

David Walker: June 12 and my name is David Walker, and I'm going to call this meeting to order. Our first order of business is to pledge allegiance to the flag. So, if you'd stand and join me, I'd appreciate it. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Thank you very much. Jeffrey, you want to do the roll call, please?

David Walker: Mr. Kelly?

Jay Kelley: Here.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Mr. Dube?

Robin Dube: Here.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Ms. Hubert?

Marianne Hubert: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Vice Chair Hitchcock?

Chris Hitchcock: Here.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: And Chair Walker.

David Walker: Here. So we have a complete board tonight, and, Graham Roeber is an alternate, and he's excused. Regular business.

Item 1: Proposal: Site Plan: 16-unit multifamily residential development. Action: Determination of Completeness Review; Schedule Public Hearing; Schedule Site Walk. Applicant: DM Roma Engineers. Location: 215 Saco Ave, MBL: 211-9-1; Zoning: GB1 district. Jeffrey.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Sure. Thank you.

David Walker: Thank you.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: So, at the board's March meeting, that's when you last saw this and you began reviewing this proposal. The proposal is a 16-residential unit project, consisting of four multi-family buildings with four units in each building. The proposed location is on the same lot where Jimmy the Greek's occupies, and it's actually a really pretty large lot for an interior area of Old Orchard Beach. It's at 2.8 acres. Public water and sewer will service the site. There are two accesses to main roads, one off of Temple and one off of Saco Ave. And the lot includes the restaurant, and that restaurant, Jimmy the Greek's, will continue to operate as it does today.

So, for the June meeting, the applicant is seeking a determination of completeness. And, as you all know, what the determination of completeness is, is it basically is a ruling by the board that says you have all the information that you need in order to properly review a proposal. It's not an approval or denial, it's just you have the information you need. So, in some respects, the record could close at that point, which, as we know, can be a detriment to the applicant, especially if they're looking to secure approval.

So for determination of completeness is on your agenda tonight, and in this month's packet is your staff memo, which includes a review of this proposal. The applicant did a nice job with the submissions, but as identified in the memo, there are some matters that need addressing, and those matters include submission of responses to site plan approval criteria, addressing comments in the fire department's March memo, conformance with the screening and buffering standards, confidence, and this is more of an opinion of mine, confidence in the property line that's behind the proposed structures, just I didn't see where there were any pins called out, and I just want to make sure of the confidence, because that is a critical property line when it comes to the location of the stormwater, location of the buildings, and so on.

Stormwater system impacts to abutting properties, and, probably the most important one out of this is the engineer peer review. The engineer peer review isn't as detailed, isn't needed to be as detailed as we normally see, but there's still improvements to public infrastructure and we need to make sure that the town's protected with those improvements.

So, in addition to what I just mentioned, there are other matters in the memo. Some are relatively minor and just need responses, from the applicant. But some items, like I said, the engineer peer review, they're more important and could result in alterations to the applicant's plans and other submissions. So, the board has the option to determine complete with conditions tonight, or the board can request the applicant address the identified matters before the determination of completeness is made. If the board choose to determine complete, the decision countdown down begins and that's where we get into trying to put the applicant in a good place, to increase their chances at a positive vote from the planning board. Because once that determination of completeness is made, that countdown begins, there's nothing really that can be done. So I know sometimes we have applicants who really want that determination of completeness made, but that can, in some respects, jeopardize an applicant's ability to get that approval.

So, with this particular proposal, it's a good project, I really appreciate what Jimmy's trying to do out here, and in my opinion I'd like to see this project succeed. And so my recommendation is the board pause that determination, just to give them that little extra time, even if it's a month of extra time. That can make all the difference, so the applicant can address those outstanding matters. But if the board choose to determine complete, you do still have that option, and on page 5 of your memo, there is a motion and conditions. If it is determined complete, you have to schedule a public hearing within 30 days of today, July 10 is when we would have that public hearing, so you'll want to schedule that too.

And then finally, Site Walk. The Site Walk is optional, but one thing I'd like to point out, and it goes the same with the other proposals that we have tonight, our normal day is July 3. Some folks may be out of town or doing other things, being so close to the July 4. So if you do choose to schedule a public hearing, just be aware that our regular date is July 3. You can choose another day, but I have certain legal requirements that I must meet in order to get a legal notice posted and abutters out. So if you chose another day it could be around no earlier around June 30 to July 1. Of course, you all have the option, I think you all know where it is, we could ask the applicant to do their best they can to stake out the corners. You can drive by yourself, take a look, entirely up to you, because Site Walk is optional. And that's all. Thank you.

David Walker: Thank you, Jeffrey. Good evening.

Jason Haskell: Good evening. Jason Haskell with DM Roma Consulting Engineers.

David Walker: Yeah. Good to see you.

Jason Haskell: Yeah. Good to see you. And then, thank you everyone for coming out and, hearing what we have to say here. So, here on behalf of *[inaudible]* [00:08:39] Investments and, Mr. Albert, on his proposed multi use project. As Jeff has said, there are four buildings with four units of Ps. Each unit is going to be two bedrooms and one and a half baths, two story buildings. Each of them are going to be proposed as rentals at this time. The project is also going to include the relocation of the two dumpsters that are out there right now. They're kind of just out on the grassed area. So, we're going to try to put them on a concrete pad and, you know, put the enclosure around them.

Then also one of the suggestions at the sketch plan meeting was to put a safety fence around the propane tanks for the residential use because it's really the green space over that area. So that's one of the things that we took into account with the redesign, and also the reconstruction of the parking lot. And mostly that area is kind of fallen apart so we're just going to take up the pavement shim where we need to, to get to the, the grade, the proposed grades, and, make it a nice surface after we're all set and done.

There are sufficient parking spaces based off of the town's requirements for the number of parking spaces for the restaurant and the residences. One of the comments in the memo was if the parking spaces were going to be designated for the residential uses. And that is our intent to – probably the intent is definitely to paint them, to put in unit numbers or something along like reserve for tenant, something along those lines on each one of the parking spaces. So it'll be 32 of them that are out there that'll be, designated as such.

Also, we are serving these with, public water, sewer, underground electric. We did receive the main water, company's ability to serve and their review of the layout and they were found in sufficient. So, with the follow-up submission, we'll include that statement in there as well. Stormwater will be, has been designed along the rear of the buildings. We're looking at doing an infiltration area. So, it will be kind of a crushed stone area that

will allow for one storage of the water as it seeps into the ground and also gives it a little bit easier of a time getting into the ground rather than having it *[inaudible]* [00:11:22].

David Walker: Is that on the map?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

Jason Haskell: So, the hatched area.

David Walker: Yep.

Jason Haskell: Is all the areas that will be gravel or, crush stone at the surface. So that's kind of where, some of the concerns are because it is relatively close to the property line. So, it'll definitely be something, the crushed stone area is definitely away from the property lines and there are no structures really close up to that area that we would be impacting but we will definitely address that in the follow up comments and go to the Town and The Peer Review Engineer.

Another different part of this is there's really no place to daylight or drain the footing drains. These are all going to be on slabs, but everything is just flat back there. That the only way that we can find a way to get, the footing drains to actually drain and not cause any heaving issues in the future is to put in exterior, sump pump. So it's kind of, those plastic containers, nyloplast structures, I don't know if you've seen those on the plants over the years, but, put a sump pump in there that all the foundation drains will tie into, and then they'll pump into the infiltration area. Not so much an issue during the rainstorm event, but on a normal cases, that's what will happen.

One item that I did want to address is the fire department. It looks like some of the same comments were on the memo this time, but it looks like the fire department did not have a chance to re-examine the plans with their comments.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: I'm not too sure. The fire department sent me a note back relatively quickly saying that they didn't see that their comments were addressed, so that's why I carried that particular comment over in the memo, where we'd like to see you address the fire department comments.

Jason Haskell: Seems like you did a pretty good job of addressing them in those notes underneath.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: That's what I tried to do, but...

Jason Haskell: Nope.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah.

Jason Haskell: Thank you. And one of the main comments that we wanted to at least address, and will definitely address with the fire department, is related to the sprinkler systems. We are currently designing wall between them. The architectural design takes into account in between the middle two units because there's that two hour rated wall between them. So our understanding of the code is that because there is that two hour rated wall that goes all the way up through the attic, the building will act as two duplexes. So those two duplexes would not require the sprinkler system because they're two separate structures because of that separation. Obviously, we want to clarify that and confirm that with the fire department, but we have talked with codes about that. And it seems like that may be the direction we go in, but obviously the final decision seems to come up with the fire department on what they want to see. We've tried to get in touch with them directly, but it's, a little bit of a phone tag.

Related to the nine criteria items for the site plan approval we'll definitely address each one of those in a follow-up response, but I don't see too many of problems addressing those standards. The two that, Jeffrey brought up was the landscaping and buffering, which were the updated plan is going to show some evergreen plantings along the property line to provide that buffer that's been taken out by the removal of some of those trees back there.

So, we will have that separation, obviously that'll be on the next plan submission. And then hopefully with the designation of the parking spaces being right up against the buildings as close to the building as possible, it'll take away from some of the concerns about safety for the residents being around the restaurant use. They'll be able to walk up behind their vehicles or walk in front of their vehicles, during the non-winter months to stay out of the main traffic of everything that is moving around. So, I guess we are here to answer any of your questions and actually before we begin I would like to have some questions for Jeffrey, actually.

The public hearing and site walk, is that something that can be coordinated now or is that something that needs the determination before that can be scheduled?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: A. They can happen any time, but, well, first, a Site Walk can happen pretty much any time, and it's not required by the ordinance. The public hearing, the official public hearing, there must be one public hearing that's scheduled after determination of completeness, but the planning board can have multiple public hearings too.

Jason Haskell: All right, thank you very much. And then, yeah, I guess at this point, any questions you may have hopefully we can address them. Thank you.

David Walker: Jason, thank you. Do you have an idea when you want to break ground on this project?

Jason Haskell: Early fall. Yeah.

David Walker: Okay. All right. Because, honestly unless I have an engineering peer review, I'm really not confident in giving a determination of completeness. I hate to delay a project like this. It's as important to us as it is to you, but I don't think any of us are engineers and we really rely on them for their input.

Jason Haskell: Yep. Understand.

David Walker: I don't know if any other board members have any comments?

Marianne Hubert: No, I will second that.

Male Speaker: I do too.

David Walker: Yeah. All right. So at this point, we're just going to wait for you to answer all these responses and to hear back from Sebago Technics. All right, on this project, if you don't mind it's probably the best course of action for you and for us.

Jason Haskell: Okay.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Unless there was something that was glaring, that you'd like to address before we move forward to updated plans.

David Walker: Nothing stuck out for me. Anybody else?

Marianne Hubert: I'm not convinced about the parking, the 32 parking spaces.

David Walker: They're going to be designated like continent 1A, 1B, but are they going to be the same color as all the other spots in the restaurant area, or are they...

Jeffrey Hinderlite: The same color as in the stripes themselves?

David Walker: The paint, yeah.

Jason Haskell: If, I guess that would be helpful, I guess, if they were different colors. I guess we could...

David Walker: I came to be *[inaudible]* [00:18:54] over at the restaurant, and I can't put my car anywhere, so I'm going to put it in my neighbor's spot, and then the neighbor's going to be upset, you know? So, some real way to designate so that restaurant goes don't use that. I mean, would that help you, Marianne?

Marianne Hubert: Yes. I think that there's a way to...

David Walker: I'm not sure if it's legal for you to use red striping, because that's filing usually, but, you know, something maybe like, something that's different than...

Male Speaker: Some sort of a barrier.

David Walker: *[Overlapping conversation]* [00:19:33] the lot.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Numbers, I think, are one option. You know, let's say, Unit 1, you could put 1A, 1B, then 2A, 2B. On the plan, you could identify those parking spaces. The only concern I have with painted spaces is the plowing and the potential for that to fade. That's the only – so sometimes signage it's more permanent. You put it in, it's done. You won't have that continuous maintenance. I'm not as concerned about that. I know, you know, Jimmy's there, so I know he'll upkeep it, but it would require his upkeep to make sure that the paint continues to be visible.

Jim Albert: And if I may add on average.

David Walker: Sure.

Jim Albert: We do have designated spaces.

David Walker: We know who you are. Would you just say your name?

Jim Albert: Oh, I'm sorry. Jim Albert, 215 Saco Avenue.

David Walker: Thanks.

Jim Albert: We do have current spaces that are designated towards handicap or other reserved painted in a very bright blue. Jeff is correct that they do need to be maintained. On average, it's every two years that I have to upgrade them. So, I would not be opposed to both signage and, whatever color paint we come up with to, you know, maybe it's orange or something, residential parking.

David Walker: Is that okay Marianne?

Marianne Hubert: Well, how many spaces do you need for the restaurant? That's a question when it's fully, you know?

Jim Albert: Yeah. We have more than adequate space other than really, really large events, which we don't do too many anymore. We have more than adequate space for both restaurant and other.

Jason Haskell: So restaurant until based off the town's requirements is 55 spaces?

Robin Dube: That's predetermined. We have no say in restaurant space.

Marianne Hubert: Yeah, no, I *[overlapping conversation]* [00:21:35], so there's room for the 55 and...

Jason Haskell: So 55 and 32, so we need 87 and we're at 121.

Marianne Hubert: Oh, okay.

David Walker: More than enough.

Robin Dube: Yeah.

David Walker: All right. Anyone else?

Robin Dube: No, so through board, I just want to say the fire department says you need the sprinkler system with four units. If they're at three, you don't need it. So, that's probably why they're telling you, you need that?

David Walker: Yeah. He knows he's got to get to the fire department. He's got the double wall, a five rated wall that he thinks will separate the two units and, mitigate the need for that. But unless the chief tells us that we don't need it, you need it, okay? So, yeah.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: And, even without of determination of completeness tonight, assuming that all these comments are addressed, I definitely see it up for a final vote in early August, so we would be able to meet the timeframe too.

Robin Dube: And through the chair again.

David Walker: Yes.

Robin Dube: That's not emails between you and Jeffrey, either. Those are written answers to all of these questions.

Jason Haskell: Yeah.

David Walker: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Jason and Jim.

Item 2: Proposal: Conditional Use/Shoreland Nonconformity: Remove, rebuild, 30% expansion single-family dwelling. Action: Determination of Completeness Review; Schedule Public Hearing; Schedule Site Walk. Applicant: Douglas Moon. Location: 6 West Tioga Ave, MBL: 320-13-2; Zoning: R3, RA & HAT. Jeffrey?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Sure. Thank you. Shoreland Zone application, we're all veterans with these at this point, I'd say. And, this particular application is not really much different than what you've all seen before. It's a tear down of a single family and a rebuild of that single family, and the rebuild includes a 30% expansion. As we know, the reason that it's before the planning board is because the structure is considered a non-conforming structure in the Shoreland zone. And the reason it is a nonconforming structure is because its current and proposed location is within 100 feet of the highest annual tide, wetlands in this particular case.

So, when, proposals come to replace and expand nonconforming structures in the Shoreland zone, there's a few key items that we look at. One is that the applicant must demonstrate the proposal meets both the conditional use criteria and also the standard conditions in the Shoreland zone. It's number one. That the new structure must be set back from the wetland, highest annual tide mark to the greatest practical extent. Number three, expansions to the new structure are allowed, but the square footage and volume cannot exceed the existing structure's square footage and volume by more than 30%. And then, finally is nonconformities cannot become any more nonconforming. Example is if you're tearing down a structure and rebuilding it, it can't be close to the water body that is regulated.

So, in your staff memo, I discussed the proposal's conformance with these standards, and as I state in the memo, there are a few items we need to determine if the proposal complies with the applicable floodplain ordinances. Oh, in addition, I'm sorry, in addition to the Shoreland zone, we, are looking at a proposal that qualifies under the floodplain ordinance, as we often do too. And for floodplain permitting purposes, the jurisdiction for actual review of the permits is the code enforcement officer. But because there is a crossover into the planning board's jurisdiction due to the Shoreland zoning standards, we still like to see that the applicant is preparing for that code enforcement review through the planning board process.

