

Town of Scarborough

Planning Board

October 6, 2008

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (7:00 P. M.)
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes (August 25, 2008 and September 15, 2008)
4. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a proposed amendment for changes to Section XVI.A. Traditional Neighborhood Development Option Overlay District of the Scarborough Zoning Ordinance
5. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a request to change the zoning on Assessor's Map R59 Lots 8A and 8C from an R-F District to an R-4 District at 98 and 108 Sawyer Road
6. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a referendum question to amend the Zoning Ordinance, Section XIX. B. & D. to allow slot machines at a commercial racetrack and to allow the TVC District uses and space and bulk regulations in the B-2 District in the area identified as the Crossroads District in the Comprehensive Plan
7. New England Expedition – Scarborough, LLC requests site plan amendment for the 90,000 square foot office building within the Gateway Square development site, relocation of the wall sign on the Cabela's building, and amendment of the signage for the Gateway Square development site
8. Walgreens requests sketch plan review for 13,150 square foot structure on 2 lots at Routes One and 114 in the Oak Hill Plaza
9. The Highlands Subdivision, Peter Simpson requests site plan amendment to swap land between subdivision lots 15 and 50 at 16 Wildrose Lane and 4 Elbridge Oliver Way*
10. New Day Realty Inc. requests site plan approval for an approximately 10,000 square foot mixed use office building on Lot 9 at Haigis Parkway Professional Center*
11. First Look Plaza, Michael Scarks requests site plan amendment for HVAC screening on site at Payne Road
12. Administrative Amendment Report
13. Town Planner's Report
14. Correspondence
15. Planning Board Comments
16. Adjournment

*Opportunity for public comment will be offered by the Planning Board on these items.

NO NEW ITEMS SHALL BE TAKEN UP AFTER 10:30 P. M.

MINUTES

Members Present

Staff

Mr. Callahan
Mr. Chamberlain
Mr. Fellows
Ms. Littlefield
Mr. Mazer
Mr. Paul
Mr. Thomas

Mr. Bacon, Town Planner
Mr. Chace, Assistant Town Planner
Ms. Logan, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Paul called the meeting to order at 7:00 P. M.

2. Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll; all members were present.

3. Approval of Minutes (August 25, 2008 and September 15, 2008)

Mr. Paul moved to approve the minutes of August 25, 2008; Ms. Littlefield seconded.

Voted 5-0

Mr. Paul moved to approve the minutes of September 15, 2008; Mr. Fellows seconded.

Voted 5-0

4. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a proposed amendment for changes to Section XVI.A. Traditional Neighborhood Development Option Overlay District of the Scarborough Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Bacon explained that this was an amendment to the overlay district so that the minimum lot size for a Traditional Neighborhood Development could be 20 acres rather than the 25 acres required at this time. He stated that this overlay was allowed for parcels in the R-4 Zone and required sewerage. Mr. Bacon stated that the overlay allowed a mix of uses with green space and 33% affordable housing units; he stated that there must be a critical mass of land for all the infrastructure. Mr. Bacon noted that this request was regarding a project that was contemplated on Sawyer Road.

Mr. Paul opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the amendment; Mr. Paul closed the public hearing.

To a question from Mr. Callahan, Mr. Bacon replied that this site was shown in the Comprehensive Plan in the Crossroads District but that district may be comprised of several different zones. Mr. Callahan stated that he thought this request may be premature since the entire area was to be rezoned. Ms. Littlefield agreed and stated that she had no problems with the amendment if staff thought the size was acceptable.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he was against going down to 20 acres because of the existing ordinance language; he stated that he thought the terminology was flawed because much of a parcel could be wet-

lands and all that would be left was a very small developable area. He stated that the parcel in question had a substantial amount of wetlands. He stated that at some point the ordinance language should be amended to indicate net residential acreage. Mr. Fellows stated that he agreed with Mr. Chamberlain. He asked how the 25 acre requirement was determined; Mr. Bacon replied that the overlay was crafted for Eastern Village which was on a much larger parcel. Mr. Bacon stated that the town was surveyed for large parcels where this overlay would apply and considered only the uplands that were available.

