

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
January 15, 2015

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

PRESENT: Chair Lowrie Sargent; Members Richard Bernhard, Richard Householder, Jan MacKinnon and John Scholz; and CEO Steve Wilson

19
20

The Chair called the Meeting of the Board to order at 5:00 pm.

21
22
23
24

1. PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: No one came forward

25
26
27
28
29

2. MINUTES:

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

December 11, 2014:

Page 1 Line 38: “Mr. Bernhard has developed a draft definition of “aesthetically pleasing”, but...”

MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that the Minutes of December 11, 2014, as amended, be approved.

VOTE: 5-0-0

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

3. CAMDEN CONSERVATION COMMISSION:

Doug Johnson, Chair of the Commission, was present along with other Commission members, to discuss the December 3, 2014, letter from the Commission to the Planning Board regarding a proposal for additional cutting of the Town forest on Ragged Mountain.

The Chair discussed the Planning Board’s role with regard to regulating timber cutting: There is no longer any local authority to review or approve permits for timber harvesting within the Town. Jurisdiction was given over to the Department of Conservation which provides notification to the Town when there has been an intent to harvest filed with them.

Mr. Johnson noted that the Commission is responsible for overseeing certain Town properties including the Ragged Mountain Recreation Area (RMRA). At the request of the Select Board, the Commission prepared an inventory and report of the Town’s natural resources that was formally accepted in 2011. They became involved in the cutting at the Snow Bowl during the review of the first round of trail improvements when they identified 64 significant trees within the project area for the new multi-purpose trail and recommended ways to preserve the trees during construction – all 64 survived. Now they understand that many of the finest of these same old trees are marked for removal during the next phase of cutting which they understand is a stand-alone timbering project not associated with any trail improvements.

Roger Rittmaster, also representing the Commission, explained the arguments against the proposal presented in their letter: There was no financial gain from the first round of cutting so that argument should not be used to support additional cutting; tree removal during the initial cutting resulted in major problems with erosion; the same thing will happen again if large trees are cut on the mountain side; and, many of the large old trees that are marked for removal add greatly to the aesthetics of the area and cannot be easily replaced. The Chair read a letter dated January 14, 2015, from Town Tree Warden Bart Wood who is also opposed to more cutting on the Snow Bowl property.

48 Landon Fake, RMRA facilities manager, was asked to explain the proposal: Mr. Fake stated
49 that they have a permit to harvest 15 acres and that all cutting was to have been done according to a
50 Forest Management Plan prepared by a professional forester before any cutting was done. The Plan
51 identifies recreation as the main goal of the Plan and offsetting costs as a secondary goal. The loggers
52 hired to do the cutting for the current round of trail improvements did not finish the job they were
53 contracted to perform; they were asked to leave after all the erosion problems that resulted from their
54 work. Another contractor has cut about two additional acres since. Rumors to the contrary, they are
55 still within the 15 acres permitted for harvesting. The cost of cutting the last two acres could run from
56 \$50K to \$100K, and the RMRA wanted to find a way to offset these costs and the reason additional
57 selective cutting is proposed. Mr. Fake defended the Plan as the best way to actively manage the
58 forest. The forest along the Kuller Trail (22 Tacks) where cutting is proposed is of uneven age and
59 many of the trees tagged for cutting are diseased or over-crowded and should be removed to improve
60 the overall health of the resource. The trail was not built as originally designed and is too steep for
61 most purposes. In addition, some very large trees in the area pose major safety concerns to trail users.
62 He added that some of these improvements to this trail section were approved by the Planning Board
63 as part of the current project.
64

65 Regarding the cash value of harvesting these trees, Mr. Fake realizes that it will be difficult for
66 RMRA to realize real income once the loggers have taken their cut, but there is value in creating work
67 for local residents; in creating products to be used for bio-fuel; and in being pro-active in managing
68 the Town's forest resource for the future. He believes that the Planning Board ought to hear from the
69 forester himself about how specific trees were slated for removal, and members of the Board
70 expressed interest in walking the site with the forester if plans for cutting do move forward in the
71 future.
72

73 *Questions from the Board:*

74 Mr. Householder: He asked if any of the trees harvested were outside of the approved site plan. Mr.
75 Fake replied that approximately one acre had been cut near the maintenance building – nothing on the
76 slope had been cut outside the approved area. Mr. Householder asked if the Nordic trail were to be
77 improved as proposed how much additional acreage would be cut. Mr. Fake replied that he estimates
78 there would not be more than an acre in total that would need to be cut.
79

