

1
2
3
4 **OLD ORCHARD BEACH PLANNING BOARD**
5 **Public Hearing and Regular Meeting**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7 **April 12, 2018 7:00 PM**
8 **Town Council Chambers**
9

10 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER at 7:00 PM.**

11 **PLEDGE TO THE FLAG**

12 **ROLL CALL:**

13
14 **Present:** Robin Dube, Marc Guimont, David Walker, Gary Gannon, Vice Chair Win Winch, Chair Linda Mailhot.

15
16 **Absent:** Mark Koenigs.

17
18 **Staff Present:** Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter, Associate Planner Megan McLaughlin.

19
20 All of the voting members are present at tonight's meeting as well as alternate David Walker.
21 Chair Mailhot stated that the Planning Board will be having another site walk and another public hearing
22 for Zarembo Group a later date.
23

24 **Public Hearing**

25 **ITEM 1**

26 **Proposal:** Site Plan Review (Dollar General): Demo existing building and construct new 7,225
27 sq. ft. retail building including associated parking, sidewalks and other site
28 improvements

29 **Applicant:** Zarembo Group

30 **Location:** 19 Heath St., MBL: 309-9-33
31

32 ***At the end of this public hearing PB will be asking to move Item 5 up before Item 2, as this**
33 **will be a motion to table at the applicant's request.**
34

35 Public hearing opens at 7:02 PM.

36
37 Abutter Seth Murdock who lives at 11 Fort Hill Avenue introduced himself and stated that he is still not
38 seeing a marked property yet and was also looking for plans for lighting.
39

40 There being no one else speaking for or against this item, the public hearing closed at 7:03 PM.
41

42 **Approval of Minutes: 3/1/18, 3/21/18**

43
44 The 3/21/18 meeting minutes are unavailable at tonight's meeting.
45

46 **MOTION:** Win Winch made a motion to approve the 3/1/18 meeting minutes, seconded by Robin Dube.
47

48 **Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:**

49 Robin Dube - Yes

50 David Walker - Yes

1 Win Winch - Yes
2 Marc Guimont - Abstained
3 Gary Gannon - Yes
4 Chair Linda Mailhot – Yes

5
6 **VOTE:**
7 APPROVED (5-1-0)

8
9 Win Winch made a motion to move item 5 out of order and to hear this before Item 2, seconded by Robin
10 Dube.

11
12 **Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:**

13 Robin Dube - Yes
14 David Walker - Yes
15 Win Winch - Yes
16 Marc Guimont - Yes
17 Gary Gannon - Yes
18 Chair Linda Mailhot – Yes

19
20 **VOTE:**
21 APPROVED (6-0)

22
23 **Regular Business**

24 **ITEM 5 (VOTED TO MOVE THIS ITEM BEFORE ITEM 2)**

25 **Proposal:** Site Plan Review: Demo existing building and construct new 7,225 sq. ft. retail
26 building including associated parking, sidewalks and other site improvements
27 **Action:** Discussion; Consideration of Public Comment; Schedule Final Ruling
28 **Applicant:** Zaremba Group
29 **Location:** 19 Heath St., MBL: 309-9-33

30
31 The applicant requested to table this item to a future meeting.

32
33 **MOTION:**
34 Motion by Marc Guimont, seconded by Win Winch to table this item.

35
36 **Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:**

37 Robin Dube - Yes
38 David Walker - Yes
39 Win Winch - Yes
40 Marc Guimont - Yes
41 Chair Linda Mailhot – Yes

42
43 **VOTE:**
44 APPROVED (5-0)

45
46 **ITEM 2**

47 **Proposal:** Subdivision Amendment: Amend “8 Lots At Wild Dunes Way” Subdivision to add
48 9th lot
49 **Action:** Discussion; Ruling
50 **Owner:** Dominator Golf LLC
51 **Location:** Wild Dunes Way; MBL: 105A-200 (portion of)

1
2 Planner Hinderliter stated that at the last meeting the Board determined that they were comfortable giving
3 A Conditional approval if the recommended changes had been made.
4 As of 4/10/18, DEP has not approved the addition of a bio retention filter to Lot #9.
5 Staff also received some additional comments from Wright Pierce.
6 Staff recommends approval of this ruling with a condition with DEP approval.

7
8 Bill Thompson, Engineer from BH2M and Project Manager for Dominator Golf introduced himself along
9 with Domenic Pugliares.