Mr. Thomas stated that it got down to how small you compact a lot and at some point it had to stop; he stated that a decent sized parcel was needed. Mr. Mazer stated that he agreed and would like to see the project on a 25 acre parcel rather than change the ordinance to meet the lower size.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the following statement as a summary of the discussion: "It is the general feeling of the Board that it may be premature to change the zoning before the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee makes recommendations to the Town Council and that the net residential acreage of 25 remain the same or be defined as buildable acreage." Mr. Callahan seconded.

Voted 5-0

5. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a request to change the zoning on Assessor's Map R59 Lots 8A and 8C from an R-F District to an R-4 District at 98 and 108 Sawyer Road

Mr. Bacon stated that this was a proposed zoning map change; he noted that one-fourth of this parcel was in the R-4 Zone and the remainder in the R-F Zone and the applicant was requesting a change to the Traditional Neighborhood District Overlay for the public hearing just conducted.

Mr. Steve Bradstreet, of Oak Engineering, stated that this was a 23.5 acre parcel with the land to the rear in the R-F Zone; he stated that there were two points of access and water main stubs had been installed. He stated that there was a letter from the Scarborough Sanitary District indicating that a force main with pump stations on each lot were acceptable. He stated that there would be one entrance but two rights of way for the 50 lot subdivision; he stated that one of the rights of way would access the town conservation land in the rear. He stated that they showed open spaces for small parks or other recreation areas. Mr. Bradstreet stated that there would be a few duplex units but most of the homes would be single family. He stated that there were considerable wetlands on the site but there would be less than 8,000 square feet of impact by minimizing the impacts from the roads. Mr. Bradstreet stated that their main issue was to determine whether they could sewer the site; he stated that they would provide stubs for about 26 lots toward Route 114 that were not currently sewered.

Mr. Paul opened the public hearing. Larry Finkleman stated that his mother owned the abutting parcel to the rear and they had no problems with the zone change. He stated that they had owned the property since 1952 and understood that there was a right of way from Sawyer Road but they did not know where it was; he stated that they did not want to lose that right of way. Ms. Doreen Reny, of 96 Sawyer Road, stated that this site abutted her property and she needed to know more; she stated that there were a couple of businesses in her neighborhood, including a day care facility. Mr. Paul explained the process for notifying abutters. Mr. Bacon stated that the properties along Sawyer Road were in an R-4 Zone and were allowed home occupations if approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals; he stated that multifamily dwellings were also allowed and day care facilities were not necessarily required to be sewered.

Mr. Glen Vaillancourt, of 114 Sawyer Road, stated that he was an abutter and had no problems with the zoning change. Mr. Paul closed the public hearing.

Messrs. Mazer, Thomas and Fellows agreed that they had no issues with changing from the R-F Zone to the R-4 Zone but felt the 25 acre requirement should remain and would like to see this project reworked

to fit 25 acres if some additional land could be acquired. Mr. Chamberlain stated that he felt this would be an extreme change to the density and the applicant could use a blended zone rather than changing the whole parcel. Mr. Chamberlain noted that there were issues about the rights of way, interconnectivity and the roadways. He stated that he thought a blended zone or an R-2 Zone would be appropriate. Mr. Chamberlain stated that this was an extreme density change and he was not supportive.

To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. Mike O'Leary, owner of the property, replied that with R-F Zoning he could build 10 to 12 houses and in the R-4 Zone he could build just under 40 homes without using the TND Zone. Mr. O'Leary stated that he did not know of a right of way to the Finkleman property but had designed a way to access their land; he stated that he did not think this project would change the neighborhood because it would be to the rear of Sawyer Road. Ms. Littlefield stated that this would change the neighborhood and she would recommend a blended zone. To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Mr. O'Leary replied that the existing home on the site was the day care owned by his daughter and would remain. Ms. Littlefield stated that the change from R-F to R-4 was a big jump.