Now, they don't need approval of floodplain permits, or any of that, but what is often important is that we like to see that they have at least an initial design, that takes into account floodplain mitigation measures, because one way that it often crosses over is the 30% calcs, because what we usually see with tear down rebuilds is, the first floor being mostly, non-habitable space, therefore floodplain protection purposes. Then we usually see two floors on top of that, which is great too because we're getting structures that are compliant with floodplain standards, which is really good. And, ultimately, a structure that's better built and safer for the environment, if you really kind of think it through.

So, anyway, to conclude, this is a good proposal and good job, Douglas and I have been communicating, and he's done a real nice job, but, part of my responsibility is to help applicants get lock in their approvals. And, I'd say that we have a pretty much a 100% success rate, as long as they follow along with the recommendations we offer. So, that is also what I'm trying to do for Douglas. So I believe there are a couple items that need to be addressed before the planning board determines complete, so we can put this proposal in a better position for that approval. But the board does have the option to determine complete, and if you do there's a motion on page 10 of your memo, along with a couple of conditions. If it is determined complete, we'll need to hold a public hearing on July 10, and, site walk is optional. So that's all.

David Walker: Thank you very much. Good evening.

Douglas Moon: Good evening.

David Walker: Would you identify yourself for the public, please?

Douglas Moon: Douglas Moon, resident at 6 West Tioga Avenue in Ocean Park.

David Walker: Thank you. So Douglas, what do you have to say about what was just read?

Douglas Moon: So we do plan to demolish the existing structure and replace it with a two story living space, residential dwelling on top of a void space to comply with the flood zone regulations. We have not come up. One of the points that we did not include in the original application was the proposed structure in terms of how it is going to fit in with the 30% expansion for square footage and volume and it's kind of our fault cause we sort of, we didn't rush into this, but this is sort of the first time around for us is, this house is co-owned by myself and my brother. My brother lives in New York and we were trying to get a meeting of minds as to what we wanted the house layout to look like. We know it's going to be a four bedroom, two and a half bath structure.

Our intent is to get rid of the – we're currently on a septic. We're going to get rid of that. We're going to attach it to the sewer system. And it's going to be – we're going to actually move it away from the HAT line, as well as the DEP line, which runs behind us, partly because it is going to be a larger footprint. But also our hope was to, with the void space, we're going to make it a little bit higher than what is required above the base flood elevation. So we could put a car underneath. We can basically essentially just have a garage space, and then the driveway is going to come up along the right side of the building. So we had to move it away.

From what I understand, the driveway is not impacted by the HAT line. I may be wrong about that. I think, that was mentioned in one of our emails, but that's the original plan. Again, as far as the design of the building, we do not have one in place yet, pending an actual physical. They'll be up next week. So, we're going to actually have to have a physical discussion about this. And then as well as the building height requirement, we have to come to an agreement as to what we want on the inside of the house, as far as the layout, and then how the flood space volume is going to affect our overall volume in terms of, you know, designing how the house is going to be built.

So, we were just – one of the questions, I mean, I don't know if I'm allowed to ask questions at this point, but one of the questions we had was, is the void space considered part of the volume of the structure?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah, it's a good question, and I think what we try to do with our review is reward applicants who are working to address issues, floodplain being one of them. Now, when you look at Shoreland zoning and strict interpretation of Shoreland zoning, in some respects, you could have a dog house attached to it, and that would be square footage and volume. But, one thing that I like to do internally, and I work with the planning board to try to get support, is if that void, that area – now if the void space is

clearly under four feet, it's definitely not included. But often people use that ground floor for a garage, for example, and maybe some other things.

So, what I've tried to do in the past is work with the applicant and the board, where if they're going above four feet, is to make sure that space is truly not habitable space. And, still keep the 30% calculations as close as I can. So, it's not livable. It's used for a garage. It's used for storage, which is often the only thing you can do anyway due to the floodplain standards. So, if you find that that void space is going to be above four feet, then let me know, and, and we'll see what we can do with that void space, to make sure that you still fall within the Shoreland zone standards. And all it has to do is like, hey, Jeffrey, at that point, because it's just you and I working together, you could send me a sketch and say, "Hey, you know, this is what we're thinking before we have the designer take this on. This is what we'd like to do, but it looks like that void space is going to be higher than four feet." And then we'll work from there. We'll find something to work for you.

Douglas Moon: Okay.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

Douglas Moon: So, yeah. So that being said, we'll just go ahead and we'll sketch out a structure that we want to have built, and do the calculations both ways, you know, with a four foot void space with a void space that we would like to have for purposes of a garage and storage, which it would be, there's really going to be nothing down there. I think by definition, you can't have any of the buildings physical or anything, wires, pipes, conduits, that type of thing.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah.

Douglas Moon: It's literally going to be just walls and, and, you know, walls and air. So, yeah, so that would be pending a meeting of the minds within our family. The design and the proposals.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah, and I can tell you that the floor plan that you submitted, that would be very close to being acceptable. I think you had a three season room. That's where we get into more habitable type of space that I would have to include in 30% calculations.

Douglas Moon: Yeah. That we understand. So, there was just kind of, there was a concept in my mind that we were just going to have to change up the open space, open deck space as far as the layout of the house. I haven't mentioned anything to the others. That's why I was just responding, I was reacting in response to what I received prior to this meeting.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

Douglas Moon: Thank you.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah.

David Walker: All right. Any comments from the board?

Robin Dube: Anybody want to make a motion? I'll make a motion. A recommended one from Jeffrey. I make a motion to conditionally determine Douglas Moon, conditional use nonconformity structure in the Shoreland zone application proposing to remove existing single family structure and build a new single family structure including a 30% expansion located at 6 West Tioga Avenue, MBL 320-13-2, as complete with the following conditions to be fulfilled on or before the August 25, 2025. There are three conditions. Condition one, submission of volume and square footage calculations for the proposed structures. Two, submission of completed floodplain permits and structures designed to meet floodplain standards. Three, submission of building elevation plans showing building height as measured using the Shoreland zoning definition height, and the height is 35 feet, right?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

Jay Kelley: Second.

David Walker: Motion by Robin, second by Jay.

Jay Kelley: Yep.

David Walker: Jeffrey, you want to call for the vote?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Mr. Kelly?

Jay Kelley: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Ms. Dube?

Robin Dube: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Ms. Hubert?

Marianne Hubert: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Vice Chair Hitchcock?

Chris Hitchcock: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: And Chair Walker?

David Walker: Yes. Motion carries 5-0. So, we will have a public hearing on July 10 at our regular July meeting. Is there an appetite for a Site Walk?

Marianne Hubert: They're all the same. I don't think so.

David Walker: So, we'll just do a drive by then.

Male Speaker: Yeah, we can do it ourselves.

David Walker: So, you don't necessarily have to be there for a particular time. If you see one of these faces roaming around, you're going to know what they're there for. Okay?

Douglas Moon: Okay.

David Walker: All right. Thank you, Doug.

Douglas Moon: Understood. Thank you very much.

David Walker: You're welcome.

Item 3: Proposal: Conditional Use/Shoreland Nonconformity: Remove, rebuild, 30% expansion single-family dwelling. Action: Determination of Completeness Review; Schedule Public Hearing; Schedule Site Walk. Applicant: Martha Blackburn. Location: 11 Tripoli Ave, MBL: 319-7-2; Zoning: R3, RA district. Jeffrey?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Everything I just said. Okay. You remember what I just said?

David Walker: Times two.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah. Really, it's literally like, the same. I'm happy to go over this with you. I would say one of the differences is the applicant has an architect on board, so I have confidence in the determination of that they would be able to meet the determination of completeness time frame more, with this particular proposal. So with this one, I would feel it's still an option, you know, I'm still looking to help you get an approval, but if you think we can get those revised 30% calculations, the completed floodplain permits, it just literally, very similar to what I said with the last one, they just need to be completed. They don't need to be approved, submitted, or anything like that. We just like to see that you're engaged in that process, and that the structure's designed, you're working on that to meet the floodplains, almost really what I just said. So, I would go through the determination of completeness with the conditions with this.

David Walker: Nice job.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Thank you.

David Walker: Yeah. Thank you.

Martha Blackburn: This is my architect, Chris Isaac.

Chris Isaac: Hello.

David Walker: Nice, nice to meet you. Any questions from the board?

Robin Dube: Nice design.

Chris Isaac: Thank you.

David Walker: Looks nice on the outside.

Robin Dube: So he did, you did do some...

Chris Isaac: I have, begun to work on some of the comments that were made about the 30%. I'm ready to – we'll submit those before the deadline this month, as well as the other things that were asked for, regarding the Shoreline zoning, as well as, the design of floodplain. We won't have the complete design of the floodplain until after the July meeting, but we can address general configuration of it, that sort of thing.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Sure. Yeah. Yeah. And the planning board can condition, which they normally do with floodplain, the projects that have flood plain elements within them, they can condition an approval that you secure that information after.

Chris Isaac: Okay.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

David Walker: Took the words right out of my mouth.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Okay.

David Walker: All right. Anybody want to make a motion?

Robin Dube: I make a motion – let's see. Where are we Jeffrey? I make a motion to conditionally determine Martha Blackburn conditionally use nonconforming structure in the Shoreland Zone application proposing to remove existing single family structure and build a new single family structure including a 30% expansion located at 11 Tripoli Ave, MBL: 3-9-7-2 as complete with the following conditions to be fulfilled on or before the August 25, 2025. Number one, is submission of revised 30% calculations for existing and proposed structures. Two, submission of completed floodplain permits and structures designed to meet floodplain standards. And three, submission of responses to eight standard conditions in Shoreline zone.

David Walker: Just a correction. You added a few dashes that weren't needed. It's, MBL: 319-7-2.

Robin Dube: I didn't dash it. I just said 319.

David Walker: Motion by Robin.

Robin Dube: Oh, I did?

Marianne Hubert: Second.

David Walker: Second by Marianne. You want to call for the vote please Jeffery?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Mr. Kelley?

Jay Kelley: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Ms. Dube?

Robin Dube: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Ms. Hubert?

Marianne Hubert: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Vice chair Hitchcock?

Chris Hitchcock: Yes.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: And chair Walker?

David Walker: Yes. And motion carries 5-0. You're on your way.

Martha Blackburn: So August 25 is when we have to have the paperwork submitted for the September meeting?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Good question, actually. You can – because it's been determined complete, that if you don't have the information, if you don't have these items addressed, you can submit it way earlier. You can submit it actually for the July meeting, which is, like, June 28 or something like that.

Martha Blackburn: Okay.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: I put that deadline in there as – so if it was determined complete, there was an absolute end date for material submission. But, because your architect's confident that he can get all this stuff together, I don't even think you have to pay attention to that

date. Just, like in two weeks is the submission deadline, get that to me and we can get you ready for final review for July on the same date as the public hearing, July 10.

Chris Isaac: Well of everything, except for the floodplain, the structural design, we'll have general responses on the structure for the flood design, but not the final design of the structure would not happen until August, and it goes to August deadline.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep. Totally up to you. So, you can even, we could see what you have at the June submission for the June submission. I'm sorry, the June deadline for the July meeting, and then we can take it from there, if you'd like?

Marianne Hubert: *[Inaudible]* [00:46:18].

Jeffrey Hinderlite: I think it's the last Monday in June.

Marianne Hubert: Okay.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yeah.

David Walker: So, Jeffrey, just a reminder, we're going to do a public hearing on this as well, July 10?

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yes.

David Walker: Does the board want to do a drive by?

Chris Hitchcock: Yeah, we will do a drive by.

David Walker: So we will drive by and just look at the property on our own. So you don't have to know. I know where you live.

Marianne Hubert: So July 10 is the next meeting.

David Walker: July 10 is the next meeting.

Martha Blackburn: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Yep.

David Walker: Okay. Thank you very much.

Martha Blackburn: Yeah. Thank you.

David Walker: Good to see you as well.

Martha Blackburn: Yeah.

David Walker: All right. Any other business? Good and welfare? All right. Somebody want to make a motion to adjourn?

Robin Dube: Motion to adjourn.

Christopher Hitchcock: So moved.

David Walker: All right. It's unanimous. I don't even have to call for a vote.

Robin Dube: Nope.

Jeffrey Hinderlite: Thank you.

David Walker: Thank you.

I attest the above minutes were approved by the Old Orchard Beach Planning Board on 10 July 2025.

Jeffrey Hinderlite, Town Planner