

[Planning Board Agenda](#) (regular meeting 01/20/04)

[Draft Minutes](#) (regular meeting 12/16/03)

AGENDA

TOWN OF CAPE ELIZABETH

PLANNING BOARD AGENDA

January 20, 2004 7:00 p.m. Town Hall

CALL TO ORDER

7:00 Minutes of previous meeting: December 16, 2003

Correspondence:

- Zoning News November 2003
- Zoning News December 2003
- Maine Sunday Telegram Article on cell phone coverage 1/11/04

OTHER BUSINESS

7:05 Tower Overlay Districts Zoning Map Amendment - The Town Council is requesting that the Planning Board review the creation of 2 new Tower Overlay Districts located in the area of the intersection of Bowery Beach Rd/Charles E. Jordan Rd/Fowler Rd and in the area of Fort Williams, Sec. 19-10-3, Zoning Map Amendment Public Hearing.

NOTE: The times on this agenda are approximate and are intended for the convenience of the applicants; however, your time could be called earlier or later than the indicated time.

DRAFT MINUTES

TOWN OF CAPE ELIZABETH, MAINE

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

DECEMBER 16, 2003 7P.M., TOWN HALL

Present: Andrew Charles, Acting Chair Absent: John Ciraldo

Peter Cotter

David Griffin

Peter Hatem

Barbara Schenkel

David Sherman

Also present was Maureen O'Meara, Town Planner.

Mr. Charles opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda for the meeting.

The first item on the agenda was to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Charles asked for corrections to minutes. Mr. Sherman stated that he did not make the motion to adjourn. Mr. Charles stated that he did. Mr. Ciraldo asked for a motion to the minutes as amended. Motion was made by Mr. Griffin and seconded by Mrs. Schenkel. Motion was carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Mr. Charles reviewed the correspondence that had been distributed to the Board that evening. Mr. Charles proceeded to the first item on the agenda, which was to be Golden Ridge Lane.

Mr. Sherman made a motion that the Board reverse the order of the agenda, as the 2nd applicant item would be brief. Mr. Hatem seconded that motion and was carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

NEW BUSINESS

Karu Subdivision Amendment- Candace Karu is requesting an amendment to the Karu Subdivision, located at 246 Ocean House Rd, to phase the construction of Arlington Lane and to convey 3,300 sq. ft. of land to an abutter. The subdivision was previously approved by the Planning Board in June and this amendment will be reviewed under Sec. 16-2-5, Amendment to a Previously Approved Subdivision.

Mr. John Mitchell of Mitchell & Associates, representing Candace Karu, introduced himself. Mr. Mitchell described the 2 amendments that they were looking for approval. Phase 1 will consist of construction of the front portion of Arlington Lane with turnaround and utilities, which would service lot 1 and existing house. The balance of utilities would be constructed upon issuance of a building permit for phase 2. The second amendment request is a land conveyance with the abutter for a strip of land on the eastern boundary of the subdivision that is approximately 3,300 sq. ft. that will keep a pond wholly on the abutters land. It will reduce the amount of open space from 53.3% to 52.3%, which is within the minimum of 40% required by ordinance.

Mr. Charles reminded the board that this is an approved subdivision and completeness is not required, just evaluating the modification presented.

Mr. Griffin asked Ms. O'Meara if there had been any calls or correspondence from the public and she replied no. Mr. Griffin stated he didn't see any need for a site walk.

Mr. Charles verified with Mr. Mitchell that the actual layout of the subdivision would not change and the layout would stay as approved.

Mr. Mitchell stated that and lot 3 was unlikely to be developed as it was sold to the abutter to maintain a buffer.

Mr. Sherman asked if the strip of land, including the portion of the pond would remain subject to the conservation easement and Mr. Mitchell affirmed that.

Mr. Charles asked for any questions. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Griffin made the following motion for the board to consider:

Findings of Fact

1. Candace Karu is requesting changes to the subdivision located at 246 Ocean House Rd to phase the construction and convey 3,300 sq. ft. to an abutter, which requires review under Sec. 16-2-5, Amendment to a Previously Approved Subdivision.

