

Old Orchard Beach Planning Board Regular Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 9, 2011

Call to Order at 7:00 pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

Members present: Winthrop Winch Chairman, David Darling, Mark Koenigs, Eber Weinstein, Don Cote, and Kristopher Fish, and Tianna Higgins excused. **Staff:** Mike Nugent, Code Enforcement Officer and Jeffrey Hinderliter, Town Planner.

ITEM 1: Conditional Use: Public Hearing: Appeal from restrictions on non-conforming uses: Requesting permission to increase the number of rental rooms from 6 to 9 within the existing structure at 47 East Grand Avenue, MBL 305-4-4 in the BRD District. Owner is William & Lesa Watson.

Chairman Winch explained the background of the conditional use.

Mr. Koenigs moved to approve the Final of Facts as written.

Mr. Darling seconded.

Motion passes unanimously.

ITEM 2: Public Hearing: Preliminary Plan: Major Subdivision, Site Plan & Conditional Use: Proposal to demolish 53 overnight cabins and replace with 53 seasonal dwelling units at 180 Saco Avenue, MBL 208-1-1, in the GB-1 & R4 Zones. Agent is BH2M, Bill Thompson.

Chairman Winch explained the background of the proposal and Mr. Thompson gave an overview before the public hearing began.

Mr. Thompson explained the existing conditions of Jeremiah's Cottages and how they will be replaced with the same amount of cottages. He showed the new layout of the project and explained there is no expanded use from what is currently there. There are 9 year round units currently on the property, and these will be eliminated with the new proposal. There are very little grading changes. There are culverts on Saco Ave. The DEP has been contacted and a storm water reports will be submitted. There will be 2 styles and possibly 5 colors. They will be pastel. Layout is in somewhat "pods". Fire chief has been consulted. There was a divider island in an earlier concept which has been taken out due to constrictions for fire engines, etc. to be able to negotiate the turns. We have street trees and are similar to the trees on Old Orchard Street. Also have Arborvitae and a berm along the front and side. The three sides of the rear there is a stockade fence as well.

Chairman Winch asked Mr. Nugent to clarify the model unit.

Mr. Nugent explained the model used for marketing reasons. The Town's attorney weighed in on this and stated it was not considered a "subdivision", but more of small pieces that are being sold separately. Therefore, they were allowed to do this with the stipulation that it is not being used and is only a model.

Public Hearing was opened at 7:22 p.m.

Ricki Letowt, 69 East Grand Avenue. Ms. Letowt asked what the definition of a seasonal dwelling.

Chairman Winch stated these cottages are being replaced cottage for cottage. He asked the attorney for the proposal to answer.

David Ordway, attorney for Summer Winds LLC explained the time frame for a seasonal definition. No use of the property from November 1st through April 1st. Currently, there are 9 year round buildings now.

Ms. Letowt asked what the difference between overnight cabins and dwelling unit.

Mr. Nugent stated this was just like Cider Hill and is single family homes. They are condos but can only be used seasonally.

Mr. Darling asked if the water was going to shut off in the off-season.

Chairman Winch stated it was in the condo docs. He asked for anyone else wishing to speak.

John Byrd, Ocean Park. Mr. Byrd asked if they were planning to develop around the stream. His concern is flooding of Ocean Park. Asked if they could expand the little lagoon as a small retention pond. He would like it to be considered.

Chairman Winch asked for anyone else.

Tom Coward, attorney from South Portland. He is speaking for Michael Urbanski who is an abutter. He has lived next to this proposed development for many years and has serious concerns of the impact to his home.

Mr. Coward passed out a brief memo to the board outlining Mr. Urbanski's concerns. He felt that the applicant has not taken appropriate cautions to the impact of the neighboring properties. He felt that it is disingenuous to say this is just a replacement, cottage to cottage. It is really replacing a single room cabin with a small single family home. He raised some concerns about the location of the compactor in relation to Mr. Urbanski's property, as well as no screening along his property and the dumpster. Some of the homes are extremely close together and one in particular seemed to be encroaching on the setback to Mr. Urbanski's property. They would like to have these issues addressed.

