

A regular meeting of the Bath Planning Board was called on Tuesday, July 2, 2024, for the purpose of conducting regular business.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

James Hopkinson, Vice Chair  
Phyllis Bailey  
Haley Blanco  
Greg Johnson  
Andy Omo

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Bob Oxton, Chair  
Cal Stilphen

**STAFF PRESENT**

Jenn Curtis, City Planner  
Karly Perry, Recording Secretary

Planning Board Vice Chair, James Hopkinson, called the meeting to order in the third-floor Council Chambers at 6:00 pm on Tuesday, July 2, 2024.

**Minutes: June 4, 2024, meeting.**

**MR. JOHNSON, SECONDED BY MR. OMO, MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 4, 2024, AS PRESENTED.**

**PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Old Business****Item 1**

**Request for Site Plan and Subdivision Amendment – 133 Commercial Street (Map 26, Lots 258 & 258-1); Bath Riverwalk, LLC, applicant. (Continued from May 7, 2024, meeting)**

Ms. Curtis announced that the applicant has requested the item be tabled an additional two months.

**MS. BAILEY MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JOHNSON, TO CONTINUE THE REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT.**

Philip Day, President of the Bath Riverwalk Home Owners Association, expressed frustration stating that members of the association were in attendance and expecting information. He asked that the association be notified in the event that the item is tabled.

Mr. Hopkinson thanked Mr. Day, noting that the City is not always given advance notice that the applicant will not be in attendance.

**PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Mr. Hopkinson announced that the Planning Board has a new member in attendance.

Ms. Curtis introduced former City Council member Phyllis Bailey, who currently serves on the board for the Bath Housing Authority.

**New Business**

**Item 1**

**Public Hearing – Request for Land Use Code Map Amendment – for:**

580 Washington St (Map 32, Lot 94 & 94-001)

606 Washington St (Map 32, Lot 94-003); Bath Iron Works, applicant

**Item 2**

**Public Hearing – Request for Land Use Code Map Amendment – for:**

10 Bath Street (Map 32, Lot 95)

607 Middle Street (Map 32, Lot 94-002)

601 Middle Street (Map 32, Lot 96)

595 Middle Street (Map 32, Lot 97)

580 Middle Street (Map 32, Lot 98); SERE, LLC, applicant.

Ms. Curtis introduced the applications, explaining that the two were originally presented as one request and later separated into two separate amendments. Both seek to rezone areas of R1 and C2 to C3.

**MR. OMO, SECONDED BY MS. BLANCO, MOVED TO FIND THE APPLICATIONS COMPLETE.**

**PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Brian Salter, Principal Civil Engineer for Bath Iron Works, introduced himself and John Fitzgerald of SERE. He then presented a property map for the area which both applications seek to have a portion of the properties rezoned, identifying the current zoning of the lots. Mr. Salter stated that the goal is to rezone the designated properties to the Business Park District, which more accurately describes the current use, adding that SERE is an affiliate of Bath Iron Works.

Mr. Salter noted that the goal of rezoning would be to allow Bath Iron Works to modernize the infrastructure, improve parking and traffic, and to attract and retain employees. He stated that there are no firm plans currently in place, as Bath Iron Works determined it would be prudent to request the zoning change first in order to determine which improvements would ultimately be feasible. Mr. Salter described that the current structures are both outdated and inefficient; adding that changing the zoning would also allow the opportunity to improve parking at both structures. He stressed the need for Bath Iron Works to improve the workplace experience in order to attract candidates for employment, which would include consolidating locations to improve productivity. Ms. Salter added that these improvements would benefit Bath Iron Works and the City of Bath, as well as residents.

Mr. Salter stressed that all plans are currently conceptual, with the guiding principals to include consolidating and updating buildings for efficiency and employment satisfaction. He acknowledged parking issues, which Bath Iron Works seeks to resolve with the input of the Department of Transportation, adding that by building vertically rather than

horizontal, Bath Iron Works would be able to minimize their footprint and increase green spaces within the city. Mr. Salter explained that the current zoning allows a height of 40', which would increase to 75'. He noted that the visual impact would in fact be lessened by the increase in setback from the street that a taller building would allow.