Mr. Callahan agreed that this was a significant change in density and he agreed with Mr. Chamberlain. To a question from Mr. Paul, Mr. O'Leary replied that he thought the net buildable acreage of the lot was 14 acres but he would build on 11 acres. Mr. Paul noted that there would be 11 fewer houses without the TND if the zoning were changed from R-F to R-4. Mr. Paul stated that he was satisfied with the change to the R-4 Zone because it would blend in nicely with the Comprehensive Plan. To a question from Mr. Mazer, Mr. Bacon replied that there were two other zones, R-2 and R-3, which would have an intermediate density.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the following statement as a summary of the discussion; "It is the feeling of the Board that the change in zoning from R-F to R-4 is acceptable to the majority of the Board but there were mixed feelings and a split in opinion with a request to take a look at a blended zone in lieu of a complete change to the R-4 Zone." Ms. Littlefield seconded.

Voted 5-0

6. The Planning Board will conduct a public hearing to receive input on a referendum question to amend the Zoning Ordinance, Section XIX. B. & D. to allow slot machines at a commercial racetrack and to allow the TVC District uses and space and bulk regulations in the B-2 District in the area identified as the Crossroads District in the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Bacon stated that this public hearing is being conducted by the Board because it a Zoning Ordinance change. He stated that the Board should comment on the land use regulations and the appropriateness of allowing the TVC Zone uses in the B-2 Zone. He stated that the allowance of slot machines at a racetrack is not necessarily limited to the Crossroads District so they could be proposed elsewhere and adjustments could be made to the Ordinance later to prevent that. Mr. Bacon stated that the projected revenue of \$8 million should be discussed. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee (CPIC) is looking at the Crossroads area and will work on that based on the November 4, 2008 vote.

Mr. Paul noted that regardless of the outcome of the referendum vote, there would be numerous state and town hurdles before anything could be done.

Mr. Steve Westra, a land use planner, noted that this was similar in size to Haigis Parkway. He distributed photos of Yarmouth Village and noted lessons learned while he was the Town Planner in Yarmouth. He stated that they wanted to see mixed uses with tree lined streets compatible with the town. Mr. Paul stated that this public hearing was not to be a proposal of the development but a hearing on the referendum question. Mr. Bacon explained that there was a proposal to the Town Council for a TVC rezoning and they chose to table the request until the referendum decision, at which time they would take the request off the table or entertain a different proposal. Mr. Westra stated that they attempted in the referendum

language to make it as flexible as possible to mold this site and took into account the existing uses and what they thought the future uses would be. Mr. Gene Beaudoin, of Feldco Development, stated that this was an anomaly because whenever a group bypassed the Town Council, the Council and Planning Board had to hold public hearings to comply with the law.

Ms. Emma Kelly, a landscape architect from Richardson & Associates, distributed a proposal for Scarborough Village and listed the basics for physical planning. She stated that they finally came to the two proposals shown for the site with a village character within the Crossroads District for a new town center. She stated that the site would be pedestrian-friendly with varied architecture that was appropriate to the region and gave a strong sense of neighborhood. She stated that the first proposal showed a main street where the casino would be integrated into the town center. Ms. Kelly stated that the second proposal shifted the village center to one side with the entertainment area on the other side of the site. Ms. Kelly stated that it was important to understand the scale of the site.

Mr. Paul opened the public hearing. Mr. Robert Tourangeau, of 1 Burnham Woods Circle, stated that he was in the horse business and had worked at Scarborough Downs, which had been a good corporate citizen but would have many hurdles to jump to attain this development. He stated that as an addiction counselor he knew that the statistics were correct when they showed that only 5% were gambling addicts and the other 95% chose gambling for entertainment. Mr. Tourangeau stated that there was nothing wrong with gambling and it did not affect the quality of life; he stated that gambling was a fact of life and the Maine Lottery and Hollywood Slots were well received. He stated that to suggest that gambling affected quality of life was a mistake; he stated that this project would raise the quality of life and would provide cultural and economic benefits that would far outweigh the fact that this will be gaming. Mr. Tourangeau stated that a vital part of the community was farming and a new track would help improve the equine industry and serve the best interests of the sport by attracting new people to the sport and recreation.

Mr. Ernest Lowell, blacksmith, stated that Maine was an agricultural state until the 1950s but had declined since that time; he stated that harness racing was the last agriculture left in Maine and several farms in Scarborough were represented with horses at the track. He stated that local farms depended on each other and there should be a way to keep farming intact. Mr. Beaudoin stated that he had environmental and planning degrees; he stated that the gaming taxes of \$6 million would be achieved for the first phase and that the gaming tax did not affect school reimbursement. He stated that much more residential real estate needed to be developed to get the same amount of taxes; he stated that, under state law, one of the steps was for the town to sign a host agreement that was the ultimate planning tool for the town to control the development. Mr. Paul closed the public hearing.

