

**TOWN OF SEBAGO  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
6:00 PM  
Tuesday, November 8, 2022  
TOWN OFFICE BUILDING**

**I. Call to Order**

Paul White called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Carolyn Calarese Andrew Plummer, Tina Vanasse, Paul White, Code Enforcement Officer Brandon Woolley, Recorder, Desirae Lyle

Absent: Susan Thuotte

Guest Present: Kim Printy, Susanne Wojak, Michael Douglas, Phil & Claudia Lowe, Janet & Nick & Ryan Anderson, Samantha Begin, Tina Libby-Hook, Van Hertel Jr, Ron & Kathy Shorey, Phil & Claudia Lowe, Barry Jordan, Charles Frechette, Kelly Hale, Nancy Thompson, Janice Johnson, Jaclen Andrews, Laurelyn Estes, Ashton Mandigo, Seth & Amanda McAllister, Shelly Willey, Marcy & Bob Laliberte, Deborah Howard, Lynda & Esther Chase, Kameron Willey, June Johnson, Paul Smith, Scott Lindsay (IF&W) Lora Lynn & Ashton.

**II. Public Hearing #1 – Site Plan Review – Kim Printy & Susanne Wojak – Map 10, Lot 24 – 180 Hogfat Hill Road – Proposed Use is for a Wildlife Rescue.**

Paul White explained that this is the portion of the meeting when everyone can speak and ask questions. After the public hearing is closed the only time, the public will be allowed to speak is under “Open to Public Questions”. The applicants are proposing to operate a facility primarily for dogs that are wolf hybrids that have been surrendered or rescued from homes.

Janice Johnson commented that she was attacked by a wolf hybrid and is against them being in Sebago.

Tina Libby-Hook asked about the wording of “Wildlife Rescue”, the applicants are primarily housing wolf hybrids, will they house more animals in the future? Ms. Printy explained that currently there are ten wolf hybrids, but they would like to work with IF&W in the future to rescue more types of animals. Andrew Plummer asked that those present speak up to help with the recording of the meeting.

Scott Lindsey introduced himself as a representative from Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IF&W). He explained that the current permit that Runs with Wolves has is for ten wolf hybrids.

Ms. Johnson asked where the animals are currently and why can’t they stay at that facility. Ms. Printy explained that the facility is in Limington and the owner there was abusive to the animals, so they are rescuing them from the Limington facility.

Kathy Shorey asked how much of the property will the wolves be contained in. The property consists of fifty-four (54) acres with 1,200 feet of perimeter fencing around the individual pens. Ms. Shorey asked if it was an “age in place” facility, is there any chance that they would be reintroduced to the wild. Ms. Printy explained that it is an “age in place” facility, they will never be in the wild again, and if they do not take the animals in, they could be euthanized, all of the animals are required to be neutered/spayed, all ten animals have lived in a home with families. The fifty-four (54) acres will be posted for no trespassing.

Nick Anderson asked if the applicants would ever have more than the current ten animals. Mr. Lindsey commented that the permit expires in January 2023 and they will need to decide if they wish to continue, they have not had any violations to date. Mr. Anderson commented that his concern is for the future and whether the applicants will be able to take in more animals that are potentially more dangerous. Ms. Printy stated that they need permission from IF&W to take in any other animals, and they would be selective to make sure that any new animal would fit in with the current animals. They will not take in an animal that they cannot control. Mr. Lindsey noted that a condition of the permit is that the animals cannot be used for exhibition, they are meant to be in the facility. Mr. Lindsey, as the permit issuer for this license, is comfortable with the facility. There are unannounced visits to make sure that the facility is operating correctly. Mr. Anderson pointed out that he had asked after the last meeting what the applicants plan is if or when an animal escapes. Ms. Printy commented that she had hoped that Mr. Anderson would visit Limington and the Sebago property so she could show him the difference in fencing. There is someone on site 24/7, none of the animals have gotten loose so there is no plan at the moment to handle this. Another of Mr. Anderson's question was if the animals are GPS tracked. They are microchipped, but not GPS tracked, the dogs are trained to respond to their name and just like a normal dog they would come back when they get hungry. Ms. Wojcik stated that they are working to trim the trees around the pens to help prevent branches from falling on the pens.

Claudia Lowe stated that she attended both site walks and was impressed by the difference. The Limington facility was poorly fenced and in disrepair. The dogs are mixed, one of them looked like a Weimaraner. The Sebago facility has great fencing with pathways between each pen, the perimeter fencing goes underground with tension wire on top. These are domestic animals that have been in homes with families. Mr. Anderson stated that the permit will be renewed again and there is a chance that the next hybrid they take in will be more dangerous. Ms. Printy explained that the permit is renewed annually and she asked that those present trust that they would not take in an animal that could jeopardize their permit.

Ms. Libby-Hook asked to clarify her original question. When the application says wildlife rescue what liability the Town have if they are only caring for wolf hybrids now. Ms. Libby-Hook asked if the animals are here in Sebago or in Limington. Ms. Printy confirmed that the animals have been moved to Sebago. Ms. Printy explained why it is listed as a wildlife rescue. They have been working with IF&W, Animal Welfare and the State attorney, as well as three other attorneys for the facility for the last year and a half to rescue the animals from the previous owner and permit holder. There have been threats to hurt the animals and the volunteers. This is why she had asked the CEO to list this as a wildlife rescue so that the previous owners wouldn't know where the animals were going. Mr. Lindsey clarified that the permit is only for the wolf hybrids. Lynda Chase asked what will happen when the previous owners find out where the animals are, is there a threat to the people living on Hogfat Hill Road?

Charles Frechette asked if any permit has been issued for this project. The Board and CEO had no knowledge that the animals had been moved. Ms. Printy apologized and asked to explain why the animals were moved. The property in Limington was for sale and went under contract. The owner made promises to Ms. Printy and Ms. Wojcik that the animals would be able to stay on the property until the permit was granted to move them, but the owner essentially kicked them off the property with no notice. Mr. Frechette asked what the proper procedure is for the Planning Board now. Paul asked Brandon if there are any ramifications. Brandon explained that the applicants are here for approval if they are denied approval, they will either have to remove the animals or appeal the decision. Ms. Printy noted that if there had been a way to wait until after the Planning Board made a decision they would have. Mr. Frechette noted that there is a process that needs to be followed.

Someone from the audience asked if the Limington permit has been canceled. The current permit for the Limington facility will be canceled when the Sebago facility is permitted. Mr. Lindsey has visited both facilities and the Limington facility was in compliance with the requirements for the permit.

Samantha Begin asked who the applicant has retained as a vet for the animals. They have hired Dr Sarah Spindell as a local vet for the animals. They have created a medical space for onsite vet visits. Ms. Begin then asked about a parasite plan for the animals. They are up to date on vaccinations and preventatives.

Kelly Hale asked if the Board or the CEO had any knowledge prior to tonight that the animals had been moved to Sebago. None of them did.

Ron Shorey asked if the land would be posted against hunting. Ms. Printy will be posting the entire property. He also asked if there is a waiting list, where if one of their animals died, they would have a list of other animals waiting to be rescued. Ms. Printy explained that there is no waiting list, there are random calls when an animal needs to be rescued.

Mr. Anderson commented that when speaking to the applicants they had admitted to rejecting ten hybrids last year. Ms. Printy corrected him, they rejected thirty wolf hybrids last year. Ms. Printy reiterated that they will not take an animal that they cannot control. When they get a call about an animal needing to be rescued, they have twenty-four hours to get approval from IF&W, get approval from the other states permitting agency (if it's in another state) and get to the animal

Someone asked when the dogs were moved. Ms. Printy stated that the dogs were moved last Wednesday, when the owner told them to leave the property. Michael Douglas commented that there are many dogs on Hogfat Hill Road that he would not approach. He has been to both facilities and seen the hybrids, he expressed that he would be more worried about the domesticated dogs that owners allow to be off leash. People have been attacked by domestic dogs before, these animals will be contained and will be following state regulations. Ms. Printy explained that she has been working with the animals for six years and they have been trying to relocate the animals for two years. There is an annual permit that is applied for and granted to one person, with someone listed as a successor should something happen to the original permittee.