Mr. Salter recalled his discussions with City Staff, who recommended the zoning change in lieu of contract rezoning in order to reduce the timeline for these improvements. He noted that the rezoning would have no impact on unrelated properties and would align with the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and future land use updates currently being proposed by Camiros.

Mr. Salter concluded his presentation by stating that the goal of the project would be a greener campus. He thanked the Board for their time.

Ms. Bailey asked Mr. Salter if any housing would be impacted.

Mr. Salter confirmed that existing properties to the west of the area are residential. He explained that these buildings have recently been acquired and are in a state of disrepair, containing hazardous materials such as asbestos and will be taken down. Mr. Salter explained that the removal of these buildings will be offset by Bath Iron Works working with community partners to increase units within the City. He added that that this would significantly increase the number of units within the City that are both efficient and sustainable.

Ms. Blanco asked how many house units would be removed.

Mr. Salter estimated that approximately five properties would be removed, with roughly fifteen units total.

Mr. Hopkinson opened the floor to public comment.

Owen Fish of Russell Street expressed concern that core issues will not be resolved, citing trespassing by employees on private property, noise, and illegal behavior. He stated that his property is used as a shortcut and that posted parking is not honored, noting that Bath Iron Works parking lots are used for barbecues and other activities. Mr. Fish expressed additional concern with employee noise specifically after midnight.

Aaron Thompson of Russell Street agreed with previous statements regarding noise. He stated that parking currently exists on Spring Street and that expansion is unnecessary, adding that vertical parking does not require rezoning. Mr. Thompson expressed concern that rezoning will erode the neighborhood's current identity as a walkway to the downtown area.

Angela Arsenault of South Street stated that she currently lives in a three-unit apartment complex next to her son and that the landlord is currently negotiating with Bath Iron Works, who is requiring that the building be vacant at the time of purchase. She expressed

concern that people are being evicted from their homes without a place to move to, and explained the difficult her son will have traveling to work without a vehicle. Ms. Arsenault expressed suspicion with Bath Iron Works motive for rezoning.

Deb Stetson of Middle Street expressed concerns that rezoning would alter that character and impact property values. She then noted her concern with the lack of planning in order for the Board to determine whether to approve prior to rezoning. Ms. Stetson recommended that the area be rezoned to C2 in order to retain the residential nature of the area.

Jim Thelen of South Street explained the impact traffic has had on his property. He expressed support for Ms. Stetson's comment and asked that plans be provided prior to approval. Mr. Thelen then testified to the disruptive behavior by employees during the evening.

Carolyn Thelen of South Street expressed her opinion that it is irresponsible to label a plan as sustainable without having a plan to show, suggesting that buildings would not be aesthetically pleasing and that additional lanes for traffic would not resolve the City's issues.

Karen Sleenman of Middle Street testified to evening noise levels and traffic issues, stating her preference to maintain the residential housing currently in place.

Nick Miller of Middle Street suggested that existing infrastructure be improved prior to creating additional projects in order to gain city support. He stated that the proposal should include additional options, and spoke to the disrespect of employees leaving Bath Iron Works. Mr. Miller addressed a prior traffic study by the City of Bath, which he stated has not improved traffic flow, and recommended parking at the former site of the Riverside property. Mr. Miller spoke to the disrepair of current parking, which he stated does not instill neighborhood support.

Camille Ross of Middle Street expressed support for previous comments and frustration that she attended seeking information which has not been provided. Ms. Ross spoke to concerns with extended construction which would cause a reduction in property values, as well as concerns to the lack of options presented. She stated that sustainability includes using what you have rather than building new. Ms. Ross concluded by describing the lack of respect by employees for the neighborhood.

Jason Lamontagne of Fisher Court expressed his general support for Bath Iron Works. He then recalled the recent purchase of surrounding properties, including an anonymous offer on his own house. Mr. Lamontagne expressed increased anxiety with the lack of information and stated that Bath Iron Works is acting in bad faith. He expressed concern that his property may be taken by eminent domain and recommended that zoning be changed to C2 only in order to require a buffer for residential properties, which C3 does not.