10 Wright Pierce comments were responded to in the March 26, 2018 letter.
11 Met with DEP and stated that that they would have the results soon.
12 Addition comments came from Wright Pierce dated April 3rd and applicant did not have time to respond
13 to prior to this meeting. A lot of these are construction related.

14
15 Elevation for the drip edge. Wright Pierce recommends a pipe put on invert for the rain garden.
16 Applicant stated that will go on the re submission to DEP. Bill Thompson also stated that when you see
17 the design on lot #9 with the rain garden and the drip edge, the contractor will follow the grading plan and
18 the grading plan dictates where the elevation will end up.

19 They can add a couple of elevations on the outlet.
20 There are calculations in the storm water report on the pressure sewer which shows the velocity can be
21 met.

22 Doesn't see any problems with the pump station design to be connected to the forced main.

23 Erosion control measures. All of these lots are drained to the perimeter of the property.

24 Performance guarantee price per foot for a forced main. We can update that cost estimate.

25 The applicant has also relocated the cart path.

26
27 They will not be able to start the construction without DEP approval.

28 Robin Dube asked if all of the payments and fees have been taken care of.

29 Planner Hinderliter stated that they all have been taken care of.

30
31 **MOTION:**

32 David Walker made a motion to conditionally approve subdivision amendment for 8 lots in Wild Dunes
33 way to add a 9th lot, location Wild Dunes Way, MBL: 105A-200 with 2 conditions:

- 34 • The lot development should not begin until applicable DEP permits are approved.
- 35 • Before granting occupancy a certification shall be submitted by the project engineer that states the
36 bio retention filters are constructed in accordance with the approved plan.

37 Seconded by Win Winch.

38
39 **Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:**

40 Robin Dube - Yes

41 David Walker - Yes

42 Win Winch - Yes

43 Marc Guimont - Yes

44 Chair Linda Mailhot – Yes

45
46 **VOTE:**

47 APPROVED (5-0)

48
49 **ITEM 3**

50 **Proposal: Ordinance Amendments: Consideration of zoning ordinance amendments**
51 **associated with contractor businesses in the Rural District**

1 **Action: Discussion; Schedule Public Hearing**
2 **Applicant: Town of Old Orchard Beach**
3 **Location: RD Zoning District**
4
5

6 Planner Hinderliter stated that in previous meetings we have looked at 2 separate matters:

- 7 • Excavation business /Contractor and storage yard issue.
 - 8 • Frack tank septic storage issue.
- 9

10 Tonight this agenda item it is only associated with the Contractor and storage yard 1 proposed
11 amendment.

12 We expect to see a conditional use application permit submitted to our office and prepared for the May
13 Planning Board meeting.

14 We previously discussed different options.

15 The one option that we are looking at right now is the Ordinance Amendments which the Planning Board
16 has jurisdiction on.

17 Ordinance amendments establish a contractors storage yard 1 as a conditional use within a certain area of
18 the rural district along Portland Avenue (the properties that have road frontage) from the Ross Rd.
19 intersection to the Scarborough town line, changing a portion of the rural district.

20

21 Beyond this conditional use, we also have specific conditional use standards added. The standards are the
22 minimum required information such as the site plan that is required. We also need a more formal plan:

- 23 • Minimum required information.
 - 24 • Minimum development requirement such as driveway distances, property lines, setbacks, and an
25 occupied residence must be maintained on the same lot.
- 26

27 Staff is recommending a public hearing on May 10th.

28

29 Marc Guimont asked if MacDonald Excavation existed prior to the towns zoning and if it is grandfathered
30 in.

31 Planner Hinderliter will do some research on this, however it did exist prior to the towns licensing.

32

33 Primary difference between:

34 **Storage Yard 1:** Allows for 3 or more construction commercial vehicles. Allows for fueling storage
35 facilities up to 10,000 gallons.

36 Appears to allow a business with employees.

37 Allows a display area

38 **Storage Yard 2:** Limits this to 2 vehicles.

39 This does not allow for fueling storage.

40 Appears to allow for a business to be conducted by a single person.

41 Does not allow for on-site displays for retail to the general public.

42

43 Chair Mailhot had some questions and wanted the Planning Board members to think about the following:

44

45 **Item A (1): Description of all vehicles, trailers and equipment stored, maintained or used by the
46 business on the property.**

47 What if vehicles change or get replaced with other vehicles.

48 One of the other things that the Planning Board can do as one of the other review criteria is to limit the
49 size and the number of vehicles.

