



Planning & Code Enforcement

2 York Street
Westbrook, Maine 04092
Phone: 207-854-0638
Fax: 866-559-0642

PLANNING & CODE ENFORCEMENT

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, February 3, 2026, 7:00 P.M.
Westbrook High School – Room 114
125 Stroudwater Street

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

This meeting will be offered as a hybrid meeting, accommodating both in-person and remote participation.

Where public comment is permitted, members of the public attending remotely will have the opportunity to provide remote oral testimony. If you wish to speak during a Public Hearing or Public Comment, use the “Raise Hand” function through Zoom (or dial *9 on your phone) when instructed by the Planning Board chair.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81700741385>

Dial-in (audio only): 1-646-558-8656

Webinar ID: 817 0074 1385

Roll Call Attendance

Robin Tannenbaum	Absent
Nancy Litrocapas	Present
Jason Frazier	Present
Karen Axelsen	Present
Kevin Price	Present
Lucas Schrage	Present
Oriana Farnham	Present
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Absent
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Present

Staff: Jennie Franceschi; Director of Planning and Code Enforcement, Becca Spitella; Senior Planner, Irlando Lobo; Planning and Code Office Coordinator.

2. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Nancy Litrocapas
2nd by Kevin Price

Roll Call Vote

Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Kevin Price	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

3. Election of 2026 Officers

Chair Nominations: **Larry McWilliams** nominated by **Lucas Schrage**.

Roll Call Vote

Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Kevin Price	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

Larry McWilliams was elected Chair.

Vice Chair Nominations: **John Turcotte** nominated by **Kevin Price**

Roll Call Vote

Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Kevin Price	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

John Turcotte was elected Vice Chair.

NEW BUSINESS

4. **Becca read into the record:** 24-000166 – Site Plan – Watt Samaki Buddhist Temple and Asian American Cultural Center – Cumberland St.: The applicant is proposing an amendment to the phasing plan for a site plan approved on August 6, 2024. Tax Map: 010 Lot: 018 and Tax Map: 011 Lot: 005 Zone: Rural District

Applicant Presentation

Craig Burtis (Acorn Engineering) presented a proposal to clear approximately 9.2 acres of a 30+ acre parcel. The clearing area, shown in brown on the third plan in the submitted packet, is consistent with the area previously presented. The proposed work includes tree clearing, stump removal, and installation of erosion controls. This work is identified as “Phase One” and represents the first major step of the overall project. The purpose of the clearing is to improve site visibility to support ongoing fundraising efforts and future project phases. The submitted materials included three plans, including a revised phasing plan. The applicant is introducing a new Phase One (0–3 months) in addition to the three previously approved phases. The applicant formally requested extending the Phase One timeframe from 0–3 months to 0–6 months to allow greater flexibility, noting the work would ideally occur during frozen ground conditions. A harvest plan and erosion control details were included in the submission. The applicant requested Planning Board approval to proceed with Phase One and indicated readiness to begin work upon approval.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Staff recommend incorporating a condition of approval requiring the applicant to amend the phasing plan prior to signature. Specifically, Phase 1 should be revised from 0–3 months to 0–6 months. Staff has no other concerns about the proposal.

The proposed phasing schedule is as follows:

- Phase 1: 0–6 months
- Phase 2: 0–3 years
- Phase 3: 3–5 years
- Phase 4: 4–5 years

The applicant is requesting flexibility in the phasing schedule to allow the project to be completed in manageable financial increments, given the overall size and scope. The motion and draft conditions of approval are included on pages 2 and 3 of the staff memoranda.

No Public Comment

Board Comment

Jason Fraizer: Raised a question regarding erosion control; asking if the applicant intends on using ECM berm.

Craig Burtis: Answered that erosion control will primarily include installation of an ECM berm. A pre-clearing and post-clearing plan have been submitted. The intent is to install silt fencing as early as possible. Trees will be selectively removed as needed to allow for installation of the silt fence, with primary focus on protecting wetlands, streams, and other natural resources on the site. As clearing progresses, trees will be ground on site and ECM will be used to supplement the silt fencing.

Nancy Litrocapes: Asked for clarification on the project timeline and whether the total estimated duration for completion of all phases is five years, as reflected in the proposed phasing plan.

Craig Burtis: Confirmed the total estimated timeline for completion of the entire project is five years, consistent with the proposed phasing plan.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed concern regarding the proposed clearing activities in advance of secured funding and a defined construction start date. He noted that investors are not yet confirmed and that the proposed phasing plan could allow clearing to occur up to three years before construction begins. He stated concern about clear-cutting approximately nine acres without assurance that the project will proceed, particularly if funding is not obtained. Larry questioned the need for early clearing to facilitate donor engagement, suggesting that modern technology—such as drone flyovers, virtual renderings, and other digital visualization tools—could be used to present the project to potential donors without removing existing trees. He referenced the City’s typical requirement that projects begin within two years of approval and stated that the extended phasing schedule, combined with large-scale clearing, raises concerns about potential environmental impacts if later phases do not move forward due to lack of funding. He encouraged consideration of alternative approaches that would minimize tree removal until financing and construction timelines are more certain.

Becca Spitella: Acknowledged that this is an atypical application step. She explained that, under normal circumstances, a property without site plan approval would not require City permits or approval to conduct clearing activities. The applicant is before the Board because the project has an active site plan approval. As a result, they are subject to additional requirements, including enhanced erosion control and site stabilization

measures, which would not otherwise apply. She noted that while the situation is unusual, the existence of a valid site plan approval ensures that additional protections for on-site natural resources are required.

Larry McWilliams: Reiterated his concern about the potential three-year gap between clear-cutting and the start of construction, even with erosion protections in place. He requested detailed information on the trees to be removed, including number of trees affected, size and quality of trees, type of wood (e.g., hardwood vs. saw-milled pine) and potential uses or value of the timber. Larry suggested that, if large-scale tree removal occurs as part of the phasing plan, the applicant should include a plan for additional tree plantings within the City of Westbrook to mitigate the loss of forested areas. He emphasized that before supporting approval, he would want measures in place to ensure replacement plantings and maintain the site's ecological and visual benefits, noting the current plan leaves a significant risk of extended tree loss without active construction.

Craig Burtis: Acknowledged the Board's concerns regarding tree clearing. He confirmed that the proposed clearing area remains 9.2 acres. He explained that the site's visibility is critical for the specific group using the property, many of whom do not utilize digital visualization tools. For this reason, physically seeing the site is an essential first step. Burtis clarified that the proposed 0–3-year timeframe for Phase 1 was intended to provide flexibility, but the applicant is willing to revert to the previously approved 0–2 year timeline for the next phase. He noted that initiatives are already in place, and discussions with the City Planning Department have begun regarding the subsequent phase, which may require returning to the Board for minor adjustments. Burtis emphasized that the intent is not to wait the full three years to begin development; the applicant plans to move forward as soon as possible. This initial clearing step is necessary for the group to properly visualize the site.

Larry McWilliams: Asked the applicant for an update on fundraising and investment progress. He inquired how much money has already been secured to start the project and sought context on how far along their efforts are to obtain funding for a project of this size, noting that the City has a guarantee in place if issues arise.

Savy K (Watt Samaki Boardmember): Responded to Board Member Larry's question regarding funding. She stated that the organization currently has sufficient funds to cover the initial tree clearing. She explained that some donors, particularly those from other states who have previously supported Kami temples, need to see physical progress on the site to visualize the project's potential, as 2D plans are not sufficient for them. Allowing donors to walk the site helps demonstrate the project's scope and value. Savy provided an example of a Kami temple in California, where donor engagement and visualization led to full project funding, noting that a similar approach is being pursued to secure larger investments for this project, which could reach multimillion-dollar levels.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed continued concern regarding the financial risk of proceeding with tree clearing before sufficient funding is secured. He acknowledged that the organization has experience with other established temples but emphasized that showing cleared land to potential investors without having the full project funded is worrisome. He noted that, while amendments could extend the timeline by one or two years, the project could still face a gap of up to four years before construction begins, raising the possibility that the project may not move forward if additional funds are not secured. He stressed that this funding uncertainty is a major concern for him.