Mr. Mazer stated that he strongly recommended the proposal to change the B-2 language to allow TVC uses and liked the separation plan for the village. To a question from Mr. Thomas, Mr. Bacon explained that the Planning Board made recommendations to the Town Council for zoning changes but the Council voted to send this request to a referendum so they had no more work to do on this topic until the vote was taken in November; he stated that the Board's comments would be taken into consideration and the Council may or may not agree with the Board's opinion. Mr. Thomas confirmed that the TVC language would allow this location to become a town center district.

Mr. Fellows stated that it was important to remember that this site would not change to the TVC Zone but the TVC language would apply to the present B-2 Zone. He stated that the ordinance language as currently written indicated that commercial racetracks would be permitted in any B-2 Zone and that should be addressed. Mr. Fellows stated that he was concerned about the language regarding the monetary amount and found it highly unusual that a dollar amount was written in an ordinance. He stated that the Town Council should deal with that issue. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Beaudoin replied that the \$8 million was a minimum combined amount of real estate and gaming taxes and would be written into the host agreement. Mr. Chamberlain asked whether there had been any thoughts from the public; Mr. Beaudoin replied that they had heard from senior housing developers and theme-oriented

hotels and heard that there should be housing near the jobs so people could walk or take the trolley. Ms. Littlefield stated that she would rather see this be a TVC Zone rather than the B-2 Zone with TVC language and she would not include the dollar amount in the ordinance. Mr. Callahan agreed that the dollar amount should not be in the ordinance and with the other opinions of the Board.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the following statement as a summary of the discussion: "It is the general feeling of the Board to favor the language that changes this zone to the TVC in lieu of the B-2 Zone including the building space and bulk requirements and uses. The location of the racino should be limited to the current Scarborough Downs property and not to any other area of Scarborough. We also find it to be inappropriate for a dollar amount to be noted in Section XIX. B. 3." Mr. Fellows seconded.

Voted 5-0

Mr. Paul called a recess at 9:00 P. M.; the meeting resumed at 9:10 P. M.

7. New England Expedition – Scarborough, LLC requests site plan amendment for the 90,000 square foot office building within the Gateway Square development site, relocation of the wall sign on the Cabela's building, and amendment of the signage for the Gateway Square development site

Ms. Littlefield recused herself from this item. Mr. Bacon stated that there were staff comments and comments from SYTDesign regarding peer review which had been addressed. He stated that the staff had no comments on the building signage, but only two freestanding entrance signs were consistent with the Haigis Parkway regulations and the applicant proposed four. He stated that there could be one freestanding identification sign shared with Neptune Properties and one business directory. He stated that there should be more specifics for screening the loading area.

Mr. Gene Beaudoin, of New England Expedition, explained that the soils on the site were terrible and they had shortened the building by 52 feet and widened it by eight feet; he stated that the external stairway was put inside the building and, to satisfy the LEED certification, they had cut down on the glass by 10%. He stated that they would submit a schematic design to the staff. Mr. Beaudoin stated that they wanted to slide the Cabela's wall sign facing the Turnpike on the rear of the building forward so it was more visible from the Turnpike access.

Mr. Beaudoin stated that they would use the two entrance signs on Payne Road and would return for the Haigis Parkway signs as an amendment to the Contract Zone. Mr. Bacon stated that staff recommended All tenants' names be put on one sign and the other should be a project sign. To a question from Mr. Mazer, Mr. Scarks, of First Look Plaza, confirmed that he and Mr. Beaudoin agreed that there would be one sign for both projects saying Gateway Square and First Look Plaza and the other sign would be the business directory sign with the tenants' names. Mr. Scarks stated that he would like to move ahead with the signage and not wait for another Planning Board cycle for the other signs. Mr. Beaudoin stated that the signs were ready to be lettered.