80 Ms. MacKinnon: She asked if the trees tagged for cutting are mostly hardwood or soft. Mr. Fake
81 replied they were mostly oak along the Kuller Trail, but in other areas slated for cutting they are
82 mixed. The problem with the Kuller trail is that many of the large trees cannot be worked around if
83 the goal to create a safer trail is to be realized. In other areas stands of trees can be left and the layout
84 of the trail altered.
85

86 Mr. Bernhard: He would be interested in learning more about the process of selecting trees since he
87 believes many of the trees in the area that he saw marked for removal are the finest feature of the trail.
88 He asked what percentage of these trees would be removed, and Mr. Fake replied the forester's
89 estimate is between 15% and 20% of the basal area of this stand will be removed.
90

91 Mr. Scholz: He asked that when the cutting is slated to go forward, that there be an opportunity for
92 interested parties to walk the area to see firsthand what is proposed. Mr. Fake agreed it would be
93 useful, especially if the forester was present to explain and answer questions.
94

95 Doug Johnson: He returned to say that regardless of whether there is a Forestry Plan or that the
96 Director of Parks and Recreation thinks that this is a good way to manage the forest, this is a

97 community forest and it is owned by the people of Camden. The Conservation Commission has a
98 different vision for how this forest should be managed, and it is important that the community know
99 what is planned and be involved in the decision-making process. The Conservation Commission
100 wrote their letter to generate discussion, and they hope that this will be the beginning of an
101 information-sharing process and a decision-making process that involves more than just a couple of
102 individuals.

103

104 *Comments from the Public:*

105 Rob Iserbyt: He is a Nordic skier and wonders how the original work on the 22 Tacks Trail was ever
106 authorized or allowed to go forward. How was so much money spent to end up with this unsafe
107 situation? The trail is very dangerous and he welcomes improvement. However, he wonders if the
108 same problems with erosion will result when even more grading is required to correct the situation.
109

110 Dana Strout: He lives adjacent to the 22 Tacks Trail and opposed the construction of a trail in this
111 area because the area was too steep and too many trees had to be cut.
112

113 Dorie Klein: She spoke to the confusion that exists regarding the blazed trees that were originally
114 marked for removal before the last work was done and those marked for removal now. Some of those
115 trees were to have been removed but weren't because the layout of the trail changed as it was
116 constructed. She does not know how someone will be able to tell the difference between those marked
117 earlier and those marked recently, and she is concerned about the actual number of trees that will end
118 up being cut. She also noted that the machinery used during that phase of the trail construction was so
119 destructive that over two years later the ground is just now settling back from being disturbed. She
120 doesn't want to see that kind of disruption happen to the same area again.
121

122 Saskia Huising: An abutter who reiterated the need to involve other parties in the discussions
123 regarding what is a community recreation area not a commercial forest. She also wants the parties to
124 figure out how to harvest without all the damage like that resulting from recent work.
125

126 Landon Fake: Mr. Fake wanted the Board to know that the Forestry Plan had been reviewed and
127 approved by both the Parks and Rec Committee and the Select Board before anything was cut. The
128 Chair asked those involved with this proposal to consider involving members of the Select Board, the
129 Planning Board, the Conservation Commission, and interested neighbors in any future discussion
130 regarding moving any timber harvesting project forward.
131

132 Copies of letters from the Conservation Commission and Mr. Wood are attached here as Attachments
133 3 and 4 respectively.
134

135

135 **4. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Ragged Mountain Redevelopment - Phase 2**

136 Town of Camden: Map 227 Lots 6, 8, 64, 65 and 67 and Map 228 Lots 3, 5, 6 and 7: Rural
137 Recreation District (RR): Ragged Mountain Recreation Area 20 Barnestown Road

138 Mr. Scholz, who has recused himself from review of this Application, stepped down.

139 *Applicant's Presentation:*

140 The Town was represented by Will Gartley of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and Surveying
141 and Landon Fake, Ragged Mountain Facilities General Manager. Mr. Gartley described this project to
142 build a new lodge and to improve the existing parking lot:

143 ➤ The most important aspect is the work that will be done to improve drainage and stormwater
144 flow over the lot so that as much water is captured before it enters Hosmer Brook as possible.

145 They will move the edge of the parking lot – which is graveled now to the bank of the stream –

146 30' - 40' away from the bank to create room for a buffer and more room to load snow. There
147 will be two under-drain systems connected to a series of catch basins running along that side of
148 the parking lot each leading to filter-lined plunge pools with rip-rap out-falls. The last 18' of
149 parking at the brook end of the lot will be paved and edged with a mountable curb to further
150 direct storm water away from the brook. The total impervious area will not be increased in
151 spite of the expanded parking capacity; they estimate 30 – 40 additional spaces will be created.
152

153 Discussion:

154 There was a lengthy discussion about the durability of asphalt curbing given the fact that snow
155 plows will be stockpiling snow on the far side of the curbing all winter long. Members were
156 concerned that asphalt curbing will take a beating and have to be replaced regularly. Mr. Gartley
157 replied that they will either have to bucket the snow over the curb or lose some parking spaces in that
158 area.
159

- 160 ➤ The hope is to pave all the parking areas with reclaimed asphalt and to find some way to
161 encourage people to park according to the layout without lining the spaces. The area in front
162 of the lodge and the handicapped spaces *will* be paved.
163
- 164 ➤ There is also a roof drain and an under-drain system in front of the new lodge intended to keep
165 any additional storm water from heading over the parking lot
166
- 167 ➤ There will be four new lights on 18' poles along the top of the lot in front of the lodges that will
168 be on photo cells which turn on at dusk. These lights will be on a separate circuit so they can
169 be turned off when the lot is closed. The original lighting plan for the parking lot was run by
170 abutters and was changed after the concept received a negative response. The entire lot is
171 lighted now and there are 30 poles. The lighting engineer's choice was either to keep the same
172 number of poles and light to industry standards or to not light the parking lot at all. Because of
173 liability issues, the engineer would not submit a plan that did not meet standards; the neighbors
174 are pleased with the current plan.
175

176 Discussion:

177 Later Board members expressed concerns regarding safety for those skiing at night. Mr. Fake
178 suggested that the majority of those skiing at night are dropped off by parents and picked up in front of
179 the lodge afterward. The designated drop off area will be well lighted. He said that it is common
180 practice now for night skiers to park close to the lodge and is sure that will continue. In addition to the
181 pole lamps, there will be lighting on the face of the lodge. The CEO reminded members that there will
182 be ambient light coming from the lighted trails reflecting off snow – it will probably be brighter than
183 they imagine even with only four lamps.
184

185 Mr. Scholz later informed the Board that he had reviewed the original plan and taken part in
186 the discussion regarding that Plan, and that the Hosmer Pond Association is happy with the changes
187 made to that Plan with greatly reduced lighting.
188

189 To address the possibility of having to install additional lighting someday, or to make
190 provisions for emergency lighting (for first responders or emergency vehicles, e.g.), Mr. Gartley
191 agreed to the recommendation to include a spare conduit so wires can be run after the parking area is
192 finished in case the Applicant wants to make changes to lighting in the future. They will connect to
193 the same parking lot circuit so lighting can be synced.

- 194
- 195 ➤ There will be one landscaped island in the lot and more plantings placed near the property
- 196 boundary line in an effort to screen the maintenance building.
- 197
- 198 ➤ They have applied for three DEP permits: Stormwater Management; Wetlands alterations; and
- 199 an NRPA permit for all work near the streams.
- 200
- 201 ➤ The existing well and the recent septic upgrade are shown on the Plan and are ready for
- 202 hookup to the new lodge.
- 203
- 204 ➤ The propane tank is shown buried near the lodge and Mr. Sargent asked why, if the tank was
- 205 buried would they need bollards as well. Mr. Wilson noted that underground installations
- 206 often include bollards to keep maintenance equipment from running over the fill pipe. Mr.
- 207 Sargent suggested that the Town could save money if the tank was above ground. If it is
- 208 buried then the Town owns it and must pay any replacement costs. If the tank is above ground
- 209 the gas company owns it. He thinks the Town could save \$5000 or more if the tank was placed
- 210 above ground to begin with. Ms. MacKinnon suggested that it is preferable to have as few
- 211 obstacles as possible in an area where people are skiing – and it would be unsightly since it is
- 212 right by the lodge. She thinks it is better underground.
- 213
- 214 ➤ The road to the toboggan area will see little change, although they will be grading in the area in
- 215 order to decrease the slope of the drive and it will be paved with reclaimed asphalt. This may
- 216 become employee parking on days when the parking lot will be filled. There is no additional
- 217 lighting proposed for this area.
- 218