Savy K (Watt Samaki board member): Acknowledged Board Member Larry's concerns and explained that the applicant has not set firm timelines for the project. The initial phasing plan lacked a fully developed funding strategy, so flexibility was intentionally built into the schedule. She confirmed that current funds are sufficient for tree clearing. Efforts are underway to secure financing for the next phase, including approximately \$2 million needed for roadway construction. Savy noted that CEI Bank, which helped finance the land purchase, has indicated a willingness to provide up to \$1 million if donor pledges can cover the remaining amount. The applicant is actively working to solidify funding and anticipates being able to proceed with the roadway within the next one to two years. She emphasized that timelines remain flexible until funding is fully confirmed.

Oriana Farnham: Expressed empathy for the concerns about tree clearing but explained she is hesitant to impose conditions requiring additional tree plantings, either on-site or elsewhere. She noted that non-profit organizations, particularly minority-owned religious institutions, are facing limited funding opportunities, and additional requirements could create undue burden. Oriana emphasized her support for the project, citing the long-term value it will bring to Westbrook once completed. She also raised a fairness point, noting that in the rural district, many as-of-right uses—such as golf courses, cemeteries, or single-family homes—could clear trees without Board approval. She suggested it would be inconsistent to treat this project more restrictively than those uses. Overall, she indicated strong support for the project and its proposed tree clearing.

Kevin Price: Expressed agreement with previous comments supporting the project. He noted that, while clearing nine acres is significant, the work will follow responsible standards and processes, providing more oversight and protection than would have been required otherwise. He viewed this as a benefit. Price acknowledged the importance of allowing the site to be visible and accessible, noting that physically experiencing the site helps stakeholders understand the scale of the project—similar to the rationale for site walks in other applications. He indicated that permitting the clearing could increase the likelihood of the project moving forward and being completed sooner. His question focused on the phasing timeline: if the Board moves ahead with the motion, he requested clarification on how to amend the approval conditions to reflect a Phase 1 timeline of 0–6 months, as he did not see this explicitly stated in the draft conditions.

Jennie Franceschi: Stated that, in consultation with the senior planner, the Board does not need to amend the motion. The plan will not be signed until the phasing schedule is updated to reflect the correct timeline, and this update will be noted on the record. The corrected Phase 1 schedule (0–6 months) will be incorporated before signature.

Jason Fraizer: Expressed support for the clearing, noting that some disruption is necessary to achieve the project’s goals and to help stakeholders visualize the site. He also asked whether, after the site is cleared and prepped, the applicant could use a conservation seed mix that includes wildflowers to promote wildlife habitat, rather than a standard stabilization-only mix.

Craig Burtis: Responded that the site will likely be cleared in the winter and mulched accordingly. He noted that any seed mix, including a potential wildlife or wildflower mix, would need to be applied in the spring. He indicated that this could be considered as part of site preparation.

**Motion by Kevin Price
2nd by Karen Axelsen**

Roll Call Vote

Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Kevin Price	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

WORKSHOP

**Motion by Kevin Price
2nd by Karen Axelsen**

Roll Call Vote

Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Kevin Price	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

5. **Becca read into the record:** 26-000056 – Site Plan – 70 Scott Drive – Prompt Oil Change: The applicant is proposing a 50' x 50' building addition on an existing commercial structure and an expanded parking area. Tax Map: 002 Lot: 035 Zone: Industrial Park District Use: Business Office

Applicant Presentation

Barry Geyer (Jones & Beach Engineers), representing the applicants, introduced Kevin King and Mike Harrison from Prompt 10 Minute Oil Change. He described the property as 1.74 acres located in the Industrial Park Zone, currently containing two buildings used for warehousing and office space by Prompt 10 Minute Oil Change. The sketch plan proposes: a 50 × 50-foot addition to Building B (southeastern building), additional parking on the west (rear) and north sides of the lot. The total increase in impervious surface is just over 4,000 square feet, raising the gross density factor from 42.5% to 48.1%, below the maximum 80%. Stormwater mitigation will be provided via a rain garden located in the northeast corner of the site. Geyer noted that the team attended a staff meeting, has received staff comments, and is working through them, with no significant issues identified.

