

OGUNQUIT PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
JULY 26, 2010

A. ROLL CALL –

The roll was called with the following results:

Members Present: Tim Pinkham, Chairperson
 Richard Yurko, Vice Chairperson
 Greg Titman
 Hank Hokans
 Craig Capone

Also present: Paul Lempicki, Code Enforcement Officer

B. MISSION STATEMENT - The Mission Statement was read by Mr. Capone.

C. MINUTES – July 12 2010 Public Hearing and Regular Business Meeting

The Minutes from the July 12, 2010 Meeting were Unanimously Accepted as Submitted.

D. PUBLIC INPUT – None

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS –

1. FINDINGS OF FACT for CCS & M, LLC – 414 Main Street - Map 8 Lot 26 – GBD2. Site Plan Review for a post 1930 structure. Application to add a 9’x12’ service entrance to an existing building.
 Application Approved on July 12, 2010.

Mr. Yurko Moved to Approve the Findings of Fact for CCS & M, LLC – 414 Main Street - Map 8 Lot 26.

YURKO/HOKANS 5/0 UNANIMOUS

2. Request for one year extension under Section 6.6 and Section 11.12 of the Town Zoning Ordinance for:
 - a) OGUNQUIT MOTEL CORP / TIDEWATER RESORT – 724 Main Street (Map 11 Lot 6). Request a Site Plan Review extension Under Section 6.6 for a previously granted Application (approved May 11, 2009).
 If requested extension is granted the new deadlines will be: project commencement before May 11, 2011, and project completion before May 11, 2012.

Mr. Yurko asked if this was the first extension for this application.

Steve Lorusso (President of the Ogunquit Motel Corp.) confirmed that it was.

**Mr. Yurko Moved to Approve the Request for Extension for OGUNQUIT MOTEL CORP / TIDEWATER RESORT – 724 Main Street (Map 11 Lot 6).
YURKO/TITMAN 5/0 UNANIMOUS**

- b) RIVERBROOK PARK AND SALES, INC. – 731 Main Street (Map 12 Lot 10-A) – Request for an additional year extension for Design Review and Site Plan Review under Section 11.12 and Section 6.6 for a previously granted Application (approved April 14, 2008) (one year extension request granted February 23, 2009). If requested extension is granted the new deadline will be project completion before April 14, 2012.

Mr. Lorusso pointed out that he had submitted a letter from the Kennebunk Savings Bank dated July 20, 2010 which confirmed that they are not willing to finance this project at this time.

Mr. Yurko asked if this was a second extension request and if this project has already received one extension.

Mr. Lorusso confirmed this to be the case.

Mr. Yurko noted that as a second extension request the applicant is required to show proof that the extension is needed due to circumstances beyond his control. He noted that the financing institution was willing to finance this project in early 2008 however they have reversed that position and are not willing to finance it at this time. Mr. Yurko agreed that the letter from Kennebunk Savings Bank confirms this.

**Mr. Yurko Moved to Approve the Request for Extension for RIVERBROOK PARK AND SALES, INC. – 731 Main Street (Map 12 Lot 10-A).
YURKO/HOKANS 5/0 UNANIMOUS**

F. NEW BUSINESS –

- 1. **JOHN KENYON – 23 East Wind Lane - Map 13 Lot 1-11 – GBD2. Design Review for a post 1930 structure. Application to renovate a cottage to include a new addition on the rear, relocation of a rear deck, redesign of ceiling structure, new front door and window.**

Mr. Kenyon addressed the Board. Mr. Kenyon summarized that he is seeking to put a 16.6 foot by 16.6 foot addition onto the rear of his cottage, relocate the deck which is currently located in the space where the new addition will be built to a position adjacent to the new addition. He is also seeking to move the front door and replace and extend several windows. He also wants to reconfigure the interior of the cottage to install cathedral ceilings.

Mr. Yurko asked if Mr. Kenyon has received approval from the condominium association.

Mr. Kenyon responded that he has and noted that the Board was provided with a set of plans which were signed by the director of the condominium association as well as one of the other board members.

Mr. Yurko noted that the “bump out” of the new bedroom brings the structure very close to Mr. Kenyon’s limited common area boundary line. He asked if there were any setback requirements of the condominium association and if they have approved this use of space.

Mr. Kenyon confirmed that the new addition will extend out to the boundary of his common area and that the condominium association has reviewed the plan and they have approved it.

Mr. Yurko noted that the plans were prepared by an architect (Brendon McNamara) and that the entire application submission packet was complete and very well presented. The rest of the Board members agreed.

Mr. Titman pointed out that this project will add a basement as well.

Mr. Kenyon confirmed this.

Mr. Yurko asked if this was the Eastwind Development and if most of the cottages there are similar in appearance.

Mr. Kenyon confirmed that it is, and they are.

Mr. Yurko asked if the applicant intends to change the façade materials.

Mr. Kenyon responded that he does not intend to change them.

At this time the Board reviewed the Design Review Submissions Checklist and found it to be complete.

Mr. Yurko Moved to Approve the Application for JOHN KENYON – 23 East Wind Lane - Map 13 Lot 1-11.

YURKO/HOKANS 5/0 UNANIMOUS

- 2. JOHN and CAROL REILLY – 297 Main Street – Map 7 Lot 17. Design Review for a pre-1930 structure. Application to: replace the rear porch with a deck, replace the garage door with a new door, add new windows, and move the barn door to the rear.**

Michael Gaudette addressed the Board to summarize the proposed project. Mr. Gaudette stated that he was told by members of the Ogunquit Historic Preservation Commission (OHPC) that this property was listed on the National Historic Register. He contacted the U.S. Park Service National Historic Register and he received a letter from them informing him that they have no registration of this property. He noted that this is important because if there were Federal funds involved it completely changes the dynamics of what may and may not be done to the property. He also contacted the State of Maine to see if the property was on a State Historic Landmark Registry and he was told that it was not. Having heard that there had been an address change on Main Street he recontacted the Federal and State Registries and was told that the property (with the new address) was not listed.

Mr. Yurko asked if Mr. Gaudette had contacted the Ogunquit Historic Preservation Commission to see if this property was on the Ogunquit List of Historic Properties.

Mr. Gaudette responded that he didn't even know about them until four days ago when Mr. and Mrs. Reilly received a letter from OHPC. He e-mailed OHPC and they are only available on Wednesday thru Friday. He tried to call them. Mr. Gaudette informed the Board that even if the property was listed under the Wells District it should also be listed under the State.

Mr. Yurko informed Mr. Gaudette that the Ogunquit Ordinance defines "Historical Significance" and states that if a property is listed in the National, State, or Ogunquit Register it has "historical

significance. Mr. Yurko pointed out that if the Board can't confirm this property's status on the Ogunquit Register than they can't make a determination.

Mr. Gaudette responded that if the property was on the Ogunquit Register he would assume that the OHPC would have notified him. Mr. Gaudette stated that Mr. DeHart, the Chair of the OHPC, told him that this property was listed on the National Register, however even if this was true, if no Federal monies are involved then the property owners are allowed to renovate.

Mr. Pinkham asked if Mr. Gaudette could provide copies of the correspondence he received from the National Parks Service.

Mr. Gaudette distributed copies of an e-mail dated June 28, 2010 from the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Gaudette informed the Board that his clients' plan is to keep the property as a single family home and do basic renovations. When he first approached Mr. Lempicki about this project they met and reviewed all the changes the applicants want to make.

(The following discussion has been reorganized for purposes of clarity in these minutes.)

Regarding the windows - Mr. Gaudette was in full agreement that he needs to maintain the character of the windows which are 9 over 6 style. It is his intent to replace these windows with 9 over 6 double hung vinyl windows. Mr. Lempicki approved this and Mr. Gaudette ordered the windows.

Regarding the front door – the existing door is 6'2" tall and 33" wide. He would like to install a 6'8" 36" door in its place. There originally was a transom window over the door which was replaced sometime in the past. While they would like to maintain the transom it is impractical in this instance due to a main carrying beam which runs down that side under the eaves. In the alternative they have come up with a door with a fourlight at the top. From a design standpoint it is his opinion that this door would look better and it would allow him to put in a flat panel along the sides of the door. Also if, in the future, the property owners have cause to replace the vinyl siding they will probably replace it with wood around the door, he would also like to widen it out to an 8" trim around the door classic to an 1850's cottage.

Regarding the front of the house (east side facing the street) – it is their intention to basically leave it untouched, with the exception of possibly replacing the windows.

Regarding the driveway side of the house (south side) – It is their intention to replace the 6 over 6 window with a 9 over 6 window. This will be done to match the other windows running down this side of the house.

Regarding the north side of the house – there is one window in the corner which is totally rotten and needs to be removed. It is their intention to move the window from the corner to the center of the wall.

Mr. Yurko asked if the windows are wooden framed windows.

Mr. Gaudette responded that they are single paned wooden framed windows and that they are all in disrepair and in need of work.

Mr. Yurko asked what these windows will be replaced with.

Mr. Gaudette responded that they intend to replace them with insulated vinyl windows.

Mr. Yurko asked why the owners want to replace the wooden windows with vinyl.

Mr. Gaudette responded that as a preservationist he would not normally do this. However the Reilly's want to go with the lower priced windows.

Mr. Gaudette informed the Board that these windows have been ordered. Mr. Lempicki gave him permission to replace the windows with "like" which are 9 over 6. However he would prefer to install an applied grill on the outside to give the impression of a divided light window.

Regarding the deck – Mr. Gaudette informed the Board that he removed the enclosed c. 1950's porch from the north-east corner without a building permit. He did this for safety reasons.

Mr. Yurko asked how Mr. Gaudette has dated these things to the 1950's.

Mr. Gaudette responded that he has been doing this work for 30 years and he has a good idea what lumber looks like and that there was pressure treated wood under the porch area which dates to the 1950's, also the types of factory made nails used. There were also jealousy windows on the porch and these aluminum jealousy windows were not available prior to 1955.

Mr. Yurko pointed out that the tax records date every portion of this building to the 1830's.

Mr. Gaudette responded that he pulled the tax records, and it was not built in the 1830's.

Mr. Yurko responded that it is difficult to tell what was there now that Mr. Gaudette has taken it down.

Mr. Gaudette responded that there are no records of what was there. He did find one photo of the house however the photograph does not show this side of the house. It is his understanding that this house was built as a single structure that has not been added on to. He noted that the tax records indicate that the barn was built in the 1830's which anyone can see is not the case. He estimates it was built in the 1930's. The house does not have any original clapboards in the back, there may have been cedar shingles at one time however there does appear to have been a door leading from the house out onto the porch.

Mr. Yurko asked if the house currently has vinyl siding on it.

Mr. Gaudette responded that it is completely vinyl sided. He looked under the siding and there is a mismatch of difference styles of wooden clapboards under the vinyl. Originally the Reilly's considered restoring the house to where the fancier front of the house would be covered in clapboards and the rear portion, which is not visible from the street, would be done in cedar.

Regarding the porch which he removed – the porch was removed for safety reasons. It was completely rotted and the underpinnings were as well. It was attached to the building with just a few new spikes. When it started to let go he made the decision to remove it for safety considerations. In addition it had a three pitched roof which is not conducive to snow in New England, also it was not built properly. They would like to replace it with an open deck. They will not change the footprint in any way.

Mr. Yurko asked if there was a survey for this property.

Mr. Gaudette responded that a survey was done in 2000 for the abutting subdivision, which has been submitted to the Board.

Mr. Yurko responded that the survey was done for the property next door and it does not show the Reilly's property.

Mr. Gaudette responded that it shows all the property lines.

Mr. Yurko stated that it only shows the property line between the subdivision and the Reilly's property. It does not indicate the locations of the structures on the Reilly property.

Mr. Gaudette referred the Board to his hand drawn sketch which he drew to scale indicating where the house sits on this property.

Mr. Yurko responded that the sketch is not a survey, however it does show that at least two portions of the building are within the setback. Mr. Yurko suggested that while this may not make the building illegal, this is a historic structure which is already in the setback and the Board should have the opportunity to review an actual survey prepared by a licensed surveyor.

Mr. Gaudette stated that he has no intention of expanding out from the footprint of the existing structure. In fact, they intend to reduce the size of the deck on the rear of the barn. He noted that the Reillys will be having a survey done on part of the property for the purpose of putting in a water line.

Mr. Yurko responded that something on this property has already been removed without permission and a Stop Work Order was issued. He understands that the Code Enforcement Officer has allowed work to continue inside of the house, however the violation has not been purged, no fines have been levied or paid, and as long as the Reillys are having a survey done for a waterline the Board would like to see the results of a full survey before they find the application complete.

