

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

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 16, 2013

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

ABSENT: Members Jan MacKinnon and Kerry Sabanty

The meeting of the Planning Board of May 16, 2013, was convened at 5:00 pm.

1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:

No one came forward to speak.

2. Minutes:

May 2, 2013:

Page 1 Line 24: The Minutes of April 4 still need to be corrected with regard to the attribution of comments regarding the regulation of storage trailers.

MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Householder to approve the Minutes of the Camden Planning Board of May 2, 2013, with the reservation that language is added in Section 2.

VOTE: 3-0-0

Changes were made to the Minutes of May 2, 2013, at Page 1 Line 24 and April 4, 2013, at Page 7 Line 7, and the language now reads: "Mr. MacLean noted that these trailers exist and they cannot eliminate them because they are grandfathered. Mr. Wilson agreed they are grandfathered, but they can be regulated by requiring permits."

3. Proposed Future Zoning Amendments

1) River Business District: Postponed

Mr. Cartwright is still trying to track down all his neighbors and is working on the proposed language as well.

2) Northern Gateway District (B-5):

Jesse Bifulco was present to discuss a new proposal from a group of Bed and Breakfast owners who want to create a new zoning district. The proposal has evolved again and the new district now includes all property with frontage on Route One from Mountain and High Streets north to the far side of the Norumbega property. The original purpose was to find a way to make "legacy properties" more viable. They have winnowed the uses proposed at the last meeting and taken a much more conservative approach to allowed uses in order to enhance lodging businesses while preserving the neighborhood. They want to be able to enhance their offerings by creating a new use called "Multi Use Lodging" which can have added amenities found in similar businesses elsewhere such as spa services and gift shops selling jewelry and clothing; they want to be able to serve dinner to their guests and to the public; and they want to be able to host more

1 functions than they can currently. There will be no restaurants permitted outside of Multi Use
2 Lodging establishments.

3
4 Existing residential uses converting to lodging will be required to go to the Zoning Board
5 of Appeals if they want to be classified as a Multi Use Lodging business. The current B&Bs –
6 the Legacy Businesses - have earned the right to be automatically upgraded based on their
7 history of being good neighbors; there have been no negative consequences to the neighborhood
8 of these businesses existing in a largely residential area.

9
10 Each added use will come with its own parking requirements above and beyond the use
11 as a B&B, so expansion of the current use will be self-limited by how much parking can be made
12 available within the setback and screening requirements of the new definition. They envision the
13 ZBA review to include an assessment of impacts like traffic and noise with special attention paid
14 to those buildings in the Historic District.

15
16 The proposed definition limits lodging rooms to sixteen which would include Norumbega
17 but not the Whitehall Inn. Mr. Bifulco indicated that if the Whitehall Inn owners perceived there
18 might be a benefit to being classified as a Multi Use Lodging establishment instead of a hotel the
19 group could re-do the definition so they would qualify.

20
21 Mr. MacLean asked if the group had spoken to the non-commercial property owners who
22 would be included in the District; Mr. Bifulco had not but noted that many of these residential
23 properties are for sale and many of those owners have not been around. One reason for so many
24 sales is that Route 1 is a very busy traffic area and many of these houses are very close to the
25 road – that is not a good selling point. Mr. Bifulco suggests that these owners may welcome the
26 ability to expand the use of their properties to make them more attractive to buyers.

27
28 Mr. MacLean spoke to the history of amendment proposals before the Board and what
29 happens when neighbors haven't been part of any discussion regarding a proposal that will
30 impact their property before it gets to the Planning Board. The more ground work that is done
31 by applicants – the more political work that is done – the better the chances that there will be
32 support when the time comes for public hearings and a vote. It was suggested that the applicants
33 might want to contact some of the High Street residents who had been involved in the Route 1
34 reconstruction project several years ago; they formed a very effective citizens group that
35 successfully re-shaped MDOT's original proposal for Route. That network might still be in
36 place enough to offer some guidance regarding public outreach for this project.

