

Town of Otisfield
Planning board Meeting Minutes
May 25, 2017

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chair –Karen Turino

2. Attendance: Chair – Karen Turino, Vice Chair – Rick Jackson, Herb Olsen & Stan Brett
(Absent - Recording Secretary – David Hyer & Alternate – Beth Damon).

Code Enforcement Officer: Richard St. John
Secretary: Tanya Taft

3. Announcement of Quorum: Board had a quorum.

4. Approve Secretary's Report:

A. Regular Meeting Minutes from April 18, 2017. *Motion to accept minutes. HO/RJ - Unanimous.

5. Discussion & Comments from public:

A. None

6. Residence - Based Business Applications:

A. None.

7. Shoreland Zoning Applications:

A. None.

8. Site Plan Applications:

A. None.

9. Subdivision Application:

A. None.

10. Upcoming Dates:

A. Planning Board Meeting June 20, 2017 at 7:00 PM.

11. Discussion & comments from Code Enforcement Officer:

A. None.

12. Discussion & comments from Board:

A. Review of Site Plan Review Application. PB members reviewed all changes that were made at prior meeting and have no further suggestions or edits. *Motion to accept the Site Plan Review Pre-Application as presented. HO/SB – Unanimous. KT asked CEO to thank Melissa and the Town of Harrison on behalf of the Planning Board for helping with this process.

B. Review of Sign Ordinance: KT: PB meeting was rescheduled from 05/16th till tonight. The BOS would like to run the draft ordinance by Bernstein & Shur legal counsel. This did not allow very much time to accomplish reviewing this Ordinance and get the final draft to the BOS in time for the public hearing on 06/1st. Given this time pressure, the Ordinance Policy Review Committee agreed to meet with the Planning Board tonight. Both committees are reviewing the Ordinance together to prevent any lag time.

PB members present: Chair – Karen Turino, Stan Brett, Herb Olson and Rick Jackson.

OPRC Members present: Chair - Joseph Zilinsky, Stan Brett, Nancy Lundquist, Diana Olsen & Karen Turino.

Discussion: PB members have had this for a few weeks. David Hyer has made comments that have been SUBMITTED INTO PUBLIC RECORD and were reviewed at this meeting.

Section 3, Applicability. *This ordinance applies to all signs in the Town of Otisfield visible from a public way.* All agree that leaving it as is would be preferred.

Section 4, The BOS shall hold a public Hearing. All agree to leave this as is. Section 4, # 3, Adoption of amendment “may, or must”. All agree that it will remain as is.

Section 5, C. Legal Actions: Enforcement, “municipal Officers”, as opposed to BOS. All agree with keeping the words Municipal Officers, because it’s standard terminology and refers to BOS.

Section 5, D. Penalties, “*shall be subject to a minimum penalty of penalty violation*” all agree that as is should be left.

Section 6, A. Permit required. Concern is if there is a sign permit form, who determines the fees? All agree that the BOS assign the fees and we do not put any specific fees in ordinances. The CEO collects the fee once the Sign has been approved by the PB.

Section 6, B. Concern is that it isn’t clear at this point if the dimensional drawing includes any supporting structure for the sign. DH thinks it should be stated if we want the kiosk to be dimensionally defined. All agree it should remain as is.

Section 7, F. Excepted signs. Question: why would we allow an “open” flag to be any larger than any other sign in town? Discussion: All agree that an “open” flag is fine to leave as is. Joe explained this ordinance is for all new signs. Existing signs are excluded. If they change, it would need to go before a new sign permit.

Section 7, H. Temporary signs: Question: Does the statement “one construction sign of up to eight (8) sq. feet for the duration of the project” come in conflict with line 4 which exempts contractor /engineer/architect signs? Discussion: Construction signs are different. All agree to leave as is.

Section 7, M. New construction. Concern is about being redundant. Discussion: This is under excepted signs and all agree that this is fine as is.

Section 8, General Restrictions. A. Concern about Seeds of Peace and all agree that this is grandfathered and maintenance is allowed.

Section 8, E. (i) internally lighted. Concern is this prohibits the use of electronic LED signs. Discussion: All agree they like the way it is and to leave it as is. Signs can be illuminated, but not from within.

Section 8, E. (vii) be attached to a movable or portable structure. Question: Would this prohibit the “shrink wrapped boat sign”? All but SB agree it would. *For the record SB disagrees on this.

Section 9, A. (i) number of outdoor signs shall not exceed (2) single sided signs or (1) double sided sign. Concern is this seems to lack clarity. Discussion: If you have more than one business, you can have more than one sign. This could be discussed in the future, but as of right now, this is fine. If it becomes a problem, it can be looked at then. SB finds this to be confusing having different sizes. Others agree to leave as is.

Section 11: Definitions. We can't put this into the Definitions Ordinance this year, because it's not yet voted on. All agree this would be a step 2 for the following year.

*Motion that we leave this DRAFT Otisfield Sign Ordinance as written and pass it back to the OPRC to submit to the BOS. HO/RJ – (3) favor (1) opposed. SB. Discussion: OPRC will submit a memo to BOS to let them know PB and OPRC are leaving DRAFT as is.

13. Unfinished Business:

A. Review the Subdivision and New Road Construction Ordinances regarding new road construction standards. Determine which to keep and which to eliminate. Resolve any differences.

14. Adjournment: With no further business, the regular meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM. RJ/SB- Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,
Tanya Taft, Secretary

Approved by: Karen Turino, Chair
Otisfield Planning Board

Approved on: June 20, 2017