To a question from Mr. Thomas, Mr. Beaudoin replied that he would like to be able to work out the screening around the dumpster and loading area with the staff. Mr. Chamberlain asked whether there was any change to the walkways as a result of the change in the footprint of the building; Mr. Beaudoin replied that the walkways would remain and one of them would facilitate emergency access. Mr. Bacon noted that Mr. Tubbs' memo referred to another area of this site and did not apply to tonight's request.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the amended site plan for the footprint of the office building, the wall signage for Cabela's and the freestanding project signs with the following conditions:

1. That the loading dock and dumpster screening details be approved by the Planning staff;

2. That the freestanding signage be revised to establish one business directory sign with Gateway Square tenants and one development identification sign listing Gateway Square and First Look Plaza;

Mr. Callahan seconded. Mr. Paul authorized Mr. Thomas to vote.

Voted 5-0

8. Walgreens requests sketch plan review for 13,150 square foot structure on 2 lots at Routes One and 114 in the Oak Hill Plaza

Mr. Josh Swirling, of Bohler Engineering, explained that they had added an esplanade on Routes One and 114 and replaced the trees with new plantings; he stated that they also showed a stairway from Route One and a safer route to the sidewalk at the building. Mr. Swirling stated that the pickup window was now shown 20 feet closer to the corner of the building which had to be away from the front door, which drives the location of the service area and the drive-through window. He stated that there was much less impact from having the window at Route One than having the loading area at Route One.

Mr. Stanley Gawron, of Gawron Turgeon Architects, stated that they had worked at increasing the mass of the building and increased the height by four feet and added more of a pattern to the windows for the feeling of a second story. He stated that the footprint was 13,000 square feet with a higher façade. He stated that, at the request of Mr. Bacon, they had improved the trim and molding of the windows and would downplay the architectural elements of the pickup window with plantings and buffering and the grading around the area. Mr. Gawron stated that the red brick building would be 26 feet high at the door with 28 feet at the middle and 30 feet at the end; he stated that they had added mass to the roof so it would not be just a façade, and bricked the window masses to create the traditional feel. He stated that they were considering dropping the awnings down for a separation between them and the signage. He stated that Walgreens' logo would be on the Route One corner of the building with their traditional font and logo with lighted letters on limestone backing. Mr. Gawron stated that there would be a wall between the plantings and the sign to conceal the cars and the pickup window.

Mr. Callahan complimented the architecture and stated that he understood that the layout of the store drove the pickup window location and was satisfied that that was the best location for it. Ms. Littlefield stated that the building was no longer boring and she preferred the new pickup window location; she confirmed that the logo would be lighted. Ms. Littlefield stated that she liked the cornice work and that they had achieved more of a village look and she was happy.

Mr. Chamberlain thanked the applicant for implementing the Board's recommendations to make the site more attractive. He noted that a wall was shown in the photo of the elevation but not on the site plan. Mr. Swirling stated that it should be on the site plan. Mr. Fellows stated that he appreciated the improvements and the effort to lessen the impact of the pickup window as well as the dropped awnings. Mr. Thomas stated that the building looked good considering the site limitations. Mr. Mazer stated that this was a good job and he appreciated the applicant listening to the Board. Mr. Paul stated that it was a pleasure to work with developers when they took the Board's input seriously. He stated that one of his pet peeves was painted crosswalks and he would like to see textured walks which would set the tone for the entire site.

9. The Highlands Subdivision, Peter Simpson requests site plan amendment to swap land between subdivision lots 15 and 50 at 16 Wildrose Lane and 4 Elbridge Oliver Way*

This item was tabled at the request of the applicant.

10. New Day Realty Inc. requests site plan approval for an approximately 10,000 square foot mixed use office building on Lot 9 at Haigis Parkway Professional Center*

Mr. Bacon stated that there was a staff review memo and memos from Mr. Tubbs, dated October 5 and 14, 2008.

Ms. Ann Callender, of Whipple Callender Architects, stated that this was a high performing, aesthetically pleasing, green building for preventative health care. She stated that the lot ran along Haigis Parkway and shared an access with Lot 8; she stated that the building had southerly exposure and was surrounded with woods. Ms. Callender stated that the site dropped off so they would have a daylight basement; she stated that the dumpster would be in the front of the building and tucked into the existing tree growth to avoid the grade of the land in the back of the building. Ms. Callender stated that about 60 feet of trees would remain on Haigis Parkway and they would add more evergreens to hide the dumpster. She stated that they would use traditional cedar shingles and break up the massing of the building with windows and trim and different roof pitches. She stated that they would buffer the parking lot so it would not be seen.

