A regular meeting of the Bath Planning Board was called Tuesday, October 6, 2026, for the purpose of conducting regular business.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Jim Hopkinson, Vice Chair
Robert Gersh
Andy Omo
George Sprague

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT
John Rutecki, Assistant City Planner
Karly Perry, Recording Secretary

DRAFT

Planning Board Vice Chair, Jim Hopkinson, called the meeting to order in the third-floor Council Chambers at 6:00 pm on Tuesday, October 6, 2026.

Mr. Hopkinson announced the resignation of Planning Board Chair, Bob Oxton, and thanked Mr. Oxton for his service and historical knowledge both personally and on behalf of the entire Planning Board.

Minutes:
September 1, 2026, meeting

MR. GERSH, SECONDED BY MR. OMO, MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED.

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Old Business
None

New Business
Item 1
Request for Final Subdivision and Site Plan Review – 4 Old Brunswick Road (Map 25, Lot 104-1); Midcoast Youth Center & Skatepark, applicant.

Mr. Rutecki introduced the application, which seeks to build sixteen units of supportive housing. The application was submitted under the old Land Use Code but will now be considered under the newly adopted Land Use Code. The project includes two structures: Building A, which is approximately 8,600 SF and Building B, which is approximately 5,100 SF. The buildings will be for housing with mixed-use on the ground floor of Building A. Mr. Rutecki then referenced the additional conditions of approval included in the Planning Board packet.

Barclay Finck of Figure 19 Architects (aka. Paul Designs Project) introduced himself as the Project Manager. He reviewed the history and purpose of the Midcoast Youth Center (MYC) in assisting local youth and young adults, including subsidized housing for those aged 18-24 who would otherwise be unhoused. MYC acquired the property at 4 Brunswick Road, which includes the skate park and youth services, with a more recently

acquired property at Oak Grove Avenue to include administrative space and dormitory style housing. Figure 19 has been involved with feasibility studies prior to MYC moving forward with the purchase and design of the properties being addressed tonight.

Mr. Finck emphasized that MYC is cognizant of the importance of retaining the laundromat and dog grooming businesses currently located in the adjacent one-story strip mall building recently acquired by MYC, which is why MYC intends to relocate these businesses into the proposed Building A. He then reviewed the site plans for Buildings A and B, noting the change from the dormitory style housing that was previously described in the Subdivision Sketch Plan to individual units. Mr. Finck presented sketches of the exterior of the buildings, a boundary survey with updated property ownership, and soil and ledge surveys. He then presented the site plan, highlighting the revision to existing curb cuts.

Mr. Finck explained that the applicant had previously requested a waiver for the necessary traffic study, however a study was ultimately performed with no finding of impact to the area.

Mr. Finck then detailed the parking area, which proposes 14 parking spaces, including 3 EV capable spaces. He then presented the landscape plan, noting that the landscape architect has not yet responded to feedback from the City Arborist (received October 5, 2026) but confirmed that any necessary revisions will be taken in order to meet the approval of the Planning Department. Mr. Finck then reviewed screening and lighting metrics, also included within the application.

Mr. Rutecki verified with Mr. Finck that the units will have 1 bed per sleeping unit with a maximum occupancy of 1 person per unit (8 per building). Mr. Rutecki then noted that the curb cut will be subject to Public Works approval, including construction details.

Mr. Finck confirmed that he was aware that Public Works would need to further review the project.

Mr. Gersh asked for information regarding bike racks, since plan details for bike racks were included within the application.

Mr. Finck identified the location of the bike racks on the site plan, which will be located between Buildings A and B, with the potential for additional storage indoors.

Mr. Gersh noted that E-bikes are popular within the community and asked if those had been taken into consideration.

Mr. Finck stated that the project had not considered E-bikes, and thanked Mr. Gersh for this input.

Mr. Sprague asked about the preservation of existing trees.

Mr. Finck stated that existing trees are identified on the plan and will be preserved to the extent possible.

Mr. Omo asked if the sidewalks between Buildings A and B could be connected, since that was preferred over the currently disconnected sidewalks shown in the plans.

Mr. Finck confirmed that the sidewalks could be connected and promised to address this issue in the final plans for the project.

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

Mr. Omo asked about a required easement regarding the parking area for the project since the northeast corner of the parking lot appears to cross lot lines.

Mr. Finck confirmed that the proper easements would be prepared and submitted.

Mr. Hopkinson reviewed some of the 10/06/2026 revisions made to the 9/30/2026 City of Bath staffing memo to the Planning Board, of which Mr. Finck may not have been aware. These revisions include a request from the Police Chief that “Knox Boxes” be installed on both buildings, written approval from the Public Works Director, evidence that the Sewer Impact Fee (calculated by the Code Enforcement Office) has been paid in full, that additional comments may be forthcoming from the City Arborist to obtain his final approval, and that the applicant still needs final approval from the Fire Chief prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Hopkinson then noted the Additional Conditions of Approval to be added, which include addressing the easements required where the sidewalks, parking lot, and access drive cross lot lines, submitting a copy of the completed traffic study to the Planning Department, and showing on the final set of plans the connected sidewalks of Buildings A and B as well as the locations of bike racks and the stop sign requested at the intersection of the proposed access drive and Congress Avenue.

Mr. Omo noted that the project’s proposed light fixture type shown on the lighting schedule will also need to be modified from 3,000 K to 2,700 K to meet the revised Land Use standards.

MR. OMO, SECONDED BY MR. GERSH, MOVED TO FIND THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

MR. GERSH, SECONDED BY MR. SPRAGUE, MOVED TO ACCEPT THE FIVE REQUESTED WAIVERS AS PRESENTED BY THE APPLICANT.

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

MR. GERSH, SECONDED BY MR. OMO, MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR 4 BRUNSWICK ROAD (MAP 25, LOT 104-4) SUBJECT TO THE STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND THE ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS FOLLOWS:

3. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVE EXECUTED ALL NECESSARY EASEMENTS FOR SHARED ACCESS TO PARKING AND ACCESS DRIVES WHERE LOT LINES ARE CROSSED, AND THAT ALL EASEMENTS ARE NOTATED ON THE FINAL PLAN.**

4. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR A FINAL PLAN-SET INDICATING THAT THE PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS SURROUNDING BUILDINGS A & B ARE CONNECTED, AND MUST ALSO SUBMIT EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVE EXECUTED AN EASEMENT ALLOWING EACH LOT TO ACCESS SAID WALKWAY CONNECTION.**

5. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER EVIDENCE THAT THE SEWAGE IMPACT FEE, AS CALCULATED BY THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICE, HAS BEEN PAID IN FULL.**

6. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST RECEIVE WRITTEN APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR, FIRE CHIEF, AND CITY ARBORIST. THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE PLANNING OFFICE A FINAL SET OF PLANS INCLUDING ANY ALTERATIONS MADE TO GAIN APPROVAL.**

7. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE PLANNING OFFICE A PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE MEETING THE STANDARDS OF SECTION 16.11, AND MUST RECEIVE WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM THE PLANNING DIRECTOR.**

8. **BEFORE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVE INSTALLED A "KNOX BOX" OR FUNCTIONALLY EQUIVALENT SYSTEM TO ALLOW THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AND POLICE DEPARTMENT EMERGENCY ACCESS TO BUILDINGS A & B.**

9. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT TO THE PLANNING OFFICE A PLAN-SET INDICATING THE LOCATION OF A STOP SIGN AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE PROPOSED ACCESS DRIVE AT CONGRESS AVENUE.**

10. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST IDENTIFY THE LOCATIONS OF THE BIKE RACKS ON THE FINAL PLAN.**

11. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST CHANGE THE LIGHT FIXTURE TYPE ON THE LIGHTING SCHEDULE TO 2700 K.**

12. **BEFORE OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT, THE APPLICANT MUST SUBMIT A COPY OF THE TRAFFIC STUDY TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR.**

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Item 2
Request for Subdivision Sketch Plan Review – 206 North Bath Road (Map 10, Lot 5); Walter Taggart, applicant.

Mr. Hopkinson noted that because this is a Sketch Plan Review, the Planning Board will not be taking action on this item, rather they will ask questions and provide feedback to the applicant on the proposed project.

Mr. Rutecki introduced the application for a subdivision to include ten individual lots and one access drive, with no building construction proposed.

Nicholas Plumer, Professional Land Surveyor licensed in the State of Maine (PLS 2547), introduced himself and then presented the subdivision application, noting that the property is located in the Rural Residential District and all lots will be serviced by private septic and well, with a minimum of 200’ frontage.

