

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  
49  
50  
51

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**June 5, 2014**

**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.

**1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:**

Deb Dodge: With regard to Agenda Item #3, Ms. Dodge had experience with a 2-2 Planning Board vote and may have useful historical knowledge to share if the Board will be taking comments. The Chair suggested that the Board wait until their discussion concerning the legal advice they received from Bill Kelly was finished before they decided whether or not to hear other information.

Lowrie Sargent: Mr. Sargent read prepared remarks regarding a long-ignored role of the Planning Board in long-range planning for the Town especially as it concerns major capital projects and expenditures. He discussed this role as it applies to the proposed demolition/reconstruction of the Town's middle school buildings and suggested that it is time the Planning Board becomes formally involved in this process. He offered the Board's opinion that this project does not appear to be warranted from a demographics perspective and suggested that the Town hold discussions regarding utilizing the existing buildings. They should be following the goals of the Comprehensive Plan which call for adaptive re-use of buildings instead of demolition; he hopes these discussions can begin soon. (A copy of Mr. Sargent's remarks is attached to these Minutes.)

**2. MINUTES:**

May 1, 2014:

There were no substantive changes made to these Minutes. All corrections and recommendations for editorial changes have are included in the Final version.

**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Minutes of the Planning Board meeting of May 1, 2014, be approved with changes.

**VOTE: 4-0-1 with Mr. Scholz abstaining because he was absent**

May 15, 2014:

Page 1 Line 15: "it was ~~his~~ not Mr. Scholz's intention to submit anything to the Board..."

Page 1 Line 26: Mr. Bernhard seconded the Motion not Mr. Householder

Page 4 Line 3: The paragraph has been replaced with the following language: "Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Wilson to address the questions raised regarding whether or not this proposal constituted spot zoning. Mr. Wilson replied that the practice of creating a new zone to allow special provisions for a specific property is more accurately defined as Contract Zoning. Spot Zoning, which is not illegal, would cover the instance when changes are made within an existing zone that applies to a specific property – or as charged here to a limited number of properties. He believes this proposal is allowed due to the fact that Camden has already defined Special Exceptions that includes a provision for a transitional zone where specific uses can be permitted as Low Impact Uses under very limited circumstances. The Ordinance already contains provisions for allowing this to happen when it is with 500' of a zone where the specific use is already allowed. The stringency of the review combined with the ability of the ZBA to set very site specific conditions is considered to offer sufficient protections to permit the concept to allow a use not otherwise allowed to be legal."

1 Page 4 Line 46: "...including the Hawthorn Inn and Abigail's, the two other B&Bs that would benefit  
2 from this change, have come forward..."

3 Page 5 Line 23: "Mr. Wilson added that after consulting with the Town Attorney he has a better  
4 understanding of the case law that supports his understanding of when a situation is non-conforming.  
5 There is case law..."

6 Page 7 Line 39: "~~He~~ Mr. Scholz hopes she understands..."

7 Beginning at Page 8 Line 33 the entirety of Item 4 is deleted.

8 All other recommendations for changes were editorial in nature and have been included in the Final  
9 Minutes.

10  
11 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Planning Board Minutes of May 15,  
12 2014, be approved as amended.

13 **VOTE: 4-0-1 with Mr. Householder abstaining because he was absent**

14  
15  
16 **3. WINDWARD HOUSE VOTING PROCEDURE:**

17  
18 The Chair discussed the May 15, 2014, vote of the Board regarding an Amendment to the  
19 Zoning Ordinance proposed by Kristi Bifulco, owner of the Windward House B&B. There were four  
20 members voting and the result was a tie which meant the proposal would not go forward toward a  
21 possible vote by the Town.

22  
23 After that meeting Mr. Sargent learned that the Zoning Board of Appeals has a policy for  
24 dealing with situations when there are not five members present and a tie vote could result: The  
25 Applicant can request – or the Board can recommend – that the Application be continued to a meeting  
26 when there are five members present. If she had appeared before the ZBA, Ms. Bifulco would have  
27 been given that option and Mr. Sargent asked the CEO to check with the Town Attorney to see if that  
28 policy applies to the Planning Board as well. Mr. Kelly's response was that it does, and that the policy  
29 was in effect, whether or not the Board was aware of that fact, on May 15. He further advises that  
30 once the Board becomes aware of a policy governing their actions, they need to implement it.

31  
32 The process applies when there is less than a full complement of Board members present at a  
33 Public Hearing: The Public Hearing can be convened or it can be continued without receiving  
34 comments. In either case the Applicant – or the Board – must decide whether or not to proceed to a  
35 vote *before* the Public Hearing is convened. If the decision is to defer the decision, the Public Hearing  
36 is continued to the next meeting when there is a full complement of the Board present.

37  
38 A board has two choices on how to proceed:

- 39 1) The absent member must certify that he/she has read the Minutes of the meeting, watched the  
40 video and read any submissions. The Board begins deliberation and then votes.  
41  
42 2) The Board can begin the hearing process over again from the beginning: In a *de novo*  
43 proceeding, none of the previous testimony or submissions is considered – it is as if the original  
44 public hearing never took place.

