

1 CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD  
2 MINUTES OF MEETING  
3 January 17, 2013  
4

5 **PRESENT:** Chair Chris MacLean; Members Richard Householder, Jan MacKinnon and Lowrie  
6 Sargent; Don White, Select Board Liaison; and CEO Steve Wilson

7 **ABSENT:** Member Kerry Sabanty  
8

9 The meeting of the Planning Board of January 17, 2013, was convened at 5:00 pm.  
10

11 **1. PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**

12 No one came forward to speak.  
13

14 **2. MINUTES**

15  
16 January 3, 2012

17 Page 2 Line 9: "~~Mr. Sargent~~ Mr. MacLean asked how far back the Town can go..."  
18

19 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Householder** that the Planning Board Minutes  
20 of January 3, 2013, are approved as corrected.

21 **VOTE: 4-0-0**  
22

23 **3. SELECT BOARD REQUEST: Clarify the definition of "Frontage"**  
24

25 Mr. Wilson explained in discussing the subject of a subdivision violation, the Select  
26 Board members found the definition of "Frontage" confusing, and asked the Planning Board to  
27 revise the definition so it is clear - especially as it involves rights-of-ways being used as frontage  
28 and access to back lots. Mr. Wilson understands the definition was changed when Jeff Nims was  
29 here, and he believes it was done with the help of the State Planning Office. He was hoping that  
30 there might be some "institutional memory" within the Planning Board to help him understand  
31 what happened and why.  
32

33 Mr. Sargent is not comfortable when rights-of-way are used as frontage; he believes that  
34 fee ownership is cleaner. He believes there are situations when a ROW has been used to access a  
35 back lot that result in street frontage that is actually shorter than intended by the Ordinance, or in  
36 driveway separation distances that may not be safe. Mr. Wilson confirmed that there are no  
37 driveway separation distances in the Town except where a property is on a State road.  
38

39 Mr. MacLean believes that if the rule on frontage is changed it could make some  
40 divisions of back lots accessed by ROWs no longer possible, and this would diminish the value  
41 of the property; this he does not want to see. Mr. Sargent believes that creating back lots may  
42 cause adjacent lots to be devalued.  
43

44 Mr. Wilson noted that there are many times driveways serving multiple lots are not  
45 reviewed, and they are not required to meet any standards. It is also not clear if there are setback  
46 requirements from ROWs; if there are an existing structure could become non-conforming if a

1 ROW passes too close. The Board might think of addressing this issue by requiring that ROWs  
2 that can serve multiple residences meet certain minimum standards depending on the number of  
3 lots that could be served. A driveway that can serve three lots might have to be 20' wide, for  
4 example, while a single lot driveway might be permitted at 16'.  
5

6 Mr. MacLean asked how often this issue comes up, and Mr. Wilson said that he has had  
7 several inquiries about breaking off back lots to sell to abutters or neighbors, e.g., but it is not an  
8 urgent problem.  
9

10 The Board decided to add the amendment to their List of Proposed Amendments.  
11

12 → The Board would like to see an updated list of proposed amendments so they can prioritize  
13 their work to a few of them for next November's ballot.  
14

#### 15 4. DISCUSSION:

16  
17 1. *Minor field adjustments:* There were none  
18

19 2. *Future Agenda items:*  
20 02/07: Prioritize Ordinance Amendments  
21

22 3. *Permit Fee Structure:*  
23

24 Mr. Wilson provided information on fees from Rockport, Rockland, Hope, Thomaston  
25 and Lincolnville. The Board believes that any fees should be determined by the "break-even"  
26 cost of the Town providing the service. They like the concept of having a combination of  
27 minimum fees with added on fees for each various components of the project which are based on  
28 different square footage costs that reflect the complexity of the project and the demand on the  
29 CEO's time for inspections, etc.  
30

31 Ms. MacKinnon would like to see a chart that includes this information in an easy-to-  
32 compare format. This can be used to support the Board's recommendations when they take them  
33 to the Select Board.

34 → Mr. Wilson will prepare a spreadsheet and input the data on fees from Camden and the other  
35 towns.

36 → Mr. Wilson will also provide the Board with information and estimates on what various projects  
37 cost the Town for the services the Codes Office provides in processing permits, conducting plan  
38 reviews, and making inspections  
39

#### 40 4. *Pending Applications*

41  
42 Tradesman Shop: A citizen came to speak to Mr. Wilson about finding a situation where  
43 could set up a small business as a sail maker in a residential zone as a Tradesman's Shop; for this  
44 he would need a Special Exception. He cannot be a Home Occupation unless he lives in the  
45 building which he does not plan to do. In addition, he needs more floor area than a Tradesman  
46 Shop permits, and more employees than a Home Occupation allows. There are very few  
47 available properties in Town that could accommodate this situation unless the floor area

1 limitations for a Tradesman’s Shop was increased, and this would mean the Ordinance would  
2 have to be amended – Mr. Wilson isn’t sure that is the answer.

3  
4 The Board recommended the man speak to the Town about the Tannery property which is  
5 about to be re-listed for sale, this time without conditions. That site would be a perfect location  
6 for this kind of business.

7  
8 There being no further business before the Planning Board they adjourned at 6 pm.

9  
10  
11 Respectfully submitted,  
12 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary