

Minutes
Bar Harbor Planning Board
Regular monthly meeting
Wednesday, March 3, 2021 — 4:00 PM

*The meeting was held via the Zoom online meeting platform,
and was broadcast live on Spectrum channel 7 in Bar Harbor
as well as online via Town Hall Streams (<https://townhallstreams.com>, where it is also archived).*

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Tom St. Germain called the meeting to order at 4:09 PM (the delayed start was due to a technological issue starting the Zoom meeting).

Planning Board members present were Chair St. Germain, Vice-chair Joe Cough, Secretary Erica Brooks, Member Basil Eleftheriou Jr., and Member Millard Dority.

Town staff members present were Planning Director Michele Gagnon, Code Enforcement Officer Angela Chamberlain, Deputy Code Enforcement Officer Mike Gurtler and Assistant Planner Steve Fuller.

Others present included Kelly Doran, John Fitzpatrick and Sarah Nicholson, who were present to represent The Jackson Laboratory (JAX). Derek Caldwell, of Sebago Technics, was also attending to make a presentation

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Brooks moved to adopt the agenda. Mr. Eleftheriou seconded the motion, which then carried 4-0 on a roll-call vote. Vice-chair Joe Cough not unable to vote as he was having issues with his audio in the Zoom meeting.

III. EXCUSED ABSENCES

With all members of the Planning Board present, there were no absences.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair St. Germain opened the public comment period at 4:10 PM. Assistant Planner Fuller read the contact information aloud. Hearing no one, Chair St. Germain closed the public comment period at 4:13 PM.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. February 3, 2021

Call to order
at 4:09 PM
(delayed start due
to Zoom issue)

All five board
members present

Four town staff
members present

Three applicant
representatives
present from JAX,
plus traffic
engineer for peer
review

Motion to adopt
agenda carries 4-0
(J. Cough unable
to vote)

No absences
to excuse

Comment period
opens at 4:10 PM;
no public to speak;
comment period
closes at 4:13 PM

Board members agreed they had not had adequate time to read and review the draft minutes from the February 3, 2021 meeting, as they were sent out to the board only earlier that day (March 3).

Minutes from Feb. 3, 2021 meeting tabled until next regularly scheduled meeting (5-0)

Mr. Dority moved to table the minutes until the next regularly scheduled meeting of the board. Vice-chair Cough seconded. The motion carried unanimously, 5-0, on a roll-call vote.

VI. REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Recommendation of the Planning Board, to be posted on the warrant for the Town Meeting of the Town of Bar Harbor on June 8, 2021, to adopt or reject a Land Use Ordinance Amendment, dated December 16, 2020 and entitled "Signage"

Recommendation of the Planning Board regarding proposed "Signage" LUO amendment

Secretary Brooks introduced the item. Assistant Planner Fuller noted the changes the Planning Board recommended during discussion at its January 6, 2021 meeting were incorporated into the draft order. These included a numbering issue in one of the definitions and a line of text on the map inset that needed to be adjusted. The changes were incorporated into the draft order which had subsequently been reviewed and advanced by the Town Council, he said.

Assistant Planner Fuller recaps process to date

Mr. Dority moved that the board recommend this land use amendment ought to pass. Mr. Eleftheriou seconded the motion, which then carried unanimously (5-0) on a roll-call vote.

Board votes to recommend proposed amendment ought to pass, 5-0

b. Subdivision Plan Compliance Review for SD-2020-05 — JAX Route 3 Housing Project

Compliance Review for SD-2020-05, JAX Route 3 housing

Location: Tax Map 115, Lot 21 off Main Street/Route 3 and encompassing a total of ±35.76 acres, according to town tax records. The subject land is in the Scientific Research for Eleemosynary Purposes district.

Applicant/Owner: The Jackson Laboratory (JAX) Application: The applicant proposes a residential development to be used exclusively by JAX employees. The project will be accessed via Woodlands Lane. It will consist of two, three-story buildings providing a total of 24 units (in a combination of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom configurations). The project will utilize town water and sewer.

Chair St. Germain welcomed representatives from JAX and asked for an update on the requested third-party peer review of pedestrian plans. Kelly Doran noted it had been "a very long road for this project" and thanked the board and Derek Caldwell of Sebago Technics.