37
38 Mr. Sargent suggested that they might include language requiring a residential
39 appearance like the B3 District does; that might make it more appealing to neighbors. He also
40 wondered if the group might be better served if the divided the District into chunks that could
41 include properties already commercial in nature and leave stretches of residential only areas.

42
43 Mr. Sargent also suggested that the definition needs to include the requirement that the
44 business is owner-occupied. He also noted that in calculating the 50% of floor space that can be
45 occupied by new businesses within the B&B, the owner should *not* be allowed to include the
46 owner's quarters since that is not part of the lodging area.

1 He believes that the change in the parking requirements to cover each new business will
2 provide a greater benefit to large property owners, and he wonders if the impact of a possible
3 large increase in volume of traffic and parking has been taken into account if the change of use
4 won't be reviewed.
5

6 It was suggested that Mr. Bifulco's next step is to get the names of the Route 1 property
7 owners and contact them to discuss the proposal. The group also needs to determine how the
8 Whitehall and Norumbega will fit into the picture as hotels. The Whitehall is grandfathered and
9 can serve dinner to the public; Norumbega cannot and would have to change classification to be
10 able to do so. Mr. Wilson suggested that one easy way to allow Norumbega to remain a hotel is
11 to change the definition of "Hotel" to make restaurants an allowed use. These businesses
12 shouldn't be exempted from the benefits of the District just because they are hotels.
13

14 Mr. Householder believes they need a better feel from landowners how they will feel
15 about moving to a new District. Mr. Sargent believes the applicants have some work to do with
16 regard to what uses should be included and what should not. Mr. MacLean agreed saying that
17 there may be other property owners who would like to see more than the three uses proposed in
18 the definition, or they may have reasons why the proposed uses should not be included.
19

20 Mr. Sargent wondered if the applicants may want to look at Site Plan Review for the
21 change of use from residential to Multi Use Inn instead of Special Exceptions granted by the
22 ZBA. Because the ZBA has so much discretion, a Special Exception review is much less
23 predictable than Site Plan Review where a property owner or prospective buyer would have a
24 better idea of what to expect.
25

26 The Chair suggested June 6 for a Public Information Meeting and asked that all property
27 owners involved receive notice. Mr. Householder believes that these owners should be
28 contacted first by the applicants; many of the summer residents will be returning by this time and
29 it should be easier to find owners at home. He also thanked the applicants for their presentation
30 packet which he found very useful. He hopes that they will continue to use this format to provide
31 information.
32

33 William Amidon, Maryann Shanahan's husband, came forward to say that Maryann had
34 been one of the leaders in the Route 1 project. She recently suffered a head injury, however, and
35 would not be able to be of assistance. He also added that they are in full support of Mr. Bifulco's
36 proposal.
37
38
39

40 **4. DISCUSSION:**

- 41
- 42 1. Minor field adjustments: There were none.
- 43
- 44 2. Future agenda items:
- 45 June 6: Discussion of River Business District proposal
- 46 Discussion of High Street Gateway District proposal
- 47

1 Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Wilson if there were any “housekeeping” amendments he would
2 like to see added to the list of Ordinance Amendments proposed for this November. Mr. Wilson
3 replied that he would like to see the definition of parking facilities changed so that a building
4 cannot be torn down to create a parking lot – he believes this in an unintended consequence of
5 the current definition.

6
7 Mr. Wilson was asked to make it clear to the Demolition Ordinance proponents, who are
8 supposed to come to a discussion of the subject at the next meeting, that this issue will *not* be
9 considered for inclusion on the November warrant; *if* the Board decides to go forward with an
10 Ordinance proposal it would be for next June at the earliest. In addition to the two district
11 amendments, the only other proposal the Board will consider for this November’s ballot is one to
12 regulate storage trailers.

13
14 3. Pending Applications: There are none

15
16 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 6:05 pm.

17
18 Respectfully submitted,

19
20
21 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary