

David Walker: Board. Good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Old Orchard Beach Planning Board public hearing and regular meeting. Today is December 11th, 2025, and I will be your chair, David Walker, for the evening. A first order of business after calling this meeting to order is for you to join me and pledge allegiance to the flag, please. 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. Look at those decorations, huh? Amazing. Let's see. Jeffrey, you want to do the roll call, please?

Jeffrey: Sure.

David: We're missing a few people tonight.

Jeffrey: Yes, missing a few. Ms. Moriarty?

Ms. Moriarty: Present.

Jeffrey: Ms. Huber?

Ms. Huber: Present.

Jeffrey: Chair Walker?

David: I'm present. Both Erin and all three of us will be voting members tonight. Excused are Graham Robert. It looks like Robin is not with us tonight. Jay Kelly is now council member, and that's it. We're pretty thin as a board tonight, but that doesn't mean we won't be efficient. Before we go to regular business, there were minutes in our packet. Did you guys get a chance to review them?

Ms. Moriarty: No.

David: Oh, good.

Ms. Huber: I'll make a motion to accept the minutes.

David: Okay. Motion by Mary-Ann. Do I hear a second?

Ms. Moriarty: Isn't that from last meeting? I'll second that.

David: Second by Erin. You want to call for the vote, Jeffrey?

Jeffrey: Sure. Ms. Moriarty?

Ms. Moriarty: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Huber?

Ms. Huber: Yes.

Jeffrey: Chair Walker?

David: Yes. That motion carries 3-0. Minutes accepted. Now onto regular business. Item one, Site Plan. Construct four-story building with 11 dwelling units, one

professional office space, and ground-floor parking. The applicant is Trillium Engineering Group. The location is 95 West Grand Ave, MBL 313-3-4, in the DD2 District. They have requested an extension so that they can get answers to last month's public hearing, as well as some other documentation that they need.

I would also request of staff that you go back to Trillium and get more clarification on what they sent back on the waiver request. Their letter states that the waivers are justified. My feeling is any applicant is justified to make a waiver request. What I want to know is, do they feel that they're safe? Can they provide us with any input to that regard? Okay?

?Mike: Just to clarify, you mean the letter from Sebago, right? The peer review?

David: Yes, Sebago [crosstalk].

?Jeffrey: Okay.

David: What did I say, Trillium? Sorry.

?Mike: Yes. Oh, and then just to clarify on the agenda, it does say the applicant's Trillium Engineering. We cleared this up verbally last month by clarifying that it's DERP LLC-

David: Talk into the microphone. I can't hear you.

?Jeffrey: That it's DERP LLC, and we'll correct that on the next agenda. Then we have your question or comment as well.

David: All right, great. Let it be noted that Robin Duby has arrived, so we now have four voting members. Do we need to make a motion to grant an extension?

Ms. Duby: Motion to extend.

David: Oh, wow, that was fast.

Ms. Duby: I'm here.

Ms. Huber: I'll second.

David: Second by Mary-Ann. You want to call for the vote, Jeffrey?

Jeffrey: Sure. Ms. Moriarty?

Ms. Moriarty: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Huber?

Ms. Huber: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Duby?

Ms. Robin Duby: Yes.

Jeffrey: Chair Walker?

David: Yes. That motion carries 4-0. Item number two, proposal. Site plan, four residential unit building. Action, determination of completeness, scheduled public hearing. Applicant is Neil Weinstein, and the location is 6-8 St. John's Street, MBL 206-24-32 in the DD2 district. We do have a letter from Drew requesting an extension. I don't think we need to discuss that anymore unless, Jeffrey, you want us to schedule a public hearing for next week. No, okay. Next month, I mean. Motion to grant the extension?

Ms. Duby: I'll make a motion to postpone the review of the 6-8 St. John's Street, MBL 206-24-32 until updated materials are submitted.

David: All right, great.

Ms. Moriarty: I'll second that.

David: Second by Erin. Motion by Mary-Ann. You want to call for the vote, please?

Jeffrey: Ms. Duby?

Ms. Duby: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Moriarty?

Ms. Moriarty: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Huber?

Ms. Huber: Yes.

Jeffrey: Chair Walker?