50 If we do have this language in, she is not quite sure that you could follow this to the letter of the law.

1 Planner Hinderliter stated that if they are changing one vehicle for a much larger vehicle then that would
2 be considered a change and part of these ordinance amendments is to allow these uses but under certain
3 circumstances. So if there is a change it could very well need to come back to the Planning Board for an
4 amendment to the conditional use approval.

5
6 **Item B (2): The outdoor storage and parking of vehicles and equipment shall be set back a
7 minimum of 50 ft. from the front property line and 25 ft. from the side rear property lines.**

8 Does the board think that 25 ft. is sufficient from the side and rear?

9 The board talked about setbacks for the rural area.

10 Planner Hinderliter stated that rural area does not currently have a setback requirement for parking.

11
12 David Walker asked how enforceable are the minimum requirements and criteria for the Code
13 Enforcement Officer to maintain and what kind of remedies are there should you find that these are not be
14 adhered to?

15 Planner Hinderliter stated that if you don't have Code Officers to enforce the code, it will not be enforced.
16 The Code Enforcement Officer needs to be aware of the Planning Boards actions.

17
18 **Item B (3): All parking and storage areas shall be visibly blocked at the time of installation from
19 both the street and abutting properties by a solid fence, earth barrier and or vegetative planting.**

20 Chair Mailhot thought that this should be a solid fence and either an earth barrier or vegetative planting.

21
22 **Item B (4): Each lot shall have a minimum of 1 acre of lot area.**

23 Chair Mailhot suggested it to read: Each lot shall be a minimum of 1 acre of lot area.

24
25 **Item B (5): An occupied residence must be maintained on the same lot of the contractors storage
26 yard.**

27 Chair Mailhot mentioned that she had thought that the intent was owner occupied?

28 Planner Hinderliter stated that it doesn't have to be owner occupied.

29
30 **Item B (6): The storage area and/or associated accessory structures must be located in the rear
31 yard area of the residential unit yard.**

32 Chair Mailhot's comment was no parking on the sides of the residence.

33 Robin Dube suggested no commercial parking on the sides, only residential.

34
35 **Item C (4): Traffic on and off site: The Planning Board may limit the traffic generated by the
36 contractor's storage yard so as to prevent adverse impacts on adjacent property.**

37 Chair Mailhot is questioning how would you limit the traffic generated?

38 Planner Hinderliter stated that if we had a conditional use permit and the specifics associated with that
39 business and where it would be located we may have a better idea and if we even need to apply it.

40 Marc Guimont stated that this should be a little more specific.

41
42 The Planning Board has set up a public hearing on this item for May 10th at 7:00 PM.

43
44 **ITEM 4:**

45 **Proposal: Ordinance Amendments: Medical Marijuana Storefronts**

46 **Action: Discussion; Schedule Public Hearing**

47 **Applicant: Town of Old Orchard Beach**

48
49 The Planning Board Creating ordinance amendments that address a moratorium that was recently enacted
50 by the council.

51 The Planning Board gave staff direction to:

- 1 • Define medical marijuana storefronts.
- 2 • Rewrite the amendments associated with retail marijuana that was approved by the council earlier
- 3 this year.

4 The amendments included non-medical and recreational sale.

5 Staff created its own language to add the medical marijuana storefronts in with that language.

6
7 The amendments simply define medical marijuana storefronts and prohibit the use town-wide. The
8 amendments will change/add language to Chapter 18 (Businesses) and Chapter 78 (Zoning). Note- the
9 PB only has jurisdiction over the changes to Chapter 78. The Council has sole jurisdiction over Chapter
10 18 amendments; although, the PB can offer comment.

11
12 Chair Mailhot invited the Mourmouras to come and speak on behalf of this ordinance amendment.

13 Peter Mourmouras from 30 Saco Avenue introduced himself. He read a letter that they were going to
14 submit to the council back in October 20, 2017.

15 It basically read to say that the Town Councilors and the Town Planner have already allowed as the same
16 use in 2014. He explained to the Planning Board that their job is to rule on land use.

17
18 Tom Mourmouras from 30 Saco Avenue stated that as a follow up they submitted that letter back in
19 October when they submitted their amendments to the ordinance.