Michael Urbanski, 186 Saco Avenue. Mr. Urbanski initially thanked the code enforcement office, in particular Tori Geaumont and Mike Nugent. He went on to explain his concerns and read from a document which he made copies for the board. (insert document).

Chairman Winch stated that he needed to keep his comments relevant to land use ordinances.

Mr. Urbanski felt offended that he was asked to move on quickly.

Mr. Darling stated that the board wanted to listen to his concerns.

Mr. Urbanski continued to give history of the property and issues with proposed entrance and exit of the proposed project. He is concerned regarding the storm water and direction of the flow of water. He was concerned about the foundations. They were to be slabs, but are partial foundations, and this is concerning regarding water run-off. He then addressed the traffic patterns and how this is a confusing area and can be the potential for accidents. He felt there should be 2 entrances and 2 exits going on to Saco Avenue and not onto Hobson.

Chairman Winch explained that these are one bedroom cottages in the same way that the current cottages are one bedroom.

Mr. Urbanski felt that the square footage of the new cottages is approximately five times as great as the existing cottages. In terms of actual square footage and not the amount of people. The size of these cottages is a major concern.

Chairman Winch thanked Mr. Urbanski.

Mr. Darling asked Mr. Urbanski about flooding issues and drainage issues specifically on his property.

Mr. Urbanski explained that he had water damage many different times in the basement due to flooding issues in the past.

Mr. Darling asked if the damage is mostly in the basement.

Mr. Urbanski stated it is really all around. It is going underground and under the road and can never access the culvert on the other side of Jeremiah's.

Mr. Darling asked if this was his major concern.

Mr. Urbanski stated he was not sure if it was his number one concern, as there are several different things which concern him regarding the project.

Chairman Winch asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Arthur Warren, 195 Saco Avenue. Mr. Warren stated he is supportive of the project, but he is very concerned about water and drainage. As the campground developed and over the last 5-7, water has become a large issue. The water table has risen significantly, and he was concerned this will increase with the development. He wondered if there should be more storm drains in the project which would alleviate the potential of increased flooding and drainage issues.

Chairman Winch clarified the water issue was due to the water table being higher over the years.

Mr. Warren stated it was the water table that has become a problem.

Chairman Winch asked for any other comments. Seeing none, the public hearing was closed at 8:13 p.m.

David Ordway, attorney for the applicant. Mr. Ordway addressed some of the comments that Mr. Urbanski made regarding the impact of the amount of cottages. He then addressed the comment regarding the new cottages being an "eyesore". He showed the board pictures of the current cottages, some being larger than the new proposed cottages. He stated he must disagree with Mr. Urbanski's calculations and comment of the new cottages being an eyesore. He then commented on the water that needs to be addressed. There are some drainage issues currently that need to be addressed. The elevation of the catch basin on Hobson Avenue is a problem. The drainage swales coming down Hobson had culverts, but one of the owners chose to fill that ditch

in and stop the flow and then produced an overflow. He commented that Bill Thompson have been involved with many, many projects in this town, and he and Les Berry have more experience in engineering in this town than most. The engineering will be going through peer review, and this is being done.

Chairman Winch stated that there is an increase in impervious surface, and that is something that needs to be reviewed by Wright-Pierce.

Mr. Ordway stated he was up to the challenge. He pointed out the question to the board is not whether it is attractive to someone, or if it is an expansion, etc. The issue is whether it is “substantially” different than what the use is now.

Mr. Koenigs asked about the square footages of the cottages, as some of the blue prints that were submitted showed the possibility of two bedrooms.

Mr. Thompson stated these were preliminary blueprints. There is an area where classified as “limited common element” which is where the owners can put their things such as BBQ’s or picnic tables. They are all one bedroom. To address the foundation issue shows a crawl space. It is a foundation below the frost line. It is a frost wall. He clarified that these are going to be one bedroom and not two.

Mr. Darling asked about the attic.

Mr. Saulnier stated that it is going to be within the condo docs that the attic cannot be used or changed to living space. It also states in the condo docs that the cottages will be seasonal. He then talked about the compactor issue. He stated that they felt it was a good spot as it was close to the entrance. He stated that they will take a look at the placement of the compactor, as well as the buffering along Mr. Urbanski’s property.

Mr. Koenigs asked if Mr. Thompson could calculate the traffic increase on Hobson Avenue due to the compactor placement, etc.

Mr. Thompson felt that the primary point of entrance will be along Saco Avenue.

Mr. Nugent stated that the board can ask for a traffic study if they feel the need.

Chairman Winch is concerned about the changes in permeable surface, the storm water, and the compactor issues.

Mr. Thompson stated there is a natural divide by grading therefore, not all the storm water is going through the storm drains. There is less than 10,000 sf of impervious surface; therefore, there is no need for a retention pond or retention catch basin. They do not need a higher level of permit from DEP. Since this is a redevelopment of an existing use, there is no need for further permitting from the state. Our storm water design is being peer reviewed by Wright-Pierce and DEP.

Mr. Darling asked if the sites were 40’x50’.

Mr. Thompson commented that this was a condo assignment of a limited common element. It does not change any of the design of engineering. It is a space that is designated to a certain unit owner. He also mentioned that there is 3.5 acres of open areas in the 10 acre parcel. This is a good amount of land in comparison to what is being developed.

Chairman Winch felt it was premature to move forward.

Mr. Darling wanted to see the peer review before we move forward with respect to the drainage.

Mr. Thompson stated these are issues that will be addressed for site plan and subdivision approval. The conditions were read through at the last meeting.

Mr. Koenigs asked what Chairman Winch wanted to table.

Chairman Winch felt there was a lot of progress made, but there are still things that need to be addressed.

Mr. Thompson asked if this can be approved preliminary subdivision tonight.

Mr. Nugent stated we had only advertised for public hearing tonight so this would need to be done at the next meeting.

Chairman Winch asked if the board has determined the application complete.

Mr. Nugent stated the preliminary application was deemed complete. This is an opportunity for the board to gather as much information as possible for an educated decision.

ITEM 3: Public Hearing & Possible Approval: Conditional Use and Waiver of number of Parking

Spaces: Proposal to convert current shop/warehouse to hotel units at 30 Washington Ave, MBL 308-1-1 in the NC-3 Zone. Owner LaBoca Corp.

Chairman Winch explained the item.
King Weinstein, LaBoca Corp. explained the request.
Mr. Koenigs asked if Mr. Weinstein submitted the parking site plan.
Mr. Weinstein stated he did.
Mr. Koenigs asked if the primary entrance was going to on Atlantic Ave.
Mr. Weinstein stated yes. He also addressed the request for the waiver for parking.
Chairman Winch asked if there was a parking ban.
Mr. Weinstein stated he has not had a problem with that, but he has been able to have people park in the VFW or some of the abutter's properties.
Mr. Koenig asked how many spaces and how many units were currently there.
Mr. Weinstein stated 8 spaces and 11 units.
Chairman Winch asked if there were issues with the police from the building.
Mr. Weinstein stated that there has never been an administrative hearing regarding the property in regards to the business license.
Mr. Darling asked how many bedrooms in each of the units.
Mr. Weinstein explained the bedrooms.
Mr. Darling asked how many bedrooms in the units.
Mr. Weinstein stated there was only one unit with three bedrooms.
Mr. Darling asked him to clarify the existing number of bedrooms in the units.
Mr. Weinstein stated that there are 18 bedrooms in the entire building. This is approximately 1800 sf that is being unused, and the only use for it in the zone would be a hotel unit with many bedrooms.
Chairman Winch asked about the drawing of the units that was presented.
Mr. Weinstein clarified that the drawing was from the initial thought, and the architect was thinking the space would be used more for J-1 students. This is not the case.
Chairman Winch opened the public hearing at 9:00 p.m.
Robert Smyrski, 34 Washington Avenue. He stated he is against the proposal because he was denied the ability to increase the amount of units at his building due to the parking constraints. The parking still becomes a problem.
Chairman Winch asked if his tenants need parking.
Mr. Smyrski stated yes, and it is difficult at times to find them.
Ricki Letowt, 28 Washington Avenue and 20 Washington Avenue. Ms. Letowt stated that Washington Avenue was zoned that the first floor was to be commercial, and the higher floors only residential. She felt that adding one extra unit would not be a hardship. She stated that she is in the area a lot owning 2 buildings, and there is never an issue with parking. Many residents in the neighborhood do not have cars. She felt that it would not change the character of the neighborhood or be disruptive in any way.
Chairman Winch read from two abutter letters:
Public Hearing: Conditional Use and Waiver of number of parking spaces. Proposal to convert current shop/warehouse to hotel units at 30 Washington Avenue , MBL 30-8-1-1 in the NC-3 Zone. Owner is LaBoca Corp.