Mr. Gaudette stated that the Reilly's property was part of the subdivision survey, and that he created his sketch by overlaying it over the existing survey. He did not feel he would be required to obtain a complete survey because he wasn't requesting any variances for setbacks of any type.

Mr. Yurko responded that he spend a great deal of time attempting to locate the Reilly's property on this survey. Finally he pulled the tax records and determined that the Reilly's lot was not on this survey it was abutting it. This survey does not indicate the house and barn or any other structure on the Reilly's property.

Mr. Pinkham stated that the Board may require, and does determine what constitutes a "standard boundary survey of the parcel" and while the survey submitted by Mr. Gaudette is an approved survey it was done for another property paid for and for the use of another applicant, and it does not apply to this current application or the Reilly's property.

Mr. Gaudette responded that he is doing nothing which requires him to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. There are no changes to the house, nor is it being moved.

Mr. Yurko responded that something substantial is being done to this historic house, and given that it has to be reviewed by this Board, the Planning Board members have the right to know what the existing conditions are in all respects. Furthermore the Board has the right to receive this information from a licensed surveyor. This is something the Board may choose to waive or require of an applicant.

Mr. Lempicki added that he would like an explanation of the photograph of the crumbling chimney. He would also like to know if the barn/garage door will fit on the rear of the barn.

Mr. Gaudette responded that there is a barn/garage door on the north side of the house which they would like to remove. The structure is incapable of supporting the weight of a vehicle and can not be used as a garage. The west wall of the foundation of the barn/garage sits on cinderblock down to a frost wall footing. The front portion of the barn sits on granite block and granite posts in the corners. The wood flooring is an 80 lb per square foot and they will support it with new sauna tubes and piling to support the center parts of the floor. It is the Reilly's intent to use this space as a workshop and a pool table room. They want to replace the barn/garage door with a standard house door and add another 9 over 6 window to the right of the new door. He noted that he has been attempting to get copies of the minutes from the meeting and has been unable to do so.

Regarding the crumbling chimney – this chimney is in the barn. It may have had a woodstove attached at one time but it is not attached to anything anymore. It is his intent to remove this chimney altogether.

Mr. Lempicki pointed out that this is not included in the application. He recommended to the Board that they ask the applicant to supply a rewrite of the application description itemizing every aspect of the project.

Mr. Yurko agreed, and added that this is a house that is 180 years old, and the plans which Mr. Gaudette has submitted are less complete than the application which the Board just reviewed for a cottage which has no historical significance. The Board needs to clearly see everything that is being done, they need to see the dimensions on all of the plans, what material is where, and he is troubled that a house with so much historical significance things are being pulled from different pieces of paper and different sources and there is a lot of ambiguity with this application. Mr. Yurko stated that when the Board approves an application it needs to be very clear exactly what they have approved. He noted that one of the drawings submitted by Mr. Gaudette has a scale of 1" to 1' which is impossible.

Mr. Gaudette responded that he can take the Board members through each and every aspect of the application. He also responded that the scale on the drawing was a mistake or a typo on his part. He also noted that the hand sketch the Board received was replaced with a CAD Drawing which was not submitted for the Board members' packets.

Mr. Yurko stated that he is not prepared to find this application complete. He would like to see a complete survey.

Mr. Gaudette stated that no where in the application packet does it say that a survey has to be done by a survey company. Usually he does include a survey package and normally he would have an architect involved however the Reillys did not want to do this just to replace a few windows and a door.

Mr. Titman responded that it seems as if there is a lot more going on here than just "replacement of a few windows and a door".

Mr. Gaudette stated that there is only a single window in the barn and he wants to go to double fire egress windows.

Mr. Hokans asked if the applicant has received the OHPC's letter.

Mr. Gaudette responded that the Reilly's received a copy and he received a copy from the Recording Secretary. He would like to meet with the OHPC but he has been unable to find a list of meeting dates for OHPC. He has also been unable to obtain minutes from their meeting.

Mr. Hokans asked for Mr. Gaudette's response to the OHPC's recommendation that the original barn door be reinstalled.

Mr. Gaudette responded that no door has been removed from the barn.

Mr. Pinkham asked the OHPC members to address the Board.

Jerry DeHart, OHPC Chair distributed copies of the Survey done for the National Register of Historic Places to the Board. He pointed out that this house was listed under "Wells Cape" which means it would not be found under one address because it was listed as part of a series of capes.

