushing rock, and due to the noise, some did not want crushing. He stated that rock crushing is part of mineral extraction. Mr. Clark stated that the person taking the minerals will be doing most of the crushing at his site, but he didn't want to say he would not be doing it. He wants this part of his permit approval.

Mr. Clark stated that he was agreeable to all the terms and conditions of the last approval. There will be no traffic over the Goose Pond bridge. He wanted to be sure the board knew what he was asking for.

Ann H. asked if he was going to be doing the stone apron? Mr. Clark stated, "Yes". Mr. Clark noted that a water truck was discussed to keep the dust down.

Mr. Clark noted that the board first Zoom meeting went well.

Roger A. noted there were several people other than the board members at the meeting. He asked if anyone had anything to say. Mr. Daniel Frasier spoke up stating he was an abutter to Mr. Clark's property. Mr. Frasier stated he was interested in what the conditions Mr. Clark was speaking about were, being an abutter. Mr. Frasier asked Mr. Clark to get in touch with him, as he wants to know more about the conditions of approval. Mr. Clark stated he would get the conditions to Mr. Frasier as soon as possible.

Ann H. asked Roger A. if the board would be going over the conditions at the next meeting. Roger stated that they would. Mr. Clark stated he would still make sure Mr. Frasier gets them prior to the next meeting. Mr. Frasier thanked the board and said he liked the zoom meeting.

Nothing further was discussed.

-----  
**Growth Permits**

**Map 5, Lot 11 (White Tail Lane) – New Home** **GP #06-20**  
This is an approved lot within an existing subdivision, meeting all the zoning requirements.

**Map 8, Lot 34 (659 Ross Corner Road) – New Home** **GP #07-20**  
This lot exceeds the minimum lot size requirements in the zoning ordinance.

**Map 3, Part of Lot 44 (Coley Trafton Road) – New Home** **GP #08-20**  
This lot meets the minimum lot size requirements in the zoning ordinance.

**Map 17, Lot 9A (30<sup>th</sup> Street) - Multi-family (In-law Apt)**

**GP #09-20**

This lot exceeds the minimum lot size requirements for a multi-family dwelling in the zoning ordinance.

**Map 1, Lot 43A (Songbird Lane) – New Home**

**GP #10-20**

This lot meets the minimum lot size requirements in the zoning ordinance and is accessed by a deeded right-of-way.

\*\*\*\*\*

**The Planning Board meeting ended at 8:40 p.m.**

**NOTE: The summer hours are in effect, the meetings now begin at 7:30 p.m. and any scheduled public hearing begins at 7:00 p.m.**

**The next Planning Board meeting scheduled will be via Zoom on Tuesday June 23, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. See the town website, [www.shapleigh.net](http://www.shapleigh.net) to obtain the link details if you wish to attend. Look under Planning Board.**

The Planning Board meets the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month unless it falls on a holiday or Election Day. Should there be a cancellation due to a storm event, holiday or Election, the meeting will typically be held the following Wednesday, also at 7:30 p.m. Please contact the Land Use Secretary if there is a question in scheduling, 207-636-2839, x4.

**The next meeting date is to be determined.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Felong, Land Use Secretary

[planningboard@shapleigh.net](mailto:planningboard@shapleigh.net)