Welcome and introduction

Ms. Doran said the lab hoped this project would reduce some stress and pressure on other Bar Harbor rentals while providing housing for JAX employees. After reviewing Mr. Caldwell's peer review, she said, the lab felt it showed that the project's proposed design met the requirements laid out in the Land Use Ordinance and also achieved, to the best of JAX's ability, pedestrian safety in the area.

JAX: peer review showed we are in compliance

Sarah Nicholson from Woodard & Curran, working on behalf of the lab, gave an overview of the peer review and thanked both the board and Mr. Caldwell for carefully reviewing the project. There were three ordinance sections identified as being relevant to the issue of pedestrian amenities, she said: §125-66 I, §125-67 G. (1)(d), and §125-67 G. (3)(s). Mr. Caldwell found compliance in all three of those areas, said Ms. Nicholson, while also providing some additional recommendations.

S. Nicholson speaks, explains what peer review found and details JAX's response

JAX then sent a response to Mr. Caldwell's report, confirming that they would incorporate some of the additional recommendations into their plans with the possible exception of two: the accessible pedestrian signal push buttons and the dynamic flashing LED assembly for the Schooner Head Road stop sign, which may need "more conversation" with town staff, she said. Ms. Nicholson noted that there was a typo in her memo (the JAX response) that referred to a "10 foot" reach standard, which was intended to be 10 inches. The plans provide a safe solution that meet engineering standards and the ordinance, said Ms. Nicholson.

Chair St. Germain asked Mr. Caldwell to weigh in. Mr. Caldwell said he found the plan, as proposed, to meet the ordinance — although he did have some technical recommendations. The location of the crosswalk, he said, met Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) and town standards.

D. Caldwell from Sebago Technics reviews his findings

Mr. Caldwell discussed some of the technical comments, such as that the curb ramps need a little bit more detail to verify that they meet Americans With Disabilities Act standards. He said that information is required as part of the MDOT entrance permit, however, so those will be addressed regardless. While there are recommendations, Mr. Caldwell said, the company found that the three ordinance sections are met.

Chair St. Germain asked staff to weigh in on how the board should integrate recommendations from the engineer into the proposed decision.

How to incorporate Sebago's findings into board's decision

Planning Director Gagnon said that the information was now part of the record and would be part of the submissions. She said it was clear that JAX was agreeing to do the additional things to concur with the memo. She said

the peer review and JAX's response would be just like any other submittal provided by an applicant. Chair St. Germain asked for clarification.

Planning Director Gagnon said the way it is structured, the materials will be part of the binder and are in addition to the previous materials already received during earlier stages of the review process. Both Ms. Nicholson's reply and the Sebago Technics report are part of the record, she said, and JAX must comply with what they had submitted so far and that these elements that go a bit further. Ms. Doran asked whether Ms. Nicholson's memo should be included. Planning Director Gagnon said both items were now included in the master binder as submittals and are part of the record.

At 4:29 PM, Chair St. Germain opened the meeting for public comment specifically regarding pedestrian safety and the report from Sebago Technics. Vice-chair Cough noted the board had been sent one email during the meeting and asked how the board wanted to deal with that and other letters that had come in regarding the subject at hand.

Assistant Planner Fuller put up the contact information for anyone who wanted to call in, while board members discussed who would read aloud written correspondence. Secretary Brooks offered to read the email from East Strawberry Hill Road resident Doris Walton.

In her email, Ms. Walton expressed opposition to the project, writing that increased and potentially dangerous traffic, limited site lines and other issues would "greatly increase the risk of serious accidents and likely injuries." She wrote that there are severe problems exiting East Strawberry Hill Road. She noted that neighbors had written citing concerns about the project and matters including blasting, construction, lights and safety.

Mr. Dority interjected and said the email was out of line with what the limited nature of public comment outlined by Chair St. Germain. He said if comments of such a nature were going to be read then all testimony, including that in support of the project, should be read. He felt comments should be limited to the specifics of the report and pedestrian safety, as there had previously been allowance at earlier meetings for comments referring to other issues. Secretary Brooks stopped reading as the letter was determined to not be directly related to pedestrian safety and the report.