The OHPC feels that this application is incomplete and does not provide a clear idea of what the applicants are trying to do. He questioned the need for all the egress windows in the barn and he would like to see a floor plan which shows why all the smaller windows need to be replaced with egress windows. Mr. DeHart noted that the OHPC spent a great deal of time trying to determine which windows are being changed and what they are being replaced with. The OHPC adamantly does not want vinyl windows in this historic home.

Mr. DeHart noted that the people who owned this home were the ones who put it on the National Historic Register, and, they went to a great deal of trouble to do so.

Mr. DeHart noted that there were three fireplaces with one bake oven in the house and he asked what has happened to them.

Regarding the vinyl siding – the OHPC requests that the vinyl siding not be on the house. Based on photographs of the house it appears that the vinyl siding was put on c. 1992. Photographs also show the existing front door with the transom and it is not a "door with windows".

Regarding the barn/garage door – if the applicant is going to change the barn/garage door OHPC would like to see it replaced with something that reflects what would have been on the barn when it was used as a barn. Mr. DeHart noted that the Commission is not opposed to the use of new materials in applications which appear older. They are open to suggestions to garage doors which look like barn doors and they are willing to work with the applicant.

Mr. Capote asked if the OHPC would be agreeable to something which looks like a barn door but is actually fixed in place.

Mr. DeHart responded that they would consider it. The problem with the door in the front is that it changes the entire aesthetic of the structure and gives it the appearance of a multi unit property.

Mr. DeHart reminded everyone that this part of Town contains the "historic corridor". He noted that this issue is not new and that this Board has dealt with properties in this neighborhood many times. The residents of Ogunquit have continually expressed a very strong concern over the appearance of this area as an entrance to Town when approaching from the hill.

Regarding the windows, Mr. DeHart expressed the OHPC's belief that the only permit which should be granted should be a true one-for-one replacement which would be a wood, true divided window. Mr. DeHart reviewed the building permit and confirmed that no exterior work was ever approved on the permit, including the windows discussed at this meeting.

Mr. DeHart summarized that this is a historic corridor and the residents of Town have made it very clear how they want this area of town to look.

Mr. Hokans asked if the OHPC has received any information from the applicant about the existing chimneys.

Mr. DeHart responded that they have not.

Mr. Gaudette responded that there have been no changes to the original chimney inside the house.

Mr. DeHart asked for confirmation that the three fireplaces, one brick oven are extant, and that two rooms still have the original wainscoting.

Mr. Gaudette responded that wainscoting has been removed. It was in bad shape. He did save what he could but previous owners did some “self home improvement” which destroyed some of it.

Mr. Titman asked if this was a “restoration” project and if the Board should concern itself with the building’s interior.

Mr. DeHart responded that he was only asking about the interior. The OHPC would like to work with the applicant. He noted that if the egress windows in the barn/garage are required because bedrooms are being put in there the OHPC will assist the applicant with this too.

Mr. Lempicki responded that no bedrooms are being put in the barn/garage. There are only two bedrooms and both are located in the main house. There are no egress windows required in the barn/garage. He reminded Mr. Gaudette that egress windows are only required in bedrooms and the Board has the authority to approve or refuse the use of larger windows in non-bedroom rooms. Mr. Lempicki also informed Mr. Gaudette and the Board that he would be willing to work with the applicants on the fines as long as they can come to an agreement with the Board and the OHPC.

Mr. Yurko added that work done on the interior of buildings with historic significance may let the Board look differently on things that are being done to the exterior.

Mr. Yurko Moved to Find the Application for JOHN and CAROL REILLY – 297 Main Street – Map 7 Lot 17 Incomplete. He suggested that the Board needs to be provided a tighter, clearer, better organized application packet which should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. A survey of the entire lot prepared by a licensed surveyor;
2. A detailed itemized list of the proposed changes to the exterior of the building, including dimensional details of existing and proposed conditions;
3. A series of clearly labeled photographs, keyed to the itemized list of changes, illustrating existing conditions and proposed changes;
4. A response to each of the Historic Preservation Commission’s concerns as noted in their July 9th memo;
5. Written confirmation that this property is or is not on any historic register (Federal, State, Ogunquit/Wells). In particular, comment on the submission of the Historic Preservation Commission that shows this property as the home of Captain Maxwell and registered as such with the Wells/Ogunquit Historic Registry.