2. The application substantially complies with Sec. 16-2-5 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED that, based on the plans and materials submitted and the facts presented, the application of Candace Karu for amendments to the previously approved Karu Subdivision, located at 246 Ocean House Rd, to phase the subdivision and convey 3,300 sq. ft. of land to an abutter be approved.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Cotter and carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Mr. Charles introduced the next item on the agenda being Golden Ridge Subdivision.

Golden Ridge Lane Minor Subdivision Review- K & K Realty is requesting Minor Subdivision Review of a 3-lot subdivision located on Golden Ridge Lane. The application will be reviewed for compliance with Sec. 16-2-3, Minor Subdivision Review.

Mr. Fisher, representing K & K Realty, gave an overview of the project. Included in this was improving Golden Ridge Lane to the Town's standards, proposed trail relocation, and the engineering specifications.

Mr. Fisher discussed the easement that currently exists between the Hagmanns and the Powells that connects to the Great Pond Trail. Their proposal is to laterally move the 18 ft. easement to coincide with Golden Ridge Lane in the Right of Way. They are also moving the street sign on other side of roadway and adding a greenbelt sign to delineate the entrance. Mr. Kennedy is

creating a 4' wide path on the easement and a chipped wood base, which will proceed 500' to the turnout on the lane.

Mr. Fisher stated an item of contention was the location of the trail. The applicant wants the easement to continue down the path and through the boundaries of the properties belonging to Amy Powell and the Youngs. The Conservation Commission had previously done a site walk and determined the easement would be better served on the southerly line of the easement being granted to the Sprague Corporation.

Mr. Fisher wanted to expound on how the applicant's proposal would be a "win-win" situation as it would not be on someone's lawn and the applicant would build the trail. He also suggested the trail that it would diminish the value of the new Powell lot if the trail bifurcated in the southern part of the easement. The plan moves the existing easement to Golden Ridge Lane, and connects to the northern part of the easement where the applicant would build a trail.

Mr. Fisher addressed the open space to be donated as conservation area. His proposal was a strip of land, 75ft. wide, which is equal to what is needed to conserve. Mr. Fisher's clients also reserve the right to carve up their 8.5-acre parcel once.

Mr. Charles stated the first item was completeness. They did receive a memo from the Town Manager concurring the financial capability of the applicant. Mr. Charles asked the board if there were any questions comments concerning completeness.

Mr. Sherman made the following motion:

BE IT ORDERED that, based on the plans and materials submitted, the application of K&K Realty for Minor Subdivision Review of Golden Ridge Lane, a 3-lot subdivision located off Bowery Beach Rd, be deemed complete.

Mr. Hatem seconded the motion and carried 6 in favor 0 opposed.

Mr. Charles stated the next item on the agenda as the public hearing and asked if there was anyone who would like to make comments.

Mr. Greg Powell, 2 Golden Ridge Lane, introduced himself and produced a letter addressed to the Planning Board and the Town Council and signed by the Powells, the Chatmans, the Youngs and the Hagmanns. It stated that they supported the relocation of the right of way to Golden Ridge Lane for the following reasons:

1. Relocation will more clearly mark the start of the trail to the public.
2. Golden Ridge Lane is an established road that will benefit trail users by clearly marking boundaries of the trail.

3. The new trail will access Great Pond trail as the existing trail does.
4. Use of the current right of way is awkward and runs through the backyards of two private residences.
5. Moving the trail will reduce trespassing on private property.
6. A legal issue exists for the validity and scope to the town's present right of way of the existing easement on the Hagmanns property.
7. The relocation would be done to no cost to the town.

Mr. Powell then handed the letter to Mr. Charles and wanted the Board to know that collectively everyone had worked hard on the relocation. Mr. Powell said that he would be happy to field any questions.

Mr. Charles asked that Mr. Powell verify which route he and the neighbors were advocating.

Mr. Powell stated that they had worked very hard with lawyers for a month and a half and the deed reflects the trail on the northerly edge.

Mr. Griffin asked Mr. Powell if it was his opinion to make easements on lot lines for future easements.

Mr. Powell agreed with this because of clarification and simplicity Mr. Kennedy had received a deeded easement from the Spragues that was clear.

Mr. Sherman clarified with Mr. Powell that if the trail were located on the northern line of the easement, it would not bisect their lot. Therefore the lot would be more valuable. Mr. Powell confirmed that.