20 Tom Mourmouras also read correspondence that he had sent to Chair Mailhot that maybe can clear up
21 some of the confusion that he sees with this current land use and how this affects adult use.

22
23 Tom stated that all they were asking for is a discussion to answer questions and educate the public.

24 The land use is already established in Old Orchard Beach for medical marijuana sales and they are asking
25 for the exact same thing.

26
27 Chair Mailhot stated that the Planning Board has been charged with taking the moratorium and use that
28 time to come up with restrictions on medical marijuana storefronts. This is defining what a storefront
29 would be for medical marijuana.

30
31 Tom Mourmouras stated that there was no intention to restrict this land use when they put the moratorium
32 in.

33
34 Marc Guimont asked who are the medical marijuana caregivers?

35 Tom Mourmouras stated the caregivers are registered with the State of Maine with DHHS. Anyone over
36 the age of 21 that is a resident of Maine and goes through a background check with the State of Maine
37 and is awarded a caregiver license with the DHHS.

38
39 Chair Mailhot suggested to the board to go on the State of Maine website and look at their medical
40 marijuana statutes which is very clearly written out.

41
42 The Planning Board scheduled the public hearing for May 10, 2018.

43
44 **ITEM 6**

45 **Proposal: Major Subdivision: 9 lot residential subdivision (Red Oak Phase III)**

46 **Action: Preliminary Plan Review/Determination of Completeness; Schedule Site Walk and**
47 **Public Hearing**

48 **Owner: Mark & Claire Bureau**

49 **Location: 141 Portland Ave, MBL: 104-2-2**

50
51 Megan McLaughlin summarized an update on this item.

1
2 The Applicant has made several revisions to the plan and submitted an updated cover letter that attempts
3 to address Staff comments and Wright Pierce comments. There are a few main comments:

- 4 • Planning Staff questioned whether or not this roadway would be intended to be accepted by the
5 Town and it is currently not proposed to be public but will be constructed in accordance with
6 Town Standards. Because the initial 750 feet of roadway was constructed back in the 2004-2005
7 timeframe and the Town does not have documentation on how it was constructed, we
8 recommend, and the Applicant agrees, that a condition be added to the plan that states “*should the*
9 *Applicant petition the Town to accept the road, the Applicant shall provide as-built*
10 *documentation of the existing 750 feet of roadway and the Town shall review for conformance*
11 *with Town Standards.*”
- 12 • The condition that the applicant is recommending the added stormwater with the individual lots.
13 Jason Vafiadis has agreed to submit a plan that shows stormwater stubs on each of the lots,
14 grading and drainage plans for each of the lots and some calculations on the stormwater BMB’s.
- 15 • The Applicant appears to be achieving their Net Development Density (NDD) by utilizing the
16 Bureau lot, however, this project has been presented as a “9 lot subdivision” and does not appear
17 to include the bureau lot in the plans as “Lot #10.” Planning staff believes the plans and materials
18 should be updated to include this lot as part of the subdivision if it is how they are achieving the
19 density for the project.
- 20 • FEMA flood plain in this area. The applicant submitted a letter of map amendment for this area
21 that they think they will receive back from FEMA in June/July timeframe. The flood plain only
22 affects lot #1. We talked about having the applicant submit a plan that shows a building envelope
23 with the current flood plain and a new building envelope with the potentially revised floodplain.
- 24 • And a couple other minor items: Test pit locations and an updated performance guarantee
25 worksheet.
- 26 • Staff also received some Wright Pierce comments.

27
28 Staff feels that the application materials are complete and recommend that the Planning Board make a
29 determination of completeness and schedule the public hearing and site walk for May.
30

31 Jason Vafiadis, representing Mark and Claire Bureau introduced himself.
32 He feels that by the next submission, all the comments will be addressed.
33

34 Chair Mailhot had some questions:

35 At the top of the plan, there is a section marked land claimed by Mark Bureau. It says that no deed has
36 been found.
37

38 Jason Vafiadis stated that they retained an attorney and in a plan filed with the registry of deeds, they had
39 found a deed that the land was owned by Mr. Bureau and was transferred to the applicant in some transfer
40 that also included a larger part of this land. The lawyer stated that in one of the descriptions was described
41 as a piece of land that was going with Mr. Bureau’s property and the land was sort of left unclaimed in the
42 previous sale of the original owner transfer that the interpretation was that that land was intended to be
43 transferred to Mr. Bureau. So the boundary survey was re issued with the attorneys opinion and references
44 that. He thinks that there is also a quit claim deed filed as well.
45

46 Chair Mailhot stated that there will be some discussion about this particularly because it meets up with a
47 very large chunk on one of the lots and it needs to be clarified.