As an abutter to the property and having participated in the site walk on June 2, 2011, we oppose the granting of the parking space waiver as requested by the above Corporation (LaBoca Corp.). We feel that the town should apply the parking standards uniformly to construction in the impacted zone. Certainly, if the owner on the corner of Washington and Fern Avenues should have to provide under house parking then the owner at 30 Washington Avenue should be in compliance with parking standards of Article VIII, Division 4. Off street parking requirements in those provisions is required. Section 78-871(c)(1) does allow new development of nonresidential properties to use on-street parking in certain circumstances, the entirety of paragraph (c) applies

"with the exceptions of residential and lodging establishments...." That means that residential and lodging establishments must continue to comply with the ordinary parking standards specified in Division 4 of Article VIII. The table differentiates between the number of spaces per room, depending on whether the lodging is characterized as a bed and breakfast, motel/hotel/cabin or boarding room/house. It seems to us that the proposed construction at 30 Washington Avenue falls under this provision whatever its final identity.

While we agree, that there are a number of parking spaces along Atlantic and Washington Avenue. During the summer tourist season the number of parking spaces is diminished by tourist usage. We also note that along Washington Avenue in front of the 30 Washington Avenue building there is a **fire hydrant** and a **no parking sign** stating "**No Parking From Here To The Corner**". This **curb is painted with a yellow no parking stripe**. Also there could be no on-street parking along Washington Avenue from the corner of Atlantic in the vicinity of the Amvets Hall parking lot and the Old Orchard House of Pizza parking lot as it would obstruct egress and ingress to the parking lots. Street parking is not very good alternative parking in the winter months. Snow banks reduce the width of the roads making 2 way traffic difficult enough without having rental unit parking with which to contend.

We believe that the zoning ordinance has been very carefully drafted to take into account the safety and well being of the Atlantic/Washington Avenues neighborhood. Nonetheless, the corner of Atlantic and Washington Avenue is of great concern to the Old Orchard Beach Police Department. Some people at 30 Washington Avenue are, upon occasion, very rowdy and the noise level is very loud into the wee hours of the morning. The pedestrian traffic to the 30 Washington Avenue site is quite heavy at times as is short stay on street parking of vehicles whose drivers run in and out of the building. On at least one occasion an individual walking by 30 Washington Avenue has been the brunt of harassing remarks. We fear that an increase in transient population may lead to additional negative activity at 30 Washington Avenue. We understand that it is not the role of the Planning Board to act on the construction of the units, but we do believe that the Planning Board's waiving the required parking spaces will impact negatively on an already difficult situation.

We urge the Planning Board **to deny the Conditional Use and Waiver of Parking Spaces requested.**

Sincerely,
Wendell and Jacqueline Drown
36 Washington Avenue
Old Orchard Beach, Maine 04064

Chairman Winch asked how long the unit would be rented.

Mr. Weinstein addressed some concerns from the letter, and stated that the board could put conditions that the front door is on Atlantic Avenue, as well as several other issues that were stated.