David: Yes. That motion carries 4-0, and we lost all the people from the neighborhood. Moving on quickly. Item three, contract zone. Six detached unit, single-family residential contract zone. Discuss revised contract zone. The developer is Saland Development, Inc. Location is 4 New Colony Drive, MBL 103-1-59 in a rural district. We had this, I think, last year. We did a site walkout there. Jeffrey, you want to get us up to speed, please?

Jeffrey: Sure. This agenda item is a revisit of a contract zone proposal that the planning board reviewed for several months. We had a site walk. I think we may have even had a public hearing. Ultimately, the proposal did not secure a planning board recommendation. At that time, during 2024, Saland Development, Gary Salamaka, who's here tonight, was proposing an 18-unit single-family development at the four New Colony Drive property. The primary reason why he was requesting a contract zone is under our regular zoning standards, I believe he could get two or three units out there. Financially, it just wouldn't work.

After several months of review, the proposal concluded with Saland Development withdrawing the application. The primary reason why the application was withdrawn was it became clear to board and the staff that we weren't going to provide a

favorable recommendation. It was important to Gary Salamaka, Saland Development, to get that favorable recommendation, so he could go to council with more confidence that they would provide a favorable recommendation. Gary wound up withdrawing the application.

The primary reason why the writing was on the wall that there was not going to be a favorable vote was because there was no true public benefit that we could find. One of the contract zones, one of the three criteria that an applicant must meet all three has some association with the public benefit, so he would likely have not received a favorable vote on one of the criteria. About a year and a half later, I think it was around the summer of 2024 when it was withdrawn. If we fast forward to today, the applicant now returns with a very similar contract zone. It's just reduced by two units. The one major change is it now includes public benefits.

I think this first one is a big one, because we've really been working on trying to create sidewalks along Ross Road, which a lot of people walk. It's a very high traffic area, and it's very dangerous. The first one is the construction of a sidewalk along Ross Road from New Colony Drive to Portland Ave

Ross Road intersection. Gary would be responsible for the financing and construction of it. Of course, it would become town prop. It would be a public sidewalk, so it would become the town's responsibility to maintain it. That's number one, public benefit.

Number two is five homes sold at affordable prices with one of the homes meeting Maine's definition of affordable housing. By affordable prices, what Gary means by that is under the median home sale price. I think I have that in the memo. It's around \$425,000 for Old Orchard Beach right now. Five homes would be under that, and one of those five homes would meet Maine's definition of affordable housing.

Then number three is short-term rental restrictions. I know some of you will be happy to see that. Both Gary and I thought we discuss this, and now that we have some pretty decent public benefits, the number of units has been reduced. Not majorly, but it's still been reduced. Short-term rental restriction and the five more affordable homes with the sidewalk are all on the table now. We thought it was a better proposal to present to the planning board that certainly has an increased chance on securing a favorable recommendation from staff and possibly the same with the planning board. That will ultimately be up to the board.

Right now, it's not a formal submission. We thought that it was just a good idea to introduce this new proposal to the planning board to get your initial thoughts, and so no actions necessary from the board. Gary's here tonight if you'd like to have a chat with him, and that's all.

David: Jeffrey, there's no sidewalks on Portland Ave if I recall correctly.

Jeffrey: Correct. Just a small-

David: We're putting a sidewalk from New Colony down to Portland Ave as opposed to going to Cascade Road. Is there a reason for that?

Jeffrey: What we're trying to do is create a sidewalk network, basically from Scarborough all the way through the entirety of Ross Road. That's part of our focus right now. The cost is considerable, so it's difficult for us to finance this, even with capital types of projects. We have links. In fact, one link that's going to be created, which is one of the major links, is from, I believe, Pond View Road out to Wild Dunes Way, which is as a result of our negotiations with Dominick and the [crosstalk].

David: That's why I was thinking we could connect right up to that.

Jeffrey: That's the goal. That's how we want to do the connections, but nothing down Portland Ave right now. Just to Portland Ave.

David: I'm looking, thinking, this is just a sidewalk that goes nowhere if it's going to Portland Ave.

?Ms. Huber: Takes care of all the people in the neighborhood that can walk up and down the street now safely.

Jeffrey: You could say that. I do believe that's not as much of a traveled portion of Ross Road as other areas are. Once again, "Oh, there's a link that goes to nowhere. What the hell are the planners doing?" [chuckles] There is a goal here. Unfortunately, we just can't do it all at once.

