

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
January 22, 2015

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

The meeting of the Planning Board convened at 5:00 pm. A video recording of the meeting is available by linking from the Town's website at <http://www.camdenmaine.gov/> or by going directly to <http://www.townhallstreams.com/locations/camden-me>.

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

2. MINUTES:

January 15, 2015:

The Discussion portion of the Minutes has not been completed.

Page 1 Line 22: The date of the Conservation Commission letter is December 3, 2014.

Page 2 Line 82: "...many of the large trees ~~can~~ cannot be worked around..."

Page 4 Line 146: "The last ~~1-1/2~~ 18' of the parking lot ..."

Page 4 Line 182 reads: "To address the possibility of having to install additional lighting someday, or to make provisions for emergency lighting (for first responders or emergency vehicles, e.g.), Mr. Gartley agreed to the recommendation to include a spare conduit so wires can be run after the parking area is finished in case the Applicant wants to make changes to lighting in the future. They will connect to the same parking lot circuit so lighting can be synced."

Beginning at Line 143: The Recording Secretary was asked to include the discussion about curbing and the following language has been added to the Final Minutes at Page 4 Line 152: "There was a lengthy discussion about the durability of asphalt curbing given the fact that snow plows will be stockpiling snow on the far side of the curbing all winter long. Members were concerned that asphalt curbing will take a beating and have to be replaced regularly. Mr. Gartley replied that they will either have to bucket the snow over the curb or lose some parking spaces in that area."

Page 5 Line 205 reads: "The box on the Application form marked "New non-residential building" needs to be checked"

The Recording Secretary was asked to include the discussion regarding the choice to bury the propane tank versus the option to locate it above ground. The following language has been added to the Final Minutes at Page 5 Line 202: "The propane tank is shown buried near the lodge and Mr. Sargent asked why, if the tank was buried would they need bollards as well. Mr. Wilson noted that underground installations often include bollards to keep maintenance equipment from running over the fill pipe. Mr. Sargent suggested that the Town could save money if the tank was above ground. If it is buried then the Town owns it and must pay any replacement costs. If the tank is above ground the gas company owns it. He thinks the Town could save \$5000 or more if the tank was placed above ground to begin with. Ms. MacKinnon suggested that it is preferable to have as few obstacles as possible in an area where

49 people are skiing – and it would be unsightly since it is right by the lodge. She thinks it is better
50 underground.”

51
52 The Chair confirmed that the trail referenced on the Plan and in the Minutes as both
53 the Kuller Trail and as 22 Tacks Trail has been officially renamed for Jeff Kuller. The
54 Town Manager provided that confirmation. To avoid confusion Mr. Sargent asked that that
55 single term – Kuller Trail – be used. Mr. Gartley stated that he has removed the term “22
56 Tacks Trail” from the Plan.

57
58 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** to accept the Minutes of January
59 15, 2015, as amended.

60 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

61
62 **3. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Ragged Mountain Redevelopment - Phase 2: Public Hearing**
63 **Continued from January 15, 2015**

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

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

67
68 The Chair read the procedure for a Public Hearing and asked the Applicant to describe
69 the project.

70
71 *Applicant's Presentation:*

72 The Town was represented by Will Gartley of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and
73 Surveying. Mr. Gartley described this project to build a new lodge and to improve the existing
74 parking lot:

- 75 ➤ There is a new two-story 5976SF lodge proposed
- 76 ➤ Improvements are planned to add stormwater infrastructure with the goal of
77 improving stormwater flow over the parking area and to prevent erosion into Hosmer
78 Brook
- 79 ➤ The power supply will be upgraded and lighting in the parking lot and lodge area
80 changed
- 81 ➤ Parking will be reorganized for more efficient – and safer – use of the lot and to
82 increase parking capacity
- 83 ➤ Measures are being taken to improve the problems with erosion
- 84 ➤ Room has been made for a 30'-wide landscaped stream-side buffer to further prevent
85 runoff into the brook

86
87 New submissions include: A revised Application form a note that it was revised on January
88 20, 2015 (the missing box was checked); Plans C-1 and L-1 both revised on January 19,
89 2015; and two illustrations of signs proposed for the new lodge with dimensions

- 90
91 Mr. Gartley went over the changes made to Plan C-1:
- 92 ➤ The finish surface of the parking lot has been identified with a new key in the Legend
 - 93 ➤ The color and key for the Kuller Trail have been changed
 - 94 ➤ The landscaped island in the Parking Lot has been labeled

- 95 ➤ There is no appropriate location for an above-ground propane tank so it will remain
96 as proposed – underground near the new lodge. The number of surrounding bollards
97 was reduced to two to make the installation less unsightly
98 ➤ Old, irrelevant Notes were removed from the Plan
99 ➤ Two Handicap Parking spaces were moved to the lodge-end of the parking island to
100 bring the spaces within 70' - 80' of the door. Because of the grade in the area nearer
101 the door, it was not practical to try to create spaces level enough to meet the
102 standards for additional spaces for Handicap Parking closer to the building. During
103 the non-skiing season the drop-off area can be used for more accessible parking
104 using temporary sign posts – that will improve this situation
105 ➤ Added a Note “Provide Extra Conduit for Future Use” to proposed underground
106 utilities run

107 Changes made to Plan L-1:

- 108 ➤ Planting areas were clarified to correspond to Lee Schneller’s written landscaping
109 plan submitted previously
110 ➤ The kinds of plantings and sizes of trees in height and caliper were provided in a
111 Legend
112

113 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Bernhard** to find that the Application
114 packet is now complete.

115 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

116

117 The Chair noted that a Site Walk had been held the previous morning with all four
118 members attending.

119

120

Public Hearing:

121 *First Public Comment Period:*

122

123 John Scholz: Mr. Scholz noted that the absence of the public at this hearing was an
124 indication that the public - Hosmer Pond residents in particular - were satisfied that their
125 concerns about stormwater, erosion and lighting have been heard and addressed by the
126 Applicant.

127

128 He then addressed the decision of the Applicant to stay with asphalt curbing instead of
129 moving to longer-lasting granite. He understands that cost is a factor, but noted that the
130 Town does not want any more embarrassment with regard to runoff and erosion and he is
131 afraid that if the asphalt fails, these kinds of problems might result. If the asphalt does hold
132 up, the role that the curbing will play in controlling runoff should work as it is designed.

133

134 *Questions from the Board:*

135

136 Mr. Householder followed up on Mr. Scholz’s comment about curbing and asked
137 why there is parking planned for the entire length of the curbing. In addition to damage
138 from vehicles, the cars will be in the path of snow removal. Mr. Gartley replied that they
139 gave up the area behind this parking to serve as a buffer and they need these spaces to make
140 their parking goal. There will be room in the buffer so they can bucket the snow to the far
141 side of this row of parking – in the past this area is where snow had been stockpiled and it
142 was lost to parking altogether.

143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190

Mr. Sargent later added that no matter how careful plow drivers are, asphalt is not as sturdy or durable as granite – even when the curbing is anchored to the ground. Once it is broken, it could get plowed aside and create a break in the edging meant to contain stormwater. These breaks could end up creating channels directing water and sediment into the brook instead of to the catch basins. In terms of maintenance, asphalt will need to be repaired more often and replaced much sooner than granite – he wonders if this longevity would outweigh the initial difference in cost. Mr. Gartley replied to a question regarding cost saying that granite is 5 – 6 times more expensive to install than asphalt. He doesn't dispute that granite will work, but explained the safeguards in the design like the fill backing up to the curbing that will help deflect storm water where the curbing might have failed.

Mr. Sargent strongly recommended that the Applicants look at the cost of granite again, or perhaps they could look at using slip form (extruded) concrete curbing instead of asphalt. Mr. Gartley replied that they might look at that option -- they used it at the High School with good results.

Mr. Householder also expressed concern about cars parked here having to back into traffic in the flow of traffic. Mr. Gartley believes that travel lanes are wide enough to be as safe as any other parking lot. He also noted that traffic will not be high volume or high speed, and that unless the facility is very crowded, this will be one of the last areas where people will park because it is on the far edge of the lot.

Mr. Sargent asked if traffic congestion does become a problem, if the Applicant would consider making the two main lanes into a one-way loop. Mr. Gartley replied that they had considered this early on, but they believe this layout is a good one. They want to get through one year's worth of traffic and parking before making changes to a Plan they believe will work once people get used to the layout.

Mr. Sargent asked if it made sense to add a crosshatched crosswalk to the paved area between the new lodge and the island – especially given that traffic will be two way in this area. The Applicant agreed to do this and will submit a revised Plan for the Board's signature.

There was discussion as well about the ability of the stormwater basins to handle the amount of water, even in the winter. Mr. Gartley replied that the success of the design relies on regular maintenance to keep catch basins open and cleared of debris on a year-round basis. They can handle the quantity of flow with many different controls, but the main goal of this design was to improve the quality of the flow especially to the brook and the pond.

Second Round of Public Comments:

No one came forward and the Public Hearing was closed. The Board had no further questions or comments.

After review of the Site Plan Approval Criteria, the following motion was offered:

MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder that having review Items 1 – 11 and found they have either been satisfied or found to be not applicable the Site Plan for the Ragged Mountain Recreation Area is approved.

191 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

192

193 For details regarding the Board review of Article XII see Attachment 1 to these Minutes.

194

195 ← Mr. Gartley will provide a revised Plan C-1 for the Board's signature at their next meeting.

196

197 Mr. Scholz returned to his seat on the Board.

198

199 **4. DISCUSSION:**

200

201 1) There were no Minor Field Adjustments

202

203 2) Future Agenda Items: No new items were added to the next agenda

204

205 3) Pending Applications:

206 02/05 Meeting Agenda:

207 Proposed Ordinance Amendments:

208 Public Information Gathering Meetings on the Business Opportunity Zone (Add a

209 new Overlay District); and the 500' Transitional Zone (Remove Low Impact Uses

210 from V and VE)

211 02/19 and 03/05 Public Hearings on both proposed amendments

212

213 4) BOZ: No further changes were made to the Draft.

214 ← The CEO will remove all editing comments and colors to have a clean draft for the next

215 meeting.

216

217 5) 500' Zone: No changes were made to the proposed draft which amends Article VIII

218 Sections 6(VE) and 7(V) by eliminating the Special Exception for a Low Impact Use

219 and renumbering following Items where necessary.

220 ← The CEO will remove all editing comments and colors to have a clean draft for the next

221 meeting.

222

223 Mr. Scholz noted that the Comprehensive Plan references this 500' provision,

224 and suggested that it may be necessary to change the language in the revised draft in

225 this regard. Members want to make sure that the current Plan does not conflict with

226 what they are attempting to do here otherwise they may have to wait until the Plan is

227 revised to make this change.

228

229 ← The Recording Secretary will search the current Comp Plan for references to the 500'

230 provision for the Board to use in making this determination.

231

232 6) Middle School Update: The Board discussed the series of letters from members that

233 are being written to put forward the several points members want the public to keep

234 in mind as they make their decision on how to vote regarding funding a new middle

235 school.

236

237 Richard Householder has written about the changing demographics in
238 Camden and the impact that population shift toward an increasingly older population
239 would have on student populations.
240

241 Jan MacKinnon is writing to rebut the claim that there were existing safety
242 problems that could be resolved only with relocation of the school building, and to
243 discuss the availability of local space used in the past when the need for an
244 auditorium arises.
245

246 After discussion regarding their experience in coming up with a renovation
247 plan for an attractive and useful alternative to building from scratch, Richard
248 Bernhard and John Scholz agreed to write more generally about the validity of the
249 option to reuse the existing buildings. Several proposals were offered by the
250 architectural firm that designed the school for reusing the facilities, but that none of
251 these designs were offered as an option to the voters. They believe a way should be
252 found to have had two options for voters – a new school *or* a renovated facility, or at
253 least have better educated voters that there *is* a viable option to spending \$28M.
254

255 Lowrie Sargent's letter will address financing with bonds and the resulting tax
256 burden of the Town's when added to the Town's current (and future) debts.
257

258 Attorney Bill Kelly wrote a letter to Board members explaining the
259 importance of remaining neutral as a Board and steps to take to ensure each member
260 speaks for themselves without taking a partisan position when commenting in speech
261 or writing about a Town issue. This is especially important when the issue in
262 question may be a project that could end up before the Board for review – like a new
263 Middle School which would require Site Plan Review.
264

- 265 7) Sound Ordinance Proposal: John Scholz and Dennis McGuirk will be prepared to
266 present a concept at the next meeting. They will have a written draft for the Board to
267 review well ahead of the meeting so they can understand the presentation from an
268 informed position.
269
- 270 8) February 5 Meeting: PIGMs first followed by the Noise Ordinance presentation.
271

272 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 7pm.
273

274 Respectfully submitted,
275

276 Jeanne Hollingsworth
277 Recording Secretary

278 ATTACHMENT 1: ARTICLE XII: SECTION 6: SITE PLAN APPROVAL CRITERIA:

279

280 Those interested in reviewing the complete language of this Section should refer to the Zoning
281 Ordinance.

282 (1) *Preserve and Enhance the Landscape*

283 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #1, Preserve and Enhance
284 the Landscape, is satisfied as shown on Plans C-1 and L-1.

285 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

286

287 (2) *Erosion Control*

288 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #2, Erosion Control, is
289 satisfied due to the Erosion Control notes on Plans C-1 and C-2.

290 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

291

292 (3) *Relationship of the Proposed Building to Environment and Neighboring Buildings*

293 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #3 Relationship of
294 Proposed Buildings is satisfied as shown on Plans C-1 and A2.

295 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

296

297 (4) *Vehicular Access, Parking, and Circulation*

298 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #4 Vehicular Access,
299 Parking and Circulation, is more than satisfied as shown on Plan C-1 and because the Applicant
300 has agreed to add a crosswalk from the Landscape Island to the building.

301 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

302

303 (5) *Surface Water Drainage*

304 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #5, Surface Water
305 Drainage, is more than satisfied as shown on Plan C-1 and C-2.

306 **Discussion:** Mr. Sargent asked again that the Applicant take a look at the make-up of the
307 curbing because of the role it plays in the design of the stormwater plan.

308 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

309

310 (6) *Public Utilities*

311 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #6 is not applicable
312 because there are no public utilities involved.

313 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

314

315 (7) *Special Features of Development*

316 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #7 Special Features of
317 Development, is not applicable because there are none.

318 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

319

320 (8) *Exterior Lighting*

321 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #8 Exterior Lighting, is
322 satisfied by the Photometric Plan Sheet E-01, Sheet A2.1, the submission titled *Proposed New*
323 *Site Lighting*, and the design cut sheets provided by the Applicant.

324 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

325

326

327 (9) *Emergency Vehicle Access*
328 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #9, Emergency Vehicle
329 Access is satisfied by Plan C-1.

330 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

331
332 (10) Special criteria for Piers, Wharves, Breakwaters, Municipal Boat Tamps, Municipal Piers,
333 Consolidated Piers and other mariner related uses...

334 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #10, Special Criteria for Piers,
335 Wharves, Breakwaters, etc., does not apply because there are none.

336 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

337
338 (11) Design standards for new construction, additions or exterior renovations in the B-1, B-TH
339 or B-TR Zoning Districts. The applicant is strongly encouraged to adhere to these standards;
340 however, the decision of the Planning Board on these design standards shall be non-binding
341 on the applicant.

342 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder** that #11, Preserve Design Standards
343 does not apply in this District.

344 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

345

346

347

348