219 Changes to the Plan:

220 On C-1:

- 221 • Identify the surface of the parking areas and drive either in writing on the Plan or adding to the
- 222 Key
- 223 • Identify the landscape island in the parking lot
- 224 • Remove the Note on the Plan worded “24' wide paved area”
- 225 • The box on the Application form marked “New non-residential building” needs to be checked
- 226 • Bring manhole covers to grade for winter maintenance access
- 227 • Relocate some handicap parking closer to lodge entrance: There was discussion about the 120'
- 228 distance from the current location and the danger of having to negotiate traffic over that
- 229 distance. The Board asked the Applicant to find a location closer to the entrance that would be
- 230 more “welcoming” to handicapped visitors

231 On L-1:

- 232 • Identify sizes of proposed trees
- 233 • Correct the spelling of Ms. Schneller’s name

234

235 Mr. Gartley noted that they had not provided much information on landscaping although there

236 is a lot of planting being considered. They want to get through the first winter to see how plowing and

237 parking work within the new boundaries before they invest time in designing something that would

238 need to be redesigned.

239

240 Lee Schneller, who has prepared a planting proposal for the stream area, later spoke to her
241 concerns about the work that was planned to mitigate the damage done to the stream bed and banking
242 from last summer and fall's erosion problems. In particular, there is also work planned to prevent
243 damage in the future and to re-stabilize and re-claim the banking. She is worried that this work, which
244 is separate from the landscaping planned for aesthetic reasons, could take a back seat if funding is not
245 available to complete all the work. She explained in detail the stream protection methods that she and
246 other volunteers will employ with guidance from the Maine DEP.

247
248 Mr. Wilson assured her that whatever landscaping plans are part of the Plan that is approved
249 will have to be completed as presented before a final Certificate of Occupancy is granted. If there is
250 not time to complete the work because of factors like winter weather approaching, conditional
251 approval can be granted requiring that the remaining work is done as soon as possible.

252
253 On A 2.1:

- 254 • Add dimensions of signs

255
256 *Article X Section 3: Site Plan Content*

257 The Board reviewed the Application and found the submissions, with the exception of the
258 changes requested above, sufficient to move forward. (See Attachment #3)

259
260 A Site Walk will be held on Wednesday, January 21, at 7:30am; and a Public Hearing was
261 scheduled for Thursday, January 22, at 5pm.

262
263 **5. DISCUSSION:**

- 264
- 265 1. Minor Field Adjustments: There were none
- 266 2. Future Agenda Items:

267 The Select Board has assigned two projects to the Planning Board: 1) Food Trucks –
268 determine whether or not the Board supports going forward with developing regulations; and
269 2) Consider revisions proposed by the Harbor Committee to the Harbor Ordinance. The Chair
270 has asked the Select Board Chair for guidance on which of these projects they want to go
271 forward first.

272 Regarding revisions to the Harbor Ordinance, the Board is not sure how the work to
273 revisions is to proceed. Members assume that the Harbor Committee will draft a proposal for
274 Planning Board review just like any other proposal for an amendment. The Board would then
275 review the proposal and determine what they would move forward to the Select Board.
276 Depending on the proposal brought forward by the Harbor Committee, the Zoning Ordinance
277 may have to be revised so the two Ordinances are in agreement with regard to piers and
278 wharves.

279 The CEO understands that the Planning Board does not have the authority to refuse to
280 send the Harbor Committee's request forward. If there is not agreement on what the final draft
281 should look like, the Planning Board can send the Select Board their version of a draft for
282 consideration. They can recommend that the Harbor Committee's version should not go to the
283 voters, but the Planning Board must send the Harbor Committee's draft to the Select Board in a
284 form acceptable to the Harbor Committee.

285 The Snow Bowl will be back on the 22nd – there will be no meeting on the 29th.

- 286
- 287 4. Business Opportunity Zone: (BOZ)

288 The Chair explained the modifications made to the landscaping standards with regard to
289 aesthetically pleasing and planting requirements. The Board will not try to develop standards
290 that address building design except for the few already in the draft and the controls in the B-3.
291 The CEO found one more place in the Ordinance that required a minor change to add this
292 overlay to Article IV.

293
294 A Public Information Gathering Meeting (PIGM) was scheduled for February 5 and a Public
295 Hearing for February 19.

296
297 5. 500' Transitional Zone:
298 Mr. Bernhard and Mr. Scholz prepared a discussion paper regarding the 500'
299 Transitional Zone. They argue that there is no reason to have this zone in the Ordinance and
300 further, that scribing a 500' circle around the areas where this would apply encompasses a great
301 many properties. (See Attachment 2) Mr. Bernhard had also provided a map of the Village to
302 show how many properties are eligible to make this conversion.