David: Gary, the four smaller homes versus the six that you're proposing, what's the difference in square footage for the smaller homes? Do you know?

Gary: Yes. They're all around 1,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet.

David: The larger ones will be 15, and the four smaller ones will be about 1,000 square feet?

Gary: Correct. Here, I've got some pictures if you want to see-

David: Sure.

Gary: -what we're doing. This is obviously the more expensive homes.

David: Beautiful.

Gary: They should be about 1,500 square feet. These are-

David: The small ones.

Gary: These are the small ones.

David: Very nice.

[background conversations]

Gary: These are houses I'm building right now. We're on the Portland half.

Ms. Moriarty: They all have garages, the small ones?

Gary: What's that?

Ms. Moriarty: They all have garages, the small ones, too?

Gary: There's some that don't have garages, and then there's some that do. There's a green one here at the 88 that doesn't have garages.

Ms. Duby: It looks blue to me. [unintelligible 00:16:07]

Ms. Moriarty: This is the small one, though, right?

Gary: That's there. This one doesn't have ramps on it, but there's no garage for that one.

David: Okay. What's this little bump out here?

Gary: That's your closet.

David: Okay.

Gary: The plan board has a lot to do with how much off-site stuff we do and increase the price of homes. Then we have the affordable one that's, I think, 266.

?Ms. Moriarty: That was 2024 number, yes.

Gary: That's got to spread the expense on the other homes. I think we'll be at high threes and high fours with these types of homes.

David: Very nice. Anybody else on the board have questions, concerns?

Ms. Huber: No.

David: All right. Looks good. We'll see you with a full proposal, I guess, next month, right?

Gary: If Jeff can do it, yes.

Jeffrey: We can do it. We can all do it.

David: Thank you very much. Thank you. 16 units. I'm sorry, I said eight. I misspoke. Item four, Conditional Use, shoreland zoning, non-conforming structure, tear-down, rebuild, 30% expansion. It's just a proposal for discussion tonight. The applicant is Glenn Fairchild, and the location is 216 East Grand Ave, MDL 201-2-3, in the RBD, RA, and HAT districts. Jeffrey, is this you? Mike.

Mike: I got this one, yes.

David: Good.

Mike: The applicant couldn't make it because he's out of state, but before they prepare a formal application, they wanted to ask some questions for some clarification. Where this is a shoreland zone, non-conforming, tear-down, rebuild, expansion, those questions have to do with relocation to the greatest practical

extent, and then change of use of a non-conforming structure, which I don't believe we've reviewed before, at least in shoreland zone.

This one's a little bit different because there's an existing single-family home. There was an existing shed that was demoed, and they're looking to turn that shed into a second unit. As far as the location, it's on the corner of East Grand Ave and Little River Road. There was an 18-by-22 shed structure that was demolished in July. They're looking to rebuild and expand the shed structure into a 18-by-22 single-family dwelling. This is non-conforming because of the 100-foot highest annual tide and wetland setback.

Like I said, those two main questions are, what are the planning board's thoughts on proposed location on the lot in regards to relocation to greatest practical extent and your thoughts on change of use of non-conforming structure? I kept all the normal information we have for one of these in the memo, just if the applicant's looking and going to this to get information. They need to submit all your standard stuff,

responses to conditions, shoreline zone, conditional use standards, demonstrate that they're not exceeding 30% of volume.

Then the new one with this that I don't think we've reviewed, as I mentioned, is the change of use. They have to demonstrate that the new use will have no greater adverse impact on the water body, tributary stream, or wetland, or adjacent properties and resources.

David: I'm looking at the map, the two exhibits, and I don't see the existing structure on here.

Mike: Are you looking at the exhibit they submitted? It should show the footprint of the-

David: That's existing shed. That's the proposal for the new location. Is there a residential unit on that property right now?

Mike: Yes, it's on the opposite side of that lot, which I don't believe you can see on-

David: It's on the other side of Little River Road?

Ms. Moriarty: No, it's off-map.

Jeffrey: Further down East Grand. If you look on page 35 of the memo, I was trying to show the hat area, and you can see where I circled the shed in red, and the other side opposite on that lot, is where the single-family home is located.

David: Let me catch up to you.

Ms. Duby: Mike, if you look at this, you're going down Little River Road. Is it on the right or the left?

Mike: Left.

David: On the left.

Ms. Duby: It's on the corner on this--

David: Yes.

Mike: The shed was demolished, so the shed's not there anymore.

David: I'm looking at it. Is this the building here?

Ms. Moriarty: That's the current single-family house, yes. This is the previously existing shed right at the corner.

David: Proposed new home, huh?

Ms. Moriarty: It's a very long lot.

David: Okay.

Ms. Moriarty: They're not proposing a lot split.

Mike: Not at this time, no.

Ms. Huber: It's 10 feet from the East Grand Avenue. Where will they park? Where is the driveway?

Mike: They provided the two exhibits because one of them, they both show different distances from the HAT, which will need to be updated because I did notice they used a 6.5 elevation, and ours is 6.3. That'll actually further their distance from it if they stay within their proposed areas. One of those spots shows a 10-foot setback, so they will need a variance. Then I believe the other exhibit, what they were showing, is it meeting both the district setbacks. It was closer to the hat than the other exhibit, but it looks like it's further from the HAT than the original structure was. That was one of the questions.

Then as far as when you're determining the greatest practical extent for relocation, you have to consider the size of the lot, slope of the land, potential for soil erosion, the location of other structures on the property, the location of septic system, which this has public sewer as far as I know, and then the type and amount of vegetation to be removed. I think the 10-foot setback from East Grand Ave, which is the first exhibit, shows the structure approximately 4.5 feet from the HAT. Then the second exhibit meets both setbacks from the roads, but it is approximately 1.5 feet from the HAT. There was questions as to if that's being relocated closer to the water setback than the current or previous shed was, which they'll need to demonstrate.

David: Again, we don't know where the driveway is.

Mike: There is a current curb cut there. I don't think it's shown in the exhibit.

David: Will it be a shared driveway with the existing home?

Ms. Moriarty: No, there's an existing curb cut off of East Grand Ave. I would say to the left of the current demolition site.

Mike: That was one of the factors in picking this location instead of somewhere else, is whenever-- I guess, DOT redid that section of East Grand Ave. They put a curb cut that's close to that structure. It's not right in front of it, but it's adjacent to where it is.

?Ms. Huber: It's probably where the high area is. It shows the high spots.

Mike: He was proposing a gravel driveway from that curb cut to the structure.

Ms. Moriarty: I don't know if we have any ordinances in place, but it's been my practice to always encourage the developers to locate their driveways on this secondary road, on the less-traveled road. I know there's a curb cut on East Grand Ave, but if Little River Road is a public road, it would be better for traffic and for safety purposes to have the driveway off of Little River Road.

Mike: I think the issue is it might be cutting in closer to the HAT, but we can check that.

Ms. Moriarty: I'm sure that's the case. I just walked past this an hour ago. I don't know what we consider vegetation and how that plays into it, but this corner is the only area on the lot that has any mature tree or vegetation. I don't know. Is there any provisions for requiring tree replacement in the shoreline?

Mike: There is specifically shoreline standards around that any removed vegetation would need to be replaced. There are specific guidelines for the type of vegetation.

Ms. Moriarty: Okay.

Ms. Duby: Going to this building, were they coming off of East Grand? Do you know?

Mike: There was no direct access from when the road was redone.

Ms. Duby: The bind doors were right there. [chuckles]

Mike: Yes, the curb cut they put in, which is probably 15 feet or so south on East Grand.

Ms. Moriarty: You can see it on Google Maps. If you look up the street view on Google Maps, you can see where the curb cut is, and you can still see the old shed. Right now, the curb is all covered in snow, so you can't actually see where the curb cut is.

Ms. Duby: I know exactly where it is.

David: Let me look it up. Hold on a minute.

Mike: Just focus on the map on page 35. Some of the comments about vegetation were some of the things I was looking at in there. Without having additional details on elevations and what's actually there, I had questioned if the middle of the lot might be a more appropriate location, because you can see how the elevation and the HAT's actually further back. If we're talking about greatest practical extent, is there

another location that meets that greatest practical extent more than this proposed location would?

After I had shared that information, they still came back with this location. My understanding was because that's where the existing shed was, so they thought that would limit impacts to landscaping and vegetation, and utilizing that current driveway curb cut. It sounds like more questions about that area.

Ms. Duby: This is the same one that built the condos across the other side, right?

Mike: I'm not sure what-

Ms. Duby: The river road, [crosstalk] You got all the new constructs.

Mike: This is different.

Ms. Moriarty: It's the overlook OB, but it's a different developer.

Ms. Duby: It is.

Ms. Moriarty: It's a different property, right? The developer's porter potty's currently basically right where the shed is.

David: It's just where you think you see the curb cut from here.

Ms. Moriarty: Let's see, where are we? Right here. That area. Right there.

[pause 00:28:45]

David: Any more from any of the members?

Ms. Huber: Yes, I think that they need to look at the middle of the lot there, where it's higher, personally.

David: Look at the middle of the lot where the grade is higher.

?Ms. Moriarty: Yes, closer to the existing house.

Mike: Yes, I think with those comments, they'd probably have to demonstrate showing the measurements that-- and responses to both greatest practical extent for relocation and demonstrate that one either meets it more than the other if they do choose this current area.

David: Also, I think that if they're going to need a variance, they should attempt that before they come back to us.

Mike: Yes. Before they fill out that application, they wanted to find out and get a feeling for the greatest practical extent for this proposed location. They might not need a variance if it's going to be located somewhere else on the lot.

David: Any more discussion?

Members: No.

David: Well, thank you.

Mike: Thank you.

David: Moving on. Just be patient with me. Item five, Proposal, Conditional Use. Amendment to Adult Use Marijuana Store conditional use approval. Rule on amendment is the action. The applicant is Theory of Wellness of Maine for LLC. The location is 11 Ocean Park Road, MDL 210-10-2, zoning in the GB1. We do have a letter requesting that they defer until next month. If someone wants to make that motion.

Ms. Duby: Motion to defer.

David: Motion by Robin.

Ms. Moriarty: I'll second that.

David: Second by Erin. You want to call for the vote, please, Jeffrey?

Jeffrey: Sure. Ms. Moriarty?

Ms. Moriarty: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Huber?

Ms. Huber: Yes.

Jeffrey: Ms. Duby?

Ms. Duby: Yes.

Jeffrey: Chair Walker?

David: Yes. That motion carries 4-0. Okay. Last but not least, item six, Ordinance Amendment. J-1 visa holders housing density and site ordinance changes. Action. Schedule a public hearing. Applicant is the town of Old Orchard Beach. This is you, Jeffrey.

Jeffrey: Thank you.

David: You're welcome.

Jeffrey: The primary purpose of these ordinance amendments is to increase housing opportunities for our J-1 visa holders. As you all know, our J-1 visa holders are very important for the success of our local economy. With our local economy being very heavy in the tourism industry and with the J-1 folks visa holders, time available during the tourist industry time, all of a sudden, we have a conflict. If it was a winter, that would be great. The housing opportunities and availability is immense.

During the summertime, it's not. As you'll see next month, which is very exciting because you're going to see the new comprehensive plan next month. As you'll see next month, one of the contributors to the lack of housing is a significant increase in

our short-term rental population. [chuckles] With the short-term rentals, it's certainly more profitable for the folks who have short-term rentals to operate as a short-term rental versus having it for J-1 purposes. This all created this barrier to getting housing for our J-1 visa holders. Then it makes it difficult on our businesses to secure the help that they need during the critical months of the year.

The town is aware of these issues, and we have been trying to find ways to remove some of these barriers. One of the barriers is related to zoning. Our response was to take a look at the zoning ordinances, try to figure out what the primary barriers are, and what we could do about them. We found that the density standards and the parking standards were really the primary barriers because right now, there's no specific J-1 visa holders housing classification. They all fall under dwelling units.

That means that the regular density requirement standards apply. With our antiquated, I would say, density standards, with lot sizes, like we have around town, people just couldn't make these work. You find these poor kids shoved in freaking basements and this and that, and just substandard housing, but there's a bit of desperation out there. What these ordinance amendments do is basically exempt J-1 visa holders from parking restrictions and density requirements, but we don't just throw everything out the window. We ensure that there is still protections and zoning in place because there are butters.

I've lived across the street from J-1 students before, and I know they like to have fun. Also, as we find, and I think it's human nature, someone may not have J-1 all the time. Wow, now I have this space where I got these bonus density requirements. I'm going to try to continue that. What we tried to do with this ordinance is to ensure that there are protections in place and also that the J-1 housing didn't have a chance to be grandfathered, meaning, whoever turns a room or whatever into J-1 housing and benefits from the exemptions, they can't then change that use to another use and still benefit from those exemptions and take advantage of a grandfathering.

David: That's done through licensing?

Jeffrey: That's done through our ordinance, but it would also be done through licensing. That's a good pickup, Dave. There is a licensing component specifically attached to establishing this use that is more than our typical licensing, where the owner of the building that has the J-1 needs to yearly present the J-1 contract to show that, yes, this is housing for J-1 in order to take advantage of the exemptions.

All that ordinance language that can be difficult to follow sometimes when it's all in pieces here and there. It's just the way our ordinances work, unfortunately, so it's hard to make sense of them. Basically, what we're doing is exempting J-1 visa holder housing from zoning requirements that seem to be barriers right now.

David: Do you think that there are businesses or renters who would take advantage of this immediately?

Jeffrey: Yes. In fact, I worked with one of our hotel owners on this ordinance. He was a very good person to work with. We batted around a number of these things, concerns, how to make it work. For example, I wouldn't have thought of this, but it's obvious. A lot of them travel with electric scooters. They don't have cars. You get

electric scooters in enclosed spaces. All of a sudden, you have a different sort of fire hazard in there. As a result, one of the new requirements that they wouldn't normally have to do is to have an inspection through the fire department before it even exists to make sure those spaces are safe.

David: My daughter owns a parking lot

model at the campground up the street, and next door to her was another park model. J-1s were in there, and there must have been four or five kids staying there. They were wonderful, but I see that as an opportunity for the town as well.

?Ms. Huber: At the corner of Millican and Walnut, that old motel there, that's a J-1 housing, right?

Jeffrey: Yes.

?Ms. Huber: They don't need car parking. You could put more units there.

Jeffrey: Exactly, but by the book, and I like having Erin, but not any particular, just because with Erin as a planner, there's a different sort of communication. By the book, you wouldn't be able to have that because they would require parking. There's no distinction between a dwelling or a motel unit and a J-1. This creates that distinction.

?Ms. Huber: Yes, that's exactly. With this, you could add more. Why couldn't we not set a time?

Ms. Duby: Who wants to live on the railroad track?

Jeffrey: They don't care.

Ms. Duby: We don't care.

[crosstalk]

Ms. Huber: That's the only time those properties can be rented.

Jeffrey: We do. We have a time limit in there.

Ms. Duby: That solves it all. That way, they can't do short-term rentals over the wintertime unless they've already licensed for it.

Jeffrey: People are creative, though, Robin.

Ms. Duby: Oh, I know. I live with a few around my neighborhood.

Jeffrey: We put a few more things in there to try to help. Do the best we can. There's always someone thinking a couple steps ahead of you. You try to be that there's a couple steps ahead, but there's just creative people out there.

David: We're going to schedule a public hearing and then make a recommendation to council?

Jeffrey: Yes.

David: Okay.

Ms. Moriarty: I have a question first.

David: Sure, Erin.

Ms. Moriarty: Is there a reason why you limited it to three or more buildings with three or more dwelling units?

Jeffrey: Yes, thank you. I thought with the multifamily, the three or more, my thought behind that was when you have three or more units, it has-- People are used to more of an intense type of use compared to a two-family, where folks may look at that more as just a strictly residential type of use. That's the only reason. It could certainly change, absolutely, but it was just to try to reduce impacts in areas where it's one or two-family dwelling neighborhoods.

Ms. Moriarty: Within each of these dwelling units, though, we're expecting there to be multiple J-1 visa holders. Is that correct?

Jeffrey: Yes.

Ms. Moriarty: It's a non-family dwelling unit, essentially.

Jeffrey: Yes.

Ms. Duby: People come up with having three different houses not together, but you said they have three dwellings. They're not going to throw that at you. I have three. [chuckles]

Jeffrey: Well, that's interesting, Robin, because three separate detached dwellings on a lot is not a multifamily dwelling.

Ms. Moriarty: It doesn't say multifamily currently.

Ms. Duby: No. [laughs]

Jeffrey: No.

Ms. Moriarty: Existing lodging establishments or buildings with three or more dwelling units.

Ms. Duby: They could be on three different streets.

Ms. Moriarty: I do wonder, though, if that's bad.

Ms. Duby: They need a place to go, unless somebody kicks the kids in the butt that are grown now that should have full-time jobs. Somebody has to do it.

David: Would you please schedule in a public hearing for January 8th, 2026? I can't believe I'm saying 2026.

Ms. Duby: January 8th.

David: Then on to other business. In January, we elect chairman and vice chair for the board. I want you to think about your desires for a position, desires for a nomination, please. All right?

Ms. Duby: I'm going to stay where you are.

David: We have a couple of visitors in the office. I know Guy, right? How are you? All right. Did you want to say anything? Are you here just to observe? Come on up to the podium.

Guy: Actually, I am here to observe. I am interested in all the different boards that we have in this town. I was at the conversation meeting the other night. I did have one question, though. We also have a desire, and it's hard for the town to bring in special police officers and lifeguards. Will this anyhow help that situation? They also need a place to stay, or they can't come.

David: That's a good point.

Guy: Right now, it has been a boundary to hiring lifeguards because there is no place to stay. They can't come, and they're not locals.

Jeffrey: I wanted to include that, originally. It was for this particular. I was working more with some of the business owners who were looking for J-1. They wanted to focus on J-1 at that time. I'm definitely looking at that, Guy.

Ms. Duby: That's a good idea.

Jeffrey: I think we can add things. I would actually write different standards for that because with this, there are limitations to the areas, the zoning districts, and the uses that are attached to it. I would expand the number of districts because usually, it's only one officer. It's not a group of J-1 visa holders. I think with one or two families, also within other residential districts, they could accommodate that sort of housing more.

Guy: In a lot of cases, they're similar, let's say, in age and group, and you could easily have two or three officers or two or three lifeguards if they had that opportunity to have a place where they could all stay for the summer to get their training and law enforcement and their lifeguard. Then it would be a huge benefit to the town.

Jeffrey: Thank you.

Susan Sheehan: [unintelligible 00:47:14] ask a question.

David: Sure. Come on up.

Susan: Hi, everybody. [unintelligible 00:47:20]

David: Your name and address?

Susan: Yes, sure. Susan Sheehan, 12 Bay Avenue.

David: Hi, Susan.

Susan: The item one, when was that extended to? Is it another meeting next month?

David: Which study?

Susan: The Trillium one. When is the--

?Ms. Moriarty: I think it's depending on when they submit their materials.

Mike: The extension was only a 30-day extension, so they'll be on next month's agenda. They do have the opportunity to request an additional 30-day extension.

Susan: They get two, right?

Mike: Yes.

Susan: Okay.

Mike: Beyond that, we anticipate a submission for the next meeting.

Susan: Do you know off the top of your head what they're waiting for?

Mike: I think they just didn't have time to get the stuff together, was my understanding. It's usually from-

Susan: Am I not allowed to ask questions? I'm sorry.

David: You're fine. She's not running this meeting. I am.

Mike: From the meeting date, when we actually hold this meeting, for example, for this meeting, for December, for the January meeting, the submission deadline is the 22nd. It's less than two weeks. I think they just didn't have time to get everything together.

Susan: Got you. Okay. No, we were just curious because- That's all I have.

David: Is that it, Susan?

Susan: Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

[crosstalk]

Ms. Duby: Second Thursday of January?

David: What?

Ms. Duby: Is it second Thursday of January? Is that when the meeting is?

David: The 8th, yes.

Ms. Duby: Okay. I've just given her enough data.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES, DECEMBER 11, 2025 (Draft)

Susan: We will see you then. Happy holidays to all of you.

David: Thank you. Merry Christmas to everybody. Motion to adjourn?

Mike: I do have plans to sign on the back table for D&E.

David: We've got plans to sign. I guess that's unanimous. Thank you, and happy holidays, merry Christmas, and all that.

Ms. Duby: We'll bring you a couple of ranches or a [unintelligible 00:49:07].
[00:52:56] [END OF AUDIO]