Assistant Planner Fuller asked if anyone from the public in the Zoom webinar wanted to speak regarding pedestrian safety and the traffic study. Nanette Schoeder, of East Strawberry Hill Road, asked if the flashing lights would be the same as the ones across from the main campus. Chair

M. Gagnon offers her perspective on how the peer review and JAX response are part of the record

Public comment period opened at 4:29 PM

Discussion about reading emails

E. Brooks reads email from D. Walton of East Strawberry Hill Road

M. Dority objects to reading of email due to comments beyond limited scope outlined

N. Schoeder speaks, asks about flashing lights for crosswalk

St. Germain said questions needed to be directed to him as chair and that he would then direct them to the applicant, which he did with her question.

Ms. Doran said yes, the plan is to have the same rapid flashing beacons at the new crosswalk as are currently in place by the parking lot.

Hearing no one else who wished to speak, Chair St. Germain closed the public comment period at 4:39 PM and opened the meeting to board member deliberations.

In response to a question from Mr. Eleftheriou regarding the scope of the review, Mr. Caldwell said they did not look at the existing sidewalk along Schooner Head Road.

Chair St. Germain asked about a suggestion in the report from Sebago Technics, Comment #16 which touched on the subject of a pedestrian hybrid beacon which would activate a red light to stop traffic when a button is pushed by a pedestrian. Sebago Technics said it is unlikely there would be enough pedestrian traffic to justify the use of such a device. Representatives from JAX echoed that, saying that even with 100 housing units it was not forecast the pedestrian traffic would rise to the level of needing a pedestrian hybrid beacon. There was further discussion on this subject.

Vice-chair Cough voiced concern about the approach outlined by Planning Director Gagnon previously, that it was sufficient just for the report from Sebago Technics and response from JAX to be filed in the master binder for the application and thereby be considered part of the record. He said if they were not referenced in the board's findings, "they're of no value down the road." He elaborated on his position.

Secretary Brooks asked if the documents could be referred to in a future motion. There was also a question about dates referred to in the draft decision (February 3, 2021 vs. March 3, 2021).

Planning Director Gagnon noted that on page 2 on the staff report there was still was one reference to February 3, 2021 that was in error and should read March 3, 2021. She said Secretary Brooks was correct, that where the draft decision had conditions A, B and C at the end, a fourth one (D) could be added that would refer to the two documents in question (those being the report from Derek Caldwell of Sebago Technics dated February 22, 2021 and the reply memo from Sarah Nicholson of Woodard & Curran dated February 23, 2021).

JAX: New crosswalk will have lights like existing Route 3 crosswalk

Public comment period closed at 4:39 PM

Discussion of pedestrian hybrid beacon and whether one is necessary here

J. Cough feels reports being in the record is not sufficient

Discussion of incorporating the reports into a motion for approval of the project

Ms. Nicholson reminded the board that Mr. Caldwell's memo found the project, as submitted, met the standard of the Land Use Ordinance. In addition to that, she said, JAX was agreeing to the refinements recommended by Mr. Caldwell. She said she wanted to reduce the board's anxiety and said JAX would follow through on everything. She reiterated the lab agreed with all of his recommendations with the exception of the flashing stop sign and the audible pedestrian push buttons/signals.

S. Nicholson reiterates that peer review found the application in compliance; wants to reduce board's concerns

Mr. Eleftheriou said he was comfortable with the approach that had been outlined regarding the two documents. He asked about the two items Ms. Nicholson had mentioned, though, and what the board's thoughts were on those. He said he did not see a need for the audibles if those are not being used or required elsewhere in town. Secretary Brooks said she was fine with the memos in the way they were written, and that the particular items in question from Sebago Technics were recommendations rather than requirements.

B. Eleftheriou asks about flashing stop sign and audible pedestrian signals

Ms. Doran said that, regarding item the two items in question (comments 6 and 13 in Mr. Caldwell's review), JAX would want to speak with the Bar Harbor Public Works Department. She said she wasn't sure that installing a flashing stop sign was in the lab's purview. She said the flashing lights could be a concern for people who live nearby if it's flashing constantly. She also raised the question of whether audible pedestrian signals were required elsewhere in town.

K. Doran explains lab's position on recommendations

Vice-chair Cough said if audible pedestrian signals aren't required elsewhere in town and it would be "unreasonable" to require them in this case. He suggested comments regarding a flashing stop sign be sent to the Bar Harbor Town Council rather than Public Works, noting that a pedestrian had recently been killed in the area. He said it might be an issue the Council would want to weigh in on, and that it could be addressed outside of the review of this particular application. He said he was not personally in favor of flashing lights, in part out of concern for neighbors.