Ms. Begin asked about emergency vet services. If there are any emergencies, they will be taken to the emergency vet in Scarborough. The animals are transported on a leash either in a crate or directly in a vehicle.

Barry Jordan commented that the applicants bought the property, built the fencing, built the kennels, built the medical facility and brought the animals to Sebago all without a permit or permission. It seems that the applicant is now asking for forgiveness. Ms. Printy explained that they did buy the property and erected fencing, the previous owner had used the medical facility space for horses, they cleaned it, painted it and epoxied the floor.

Desirae Lyle asked to relay a question from an abutter who was unable to attend the meeting. Will the property be occupied by the applicants? If not, what arrangements are being made to made to oversee the property and provide for the health and safety of the animals. Both applicants are caring for their elderly relatives, but there are volunteers living on sight 24/7, during the day there could be two or three volunteers. There are cameras around the property and on the pens.

Kameron Willey asked about the threats to the animals and the volunteers and how will the people of Sebago be protected. Ms. Printy explained that she was one of the people that was threatened. The individual making the threats lives next to the facility in Limington, she doesn't believe that that individual will make the effort to come to Sebago.

Paul White closed the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

### **III. Correspondence**

Desirae Lyle informed the Board that Carolyn Calarese, who was absent from the October 11, 2022 meeting has completed the Planning Board Members Missed Meeting Affidavit and can therefore participate in tonight's meeting.

### **IV. Open to Public Questions**

There were no questions at this time.

### **V. Review of Minutes (October 11, 2022)**

Tina Vanasse made a motion to approve the October 11, 2022 meeting minutes as presented. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

### **VI. Old Business**

#### **a. Site Plan Review – Kim Printy & Susanne Wojak – Map 10, Lot 24 – 180 Hogfat Hill Road – Proposed Use is for a Wildlife Rescue.**

The Board noted that they attended the site walk at 180 Hogfat Hill Road, then traveled to the Limington rescue to view the wolves in their current environment.

Paul White reminded the audience that there would be no public comment during this portion of the meeting.

Andrew Plummer noted that the Board attended the site walk at 180 Hogfat Hill Road. There are seven kennels approximately 5'x12' surrounded by perimeter fencing that has three (3) lines of barbless tension wire on top. The Board then went to the Limington facility, Andrew's impression of the facility was ramshackle. Those present in Limington were able to enter the kennels and interact with the animals. Both facilities were clean. One of the animals was in a smaller enclosure and it was explained that the dog "Trouble's Mother" get her own pen when she eats so that "Trouble" doesn't eat her food. Andrew reminded everyone that we live in Sebago, and are surrounded by wild animals. Carolyn Calarese commented that she was impressed with the security in Sebago. She asked about the dogs digging under the fence and was assured that the fencing extends underground. If a dog were to get out there is a common area with gates and a perimeter fence that they would need to go through as well. Tina Vanasse explained the routine for feeding the dogs. The staff has been trained to enter the common area and lock it behind them, then enter the kennel and lock that gate behind them as well. Andrew voiced his concern that the applicants moved the dogs before approval was granted. He doesn't believe that the Board can ask them to remove the dogs because IF&W will show up and euthanize the animals. Tina agrees that she is upset that the animals were moved without approval.

Desirae Lyle was able to project videos from the Limington rescue visit for the audience to see.

Carolyn asked when the property in Limington went under contract. Ms. Printy explained that the owners listed the property near the beginning of December, and a condition of the sale is that the house be gutted, so there will be construction debris in the driveway. The owner had run out of oil for heating and had shut off power and water, leaving Ms. Printy and Ms. Wojcik with no option but to move the animals to ensure their safety. Ms. Printy did notify Mr. Lindsey that the animals needed to be moved and the license transferred. She apologized again for moving the animals before tonight's meeting. Andrew asked Mr. Lindsey what would happen if the Planning Board were to deny this application. Mr. Lindsey responded that the rescues permit would be rescinded

and all efforts would be made to relocate the animals, but there are few places that are able to take the animals in, and they would need to be permitted through IF&W. He has tried to rehome an animal in the past and no one was able to take them. Relocation would be the first attempt; euthanasia would be an option as well. Mr. Lindsey could not guarantee that homes could be found for all ten animals currently residing with Ms. Printy and Ms. Wojcik.