303
304 To ensure that the Board was able to see arguments on both sides of the situation, Mr.
305 Wilson suggested there could be valid reasons to retain the provision, but the Board might
306 consider narrowing the scope of where it would apply – such as limiting the Special Exception
307 to properties within 100' of a district line or to those actually abutting a district line. He
308 learned that one reason the provision was originally created was to give home occupations
309 room to expand their business within a residential setting. The Low Impact Use means that a
310 residential component has to remain in place – the building can't simply be converted to a
311 business; there are other controls as well with the Low Impact Use classification.

312
313 Mr. Sargent agrees that 500' is too far to allow this “transition” from one district to
314 another, and that is his major concern with the provision. If this was supposed to be a fix for
315 Home Occupations then they should look again at Home Occupations to see if they can find a
316 way to make that designation more flexible to allow for some growth. Ms. MacKinnon agreed
317 saying that it should be easy to set specific standards to address the needs of growing home
318 businesses with acceptable limits.

319
320 Mr. Bernhard asked if home owners in these districts could complain that some of their
321 rights are being taken away. The Chair responded that every time a zoning change is made
322 someone loses rights – others may gain; these kinds of changes are the nature of zoning.

323
324 Mr. Wilson asked the Board if they intended to get rid of Low Impact Uses altogether
325 in the V and VE Districts; or, do they simply want to do away with the 500' provision which
326 only appears in these two districts. If they just remove the 500' language then Low Impact
327 Uses would be permitted everywhere in these districts. The Board agreed to strike the entire
328 paragraph in both districts and to take the proposal to a PIGM on February 5.

329
330 6. Middle School Update: Richard Householder and Jan MacKinnon discussed the letters they
331 are writing as citizens, and not as Board members, to provide information on various aspects of
332 the proposed middle school. Ms. MacKinnon is gathering information from the Police
333 Department on safety issues resulting from traffic on Knowlton Street – an issue raised by the
334 School Board to support moving a new school back from the street, but she is being told there
335 is no record of problems over many years. If there had been a problem there are many ways to
336 have resolved them -- including prohibiting parking on Knowlton Street. Because the drop-off

337 zone has helped move traffic along the street in recent years, it appears that safety is not an
338 issue, and that is the information Ms. MacKinnon wants to convey.

339
340 7. Sound Ordinance Proposal: The proposal will be ready for review by the CEO prior to
341 distribution to Board members – they will have the document well in advance of the February
342 5 meeting when the draft will be presented for discussion.

343
344 There being no further business before the Committee they adjourned at 8:15pm.

345
346 Respectfully submitted,

347
348
349 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

350 ATTACHMENT 1: RAGGED MOUNTAIN SITE PLAN SUBMISSIONS

351 The Plan under review consists of the following:

352	Description of Document	Date
353		
354	1. Town of Camden Application for Site Plan Review	December 31, 2014
355		
356	2. Site Plan Review Letter: Article XII Sections 3 (Site Plan Content),	
357	4 (Supplemental Information) and 6 (Approval Criteria)	December 31, 2014
358		
359	3. Location Map	
360		
361	4. Deeds	Previously Submitted
362	5. Abutters List	
363		
364	6. Photographs	
365		
366	7. Renderings of new Lodge (2)	
367	8. Preliminary Planting Proposal	December 28, 2014
368		
369	9. Parking Lot Lighting Submittal (Larry Bartlett)	December 30, 2014
370	10. Aerial Plan (AE-1)	February 7, 2014
371		
372	11. SV-1 Existing Conditions Plan	February 20, 2014
373	12. Landscape Plan L-1	December 30, 2014
374	13. C-1: RMRA Lodge and Parking Site Plan	December 30, 2014
375	14. C -2: RMRA Site Details	December 30, 2014
376	15. A2.1: Building Elevations (Steven Blatt Architects)	December 11, 2014
377	16. E-01: Photometric Plan (Larry Bartlett)	December 30, 2014
378	17. E-02: Electrical Site Plan (Larry Bartlett)	December 30, 2014
379	18. Lighting Fixture Schedule	November 21, 2014
380	19. Agent Letter	September 19, 2014

381 The Board proceeded to review the Application against Article X Section 3. Site Plan Content:

382

383 **Site Plan Content**

384 (a) *Owner's name and address*

385 *Provided on C1.*

386 (b) *Names and addresses of all abutting property owners*

387 *Provided with Application.*

388 (c) *Sketch map showing general location of the site within the Town*

389 *Provided with Application.*

390 (c) *Boundaries of all contiguous property under the control of the owner or applicant regardless of*
391 *whether all or part is being developed at this time.*

392 *Provided on SV-1.*

393 (e) *Zoning classification(s) of the property lines of the property to be developed and the source of this*
394 *information.*

395 *The different zoning districts are shown on a Town GIS Map.*

396 (f) *The bearing and distances of all property lines of the property to be developed and the source of*
397 *this information. The Board may require a formal boundary survey when sufficient information is not*
398 *available to establish on the ground, all property boundaries.*

399 *Provided on SV-1.*

400

401 (g) *The location of all building setbacks required by this Ordinance.*

402 *Provided on C1*

403

404 (h) *The location, dimensions, front view, and ground floor elevations of all existing and proposed*
405 *buildings in the site.*

406 *Provided on C-1 and submitted previously.*

407

408 (i) *The location and dimensions of driveways, parking and loading areas, and walkways.*

409 *Provided on C-1.*

410

411 (j) *Location of intersecting roads or driveways within 200 feet of the site.*

412 *Shown on Aerial Plan AE-1.*

413

414 (k) *The location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal*

415 *Shown on C-1.*

416

417 (l) *The location of open drainage courses, wetlands, stands of trees, and other important natural*
418 *features, with a description of such features to be retained and of any new landscaping planned.*

419 *Shown on C-1*

420

421 (m) *Location and dimensions of any existing easements and copies of existing covenants or deed*
422 *restrictions.*

423 *Warranty Deeds previously submitted.*

424

425 (n) *Location, front view, and dimensions of existing and proposed signs.*

426 *Pictures previously submitted.*

427 (o) *Location and type of exterior lighting.*

428 *Provided on E-01 and E-02.*

429
430 (p) *Copies of applicable State and Federal approvals and permits, provided, however, that the Board*
431 *may approve site plans subject to the issuance of specified State approvals and permits where it*
432 *determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan review.*
433 *All necessary permits have been applied for and are pending.*

434
435 (q) *A signature block on the site plan, including space to record a reference to the order by which the*
436 *plan is approved.*

437 *Provided on C1.*

438
439 Section 4. Supplemental Information

440 The Planning Board may require any or all of the following submissions where it determines that, due
441 to the scale, nature of the proposed development or relationship to surrounding properties, such
442 information is necessary to assure compliance with the intent and purposes of this Ordinance.

443 (1) Existing and proposed topography of the site at two-foot contour intervals, or such other interval as
444 the Board may determine, prepared and sealed by a surveyor licensed in the State of Maine.
445 *10' intervals over site except areas where grading will occur are shown at 1' - 2' intervals.*

446
447 (2) A storm water drainage and erosion control plan prepared by an engineer or landscape architect
448 registered in the State of Maine...

449 *A DEP Storm Water Permit is required – details of engineered system shown on C-1 and C-2.*

450
451 (3) A utility plan showing, in addition to provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal, the
452 location and nature of electrical, telephone, and any other utility services to be installed on the site.

453 *Shown on C-1, E-01 and E-02.*

454
455 (4) A planting schedule keyed to the site plan and indicating the varieties and sizes of trees, shrubs,
456 and other plants to be planted.

457 *Shown on L-1. Narrative prepared by Lee Schneller provided.*

458
459 (5) In addition to items (a), (c), (d), (l), (m) and (o) in Section 3, applications for Piers, Wharves,
460 Breakwaters and Boat Ramps shall include:

461 *Not applicable.*

462
463

465

466 Prepared by Richard Bernhard & John Scholz
467 for Planning Board Review
468 12/11/14
469

470 The current Camden Zoning Ordinance permits commercial uses as a Special Exception on lots in the
471 Traditional Village (V) or Village Extension (VE) districts that are in or partly within, 500 ft. of a
472 business (B-1, B-2, B-3, B-H, B-TH, B-R, B-TR) or industrial (I) district.

473

474 No one is certain about how this exception came about. One suggestion is that around 1994, Zoning
475 District boundaries were being scrutinized and there was a location at which a clear business-to-
476 residential distinction was not evident: at the intersection of Main and Mountain Streets, opposite the
477 Library. Here, on the first block of Mountain Street (Traditional Village district) there were a number
478 of businesses: the Camden Farmers' Union (retail, gas pumps, and fuel delivery), a funeral home, and
479 the then-active Methodist church.

480

481 Some people in the community did not wish to see the limitations of a residential district imposed here
482 and enjoyed the commercial atmosphere of this block. So, the 500 ft. interstitial area was developed
483 and written into the Ordinance allowing low impact commercial uses upon Special Exception
484 throughout the entire Town, at every point where a (V) or (VE) property abuts one of the business
485 (except B-4) or industrial zones.

486

487 If one scribes this 500 ft. ring on the zoning map, it becomes evident that there are many locations
488 within the ring that one would not associate with commercial use: the majority of Pearl Street,
489 Chestnut Street (up to Limerock), Bayview Street (past Limerock), Atlantic Avenue, Sea Street, parts
490 of Eaton Avenue, lower High and Mountain Streets, much of the inner village, Millville, outer
491 Washington Street, and areas of the Village Extension area near Shirrtail Point. At these locations and
492 others, the residential qualities seem so intact that commercial intrusion does not seem appropriate.
493 This use of a transitional zone is often found in cities where districts tend to often have more mixed
494 use crossing district lines.

495 Recently, the Planning Board heard the application for a Special Exception within this 500 ft. ring on
496 High Street. While discussion centered on specific language of the Zoning Ordinance relative to this
497 ring, it neglected to observe the natural and perceived boundaries that existed there and elsewhere in

498 the town. Here, a defined “edge” exists between downtown (B-1) and High Street (V). Such things as
499 building lines engaging the sidewalk, taller buildings with party walls, on-street parking, little
500 vegetation, a colorful palette, noticeable human activity, and its compact form characterize the
501 downtown. At High Street, directly at the zone boundary, detached buildings, front yards, diminished
502 on-street parking, and vegetation at the street line, less sidewalk, impart a distinctly residential
503 character. The boundary has provided a distinct and natural break.

504
505 The same distinctions exist at other Business-Village boundaries: Elm Street to Free Street,
506 Elm/School Street to Union Street, and the Knox Mill area to Mechanic and Washington streets. It is
507 also evident at the location that sponsored the 500 ft. Special Exception at Main and Mountain Streets
508 where the former Farmers’ Union is now a meeting hall and the Methodist church is now a residential
509 condominium.

510
511 One of the aspects that make Camden very attractive and different from other communities is the
512 distinction between areas with defined characteristics or zones. The harbor has a precise edge. The
513 chain of Camden Hills, thanks in large part by being kept undeveloped, form a distinct boundary and
514 backdrop to the village. The downtown shopping district is compact and defined. Rural areas are
515 open. Cottage communities hover around lakes. There is no “blur” between parts of the town—
516 natural and built environments have defined uses into a harmonious patchwork quilt.

517
518 With these observations in mind, our recommendation is to do away with the 500 ft. interstitial area
519 and—as it is with all other zoning district boundaries—make the present boundaries the point where
520 different uses occur. The opportunity to revisit such a transitional zone in the future remains should
521 the fabric of the Town change.

522

523

ATTCHMENT 3: Conservation Commission Letter

Dear Camden Planning Board:

Through conversations with Landon Fake, Parks and Recreation Director, the Camden Conservation Commission (CCC) is aware that a plan had been put in place to harvest trees on areas of the Camden Snow Bowl property not related to skiing activities. The primary motivation for this harvesting appears to be economic. The CCC also understands that the plan has been put on hold this year because of controversies surrounding tree removal that was done as part of the program to improve the ski area.

The members of the CCC do not believe that this timber harvest is in the best interests of the Camden community and wish to explain the reasons for their opposition to this plan.

The economic rationale for harvesting timber at the Snow Bowl was described in the Forest Management Plan for the Camden Snow Bowl dated February 20, 2014, commissioned by Landon Fake, and prepared by Mitchell Kihn of Mid-Maine Forestry. The Plan was detailed and thorough. Mr. Kihn estimated that the total stumpage value of harvestable timber on the Snow Bowl Property was \$101,065, which represents the "liquidation value" if the entire property was cleared (Page 20, Forest Management Plan). He also noted that such an extreme degree of harvesting is not recommended and that this calculated value of timber assumed that a wood yard could be located part way up the slope. The stumpage value did not include the costs of harvesting the timber or of related forestry services. It did include the value of timber that was harvested in preparation for the redesign of the ski slopes done this past summer and fall. We understand that the cost of removing this timber from the ski slopes equaled the value of the timber, and there was no net income to the Town of Camden from the trees that were removed.