Chairman Winch read from the second letter:

To: Ms. Victoria Geaumont
Town Planning Board
Town Hall
Old Orchard Beach Maine

Fax: 207-934-5911

From: Elwood Clark and Family
12 Evergreen Avenue (MBL308-1-20)

Pages: 3 not including cover page

**The Clark Family
12 Evergreen Avenue (MBL 308-1-20)
Old Orchard Beach, Maine 04064**

8 Jun 2011

To: Ms. Geaumont/Town Planning Board
Old Orchard Beach Town Hall
1 Portland Road
Old Orchard Beach, Maine

Re: Proposed Conditional Use and Parking Space Waiver for Change in Land Use at 30
Washington Avenue, MBL 308-1-1 in the NC-3 Zone by LaBoca Corporation

Dear Ms. Geaumont and Planning Board Members:

We ask you to deny this application for conditional use and waiver of parking space requirements.

We own the cottage and property nearest and immediately adjacent to the proposed land use change and associated building modifications. We will be most directly affected by this proposal if it were to be approved. LaBoca Corporation has not discussed their proposal with us, nor any proposed actions they intend to implement to mitigate its adverse impacts on us. We strongly disagree with their application representations. Their application fails to list our single family residential property as an affected R-2 abutted property. They fail to mention that our driveway parallels the Evergreen Avenue alignment and passes immediately in front of their proposed new hotel access/egress doorway, creating an unsafe condition. Their conditional use application appears to be incomplete, lacks substance and critical details as to how a hotel, a non-conforming land use in NCD-3 under town zoning regulations, would operate outside our front door without logistical support or parking, while supporting the character and wholesome environment of our residential neighborhood. We would like to see a more complete application and scaled plot plan with specific setback distances, property line measurements, screening and buffer proposals, hotel operational specifics before any land use decision is made.

Our property and the applicant's property lie on the zoning boundary between Residential R-2 and Neighborhood Commercial District NCD-3. We purchased the cottage over 20 years ago, and have experienced a steady decline in our family's ability to use our property, given safety issues, noise, and other nuisances emanating from the adjacent NCD-3 zone and LaBoca properties. The LaBoca property is a massive three-story structure built from property line to property line, without building setbacks. It overshadows our cottage. Building tenants and NCD-3 streets are loud, especially during the summer months. The northwest corner of the apartment building sits on or near our property line. A parking lot was constructed directly behind our cottage without buffering or screening. Later, a large propane storage tank was placed in the parking lot not far from the southeast corner of our cottage, again without screening, fire/blast protection, or buffering. LaBoca property owners seem to view our property as their own with respect to access and egress. This past summer we arrived at our cottage to find a LaBoca construction contractor had taken over the southern third of our property for use as a construction material staging, waste material storage, and truck parking area. While our

parents' love of the beach overshadowed these neighborhood nuisances, the rest of the family has grown increasingly concerned about apartment noise, the nearby propane tank, high speed cars, and inebriated pedestrians using our property to relieve themselves.

Our front porch faces Evergreen Avenue and is just a few feet behind our evergreen hedge along the one-way street. There is no parking on Evergreen in the vicinity of the proposed hotel conversion and a very narrow sidewalk. The current lack of street-level apartments, and building entrances along Washington & Atlantic Avenues mitigate some of the raucous milieu from the apartment building, but it is loud and largely uncontrolled. Hotels will be worse. Placing a hotel and hotel entrance on Evergreen Avenue will introduce a significant pedestrian and vehicular traffic to our residential neighborhood. Hotels are non-residential land uses under the Old Orchard Beach zoning code, and do not appear to be authorized within the NCD-3 zone. The Town seems to recognize through its zoning provisions that hotel operations do not belong in residential areas. How will the proposed hotel operate safely in our residential neighbor without further adverse impact on our cottage use? Where will these hotel guests park their vehicles? What kind of transients and activities are being proposed? We ask the Board's to protect us and our property from non-compatible land uses, uses that are not likely to promote and support a wholesome residential neighborhood environment. NCD zoning is to support surrounding residential neighborhoods, not destroy them.