Daniel Burson of Russell Street acknowledged Bath Iron Works as part of the City. He then strongly urged the Planning Board to reject the proposal as both irresponsible and disrespectful. Mr. Burson stated his need for a plan prior to approval of a zoning change and his belief that rezoning would not be a good choice.

Dick Hill of South Street described his family history in the area and expressed concern that the house would become surrounded by commercial properties. He recalled the history of the City, with land increasingly becoming commercial. Mr. Hill stated that in 1998 he testified in order to attempt to halt rezoning on Middle Street properties with the same sentiment that it is irresponsible to ask for rezoning without a plan for development. Mr. Hill asked if the intention of Bath Iron Works is to tear down properties, including the Deering and Litchfield Houses. He spoke to the need to permanently stop commercial crawl and to reclaim the cement wall on Middle Street. Mr. Hill stated that the City should work together to determine a plan and thanked the Board for their consideration. Mr. Hill then added his opinion that adding sidewalks near the post office has increased traffic and expressed objection to the request without providing a plan for review.

Jess Mello of Shepard Street stated that she has asked employees not to get high prior to beginning work and discarding nip bottles over the parking lot fence. She expressed concern with the lack of a zero tolerance policy by Bath Iron Works and the drunk driving by their employees.

Misty Jacobs thanked the public for their comments and expressed concern with the statement regarding revitalization as a euphemism for tearing down old properties. She stated that it is an issue of social justice which will have a negative impact on housing.

George Lambert of South Street thanked the Planning board for the hearing and described the request as outrageous without a solid plan. He then spoke to traffic issues, being assaulted by an employee, and the increase of noise and danger to neighbors and schools.

Peter Lashley of the north end spoke against granting an open request and urged the Board to consider the worst case scenario. He described the lack of information on the project as insulting.

Ian McEneaney of Bath Street expressed opposition to the increase in building height and expressed his surprise by the lack of information provided by Bath Iron Works.

Dick Hill asked the Planning Board to ask the applicant to state the area in which they are soliciting residents to purchase their properties. Mr. Omo asked Mr. Hill for clarification on the cement wall he previously described, which is adjacent to a parking lot owned by Crooker Construction.

Juanita Wilson introduced herself as a property owner of a building on South Street and asked if SERE will be speaking on their application as they appear to be purchasing properties and expressed concern with the lack of planning and presentation. Ms. Wilson

referred to a property in Brunswick owned by General Dynamics on which housing could be built in order to shuttle employees to Bath Iron Works.

Brenda Elwell-Taylor stated that her family owns multiple properties in the neighborhood and recalled properties that were previously removed by Bath Iron Works which were privately purchased, moved and preserved. She spoke to the beautiful properties being destroyed and the need to balance employment with preserving both properties and the history of the City of Bath.

Mr. Hopkinson closed public comment.

Ms. Bailey stated that she is intrigued by the scope of targeted housing purchases in the area.

Mr. Omo expressed concern with the allowed uses within the C3 zone without a buffer to residential properties and what rezoning would expose the area to.

Mr. Johnson observed that the C3 district requires a 20' setback.

Mr. Hopkinson explained that contract rezoning includes a provision that requires a plan to be presented. He then noted the option to rezone properties to C2 rather than C3. Mr. Hopkinson thanked the public for their respectful and professional approach and insight, explaining that the Code Enforcement Officer would enforce the zoning and that the duty of the Planning Board is solely to determine whether or not to recommend approval of the amendment to City Council, which would allow another opportunity for the public to comment on the request.

Mr. Salter expressed his appreciation to residents for their feedback, noting that Bath Iron Works shares those concerns regarding employee behavior, narrowed roads, and sidewalks currently in disrepair. He stated that this is his second year of employment and cannot speak to the past, he then assured the public that he is a father and sympathizes with these issues as well as with housing issues.

Mr. Salter stated that plans are currently conceptual and based in optimizing parking to the east of the area to alleviate traffic issues. He acknowledged the desire by the public for concrete plans and reiterated that the consultants are awaiting the parameters for construction prior to moving forward. Mr. Salter stated that the project is specific to the Sup Ship building and would have no impact on the properties they have acquired. He then confirmed that the west gate lot is owned by Crooker Construction and that they are working together to make improvements.

Mr. Omo acknowledged the option for contract rezoning within C2 and asked the reason for the request to rezone, other than building height.

Mr. Salter stated that it is the preference of Bath Iron Works to rezone to C3 in order to have all available options, noting that the ultimate goal of the project is to improve the area and increase green space within the City.

Ms. Blanco asked if a parking garage is being considered, which Mr. Salter confirmed it is but has not been determined to be part of the project, noting his preference that parking be located closer to the highway.

Ms. Bailey asked for clarification on the property purchases outside of the scope of the project.

Mr. Salter stated that areas along Washington Street may be required in order to expand parking.

Mr. Hopkinson reopened the floor to public comment.

Mike Hennessey questioned the area being surveyed and asked who hired the surveyor. Mr. Salter stated that the survey is being conducted by a consultant for Bath Iron Works. Mr. Hennessey expressed his opinion that the action is not politically favorable.

Mr. Salter stated that he himself is a licensed surveyor and noted that it is best practice to survey outside of the project boundaries. He noted that the survey is also being conducted to identify utilities and surface drainage.

Mr. Hopkinson sympathized with the public then stated that the Board can only address concerns relating to the change in zoning district. He clarified that the Board reviews all permissible uses, not only those requested of the applicant. He asked the public to focus their comments on the application.

Evan Goettle asked why contract rezoning is not being utilized.

Mr. Salter stated that Bath Iron Works is requesting rezoning for the previously stated reasons as well as to reduce the timeframe to begin work.

Mr. Fish thanked the Board and spoke to own experience in design. He expressed his opinion that there is no reason for Bath Iron Works to be surveying where they are. He accused Bath Iron Works of paying fines in order to accomplish their goals and expressed concern that the representative for SERE has not spoken on the project. Mr. Fish stated that he will continue to object and urged the City to require Bath Iron Works to resolve existing issues.

Mr. Hill stated that SERE is listed as an applicant.

Mr. Hopkinson noted that the applicant has asked Mr. Salter to speak on their behalf.

Mr. Hill suggested that Bath Iron Works and SERE develop a committee with community partners to discuss the project.

Mr. Salter expressed appreciation to the public and agreed to the need for community input.

Ms. Stetson expressed concern that no plans are being presented. She surmised that because homes are being purchased at rates above market value, there must be a plan for those properties.

Ms. Ross asked Mr. Fitzgerald why C3 zoning hasn't been requested.

Mr. Lamontagne asked the Board to consider including deceit by the applicant in their recommendation to City Council.

David King recalled a prior request to convert the area to C2, which was resolved by the presentation of plans. He recommended that providing plans would be beneficial to the applicant, explaining that the purpose of the C2 district is to provide a transitional area for residential properties.

Ms. Arsenault expressed concern that the green wall would be removed. Mr. Salter assured the room that no additional walls will be built.

Mr. Fitzgerald, Manager for SERE and consultant for Bath Iron Works, expressed the desire for a plan and stated that applicants are seeking feedback prior to presenting a plan. He noted that four or five properties are being purchased in order to ensure adequate infrastructure moving forward, adding that all options are being considered. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that rezoning is being requested in order to expand on Washington Street. He recognized the lack of action from the previous traffic study and stated that further studies are necessary to improve the flow of traffic.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted the number of employees as well as their children, acknowledging the need for housing. He described a number of transportation services being utilized throughout the state in order to resolve commuting issues.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that it is his belief all intended properties have been purchased with possibly one exception.

Mr. Hopkinson closed public comment.

Mr. Hopkinson cited the Land Use Code, which requires the Planning Board to make a determination within a 21-day period, unless the applicant requests to table.

Ms. Bailey suggested the Board move forward with a recommendation.

Ms. Blanco asked if the request could be tabled in order to allow the applicant to work with the public. She acknowledged Mr. King's point regarding the C2 as a buffer, and agreed that preliminary plans would have been beneficial to the decision making process.

Mr. Omo expressed his inclination not to recommend then agreed that Ms. Blanco raises a good point.

Mr. Johnson expressed concern with the deadline.

Mr. Hopkinson clarified that the Board has the opportunity to extend the deadline by 21 additional days.

**MR. OMO MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. BLANCO, THAT ITEMS 1 AND 2 TO EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR APPROVAL BY 21 DAYS AND TABLE TO THE AUGUST 6, 2024, MEETING.**

Ms. Bailey asked if the applicant would present a plan at the August meeting.

Mr. Omo stated that his intent is to allow the applicant time to meet with the public.

Mr. Johnson expressed concern that even with a sketch plan the applicant would not be required to follow the plan.

Ms. Blanco spoke to her intent to allow the applicant time to consider alternatives.

**PLANNING BOARD APPROVED WITH THREE IN FAVOR AND TWO OPPOSED.**

Mr. Hopkinson thanked the public for their comments.

**Item 3**

**Public Hearing – Request for Contract Rezoning – 80 Congress Avenue (Map 29, Lots 13 & 14); Bath Housing Development, applicant.**

**Item 4**

**Request for Site Plan and Developmental Subdivision Approval – 80 Congress Avenue (Map 29, Lots 13 & 14); Bath Housing Development, applicant**

Ms. Bailey stated that she is on the Board of Directors for Bath Housing and that she has no financial interested in the project She stated her belief that she has the ability to be impartial in reviewing the current application.

Mr. Hopkinson asked for a show of hands as to whether to allow Ms. Bailey to participate in these applications.

**THE PLANNING BOARD VOTED TO ALLOW MS. BAILEY TO PARTICIPATE WITH THREE IN FAVOR AND 1 OPPOSED.**

Ms. Curtis introduced the requests, noting the memo provided to the Board including draft findings of fact for the project.

**MR. OMO MOVED, SECONDED TO MS. BLANCO, TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.**

**PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Deb Keller, Executive Director for Bath Housing Authority, introduced Project Engineer Steve Bushey of Gorrill Palmer and Architect Ryan Senatore. She then presented plans for the proposed housing project, whose purpose is to replace the current Anchorage housing as the first of a three-phase housing project. Ms. Keller noted that the full project will protect currently undeveloped land with trail networks utilized by KELT, while creating housing at all levels for the city. She reviewed all phases of the project, highlighting the current application.

Ms. Keller explained that Bath Housing Authority is requesting contract zoning in order to condense housing within the highlighted portion of the property, noting that the area as a whole would actually allow significantly more housing than that requested.

Mr. Bushey of Gorrill Palmer thanked the Planning Board and City Staff. He identified the location of the project on the property map, noting that the contract rezoning is consistent with the City's growth plan. He presented a summarization of the density increase and reviewed the area's current development which includes private water and sewer utilities.

Mr. Bushey then presented plans for the structure which will include 48 units, 21 parking spaces on site, with an additional 20 parking spaces on the abutting lot for which an easement for parking will be given. He noted that screening has been increased at the parking nearest the property line as requested by the Board.

Mr. Hopkinson clarified ownership of the property with the applicant, noting that the center parcel is owned by a separate entity.

Mr. Bushey presented plans for the parking lot to include emergency access. He then identified the location of waste management, new sidewalks with access points to the street, and the location of the water line to be relocated along with sewer and power lines. Mr. Bushey noted that the intent of the applicant is to add solar panels to the roof of the building.

Mr. Bushey reviewed the sidewalk turn radius for which the applicant is requesting a waiver, as well as an additional waiver for lighting. He then gave an overview of draining, including pipelines connecting to a single catch basin and additional drainage to the south of the property and north of Whiskeag Creek. Mr. Bushey noted that all existing catch basins will be replaced. In addition, roof runoff will be controlled to slightly reduce current stormwater management.

Mr. Hopkinson recalled concerns regarding drainage at the current site of a church. Mr. Bushey stated that he has identified a drainage pipe on this property which still requires additional investigation, noting that this will not impact the current project.

Mr. Bushey presented data with calculations for traffic increases, which includes the projected increase for the project. He described the increase as minor, noting that recent information shows that the intersection has improved over time. Mr. Bushey spoke to potential improvements to the intersection for pedestrian safety.

Mr. Bushey then identified trees that will not be retained during construction. He estimated that seven trees will be removed and replaced with younger trees. Mr. Bushey acknowledged that specific trees are not always available when planting is being implemented, and assured the Board that any changes to the plan would be submitted for Planning Board approval.

Seth Parker of Bath Housing Authority introduced himself and explained that the objective of the project is to replace existing housing which has become inefficient, as well as to build new housing. He stated that the project will allow the opportunity to relocate residents of the Anchorage in order to build additional housing at the existing site as part of Phase II. He expressed the challenges of creating new housing and expressed the goal of Bath Housing Authority to provide aesthetically pleasing housing while maintaining economic feasibility. Mr. Parker explained that current residents and planning staff were included in the discussion along with members of the public, and stressed the difficulty in financing economic housing.

Mr. Senatore introduced himself, then presented floor plans and renderings of the building façade.

Ms. Curtis asked if there was a space designated for snow removal. Mr. Bushey identified a potential storage area, noting that snow may be removed from site if necessary. Ms. Curtis asked that this detail be added to the plan, to which Mr. Bushey agreed.

Ms. Curtis asked about electric vehicle charging as required by the Maine State Housing Authority. Mr. Bushey confirmed that two stations would be added to accommodate four vehicles, and confirmed that this would be added to the plan as well.

Mr. Johnson expressed concern with the elevation of catch basin 3 in comparison to the floor level of the building. Mr. Bushey agreed to make the necessary adjustments.

Ms. Blanco asked if the existing sidewalk at Congress Avenue would remain, which Mr. Bushey confirmed is outside of the project right of way and would not be impacted. Ms. Blanco asked if the Bike and Pedestrian Committee had been consulted. Ms. Keller confirmed that the Committee was invited but unable to attend focus group meetings. Plans were later shared with the Committee with no comments received.

Ms. Blanco addressed comments from Public Works regarding improvements to the pedestrian area. Ms. Keller stated that the current project cannot financially support these improvements; however Bath Housing Authority will contribute \$5000 to study the area, noting that the additional eleven units would not significantly impact the intersection.

Mr. Hopkinson opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. King expressed his familiarity with the area and his opinion that the buildings presented are not something the City should take pride in. He compared the project to the building across the street and stated that contract rezoning is a tool to allow for minor adjustments and should be mutually beneficial. He stated his opinion expressing concern with Bath Housing Authority's attitude and that future changes to the Land Use Code are being utilized for the project.

Mr. King spoke to his intent to protect the architectural integrity of the city. He noted that a requirement of contract rezoning is to create a building compatible with the surrounding area, as well as with the Comprehensive Plan, which includes provisions to maintain historical design with compatible building materials. Mr. King spoke to Congress Street as an entranceway to the city and expressed his belief of its importance.

Mr. Hopkinson closed public comment.

Ms. Blanco spoke in support of Mr. King's comments and expressed concern regarding the building height.

Ms. Keller noted issues with the current Anchorage building including water infiltration and other significant issues. She stated that the height allows for adequate drainage and ceiling height.

Mr. Omo asked if the request for contract rezoning extends to all phases of the project.

Ms. Curtis stated that the building height and density exceptions are exclusive to the current project.

Ms. Keller reiterated that Bath Housing Authority has the authority to build additional units over the entire property. She noted that if the new Land Use Code is adopted, contract rezoning would not be required for concurrent phases.