J. Cough suggests Town Council and Public Works tackle matter of flashing stop sign

Mr. Dority urged the board to be cautious about flashing lights. He felt it could be a precedent-setting decision and that it could be irritating to neighbors. The board should be extremely careful to require something that isn't required elsewhere in town, Mr. Dority cautioned. Vice-chair Cough clarified he didn't think the Planning Board should require JAX to pursue either recommendation.

M. Dority expresses concerns about precedent, and lights bothering neighbors

There was discussion on refining language for a motion. Mr. Eleftheriou felt that, as mentioned by Ms. Doran, an evaluation with the Bar Harbor Public Works Department, particularly with regard to the flashing stop sign, was appropriate.

Discussion on refining a motion

Secretary Brooks moved to approve SD-2020-05 Subdivision — JAX Route 3 Housing per the Bar Harbor Land Use Ordinance sections 125-67 and 125-69 N. per the decision dated March 3, 2021, subject to the conditions referenced in the staff report [and in the decision dated March 3, 2021], namely: a.) regarding the Wastewater Department, b.) regarding the Bar Harbor Water Department, c.) regarding the MDEP Site Location of Development permit and adding condition d.) referring to two memos in the March 3 packet, one from Sebago Technics [dated February 22, 2021] and the second a response to that from Woodard & Curran [dated February 23, 2021], and that within that [latter] memo, items 6 and 13 will be evaluated with the Public Works Department. Mr. Dority seconded the motion.

SD-2020-05: Approved, per decision dated 3/3/21 and subject to conditions A, B and C in staff report/draft decision, plus condition D, referring to the two reports relating to pedestrian amenities

Planning Director Gagnon asked a clarifying question about which memo Secretary Brooks was referring to. Ms. Brooks clarified that she was referring to items 6 and 13 in the Woodard & Curran 2/23 response memo.

M. Gagnon asks a clarifying question

Mr. Dority said if that was considered an amended motion, he would amend his second. Vice-chair Cough thanked Mr. Caldwell for his report, saying it had given him peace of mind. Mr. Dority noted he was the one member to vote against requesting the peer review at the last meeting, but said Mr. Caldwell's review was well worth it and said he had learned a lot. The motion carried unanimously, 5-0, on a roll-call vote.

Board members thank D. Caldwell for his review

Motion to approve carries, 5-0

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

There being no business listed under other business, the board moved on to the next agenda item.

None

VIII. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

Vice-chair Cough said he felt the board has not been able to devote adequate time to Land Use Ordinance issues and said he would like to return to having a second meeting each month. He suggested the calendar could be modified as early as the next meeting. Chair St. Germain said he shared the sentiment, and asked if the board should consider a regularly scheduled workshop to focus on such issues.

J. Cough suggests return to two meetings/month in order to address LUO amendments

T. St. Germain: maybe workshops?

Planning Director Gagnon said that having two meetings per month is difficult, as projects begin to overlap and logistics get complicated. "It's very difficult to manage," she said. She asked Vice-chair Cough if he thought development projects were lagging or if it was working on Land Use Amendments that was lagging. She said if it was the latter, scheduled workshops solely for that issue might be more meaningful. Vice-chair Cough said he felt work on Land Use Ordinance amendments was lagging.

M. Gagnon cautions against two meetings, but said workshops could be good way to delve into land use issues

Mr. Dority said spending more time on land use issues is critical, but reflecting on having been on the board when it had two meetings a month he cautioned against going that route. Mr. Dority said the workshop path seemed like the better way, where the board would be more likely to spend its time dealing with exclusively with land use issues.

M. Dority in favor of workshop approach to address LUO items

Mr. Eleftheriou agreed with the idea that there had been a lack of movement on land use issues, through no fault of the Planning Department. He said the board had been spending a lot of time working on vacation rentals lately, adding that while the board had been working on housing for ten years it felt like little progress had been made. A workshop with one member of the Planning Department present could be an option, he said, adding that he did not want to further burden an already busy department.