No Staff Comment

No Public Comment

Board Comment

Larry McWilliams: Asked what existing business currently occupies the building that is proposed for the oil change addition.

Kevin King: Stated that the Kay Brothers own the property, and his company operates the warehousing and distribution use on site. The facility distributes supplies to 26 Prompt Oil Change locations, none of which are currently located in Westbrook. He explained that the distribution operation provides an economic advantage, allowing the company to offer competitive pricing to customers. The proposed expansion would support continued growth, primarily in New Hampshire, with the potential for a future location in Westbrook if a suitable site becomes available.

Larry McWilliams: Asked for confirmation that the facility will continue to function primarily as a warehousing and distribution center for equipment and supplies, and that oil change services will not be performed at this location.

Barry Geyer: Clarified that the use will remain warehousing only and that no oil change services will be conducted at the site. He noted that oil will be stored within the proposed addition as part of the distribution operation.

Jason Fraizer: Asked for details regarding the oil storage containment measures currently in place, specifically what spill prevention and containment systems are used in the event of a leak or spill.

Barry Geyer: Stated that the proposed addition will include three 4,000-gallon vertical oil storage tanks located inside the building. Each tank will have secondary containment surrounding it. He explained that any spill would need to escape the tank, the secondary containment system, and the building before reaching the exterior, which he indicated is highly unlikely.

Kevin King: Added that the facility files a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) report with the EPA and the Maine DEP. He noted that regulations require 110% secondary containment capacity for the storage tanks, and that Warehouse B includes an additional third level of containment for added protection.

6. **Becca read into the record:** #26-000067 – Amendment to the Land Use Ordinance - §335-1.8
Definitions; §335-2.14 – Home day care provider, day care center and childcare center & §335 Article V
Zoning Districts: The proposed amendment revises the definitions and standards for childcare facilities within Westbrook to better align with State standards.

Staff Presentation

Jennie Franceschi: Reported that during the most recent legislative session, two bills were passed amending state law related to childcare. The changes: increase the number of children permitted in unlicensed home daycare, providing additional flexibility for providers. Expand where childcare facilities may be located within municipalities by allowing them in additional zoning districts. Jennie then turned the discussion over to Becca to review how these state law changes affect specific sections of the City's ordinance.

Becca Spitella: Explained that the proposed amendments are driven by recent state legislative changes as well as a broader review of the City's childcare regulations. In addition to incorporating required state updates, staff reviewed local classifications and terminology to better align with state statute and simplify the application process. The proposed revisions would rename "day care center" to "small childcare center" and "home day care provider" to "family childcare provider," along with minor definition changes. The age reference for small childcare centers would also be updated from under 16 to under 13 to match state law. Becca noted that most of the substantive changes relate to general provisions and are intended to provide greater flexibility. Proposed amendments would allow play areas to be located outside of rear yards when site conditions make rear-yard placement impractical, subject to approval by the reviewing authority. Similar flexibility is proposed for parking requirements, allowing applicants to demonstrate reasonable alternatives, such as on-street parking on low-volume streets. Finally, consistent with state requirements, family childcare providers must now be permitted by right in all residential zoning districts. Approval authority would shift from the Planning Board to the Zoning Officer. Commercial zoning districts would remain unchanged.

Kevin Price: Asked for clarification regarding the requirement that "outdoor recreational space is available." He inquired whether the language was intentionally broad and whether it could include space such as a city-owned park, or if a specific type of designated outdoor area was intended.

Becca Spitella: Responded that the language mirrors state statute. She acknowledged that the term "outdoor recreational space" is somewhat ambiguous and may raise questions about what qualifies, such as whether it must be a park with play equipment or if an open field would suffice. She noted that the intent was to maintain some flexibility consistent with state language but agreed the City could consider clarifying the standard further if desired.

Kevin Price: Stated that he was trying to understand how the provision would function in practice, including whether children might need to walk a quarter mile to access such space.

Becca Spitella: Clarified that state statute references outdoor recreational space being available "within a reasonable distance," which is a broader standard. She explained that the proposed ordinance instead specifies a

quarter-mile distance to provide more clarity; however, staff recognized that even a quarter mile may be a considerable distance for younger children.

Kevin Price: Stated that the proposed changes overall make sense. He noted that the amendments appropriately align the ordinance with state requirements and incorporate additional housekeeping updates while the section is being revised. He added that this approach is consistent with how the Board has handled similar updates in the past and expressed his support for the proposal.

Larry McWilliams: Asked whether the increase in the number of children permitted without licensing is being required by the state and sought clarification that the change is driven by state legislation.

Becca Spitella: Confirmed that the change is state-mandated and noted that it increases the allowed number of children by just one compared to the previous limit.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed confusion about why the state would allow an increase in the number of children in a home childcare setting without imposing additional licensing or regulatory requirements. He questioned the rationale behind permitting more children under the same oversight.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that the change is intended to provide flexibility for very small home-based providers. Currently, they can care for up to two children, and the state is allowing one additional child, potentially one more if the children are siblings.

Larry McWilliams: Summarized that, under the new state allowance, a home childcare provider could potentially care for up to four children, not including their own.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that the state views childcare as an essential need and is encouraging small-scale home-based providers. By allowing a few additional children in these settings, the state aims to increase neighborhood-based childcare options while maintaining flexibility for providers.

Larry McWilliams: Asked whether Code Enforcement would continue to oversee compliance with regulations, such as noise or play area standards, and whether the proposed ordinance changes would affect how these rules are enforced.

Jennie Franceschi: Responded that the standard would treat a childcare home as compatible with a typical single-family household. The key consideration is reasonableness—similar to how a family with several children would naturally generate noise—so the expected activity would be considered compatible with a residential neighborhood.

Larry McWilliams: Asked for clarification on the process, noting that if a home childcare provider is not licensed or registered, they still must notify the City to operate. He questioned how Code Enforcement would monitor or enforce compliance for unlicensed or unregistered operations.

Becca Spitella: Asked for clarification, noting that “childcare facility” is used as an umbrella term. She asked whether Larry was referring to all types of childcare providers or a specific category.

Larry McWilliams: Clarified that he was asking about all home-based childcare providers. He expressed concern that, for smaller-scale operations without licensing or registration, the City might not even be aware that a childcare facility is operating, making enforcement of the new regulations challenging.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that even for small, unlicensed home childcare providers, there would still be a change-of-use review. State licensing typically involves communication with local authorities to ensure the use is permitted at that location, so Code Enforcement would maintain some level of oversight and coordination.

Larry McWilliams: Asked for confirmation that operators would still need to register with the state in order to run a childcare facility, even under the new small-scale allowances.

Jennie Franceschi: Clarified that registration with the state is only required if the provider cares for more than three children. Providers staying at or below that threshold would not need to be licensed or registered.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed concern that allowing anyone to care for up to three children in their home without state registration or licensing creates a potential safety risk. He questioned how the City could monitor or regulate these small-scale operations if it has no way of knowing they exist.

Jennie Franceschi: Responded that for such small numbers—typically three or fewer children—the situation is usually informal, like a neighbor caring for children the parent knows. She noted that high-capacity facilities are where licensing and stricter oversight are necessary, but small-scale care is generally considered compatible with a single-family home, which aligns with the state’s rationale.

Larry McWilliams: Asked whether there is any standard for fees that home childcare providers can charge and how taxation or reporting would work. He expressed concern that small-scale, unregistered operations could essentially be running a business without oversight, noting that cash payments could go unreported, which would be illegal.

Becca Spitella: Responded that it is the responsibility of the individual operating childcare to report any income and comply with tax laws; the City does not enforce financial reporting for these small-scale, unlicensed operations.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed that he feels the regulations are too flexible. He admitted he does not have children or experience with daycare, but stated that if he did, he would want assurance that any caregiver—even a neighbor—would be trustworthy and properly monitored, especially when payment is involved.

Karen Axelsen: Shared her personal experience, noting that she used both an informal, unstructured daycare with a family friend and a more structured, licensed facility. She highlighted that licensed facilities offer benefits like using FSA accounts for reimbursement, but ultimately, choosing a daycare comes down to the parents’ comfort level. She added that informal care—like at grandparents’ homes—still involves parental responsibility, and the same principle applies to small home-based childcare.

Kevin Price: Stated that he wants to ensure the Board understands how the new regulations will operate, as it is new to him. He asked whether other recent state legislation, specifically LD 997 and LD 1829, might result in similar updates or tweaks to the City’s ordinances in the future.

Jennie Franceschi: Provided an update on broader state legislation affecting housing and zoning. She explained that municipalities are required to implement several mandates, including limiting parking to one space per unit in growth areas and allowing residential use in all commercial districts. She noted that this latter requirement has caused concern in some areas, such as Portland’s working waterfront, where allowing residential could displace existing businesses.

Jennie Franceschi: Also discussed LD 1829, a major zoning law mandating additional density in downtown areas and certain residential growth districts, including minimum lot sizes of 5,000 square feet. She explained that this density is not compatible with the City’s current layout and that the City, along with neighboring municipalities, is advocating at the state level to seek adjustments. The goal is to allow higher density in designated growth areas

while protecting sensitive areas outside those zones, even if sewer infrastructure is present. She noted that once the legislative session concludes in mid-April, the Board will be briefed on the implications for the City's zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan. Jennie emphasized that the state's recent session was very active and will require the City to make multiple ordinance updates, with additional conversations and potential adjustments continuing in the months ahead.

Karen Axelsen: Asked if the summary of the state legislative updates could be sent to the Board and inquired whether the City needed representation at the upcoming public hearing in Augusta.

Jennie Franceschi: Confirmed that she will attend next week's public hearing in Augusta to provide testimony on behalf of Westbrook. She explained that the effort will continue through work sessions and onto the floors of the Senate and House, as municipalities are currently coordinating to address these legislative mandates.

Lucas Schrage: Asked who sponsored the original bill

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that LD 1829 was originally sponsored by Speaker Fechto. She noted that the bill received little attention in the previous session due to the large number of bills, so municipalities had limited opportunity to provide input. She added that in the current session, a "fix" bill—LD 2173—is being considered to amend LD 1829. The proposed edits aim to remove mandates outside designated growth areas, provide municipalities an additional year to implement the provisions, and clarify that the standards apply specifically to properties served by public sewer and water, rather than allowing alternative or engineered septic systems. Jennie emphasized that these changes are intended to focus growth appropriately while avoiding unintended complications, particularly in rural areas, and that municipalities are coordinating efforts to influence the outcome.

Nancy Litrocaples: Asked for the specific bill numbers to research in order to better understand the legislation. She also requested that the City Planner email the information to the Board for reference.

Jennie Franceschi: Emphasized that the proposed legislative changes could have significant local impacts. She cited Route 302 as an example, where allowing 5,000-square-foot lots along the corridor could create numerous driveways, raising access and safety concerns. Jennie explained that Westbrook's approach to growth has been intentionally focusing on consolidating lots and managing development to protect sensitive areas, such as the Millbrook watershed. She noted that while the City supports growth, applying broad state standards solely based on the presence of sewer infrastructure ignores local context, environmental concerns, and the City's carefully planned growth strategies.

Kevin Price: Offered a way to visualize a 5,000-square-foot lot, noting that it is slightly larger than a professional basketball court (about 4,700 square feet). He explained that, theoretically, four housing units could fit that lot, emphasizing how much density the proposed standards could allow.

Jennie Franceschi: Concluded by inviting Board members to email her with any follow-up questions. She confirmed that she will send the Board the relevant bill numbers along with talking points outlining the City's objectives and positions.

Meeting Adjourned.

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY.

A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-0638 and ilobo@westbrook.me.us