Mr. Sherman recalled from the site walk that someone had posed the question to Mr. Powell if it made a big difference where the trail was placed and his answer was no.

Mr. Powell said that he didn't mean that and they had spent a lot of money on lawyers working on deeds.

Mr. Charles thanked him and asked for other comments.

Mr. Michael Duddy, 11 Crescent View Avenue, and also the chair of the Conservation Commission spoke. Issues he thought had been taken care of earlier in the year are still being discussed tonight. Mr. Duddy stated, in his years of being on the Board, that placing a trail on a property line is not an important factor to the Conservation Commission. They try to site trails to give the citizens of the Town the best experience, on higher dry area, and off property lines so only one property owner is impacted.

Mr. Duddy stressed that from the beginning they had been emphatic that the northern trail location is not desirable. It is unfortunate that deeds were drafted. They had been clear on what trail would best serve the town. The Conservation Commission vehemently opposed the trail to be located on the northern part of the easement and were unanimous to have it located on the southerly section. Mr. Duddy wanted to emphasize that they had compromised by having the trail move from the Hagmanns property to a walkway that would run along Golden Ridge Lane and that the verbiage could be easily changed by 18 ft to reflect the desired trail location.

Mr. Charles asked Mr. Duddy what the Conservation Commissions take was about the issue of legality surrounding the easement on the Hagmanns property.

Mr. Duddy stated that it was a new development to him.

Mr. Charles asked for Maureen's opinion.

Ms. O'Meara suggested that if it is an issue, they take it to the Town attorney to look at.

Mr. Sherman said he would want to get more guidance, as there seemed to be a subtle threat and would not want the town to end up without access to the Great Pond.

Mr. Charles suggested that they continue the Public Hearing.

Jonah Rosenfield, 243 Spurwink Ave., wanted to reiterate what Mr. Duddy said. Mr. Rosenfield, who is also a Conservation Commission member, said that they look at what is best for the town and that they would not want to "trade down" assets. The southerly trail on the easement is best for the town.

Jeff Kennedy, the applicant, disagreed because the people are not using the trail properly now and their compromise would be the northerly trail.

Mike Pulsifer, 30 Broad Cove Road and a member of the Conservation Commission, wanted to state that he thought that the current trail made him feel uncomfortable as it is in the back of the residents yard and someone had actually inquired to what they were doing.

Mr. Charles asked if anyone else cared to speak. Without anyone forthcoming, Mr. Charles closed the public hearing.

Mr. Charles asked if Mr. Fisher wanted to make a brief comment.

Mr. Fisher stated that the contention was on which side of the easement the trail will go.

He stated that the applicant is the one that will be financially and physically building the trail and would like to see the trail in the northerly section.

Mr. Hatem wanted Mr. Fisher to explain the opposition of the southerly trail in a 1-2-3 format.

Mr. Fisher stated that part of the area in the building lot owned by the Powells, had been tested for a septic system and that area is located very close to the southern trail.

Mr. Sherman asked how far away a new house would be from the existing greenbelt trail.

Mr. Fisher stated that depended on where the house is built.

Mr. Charles asked if the house could be situated differently on lot.

Mr. Fisher answered yes.

Mr. Charles invited members of the board to pose any questions they might have at this time.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Fisher how they planned to deal with the open space issue.

Mr. Fisher wanted comments from the board and pointed out the allotted land.

Mr. Charles asked Ms. O'Meara for comment on that particular portion of land.

Ms. O'Meara stated she had met w/the applicant's representative to come up with a relatively painless way to meet the open space standard. She suggested providing an easement over the wetland on the southern side of the lot the K & K lot with a dry walkabel edge, and then continuing the easement along the property line to reconnect with the Great Pond trail, creating a loop

Ms. O'Meara pointed out that this was not a clustered subdivision with a determined amount set aside. The current open space impact fee numbers for a new subdivision are 12,545 sq. ft. of open space per lot or \$4320.00 per lot, which is saved to purchase more open space. The requirement also gives the Planning Board the authority to determine if there should be a land donation or fee. The Planning Board should also look at the quality of open space, not just quantity. Ms. O'Meara stated that there was not a lot of quality open space but could possibly create a dry edge along lot 3 and reconnect to the greenbelt trail.

Mr. Kennedy stated up until a week ago the land donation had been sufficient and the wetland and easement donation should be sufficient.

Mr. Fisher said they would be willing to donate entire wetland or any portion thereof but do not want the upland edge reconnection because of privacy to the property owner.

Mr. Charles stated because of the unresolved placement of new easement, of open space vs. impact fee, and potential legal issue with the current easements, there could be an impact on any potential ruling. Mr. Charles wanted feedback at this point from the Board.

Mr. Cotter stated the legality issue was not a problem for him and believes the applicant has put a lot of time and potentially money into a better trail and thinks it is an improvement. He believes that with the questions remaining could easily be handled by conditions placed upon approval.

Mrs. Schenkel asked if improvements made on the parcel would count as part of open space?

Ms. O'Meara stated that there is a serious precedent that they potentially could be setting in trading one easement for another and the improvements and easements are one package. Without the improvements, it is not an equivalent trade.

Mr. Griffin asked if the Sprague easement would allow citizens to walk it.

Mr. Fisher said that it was intended for the Spragues, but they realize it coincides with the public easement.

Mr. Hatem asked if they could do basically whatever they want on that easement.

Mr. Fisher acknowledged they would be able to have vehicular access.

Mr. Griffin didn't think they should be arguing about the 14ft., as the applicant will be putting in considerable time and money into the new trail.

Mr. Hatem mentioned that they had an existing easement and that should not be forgotten or surrendered without looking at very carefully.

Mr. Sherman likes the idea of moving the easement and the only problem was the difference of the trail where the Conservation Commission had recommended it.

Mr. Charles said that they could continue on or send the applicant away until certain issues were addressed.

Mr. Cotter was not in favor of tabling the application.

Mrs. Schenkel stated that the Conservation Commission is not standing on ceremony and perhaps they could reconsider putting

it on the southerly edge.

Mr. Sherman suggested a 3-minute break for the client to confer.

Mr. Fisher returned after the break with the applicant acquiescing to the movement of the trail to the southerly edge of the easement as well as 40,000 sq. ft. of open space.

Mr. Charles asked for comments.

Mr. Sherman found it favorable.

Mr. Griffin favored allowing the applicant to have the 18ft waiver for the road.

Mr. Charles wanted Mr. Cotter to make sure he deleted condition 6 & rewrite.

Mr. Fisher asked for another moment to confer.

Mr. Fisher returned saying they stood by their revised proposal.

Mr. Sherman wanted to know if the open space would be of any value to the town and does it have dry accessibility.

Mr. Fisher said it is an RP2 wetland with no ponding. During winter and dry summer months it was accessible but during spring months it was wet.

Mr. Charles wanted to reiterate what the Planner had mentioned with the dry edge for accessibility and this seemed questionable.

Mr. Sherman asked Ms. O'Meara if this would typically go back to the Conservation Commission for review for the 40,000 sq.ft. of open space.

Ms. O'Meara said typically yes. The Commission will usually go to the land and verify it is dry and a valued piece.

Mr. Sherman asked for Mr. Duddy's position on the compromise.

Mr. Duddy said as an individual member he thought it was a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Rosenfield and Mr. Sterling(Conservation Commission members) agreed with Mr. Duddy.

Mr. Cotter made the following motion for the Board to consider:

Findings of Fact

1. K & K Realty are requesting Minor Subdivision Review of the Golden Ridge Lane Subdivision, a 3-lot subdivision located off Route 77, which requires review under Sec. 16-2-3, Minor Subdivision Review.

2. The application depicts a buffer strip with tree and shrub plantings, but does not specify number of plantings, species, or minimum size at time of planting.
3. The proposed pedestrian easement location has been revised and the easement document should be revised to reflect the changes.
4. The proposed pedestrian easement will replace an existing pedestrian easement that currently has a marked greenbelt trail.
5. The road maintenance agreement needs to be revised to reflect sole responsibility of the applicant to maintain the road.
6. The applicant needs to provide open space to meet the open space standard.
7. The application substantially complies with Sec. 16-2-3, Minor Subdivision Review.

THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED that, based on the plans and materials submitted, the application of K&K Realty for Minor Subdivision Review of Golden Ridge Lane, a 3-lot subdivision located off Bowery Beach Rd, be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the plans be revised to reflect the comments of the Town Engineer in his letter dated 12/9/03.
2. That a planting schedule for the buffer strip be added to the plans which details number of plantings, species, and minimum size at time of planting;
3. That a pedestrian easement be submitted for the location approved by the Planning Board, in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney and signed by the applicant.
4. That the Planning Board recommends to the Town Council that the existing pedestrian easement not be extinguished until a greenbelt trail is installed in the new easement, which has been inspected for compliance with the approved plans by the Conservation Commission.
5. That a revised road maintenance agreement be submitted in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney and signed by the applicant.
6. That the applicant offer 40,000 sq. ft. open space along the southern edge of lot proposed lot c with a connecting easement; and
7. That there be no sale of lots nor issuance of a building permit nor recording of the subdivision plat until the plans have been revised and the above conditions have been satisfied.

Mr. Griffin seconded the motion.

Mr. Charles asked for discussion on conditions or findings of fact.

Mr. Charles suggested that the condition be that the applicant offers 40,000 sq.ft. of open

space along the southern edge of proposed lot C, with a connecting easement.

Mr. Hatem wanted to clarify that the Town Council must approve the stipulations

and wanted to know a time frame.

Ms. O'Meara recommended that the applicant take care of all issues before approaching

the Council as they have a lot of work to do in 90 days.

Mr. Charles asked if there was any more discussion before the board. He also added he

was uncomfortable with open space as proposed and that the applicant had done a

job with easement work.

Mr. Charles then asked for a vote and it carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Mr. Hatem moved to adjourn.

Mr. Cotter seconded the motion and was 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Laurie Palanza

Mrs. Schenkel concurred.

Mr. Charles wanted to propose a motion for the board to consider:

Findings of Fact

1. The Aucocisco School is requesting Site Plan review of a change of use of an existing building located at 126 Spurwink Ave from a church to a school, which requires Site Plan Review and a Conditional Use Permit.

2. The application substantially complies with Sec. 19-9, Site Plan Regulations and Sec. 19-5-5(D), Conditional Use Standards.

THEREFORE BE IT ORDERED that, based on the plans and materials submitted and the facts presented, the application of the Aucocisco Learning Center for Site Plan review to change the use of the building located at 126 Spurwink Ave from a church to a school be approved with the following condition:

1. That new submittal documents be provided detailing building changes presented at the November 18, 2003 Planning Board meeting prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Griffin and carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Golden Ridge Subdivision - K & K Realty (Vicki and Jeff Kennedy) are requesting Minor Subdivision Review of the Golden Ridge Lane Subdivision, a 3-lot subdivision located off Route 77 and Golden Ridge Lane, Sec. 16-2-3, Minor Subdivision completeness.

Mr. Ciraldo wanted to remind the board that they need to determine completeness on the application once they rule on that than can move to a substantive discussion.

Mr. Fisher introduced himself from Northeast Civil Solutions representing K & K Realty and Jeff & Vicki Kennedy and their request for preliminary approval for minor 3-lot subdivision located of Golden Ridge Lane.

Mr. Fisher did an overview of the plans. He displayed an area of 15 acres and they propose 3 different lots to be created at the end of Golden Ridge Lane. Golden Ridge Lane is currently a private way that extends 600 ft. He mentioned to the board that they were there last year for a private accessway permit, which they withdrew and now are going for the minor subdivision relative to the 3 lots.

Mr. Fisher showed the portion of the Greenbelt trail and where it connects. They are currently proposing to relocate the trail and have it still connect to it's original point to the Sprague land and go on to Great Pond. He displayed the existing and proposed trails, the drainage easement, wetlands, building envelopes, and soils boundaries.

Mr. Fisher recognized a letter from Amy Powell, and Mr. Fisher acknowledged speaking to Leslie Young and she and her husband are going to provide them a letter acknowledging they are part of the plans for this subdivision.

Mr. Fisher indicated they had changed the plans from saying remaining lands to lot C. They have also indicated all the building lots as they appear on the plans.