B. Eleftheriou also in support of workshops, as he feels LUO issues are lagging, too

Secretary Brooks agreed and said a workshop sounded good, perhaps every other month, solely focused on land use items so meetings could be focused on applications. She said she felt the schedule shouldn't be amended at this point in the year but adding workshops would be good.

E. Brooks also in support of workshops

Vice-chair Cough said he was fine with workshops. Answering Planning Director Gagnon's earlier question, he said he felt the board was not progressing enough on land use issues. "It's kind of been a slog," he said.

J. Cough OK with workshops

IX. REVIEW OF PENDING PLANNING BOARD PROJECTS

a. SD-2021-01 — Harbor Lights

b. PUD-2021-01 — Jones Marsh

Updates on two projects in the pipeline

Assistant Planner Fuller reminded the board and those watching that neighborhood meetings for both projects were scheduled for the following day, Friday, March 4, 2021. The self-guided site visits, having started on February 26, remained ongoing through the start of those meetings. He said a public comment from the Hatches (relating to the Harbor Lights project) had been forwarded to the Planning Board and the applicant.

Reminder about self-guided site visits and upcoming neighborhood meetings

Mr. Dority noted that his conflict of interest involving Greg Johnston's company has been resolved and asked if there was a process by which he could return to adjudicate these projects.

M. Dority has question about conflict of interest

Vice-chair Cough said the board would be required to wait until the application in question was once again under consideration. As long as Mr. Dority was up to speed by then (from reading the minutes and/or watching the recordings), he said, it would just be a matter of taking it up at the time and taking the appropriate action. He asked a question about the self-guided visits. Assistant Planner Fuller answered.

J. Cough answers M. Dority's question about conflict of interest and rejoining the application review

Mr. Eleftheriou asked a question about multi-family dwelling units that came up at the February Planning Board meeting in relation to the Harbor Lights application. He asked if it would be worthwhile to get Town Attorney Ed Bearor's opinion prior to the meeting. Planning Director Gagnon said staff met with him last week and were awaiting his response.

Question about getting E. Bearor's opinion on MFI / MF2 question, staff is already on it

X. ADJOURNMENT

At 5:29 PM, Mr. Dority moved to adjourn. Vice-chair Cough seconded the motion, which then carried unanimously (5-0) on a roll-call vote.

Board moves to adjourn at 5:29 PM (5-0)

Minutes approved by the Bar Harbor Planning Board on April 7, 2021:

4/9/21 Erica Brooks

Date Erica Brooks, Secretary, Bar Harbor Planning Board

Notes

Bar Harbor Planning Board

Workshop (immediately following business meeting)

Wednesday, March 3, 2021 — 5:35 PM

I. Accessory Dwelling Units (continuation of discussion from Feb. 3, 2021 meeting)

The workshop opened at 5:35 PM, following a six-minute break between the end of the business meeting and the start of the workshop. The workshop began with Planning Director Gagnon reviewing a document titled "Accessory Dwelling Units Discussion Starter," which she had prepared and shared with the board in advance of the workshop.

Planning Director Gagnon said the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) should remain subordinate to the primary living quarters, and said the board would need to consider: "What is subordinate?"

CEO Chamberlain said she had reviewed the discussion starter document and said her first reaction was it represented too many restrictions that would be off-putting to people and keep them from doing an ADU. She said she agreed that accessory should equate to smaller, but had concerns about capping the size at a certain number.

Vice-chair Cough said he appreciated the work that had gone into the document and said it provided a nice framework for discussion. He suggested going through each of the points in the document and getting a sense of where the board's thoughts were on each one. He said he agreed with CEO Chamberlain's concerns on the quantity of regulations.

There was a discussion about what districts the board should be looking at, at this time. There were five zoning districts mentioned: Downtown Residential, Downtown Village Transitional, Village Residential, Mount Desert Street Corridor and Village Historic. When it was realized that Downtown Village Transitional does not have a minimum area per family requirement, the district was removed from the list.

Planning Director Gagnon suggested doing a table of those districts for the next meeting, showing the specific dimensional standards in each one so it can be easily seen how they differ. There was also a request from the board to see the zones that have water/sewer.

What follows below is a copy of the notes provided to the board in advance of the meeting, with a summary of comments made during the workshop *provided below in italics*.