Paul asked if the Board would like to move on to the (site plan review) checklist. Tina voiced her support in moving forward with the application process. Mr. Printy and Ms. Wojcik acted without permission out of desperation because there were no alternatives. Tina commented that she would have liked the CEO to have been notified. Paul noted his concern and that the Board should consider denying the application on the grounds that the animals were moved without approval from a Town official. Brandon commented that the applicants have given the Board an explanation and a reason for their actions, he is unsure what else they could have done to avoid this situation. (Many members of the public left at this time.) Carolyn commented that the public was leaving before the Board could make a final decision. She is upset that the animals were moved without notifying the Town. She asked if the State needed to be notified when an animal leaves the property for a vet visit. Ms. Printy answered that there are no regulations. Carolyn did note that she was comfortable with the level of security in Sebago versus what was in Limington. Tina asked if the applicants have ever been written up for a violation. There have been none. Mr. Lindsey explained that if a violation was noted then disciplinary action would be taken. Paul reiterated that the public cannot ask questions during this portion of the meeting. Andrew clarified that the Board, by not moving forward, would possibly be asking the applicant to put their animals down. Tina asked if the Board should ask the town attorney for guidance. No other Board member felt that this was necessary.

Andrew Plummer made a motion to move forward with the application process even though the animals have already been moved to the property. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with three in favor and one against.

The Board took a five-minute break from 7:39 p.m. to 7:44 p.m. The Board then reviewed the Land Use Ordinances Section 4 and 7.

Paul White made a motion that this is an allowed use under Land Use Ordinance Section 4 as animal husbandry. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this is a minor project. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

The Board proceeded to review Land Use Ordinance Section 7 D – Administration. The application was submitted on September 30, 2022. Desirae Lyle reported that all fees have been paid to date. The applicant was placed on the October 11, 2022 agenda and then the November 8, 2022 agenda.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that no professional or peer review is needed. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

A Site Walk was performed on Saturday, October 22, 2022. The public hearing was conducted at the start of this meeting.

Ms. Printy and Ms. Wojcik explained that the operation is a nonprofit, they fund the rescue as well as relying on generous donations and applying for grants as needed. Ms. Printy commented that she would approximate \$60,000 for annual operation of the rescue.

Carolyn Calarese made a motion that the financial guarantee is sufficient. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Andrew proposed that as a condition of approval a notification plan should be put into place. He suggested that the applicants pay the Town to send certified letters to the abutters requesting the contact information of all individuals in the household so that in the event something were to happen neighbors and/or interested parties can be notified in a timely manner. Carolyn agreed that this is a good idea and that the Town should be notified as well.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that under conditions that a certified letter be sent to all abutters requesting contact information, to be paid for by the applicant. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Paul White made a motion that a building permit is not applicable since there are existing buildings that the applicants will be using. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Andrew Plummer made a motion to accept Land Use Ordinance Section 7 E – Contents of Site Inventory and Analysis as complete. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Andrew Plummer made a motion to accept Land Use Ordinance Section 7 G – Site Plan Application as complete. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

The Board then reviewed Land Use Ordinance Section 7 H – Criteria and Standards.

1. ***BUFFERS, SCREENING, LANDSCAPING, NATURAL FEATURES*** – *Adequate provision has been made with regard to buffers, screening, landscaping, and the preservation and enhancement of significant natural features.*

The Board agreed that the fencing is sufficient and Ms. Printy and Ms. Wojcik noted that they will not take in an animal that they don't feel that they can control.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that what has been presented is acceptable. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

2. ***BURDEN ON MUNICIPAL SERVICES*** – *Adequate provision has been made to avoid any undue burden on municipal services.*

Andrew Plummer made a motion that there are no burdens on municipal services. Motion was seconded by Carolyn Calarese. Motion carried with all in favor.