Mr. Fisher responded to Ms. O' Meara's question concerning portion of the Town's Plans that had a portion of the BA district

not typically located in the wetland area and they have no problem with that. He demonstrated the larger wetland is part of lot c where the Kennedy's at some point would like to build a house.

Mr. Fisher displayed the topographical maps that the board should have had before and gave his apologies for that omission. He also stated they had to break up the plans to two different plans because they were getting huge and were not able to display bearings.

Mr. Fisher then stated he would welcome discussion on the RP1 & RP2 wetlands delineation.

Mr. Ciraldo asked what the delineation was based on.

Mr. Fisher said the delineation was based on 3 factors: hydrology, plant life, and soils test. He also submitted the initial soils test data on lot A and lot C, as well as the design for septic system. Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Kennedy is working with the Town Manager in respect to financial capability.

Mr. Fisher made reference to an informal note from Ms. O'Meara for issues of incompleteness. That is changing the reference of accessway to roadway.

Mr. Ciraldo asked ms. O'Meara what has and what hasn't been addressed in the list of incompleteness.

Ms. O'Meara stated the only thing that could be taken off the list is the HHE 200 designs. She stated everything else still hasn't been submitted. Assuming she had the plans there are two items still missing: 1. Right title and interest for lot b, 2. Financial capabilities had yet to have been discussed between the Town Manager and K & k Realty.

Mr. Hatem wanted to know if there was a purchase and sale agreement for Lot A and the status of Lot B.

Mr. Fisher stated there was a land contract for lot A and lot b has been sold to the Young's.

Mr. Charles's wanted to clarify that there would only be determination of completeness or incompleteness tonight. He also stated he didn't think they were ready for final approval, and he also feels due to the amount of deficiencies that they could not find completeness and feels to send it back. He also thinks that issues with the greenbelt should be taken up with the Conservation Commission.

Mr.Ciraldo stated that Mr. Charles was correct in the determination of completeness only for this meeting.

Mrs. Schenkel was confused because the submission says 16 acres and it didn't add up.

Mr. Fisher stated the roadway was not included in the acreage and it was rounded up.

Mr. Ciraldo joined Mr. Charles in concern with incompleteness. He stated that from the distance it is hard to determine and should go to planning staff to review prior to the board. He also wanted to reiterate that it has to go through completeness and then approval.

Mr. Fisher wanted to state that nothing had changed on the plans for physical boundaries and contours. He also said the property has changed and they have eliminated the BA district. He said they did have the HHE 200 designs, but do not have financial capability and had thought that went in conjunction with final approval and need the letter from the Young's. Mr. Fisher said other than the road changes, everything else was done.

Mr. Ciraldo wanted to reiterate again that this needed to be determined as complete or incomplete.

Mr. Griffin concurred, as the Town Engineer has not been able to review newly submitted plans.

Mrs. Schenkel stated that they might want to have a sight walk also due to wetland issues.

Mr. Ciraldo asked for a motion.

Mr. Charles made the following motion for the board to consider:

BE IT ORDERED that, based on the plans and materials submitted, the application of K&K Realty for Minor Subdivision Review of Golden Ridge Lane, a 3-lot subdivision located off Bowery Beach Rd, be deemed incomplete.

The enclosed memorandum includes a list of incomplete items. In accordance with Sec. 16-2-3(a)(3), you have four months to have the application deemed complete or the application will be considered withdrawn.

Mr. Cotter seconded the motion and carried 6 in favor and 0 opposed.

Mr. Ciraldo stated they would review completeness at the next meeting and should talk about a public hearing and site walk.

Mrs. Schenkel wanted a site walk and requests a Conservation Commission member to join them. Mrs. Schenkel was unclear on where the building envelope is and should have something there to clarify.

Mr. Ciraldo thinks a site walk is necessary and wanted to determine a time to do that.

Mr. Ciraldo put forth December 6th, and that was acceptable for

the board.

Mr. Ciraldo asked Maureen for someone from the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Ciraldo noted since everyone was in agreement to the public hearing they will have one.

Mr. Hatem had a question with the easement and since it is town owned that the Town Council would have to approve.

Ms. O'Meara stated that she had spoke with the town Manager and he wants the Planning Board and the Conservation commission to make a recommendation.

[Return to top](#)