48 Jason Vafiadis stated that this will definitely be in the next submittal.
49

50 Chair Mailhot asked if there are any plans at this time for future development of lot #10.

1 Mr. Vafiadis stated that he didn't think so because they want to keep a privacy buffer.

2
3 Chair Mailhot also asked what is the "understanding" about removing the tree growth prior to project
4 approval.

5 Jason stated that Mr. Bureau has already taken it out of tree growth.

6
7 Marc Guimont stated that the responsible party for stormwater maintenance is the developer. Who would
8 maintain the percolation pond? This should be clarified, make a note and be filed in the registry of deeds.

9
10 Jason Vafiadis stated that there is a homeowners association and they will always maintain the
11 stormwater.

12
13 Homeowners Association will provide for adequate solid waste and sewage disposal and it is anticipated
14 that the town of Old Orchard Beach curb side pick up will be available by contract service if the road is
15 accepted by the town.

16 Jason Vafiadis stated until such time, this will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association. His
17 understanding is that whatever company and whoever has the contract with the town can privately
18 contract with the homeowners association provided the road is built to town standards.

19
20 Marc Guimont was concerned with the fact that if this pond retains or detains water it is going to be
21 standing water and could be a danger to children. Would that be fenced in?

22 Jason Vafiadis stated that these ponds are underdrain soil filters. The ponds hold the water while it rains
23 for a time period of 24 to 72 hours. The ponds will be dry over normal times. There are no standards that
24 he is aware of that requires fencing however they will take a look at that.

25
26 Marc Guimont would also like some thought to be put in for street lighting.

27
28 Chair Mailhot set the site walk for May 3, 2018 at 5:30 PM.

29
30 **ITEM 7**

31 **Proposal:** Subdivision Amendment: Amend Church St. Station Plan to change location of one
32 building unit and add easement

33 **Action:** Discussion; Ruling

34 **Owner:** Church Street LLC

35 **Location:** 164 Saco Ave., MBL: 208-1-9, GB1 & R4

36
37 This amendment is to change the location and add an easement. There is a water easement for Maine
38 Water being added to the plan for access to a water shut off valve that is located on or adjacent to this
39 property.

40
41 **MOTION:**

42 Marc Guimont moved to approve the subdivision amendment for Church Street Station to adjust the
43 location of unit #1 and add a 30' easement from Maine Water located at 164 Saco Avenue, seconded by
44 David Walker.

45
46 **Planner Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:**

47 Robin Dube - Yes

48 David Walker - Yes

49 Win Winch - Yes

50 Marc Guimont - Yes

51 Chair Linda Mailhot – Yes

1
2 **VOTE:**
3 APPROVED (5-0)
4

5 **ITEM 8**

6 **Proposal:** Subdivision/Site Plan Amendment: Amend Atlantic Park Condominium to allow
7 construction of 20 new units, sidewalks, parking, access ways, landscaping, and
8 other misc. improvements.

9 **Action:** Discussion; Schedule Site Walk and Public Hearing

10 **Owner:** KAP Atlantic, LLC

11 **Location:** 11 Smithwheel Rd., MBL: 210-1-7
12

13 The proposed Atlantic Park amendments are basically a re-approval of a proposal that secured PB
14 approval during 2003. The problem is the 2003 PB approval is not valid because it was not recorded. So,
15 it is really an amendment of the original plan which was approved during 1989. Some of the existing
16 built portions of Atlantic Park was permitted in accordance with the valid and approved 1989 plan, other
17 parts were permitted in accordance with the 2003 plan that does not legally exist. 92 units were and are
18 still are approved because the 1989 approval is the only one that is legally valid. The 2003 proposal
19 reduced the number but is not valid. The 2018 amendment is similar to 2003 and reduces the total unit
20 count to 55. 34 units are constructed. This proposal will add 21 new units. Ultimately, the proposed
21 2018 amendment will help correct this which should help current property owners as titles will be cleaner.
22

23 The Planning Board reviewed this proposal during November 2017 and decided not to make a decision on
24 the proposal until the Applicant addressed the outstanding items listed in the memo. These included:

- 25 • Address items in the 2010 Notice of Decision (NOD)
- 26 • Address items in the 2010 Wright-Pierce Peer Review memo
- 27 • Address comments from Department Heads
- 28 • Submit a letter identifying modification, issues, etc.
- 29 • Submit 2 full plan sets and any additional info that's changed (e.g., stormwater)
30

31 Planning Staff did not see where the above-mentioned items were addressed in the current submission.
32 The 2010 NOD requested several items that may no longer be applicable (i.e. size of the swimming pool,
33 parking space evaluations, lighting, decks/stairs violating setback, shoreland zoning implications, etc.) but
34 the Applicant should address each of these in their submission materials.
35

36 Planner Hinderliter stated that we just received some information from Wright Pierce.
37 He also mentioned it would be helpful to hold a public hearing to let the public to have the ability to see
38 the plans and to provide comment and possibly a site walk and ask that Bill Thompson address the
39 outstanding comments including the new Wright Pierce comments.
40

41 Bill Thompson stated that they have a storm water design and they presented it to DEP with favorable
42 approval.

43 They will go through all of the comments with staff and Wright Pierce to make sure that everything is
44 addressed.
45

46 Chair Mailhot scheduled a site walk for May 3, 2018 at 5:00 PM. and schedule a public hearing for May
47 10, 2018.
48

49 **ITEM 9**
50

1 **Proposal: Site Plan Sketch Plan Review: Construct 40' x 80' Garden Center.**
2 **Action: Discussion; Recommendations**
3 **Applicant: Robillards Garden Center, LLC**
4 **Location: 85 Cascade Rd., MBL: 103-3-3**
5

6 This proposal is for the demolition of existing cabins/cottages and a single-family home and the
7 construction of a 40x80 building and associated storage bins/parking to support a Garden Center. This
8 proposal is in the sketch plan stage.
9

10 The Applicant is proposing to connect to the existing public water and install an onsite septic system. The
11 proposal currently uses the existing curb cut for two-way traffic and proposes to create an additional “exit
12 only” drive so that they can separate the store customers from the customers purchasing bulk products
13 such as mulch.
14

15 The property is located in the NC-4 district (Cascade Road Neighborhood Commercial District). Another
16 parcel in this district also used to be a garden center a few years ago. Garden centers and agricultural uses
17 are permissible in the NC-4 district. However, because this is construction of a new nonresidential
18 structure it requires review as a Site Plan by the Planning Board.
19

20 The lot size is 50,094 sq.ft and the minimum lot size with water is 40,000 sq. ft in this district so it meets
21 those requirements. It also exceeds the frontage requirement of 200 feet.

22 Items staff recommended the Planning Board to discuss:

- 23 • Details on signage with the applicant.
- 24 • Details on lighting.
- 25 • Site distance.
- 26 • Driveways on Major Roads.
- 27 • Number of trips during peak hours and in general at the site.
- 28 • Landscaping.
- 29 • Parking standards.
- 30 • Off street loading.
- 31 • Storage areas.
- 32 • If the project is going to disturb greater than 1 acre, it will need to meet the Chapter 71, Post-
33 Construction Stormwater Management ordinance including the requirement to submit a Post-
34 Construction Stormwater Management Plan for the PB to review
35
36

37 Bill Thompson, BH2M representing the applicants introduced himself.

38 This has public water and a small septic area. They will try to minimize traffic. There is a stream in the
39 back with a 75' setback. It will have classic landscaping products.
40

41 David Walker asked if they will be spraying any pesticides. The applicants will not be spraying any
42 pesticides.

43 Robin Dube asked if they will have any screening at the borders of the property lines.

44 Bill Thompson stated that they will have plantings for buffering and they will meet the ordinance.
45

46 **Other Business**

47

48 **Good and Welfare**

49

1 Robin questioned the sign coming out of Red Rocket going on to Union Avenue. The Planning Board
2 decided that no traffic was to exit onto Union Avenue. Planner Hinderliter will check this out.
3 Planner Hinderliter also had a conversation with Red Rocket owners stating that they had to get the signs
4 up by April 9th and get back to him about a plan that they have going forward.
5

6 **ADJOURNMENT at 9:10 PM.**
7
8

9 *I, Valdine Camire, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Board of the Town of Old Orchard*
10 *Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of Eleven (11) is a true copy of*
11 *the original minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of April 12, 2018.*
12

13 *Valdine L. Helston*
14
15
16
17