3. ***CONGESTION, UNSAFE CONDITIONS*** – *Any traffic increase attributable to the proposed project will not result in unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions on a road in the vicinity of the proposed development.*

Carolyn Calarese made a motion that there is no congestion or unsafe conditions. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

4. ***GROUNDWATER PROTECTION*** – *The proposed site development and use shall not adversely impact either the quality or quantity of groundwater available to abutting properties or public water supply systems. Projects involving common on-site water supply or sewage disposal systems with a capacity of two thousand (2000) gallons per day or greater shall demonstrate*

*that the groundwater at the property line will comply, following development, with the standards for safe drinking water as established by the State of Maine.*

Tina Vanasse made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

5. **HAZARDS/NUISANCES** – *Adequate provision has been made to avoid any hazard to travel on public or private ways, or any glare or other nuisance to the use of adjoining public or private property.*

Carolyn Calarese made a motion that there are no hazards or nuisances. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

6. **IMPACT ON NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES** – *Adequate provision has been made to prevent any undue adverse effect upon adjacent or nearby properties.*

Andrew Plummer made a motion that there is no impact on neighboring properties. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

7. **OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING** – *Adequate provision has been made for off street parking and loading.*

The animals are loaded and unloaded into vehicles inside the fencing.

Carolyn Calarese made a motion that what has been presented is sufficient. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

8. **OPEN SPACE**

- a. *Common open space areas shall be contiguous, where possible.*
- b. *Common open spaces as shown on any approved development plan shall contain a notation that common open space areas shall not be further developed for any other use.*
- c. *When reviewing the location and type of open space designated in an application, the Planning Board shall require:*
  1. *Individual lots, buildings, streets, and parking areas shall be designed and situated:*
    - a. *to minimize alterations of the natural site*
    - b. *to avoid the adverse effects of shadows, noise and traffic on the residents of the site*
    - c. *to relate to surrounding properties and to improve the view from and of buildings*
  2. *Diversity and originality in lot layout and individual building, street, parking and lot layout shall be encouraged.*
  3. *Open space shall include irreplaceable natural features located on the tract (such as, but not limited to, stream beds, significant stands of trees, individual trees of significant size, and rock outcroppings).*
  4. *Open space intended for recreation or public use shall be determined by the size, shape, topographic and location requirements of the site.*

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

9. **OUTDOOR DISPLAY/STORAGE** – *Adequate provision has been made to locate and design proposed outdoor display and/or storage areas so as to avoid any safety hazard to vehicular and pedestrian traffic on and off the site.*

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 10. PROPER OPERATION OF PROPOSED USE** – Adequate provision has been made to assure the proper operation of the proposed business(es) or activity(ies) on the site through the provision of adequate and appropriate utilities, drainage, water supply, sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, access, parking and loading, and other necessary site improvements.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement has been met. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 11. PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, WELFARE** – Adequate provision has been made to prevent any significant adverse effect upon the public health, safety, or general welfare of the neighborhood or community.

Tina Vanasse made a motion that there is no adverse effect on public health, safety and welfare. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 12. SCENIC AREAS/NATURAL BEAUTY** – Adequate provision has been made, including, but not limited to modification of the proposed design of the site, timing of construction, and limiting the extent of filling or excavation, to protect to the maximum extent possible, the scenic or natural beauty of the area including scenic areas designated in the Comprehensive Plan, aesthetics, historic sites, archaeological resources, rare and irreplaceable natural areas, wildlife habitats including deer wintering areas identified in the Comprehensive Plan, existing uses, air quality, water quality, or other natural resources within the town or in neighboring towns.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 13. SHORELAND VEGETATION/VISUAL ACCESS** – Whenever a project is situated, in whole or in part, within two hundred fifty feet (250'), horizontal distance, of the normal high-water line of any great pond or river, or within two hundred fifty feet (250') horizontal distance, of the upland edge of a freshwater wetland, or within seventy five feet (75'), horizontal distance, of the normal high-water line of a stream, adequate provision has been made to conserve shoreland vegetation, visual points of access to waters as viewed from public facilities, and actual points of public access to waters.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 14. SOILS** – That the proposed project will be built on soil types which are suitable to the nature of the project and that adequate provision has been made to avoid erosion, contamination of ground or surface waters, interference with adjacent land, over-burdening of natural or artificial drainage systems, and/or any other adverse effects of inadequate drainage.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 15. SPECIAL FEATURES** – Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas and structures, shall be subject to such setbacks, screen plantings or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to prevent their being incongruous with the existing or contemplated environment and the surrounding properties.

Carolyn Calarese made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.



- 16. TRAFFIC MOVEMENT** – Adequate provision has been made for traffic movement of all types, including pedestrian, into, out of, and within the proposed project. The Board shall consider traffic movement both on-site and off-site in making its determination under this criterion.

Tina Vanasse made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

**17. UTILITIES**

- a. All utilities included in the site plan shall be reviewed as to their adequacy, safety and impact on surrounding properties. Storm drainage, sanitary waste disposal, solid waste collection and disposal, water supply, electricity and telephone services shall be reviewed.
- b. The following criteria shall be followed:
  1. Emphasis shall be placed on the protection of floodplains; reservation of stream corridors; establishment of drainage right-of-ways and the adequacy of the existing system; the need for improvements, both on-site and off-site, to adequately control the rate, volume and velocity of storm drainage; provide for treatment of effluent, and maintain an adequate supply of potable water at sufficient pressure.
  2. Whenever feasible, utility lines shall be installed underground.
  3. Any utility installations above ground shall be located so as to have a harmonious relationship with neighboring properties and the site.

Tina Vanasse made a motion that this requirement does not apply. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

- 18. WASTE DISPOSAL** – The proposed development shall provide for adequate disposal of solid wastes and hazardous wastes.

All solid waste shall be disposed of at a licensed disposal facility having adequate capacity to accept the project's wastes.

- a. All hazardous wastes shall be disposed of at a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility and evidence of a contractual arrangement with the facility shall be submitted.

Ms. Printy noted that farmers request the wolf waste. It was noted that any deceased animals will be cremated and buried on the property.

Andrew Plummer made a motion that this requirement has been met. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Desirae Lyle again confirmed that all fees have been paid to date.

Any threats against the rescue should be seen as a civil matter and while there are valid concerns, the Planning Board should not make a decision based on emotional responses.

Tina Vanasse made a motion that no bond or escrow account is needed for this application. Andrew Plummer seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Tina hopes that the abutters will reach out and view the rescue. Mr. Lindsey confirmed that allowing people on the property to view the rescue would not affect their permit, if they were to charge people to view the rescue that would not be covered by their permit. Tina reiterated that the Board has listened to the concerns raised and hopes that the abutters take the time to visit the animals.

Andrew Plummer made a motion to approve the project as presented. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with three in favor, and one abstention.

**b. CEO Updates**

Brandon Woolley had nothing to report at this time.

**c. Goal Setting Items**

**1. Scheduling Workshop (December 13, 2022)**

Tina Vanasse made a motion to hold a workshop on December 13, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. Carolyn Calarese seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

Andrew commented that he was upset by how the Board and the applicants were treated during the meeting tonight, especially when the Town attorney was paid \$900.00 to write a letter to all of the Boards telling them to be kind to each other.

**2. New State Law – LD 2003**

This was not discussed tonight.

**3. Ordinances – All & Quarry**

The Board discussed the upcoming Public Hearing on November 17, 2022. Paul White noted that since the matter is in court the Planning Board can state their concerns but should take a neutral stance on the amendments to the ordinance since the application may come back before them. It was clarified that the Board will only be reviewing the use table amendments at the public hearing. The Selectmen will need to hold another Public Hearing after the Planning Board holds their hearing. Andrew noted that he has questions for MMA (Maine Municipal Association) regarding the legality of approving an ordinance that would directly affect a project that is in court now. As chair Paul offered to contact MMA if Andrew sends him the questions.

**VII. Adjournment**

Andrew Plummer made a motion to adjourn at 8:25 p.m. Tina Vanasse seconded the motion. Motion carried with all in favor.

**Respectfully Submitted,**



**Desirae Lyle**  
**Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk**  
**Approved at the December 13, 2022 Meeting**