YURKO/HOKANS

Mr. Yurko noted that this will also give the applicant time to work with the Code Enforcement Office and the Ogunquit Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Gaudette agreed and he added that on the Building Permit he has permission to do the doors and windows, and it is on the Building Permit.

Mr. Yurko responded that Mr. Gaudette no longer has permission to do the doors and windows. There is an application in front of the Board and the Board will determine what is permitted and what is not. Mr. Yurko reminded Mr. Gaudette that his building permit stopped with the Stop Work Order. He informed Mr. Gaudette that he can no longer assume that the doors and windows he has discussed with Mr. Lempicki are still approved. This falls under the Design Review jurisdiction of the Planning Board.

Mr. Lempicki stated that the agreement was that if Mr. Gaudette submitted his Design Review he would be allowed to work inside – not outside. This would fall under the changed Building Permit and Mr. Gaudette had agreed to this.

Mr. Lempicki stated that the original Building Permit has changed due to the Stop Work Order.

Mr. Pinkham agreed.

Mr. Gaudette asked to have this on the record.

Mr. Hokans asked if the Board can refuse the use of vinyl siding.

Mr. Yurko responded that the Board has jurisdiction to review materials to be used under Design Review.

Mr. Pinkham reminded everyone that the OHPC has asked, as these buildings come before the Board, that this would be an opportune time to put some of them back into their historic condition.

Mr. Lempicki stated that the Ordinance states that residents in the GBD or DBD who have wood or clapboard siding and who want to install vinyl siding need to come before the Board for Design Review for approval to change the type of siding.

Mr. Yurko asked if the same applies to vinyl windows.

Mr. Lempicki agreed.

Mr. Hokans asked about the windows at the Reilly's property.

Mr. Gaudette responded that the existing windows are all wood but the proposed new windows are vinyl.

Mr. Titman asked for proof that the home is on the Historic Register, because its status will determine how rigid the Board needs to be.

Mr. Gaudette stated that he has never received a copy of anything.

Mr. DeHart stated that he will pull the paperwork and provide it to the Board and the Applicant. However this is a pre 1930's building. From a historic point of view – this is a 1730's building, a Captain Maxwell property. The OHPC feels very strongly about this building staying within the same

materials as it was constructed in. This applicant is doing an entire renovation, this isn't just a simple change of door or a few windows. It isn't only the OHPC that has expressed concern over this area of Town. This is the corridor into Town and residents have made it clear that the historic character needs to be maintained.

Mr. Gaudette stated that he has worked and lived in several historic districts and when a commission is created they put together a book of guidelines which make it clear to applicants what may and may not be done, and the procedures for making changes. On the National Register, if there are no Federal monies involved for restoration there is no stipulation thru the National Park Service that can force a home owner to do anything. They can do anything they want to their property as long as there are no Federal funds involved.

Mr. Gaudette agreed to work with the OHPC, however the issue is that the Reillys wanted to do it this way in order to save money. He agreed that working with an architect will produce a more concise drawing and he agreed to try to do this, and will come back before the Board as soon as possible.

Mr. Yurko restated his motion:

Mr. Yurko Moved to Find the Application for JOHN and CAROL REILLY – 297 Main Street – Map 7 Lot 17 Incomplete. He suggested that the Board needs to be provided a tighter, clearer, better organized application packet which should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- 1. A survey of the entire lot prepared by a licensed surveyor;**
- 2. A detailed itemized list of the proposed changes to the exterior of the building, including dimensional details of existing and proposed conditions;**
- 3. A series of clearly labeled photographs, keyed to the itemized list of changes, illustrating existing conditions and proposed changes;**
- 4. A response to each of the Historic Preservation Commission's concerns as noted in their July 9th memo;**
- 5. Written confirmation that this property is or is not on any historic register (Federal, State, Ogunquit/Wells). In particular, comment on the submission of the Historic Preservation Commission that shows this property as the home of Captain Maxwell and registered as such with the Wells/Ogunquit Historic Registry.**

YURKO/HOKANS 5/0 UNANIMOUS

G. CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER BUSINESS – None

H. OTHER BUSINESS – None

I. ADJOURNMENT -

Mr. Hokans Moved to Adjourn at 7:30 p.m.

HOKANS/YURKO 5/0 UNANIMOUS

Respectfully Submitted

Maryann Stacy
Recording Secretary