Mr. John Mitchell, of Mitchell & Associates, stated that at the request of the staff, they consulted a traffic engineer who suggested moving the future driveway for Lot 8 as far away from the Lot 9 driveway as possible. He stated that they had expanded the fire lanes in two locations in the rear, changed the curb to mountable concrete curbing, added walkways in the rear of the building and placed a hydrant in the parking lot landscaping to satisfy the Fire Department. Mr. Mitchell stated that it would be difficult to put a five foot wide pedestrian walkway through the center of the parking lot divider island because it would leave only two feet of planting area and the grading and wetlands would not allow them to expand the width of the island. He stated that they had added a trail to interconnect the lots within the subdivision. He stated that they added a note to the plan indicating that all the lights would be on timers and extinguished an hour after closing. He noted that the dumpster would be five feet below the elevation of Haigis Parkway. Mr. Mitchell addressed the technical issues noted in Mr. Tubbs' memo.

To questions from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Mitchell replied that the access to the site and to Lot 8 was a two-way driveway and fencing around the dumpster would be solid board fencing. Mr. Chamberlain stated that the building was attractive and asked what was at the top of the elevator shaft. Mr. Mitchell stated that it was a circular window. To a question from Ms. Littlefield, Ms. Callender replied that the signage for both lots would be at the edge of the property. Ms. Littlefield recommended that the stop sign be at the exit from Lot 8 for entering vehicles.

Mr. Callahan stated that he was happy with the building. Mr. Fellows stated that the building was attractive and he agreed with the location of the stop sign and the location of the dumpster. Mr. Mazer agreed that there should be a stop sign.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the site plan for New Day Realty with the following conditions;

1. The Planning Board reserves the right to revisit the driveway design within the access easement to ensure access to Lot 8 will be safe and convenient.
2. The dumpster pad shall be screened with additional landscaping.
3. The installation of the Stormtect, Stormtreat systems and the roof line drip edge shall be inspected by a third party engineer. Inspection reports shall be submitted to Planning staff for final review and approval.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the traffic impact fees shall be paid in full.
5. The applicant must finalize their DEP permit, per the Board's approval of Phases 1A and 1B of the Haigis Parkway Professional Center subdivision prior to the issuance of a building permit.
6. A stop sign shall be added to the three-way intersection at the entrance.
7. Final signage shall be approved by the Planning staff.

Mr. Chamberlain seconded.

Voted 5-0

11. First Look Plaza, Michael Scarks requests site plan amendment for HVAC screening on site at Payne Road

Mr. Paul asked the Board to suspend the 10:30 closing rule because this was a critical construction issue.

Mr. Scarks stated that the point of the proposed screening was not architectural but to screen the roof top installments. He stated that, for energy conservation purposes, the HVAC units were 18 inches larger than planned so the mass of the enclosures was larger. He stated that the color would blend in with the grey of the building.

Mr. Paul asked whether there could be a compromise with more of the same architectural feel that was on the original plan. Mr. Scarks suggested a false gable with lattice work and louvers for air flow. Mr. Paul agreed that four gables would work better. Mr. Fellows noted that the Design Standards indicated that screening shall be integral to the architecture. Mr. Paul stated that he would like the building to retain the charm and character of the original design.

Mr. Paul moved to require that a specification for the screening be submitted to the staff for Administrative Amendment; Mr. Callahan seconded.

Voted 5-0

12. Administrative Amendment Report

Mr. Chace stated that Blue Canoe had been sold to Circle K and the Chairman had given an Administrative Amendment for the color of the building to become tan and for the sign change.

13. Town Planner's Report

Mr. Bacon stated that new Ordinance including the new RH and RH2 Zones would be distributed to the Board in the near future.

14. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

15. Planning Board Comments

Mr. Paul noted that he and Mr. Fellows would be absent from the October 27, 2008 meeting and the attendance of the rest of the Board was critical. He thanked the Board for hearing an item after 10:30 P.M.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 P. M.