A. Consider accessory dwelling unit (ADU) language that will:

1. Increase in the number of affordable housing units;
 - *Planning Director Gagnon: "Affordable" does not automatically equate to subsidized. Need housing that is affordable to different income brackets.*
2. Increase the housing stock;
3. Respect the appearance and scale of neighborhoods; and
 - *This is more of an issue in built-up areas on water/sewer than it is in rural areas*
4. Assure that the single-family character of the property is maintained and the accessory dwelling unit remains subordinate to the primary living quarters.

B. Consider allowing several forms of ADUs such as **detached, attached, inside, above the garage, and garage conversion. Consider grouping these types of ADU under **accessory detached dwelling units (ADDU)** and **accessory apartments (AA)**.**

C. Accessory Detached Dwelling Units (ADDU) — *anything not within the primary home*

1. **Definition:** a dwelling unit that is accessory and secondary to the principal dwelling. May be constructed as a detached dwelling, above a detached garage, or within the detached garage (conversion). An accessory detached dwelling unit must be detached from the principal dwelling.

- *The word “garage” could be replaced with something like “subordinate structure on site.” Garage may be too specific/limiting.*
2. Allow a maximum of one ADDU per lot that is occupied by a single-family detached dwelling.
 - *CEO notes there are some districts where you can already do more than one. So should it be just one, or one above what’s already permitted? J. Cough says the latter is his preference.*
 3. Exempt the ADDU from the minimum area per family.
 - *There’s an agreement here that this is the key incentive. If you don’t do this, there’s no point in doing it.*
 - *M. Gagnon: maybe allowing one over lot coverage, with parameters. J. Cough says the parameters would be setbacks.*
 - *E. Brooks: will need to check to make sure some of the parameters aren’t too restrictive (need to apply them to real lots to see on this)*
 - *J. Cough: allow for grandfathering, as well.*
 - *M. Gagnon: Will non-conforming structures be allowed to benefit?*
 4. Do not allow the sale of an ADDU separately from the principal dwelling.
 - *After discussion, there was general agreement to remove this concept.*
 5. On the lot, either allow a detached garage or a detached ADDU (i.e. one or the other but not both).
 - *General agreement to take this concept out for now, too.*
 6. Allow an ADDU to be constructed as a second story within a detached garage if the height of the ADDU over the garage and/or the garage (pre-ADDU) does not exceed the height of the principal dwelling on the lot.
 - *Take this out. Just stick with general height limit in the specific zone.*
 7. The GFA of the ADDU should not exceed 50% of the principal dwelling’s floor area.
 8. The ADDU should not exceed 40% of the building footprint of the principal dwelling.
 9. The ADDU should not exceed 1,200 square feet.
 - *These were all seen as relating to one another. Note from M. Gagnon: use existing definition of accessory dwelling, structure used in Ch. 125 as a lead.*
 10. The ADDU should have a roof pitch, siding, and window proportions that are similar to that of the principal dwelling.
 - *Remove*
 11. The ADDU should not exceed two stories or the height of the principal dwelling, whichever is less.
 - *Remove*

12. The ADDU should not be used as a short-term rental.

- *Leave this in, no opposition to it.*

13. Provide parking consistent with what is required in each district for a dwelling unit (1 space/dwelling unit). Consider not requiring parking for ADDU of less than 400 SF.

- *Delete the last sentence.*

D. Accessory apartment (AA):

- *Discussion here of either integrating this concept into the ADDU definition, or use the same lines of thinking here as there.*

1. **Definition:** a dwelling unit located within the principal dwelling but accessory and secondary to the principal dwelling unit. May be constructed as an attached addition to the principal dwelling or within the same structure as the principal dwelling.
2. Allow a maximum of one AA per lot occupied by a single-family detached dwelling.
3. Exempt the AA from the minimum area per family.
4. The GFA of the AA shall not exceed 35% of the total floor area of the principal dwelling.
5. The AA should not exceed 1,200 square feet.
6. The AA should not be used as a short-term rental.

Provide parking consistent with what is required in each district for a dwelling unit (1 space/dwelling unit). Consider not requiring parking for ADDU of less than 400 SF.

- *There was also some discussion of Design Review Board involvement.*

II. Discussion on rooftop parking(request of Planning Board chairman)

Planning Board Chairman St. Germain introduced this concept and explained why he was bringing it to the board. There was brief discussion on this subject before the workshop adjourned, with agreement that it could be looked at in more detail at a later date.