Mr. Omo asked if the sight lines for the proposed access drive on North Bath Road would be adequate. Mr. Plumer confirmed that there is approximately 300’ - 450’ sight distance on either side of the access drive on North Bath Road.

Mr. Hopkinson asked if the applicant anticipated requesting waivers.

Mr. Plumer stated that he had questions regarding what exactly is required under the new Land Use Code, specifically regarding lighting.

Mr. Hopkinson noted that the applicant can work with the Planning Office to address any questions, then stated that he took no issue if a lighting waiver is deemed necessary, based on the rural area. He added that lighting is typically a safety requirement for public areas such as parking lots.

Mr. Hopkinson asked how access would be made to Lots 1 and 10, which are adjacent to North Bath Road and the internal access drive.

Mr. Plumer confirmed that those lots will be accessed by the internal road. He then noted his understanding that approval by both the Police Department and the Fire Department will be required. Mr. Plumer added that the access drive will be private and under the purview of a Homeowners Association (HOA).

Mr. Rutecki added that the internal road will likely be classified as a street, which would require paving, however many standards can be waived, if requested by the applicant.

Mr. Plumer noted that the applicant does not intend to cut trees outside of the internal roadway and may request a waiver. He then expressed concern regarding the requirement for granite survey monuments, which are more cumbersome to install than the standard metal surveyor pins.

Mr. Rutecki confirmed that this requirement may also be waived with supporting information.

Mr. Hopkinson agreed that surveyor pins should be satisfactory for the project, so long as they are noted on the site plan.

Mr. Sprague asked the location of the fire pond, which is located on remaining property to the northwest and not included in the subdivision plan.

Mr. Omo asked about exposed bedrock or granite ledge within the property.

Mr. Plumer stated that the septic study found all lots to be suitable, adding that an engineer will provide a stormwater plan for the final application.

Mr. Omo asked the Board if a site walk would be helpful, to which all agreed that it would.

Mr. Rutecki recommended that the applicant includes traffic calming measures, such as a stop sign at the intersection of the access drive with North Bath Road, within his final plan.

Mr. Hopkinson opened the floor to public comment.

Kathryn Kiplinger of North Bath Road asked if there would be any restrictions on the size and type of home on each lot.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that private restrictions may be proposed by the applicant in addition to City building requirements, which fall under the scope of Code Enforcement.

Mr. Rutecki noted the standards for the Rural Residential District, including setbacks and height limits.

Mr. Sprague noted that the applicant states that the HOA rules will include a prohibition on mobile homes.

Sam Lambert of North Bath Road noted natural water courses to the southern end of the property and asked whether those have been accounted for. He then asked if this is a multi-phase project.

Mr. Plumer confirmed there are currently no plans for additional development.

Mr. Lambert described the active population of amphibious creatures and owls that inhabit the area.

Mr. Hopkinson confirmed that both City Staff and the Planning Board will be paying close attention to those issues.

Mr. Plumer added that a wetlands specialist will be consulted for this project to perform a wetlands delineation survey of the entire property.

Rich Truluck of the Sagadahoc Rod, Gun, and Skeet Association expressed concerns regarding the existential threat of new neighbors who may be unaware that their neighbors shoot guns at 10am on Sunday morning.

Mr. Hopkinson agreed that this is a reasonable concern, but outside of the standards of Planning Board approval. He recommended that this information be provided to potential buyers by the applicant in real estate disclosures for the properties.

Mr. Rutecki encouraged the public to review Article 8 of the Land Use Code for approved uses and email him directly to discuss any questions or concerns they may have.

Mr. Hopkinson closed the public comment session.

No additional comments by the Planning Board.

Other:
Election of Officers

MR. GERSH, SECONDED BY MR. SPRAGUE, MOVED TO NOMINATE JIM HOPKINSON TO SERVE AS CHAIR AND ANDY OMO TO SERVE AS VICE CHAIR.

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

MR. HOPKINSON, SECONDED BY MR. GERSH, MOVED TO NOMINATE ROBERT GERSH AND ANDY OMO TO SERVE ON THE HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE.

PLANNING BOARD UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The Planning Board agreed to postpone the nomination for the Bath Development Corporation Board.

MR. HOPKINSON MOVED TO ADJOURN, SECONDED BY MR. GERSH.

MEETING ADJOURNED BY UNANIMOUS ACCLAMATION AT 7:13 PM.

Minutes prepared by Karly Perry, Recording Secretary