On September 6, Doug Johnson, Kristen Lindquist and Roger Rittmaster from the CCC walked the 22-Tacks Trail (now renamed the Kuller Trail) to assess what work had been done in preparation for harvesting timber in this area of the Snow Bowl property. A majority of the large trees along the trail were marked for harvesting, except those trees that had been previously tagged for preservation when the trail was built, because of their proximity to the trail (see attached report).

We believe that the harvesting of these trees is not in the best interest of maximizing the value of this portion of the forest. First, there is little economic benefit to be gained from such harvesting. Even the clear-cutting of land for widening the ski trails did not yield a profit to the Town of Camden, as the loggers were paid with the trees they harvested. Selective cutting of trees elsewhere on the Snow Bowl property would be more labor intensive than the clear cutting done for the ski trails.

Secondly, as noted in the Forest Plan, the highest priority in managing the Snow Bowl is for recreation. The Kuller Trail combines the scenic beauty of a hardwood forest and easily accessible hiking thanks to the well-graded trail. Harvesting the oldest and largest trees in the forest will degrade the scenic value of the trail. Furthermore, there are few mature forests in Maine, due to past clearing of land for farming, grazing and timber harvesting. Preserving some forests as “forever wild” is valuable in itself, enhances the recreational appeal of the Snow Bowl area, and is consistent with the management of the surrounding Ragged Mountain Preserve.

The median age of five old growth forests in Maine ranges from 100 to 200 years, with the oldest trees being over 400 years old (Barton A.M., The Changing Nature of the Maine Woods. University of New Hampshire Press, 2012, Page 80). The estimated age of the forest surrounding the Kuller Trail is 70-90 years, far from what would be considered a mature, old-growth forest, but still impressive when compared to much of the forested land in Camden. We believe that this forest deserves preservation for posterity as an eventual old growth forest.

Thirdly, there are risks to harvesting trees on steep slopes. As was seen during tree removal at the Snow Bowl this summer, an increase in erosion is a consequence of deforestation, although the degree of erosion can be reduced by fastidiously adhering to erosion prevention measures. Some erosion normally occurs during heavy rains. Tree roots limit the amount of soil loss, and the tree canopy slows runoff. Removing trees on steep slopes will increase the amount of erosion, even when best practices are employed. Considering the thousands of trees removed recently at the Snow Bowl, the mountain needs to recover from the canopy loss, that serves to protect the Goose River watershed and Hosmer Pond.

The Camden Conservation Commission believes the aesthetic and environmental harm of harvesting timber on the Snow Bowl property outweigh any economic benefit that can be obtained from the removed trees. We urge the Town of Camden not to do any further harvesting of trees on Snow Bowl property.

Respectfully submitted,

Camden Conservation Commission

Carla Ferguson
Thomas Hopps
Douglas Johnson, Chair
Robin Kern
Kristen Lindquist
Roger Rittmaster

January 14, 2015

Richard Householder
Camden Planning Board

I am writing in regard to a letter signed by Douglas N. Johnson, Camden Conservation Commission, dated December 3, 2014.

The letter references a plan to harvest additional timber on the Snow Bowl property beyond that required for the trail system.

The letter also references a study done by Mid- Maine Forestry that concluded that if the Snow Bowl property was to be clear cut and the cost of harvesting was subtracted from the clear cut stumpage value there would remain no economic rationale of any additional harvesting.

If the above information is correct I fail to understand why this issue is even being discussed.

Beyond economic considerations I am hopeful that the Board is well aware of the values inherent in protecting what remains of Camden's forests. Every year the human footprint encroaches on what is left of our forests and they are not replaceable.

The site walk mentioned in the letter noted that the majority of large trees remaining on the Snow Bowl property were marked for removal. Those trees not only help to purify the air we breathe they cool the environment, provide essential habitat and migration corridors for our wildlife and stabilize the soils that filter the drainage waters.

Added to the above our trees add significantly to the ambience of our town and the attraction that has for the value of our tourists.

It is of note that in other parts of Town we spend considerable sums each year trying to protect and enhance the life span of trees the same size and age and here we are discussing removing them from our skyline.

I respectfully request that the Planning Board do whatever it can to prevent any further timber harvesting at the Snow Bowl.

Barton Wood
Tree Warden
Town of Camden

DRAFT