We request that the current application be denied. Our specific concerns include:

(1) Application Concerns:

a. Standards for Conditional Uses: We strongly disagree with LaBoca's application assertions that additional vehicle parking is not required for a hotel use, that the proposed development will not create noise, hours of operations, loss of privacy, or other nuisances. We believe the current proposal will adversely affect adjacent properties and affect property value. We have years of rowdy, loud, late night inconsiderate behavior from building tenants and encroachments to support our view. Landscape screening and noise buffering will be required to protect residential properties like ours from this type of land use, especially when it is so near our front door step.

b. We request preparation of a complete application and proposal, including complete scaled plot plan of the proposal, showing property lines, building setbacks, distances from abutting residences to new proposed building entrances, proposed pedestrian and vehicular access/egress lanes, vehicle parking/holding areas, proposed landscaping or wall screening and buffer proposals (they are needed in our opinion), a proposed hotel operations scenario, and specific measures to protect our single family property from transient impacts. Where will the hotel office, registry, check-in/out functions be located? How will housekeeping functions, including laundry, linen, & bathroom supply logistics be handled? Why can't proposed rooms be accessed from the building interior through its main entrance? What restrictions will be placed on hotel use – to prevent the facility becoming an adult entertainment facility?

(2) Loss of Privacy, Noise, Encroachment & Adverse Visual Impact: We want to minimize the adverse visual, noise, and traffic impacts from the proposed development. Our concerns include street-level windows and doors near our property line, increased late night pedestrian/vehicular traffic, hotel registering or transient parking operations

(searching for unavailable parking spaces in front or near our cottage). We want assurances to include restrictions on proposed hotel operations that the proposed business operation will prevent the immoral or illegal use of the adjacent property (e.g. hourly room rates), prevent intrusion or unauthorized use of our property for construction, transient parking, or other uses. Given the lack of building setbacks, we would like to see other access/egress approaches fully explored before new street access is approved onto Evergreen Avenue. We would like visual and noise mitigation for any proposed non-conforming land use.

(3) **Driveway Right-of-Way:** We want to be sure that any proposal does not cut across our driveway entrance from Evergreen Avenue, or introduce a doorway that opens out into our vehicular travel lane, thereby creating an unsafe corridor for travel. Our driveway has been used as such in its present location for over 20 years.

(4) **Parking Waiver:** Transient hotel use is very different from apartment use given the mobility and high turnover rate for guests. We agree with other abutting neighbors that a parking waiver **should not** be granted. Given the proposed hotel entrance doorway, we anticipate "guests" will be illegally parking along Evergreen Avenue, in front of our cottage, or worse using our driveway.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns, and hope that you will deny this conditional use application. Whatever your decision, we request the Planning Board to document its rationale and findings with respect to land use compatibility, zoning compliance, and required mitigation for the proposed development. Please contact us directly if needed at the following telephone numbers:

Sincerely,

Elwood W. Clark
Dover, NH
(12 Evergreen, OOB)

James W. Clark
University Place, WA
(253) 565-3032

Christine M. Hamann
Barrington, NH
medallion@metrocast.net
Cell: (603) 817-6372

Gregory Clark
Dover, NH
gclark777@yahoo.com
Cell: 603-781-7818

Stephen D. Clark
Albuquerque, NM

cc: wjpdrown@prexar.com [wjpdrown@ime.net]
upclarks@nventure.com

Chairman Winch read from a letter from Deputy Chief Keith Babin regarding parking issues:

Chairman Winch asked for any other comments. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing at 9:15 p.m. Mr. Darling stated that he felt the limiting conditions that Mr. Weinstein spoke of made sense; the main entrance, connecting the parking lot, and the minimum stay. To address the abutters concerns he felt maybe a

minimum 30 day stay. He asked if Mr. Weinstein's plan was to rent it out nightly.

Mr. Weinstein stated no.

Mr. Darling asked if we have addressed all the Findings of Fact, and is the code office satisfied.

Mr. Nugent stated he cannot grant a semantical permit.

Mr. Weinstein stated he would add that it would be licensed as a hotel and furnished as a hotel. There are people who are just moving to the area to get settling, and they wish it to be settled and self-contained.

Mr. Koenig moved to accept the conditional use waiver for number of parking spots for 30 Washington Avenue, MBL 308-1-1.

Mr. Darling seconded.

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Darling moved to allow the conversion of the current shop/warehouse to one hotel unit at 30 Washington Ave, MBL 308-1-1 in the NC-3 Zone with the following conditions: 1) The main entrance of the building to be on Atlantic Avenue, 2) Minimum 30 day stay for resident. 3) To have an exit from the parking lot on Evergreen Avenue, as well as Atlantic Avenue.

Mr. Koenigs seconded.

Motion passes unanimously

The applicant stated ultimately if the town comes through with the sidewalk he would put in several street trees which would dress things up nicely.

ITEM 4: Public Hearing: Amendments to the following sections of the zoning ordinance: Chapter 78, Article I, Section 78-1, Article II, Section 78-34, 78-38, 78-68, 78-70, 78-94, 78-95, Article III, Section 78-142, Article IV, Section 78-212, 78-213, Article V, Section 78-246, 78-276, 78-302, 78-353, 78-354, 78-355, 78-376, 78-396, 78-397, 78-426, 78-427, 78-428, 78-429, Article VI, Section 78-686, Article VII, Section 78-1268, Article VIII, Section 78-1625, 78-1627, 78-1629, 78-1631.

Open public hearing at 9:26 p.m.

No one wished to speak, therefore, public hearing was closed at 9:26 p.m.

ITEM 5: Plenary Site Plan Review Determination of Completeness: Set a Public Hearing Date:

Reconstruction of the clubhouse formally known as the Old Spruce Lodge within the footprint of the existing structure, Wild Acres Resort, 179 Saco Avenue, MBL 208-3-2/315-3-1, in the Campground Overlay district. Agent: Lewis Chamberlain, Attar Engineering, Inc.

Chairman Winch reviewed the proposal.

Ed Keiser, representing the applicant approached the board and showed a rendering of the proposal.

Chairman Winch asked if they are building what is there on the same footprint why did they need to come to Planning Board.

Mr. Nugent felt it was not clear that he could grant the approval himself, and he felt it was prudent to make this a public process due to the residential flavor of the neighborhood. He stated that a site walk would be for June 7th.

Mr. Darling asked how many square feet the building is.

Mr. Keiser felt it was around 3000 square feet.

Mr. Darling asked if there was a landscape plan yet.

Chairman Winch stated that it was a pine grove so there is not much that needs to be done.

Mr. Darling moves to determine the application complete at Old Spruce Lodge within the footprint of the existing structure, Wild Acres Resort, 179 Saco Avenue, MBL 208-3-2/315-3-1 in the Campground Overlay district.

Mr. Koenigs seconded.

Motion passes unanimously

ITEM 6: Conditional Use: Determination of Completeness; Set Public Hearing Date: The addition of 20 feet to the existing radio antennae at The Town of Old Orchard Beach Fire Department at 136 Saco Avenue, MBL 207-3-8 in the GB-1 zone.

Chairman Winch explained the need for the planning board approval for this. He asked if they have submitted

an application.

Mr. Nugent felt it was prudent to table this item, as the town is not ready for this.

Chairman Winch moved to table ITEM 6: Conditional Use: Determination of Completeness; Set Public Hearing Date: The addition of 20 feet to the existing radio antennae at The Town of Old Orchard Beach Fire Department at 136 Saco Avenue, MBL 207-3-8 in the GB-1 zone.

GOOD & WELFARE

Mr. Nugent welcomed Jeffrey Hinderliter to the town as our new Town Planner. The board was very welcoming.

Meeting adjourned

I, Tori Geaumont, Secretary to the Planning Board of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of six(6) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of June 9, 2011.

Tori Geaumont