Mr. Bushey noted that Bath Housing Authority will be required to pay impact fees to the Bath Water District, therein improving city infrastructure.

Ms. Bailey asked if the new infrastructure will alleviate issues.

Mr. Bushey explained that the new pump station will assist in regulating flow in order to offset the increase, however the impact fee will have the greatest impact on infrastructure.

Ms. Blanco asked if the geotech report has been received.

Mr. Bushey stated that the report has been completed but is not yet available.

Mr. Johnson suggested that the building be raised further to increase the slope to the sidewalks. Mr. Bushey agreed and stated that he is awaiting the results of the geotech survey to make final determinations. Ms. Blanco observed that this would increase the height of the building.

Mr. Hopkinson reviewed the conditions for approval, including \$5000 to be contributed to study congestion at the intersection, additional information on snow removal and EV stations to be included on the final plan, notes addressing drainage, and that catch basin 3 be addressed.

**MR. OMO MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JOHNSON, FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION AND SIT PLAN APPROVAL FOR 80 CONGRESS AVENUE (MAP 29, LOTS 13 & 14), WITH THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS AS PRESENTED, TO INCLUDE WAIVERS FOR 10.3 F AND 10.27 B, AND WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT NOTE 1 ON THE LANDSCAPING PLAN BE REMOVED, THAT THE EV CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE BE INCLUDED ON THE PLAN, THAT THE SNOW REMOVAL BE INCLUDED ON THE SITE LAYOUT ON THE PLAN, AND THAT CATCH BASIN 3 BE REDESIGNED FOR BETTER DRAINAGE TO THE SATISFACTION OF PLANNING STAFF, AND WITH THE CONDITION THAT CONTRACT ZONING BE APPROVED.**

**PLANNING BOARD APPROVED WITH FOUR IN FAVOR AND ONE OPPOSED.**

**MR OMO MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JOHNSON, TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT THE CONTRACT REZONING APPLICATION, INCLUDING THE \$5000 CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY AND REDESIGN OF THE CONGRESS STREET INTERSECTION, WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT SATISFY THE FINDINGS OF FACT INCLUDING 8.20, E PARAGRAPH 2.**

**MOTION PASSED WITH THREE IN FAVOR AND TWO OPPOSED.**

#### **Item 5**

**Request for Historic District Approval – 910 Washington Street (Map 26, Lot 179); Benjamin Martin, applicant.**

Ms. Curtis introduced the application to replace the front door, noting staff comments provided.

Mr. Martin reviewed the project, stating that he and his wife have acquired a full-paned door which will be refinished with the intent to allow more light into their home, while preserving the historic charm of Bath.

Ms. Blanco asked the applicant if a storm door had been considered.

Mr. Martin expressed his preference for the door presented to provide additional security while being used permanently.

Mr. Omo confirmed the replacement door is solid wood.

Ms. Blanco suggested different sticking be used, comparing the detail to existing doors within the neighborhood.

Mr. Omo noted that stickings [vinyl window stickers] could be added to the proposed door.

Mr. Martin noted that he may return to the Board in order to request that the bottom panes be frosted glass.

Mr. Hopkinson opened the floor to public comment, to which there was none.

Ms. Blanco expressed concern for preserving the existing character of the door, to which Mr. Johnson agreed. Ms. Blanco asked if the adjoining property owner had been consulted.

Mr. Martin stated that he had approached the neighbor, who was not interested in the change. He noted that the properties are separately deeded entities.

Mr. Omo expressed concern that the new door does not include the existing adornments, to which Mr. Martin agreed to further embellish.

Ms. Blanco suggested that the bottom panes be frosted.

**MR. OMO MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE DOOR BE PAINTED TO MATCH THE HOUSE AND ORNAMENTATION BE ADDED TO THE DOOR TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY PLANNER.**

**PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Other Business**

None

**MR. OMO, SECONDED BY MR. JOHNSON, MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**MEETING ADJOURNED BY UNANIMOUS ACCLAMATION AT 10:20 PM.**

Minutes prepared by Karly Perry, Recording Secretary