45  
46 However, if a vote has already been taken the Board has the option, as does the Applicant, of  
47 requesting that the Board reconsider their decision. Notice must be provided to the Applicant and to  
48 interested parties that the Board will be deciding whether or not they will reconsider their decision.

1 The Board is not required to hold a new Public Hearing. If they do not, they would go forward to vote  
2 again without further receiving any new evidence.  
3

4 Mr. Sargent informed those attending that he has consulted with the Select Board Chair. They  
5 will ask Bill Kelly to draw up procedures for the Planning Board, Select Board and ZBA to use. Select  
6 Board member Leonard Lookner expressed concerns that applying this policy retroactively in the  
7 Bifulco case might open the Town up to claims that individuals were denied their right to be re-heard  
8 going back many years. It was explained, using the ZBA's policy as an example, that there are time  
9 limits that apply to requests to reconsider that are part of the State's statutory procedure for Appeals  
10 Boards.  
11

12 Mr. Bernhard expressed concerns that the Board is abandoning a policy they have followed for  
13 years by adopting this new procedure, and he wondered if they have the right to just do that. The Chair  
14 explained that if they learn what they have been doing is wrong, they have the obligation to adopt the  
15 correct procedure. They have done it before when during the Fox Hill review they learned that a non-  
16 voting alternate member must step down from the podium and sit with the public – they had never  
17 done that previously. When they learned it was required by Statute, they began following the policy.  
18

19 Regarding the Windward House vote, either Ms. Bifulco can make the request to reconsider or  
20 the Board can decide to move forward its own. Because of the level of interest in Ms. Bifulco's  
21 proposal, Mr. Sargent proposed that it would be in everyone's best interest to conduct a new public  
22 hearing, and the Board agreed this was the best course to take to rectify the situation and they set a  
23 hearing for Thursday July 3. After hearing comments from the public regarding the fact that this was  
24 the lead-in to a very busy holiday week-end, the Board agreed to move the hearing back one day to  
25 Wednesday, July 2. Mr. Sargent did not want to wait further into July to begin the hearing process  
26 over again because any delay might mean that the proposal would not reach the Select Board in time  
27 for them to consider adding the item to the November Warrant. He informed those interested in  
28 submitting testimony in advance of the July 2 hearing that later on the agenda the Board would be  
29 discussing forming a policy regarding submissions of testimony or comments for the Board's review.  
30 That policy will be in effect for the July hearing. It will be posted online so people can follow the new  
31 rules to ensure their comments will be considered. There will also be strict enforcement of the three-  
32 minute rule for testifying. Nora McGrath will serve as timekeeper and will try to find a way to signal  
33 that the speaker's time is nearly up. She will signal again at three minutes and the Chair will stop the  
34 testimony.  
35

36 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Public Hearing on the  
37 Windward House be rescheduled for July 2, 2014, and that notice of said meeting be published in the  
38 newspaper and in the Town Office.

39 **VOTE: 5-0-0**  
40

41 ← The CEO will ask the Town Attorney to be present at the hearing to answer questions.  
42

43 **4. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Mixed Commercial and Residential Development**

44 Cartwright, Frazer and Gerard: Map 113 Lot 84-1: Business River (BR) District:  
45 Mt. Battie Street  
46

1 The CEO informed the Chair that the meeting has been advertised as a Public Hearing. If the  
2 Board does not finish with the Application this evening, they can continue the hearing until the next  
3 meeting. But in case they want to hold the hearing tonight it has been properly noticed.  
4

5 The Chair read the procedure for conducting Public Hearings and asked the Applicant to  
6 present a summary of the proposal. Tom Fowler of Landmark Associates was present to represent the  
7 Applicants in their request to construct four buildings (numbered as Buildings #1 – #4) -- two  
8 commercial (#2 and #4) and two a mix of commercial and residential -- on a parcel in the Business  
9 River District.  
10

11 At the pre-application meeting the Planning Board had asked for more information regarding  
12 stormwater management, erosion control measures and the drainage patterns over the lot. Mr. Fowler  
13 believes the revised submissions now meet the Ordinance requirements. In addition, they have now  
14 applied for two Permits-by-Rule (PBR) from the DEP to make minor drainage improvements. They  
15 also want to reinforce a portion of the existing drainage channel, and although the nature of the work is  
16 purely maintenance, the proximity of the project to the river may drive an additional PBR. They also  
17 require a Stormwater Permit-by-Rule – a new, simplified process available when developers will be  
18 disturbing more than an acre of land that will result in new impervious surface area less than an acre in  
19 size. It works like the regular PBR – if the Applicant has not been notified that more information is  
20 required or that the permit is denied, the permit has been approved.  
21

#### 22 *Questions from the Board*

23

24 Ms. MacKinnon noted that she had missed the previous meeting but had been on the Site Walk  
25 held awhile ago for a previous proposal on the same lot. The CEO informed Ms. MacKinnon that she  
26 missed the pre-application meeting – the formal review process begins this evening. Mr. Sargent  
27 added that the Board had asked the Applicant to hire an engineer and come back with more  
28 information which they have done. He does not believe there was any information presented at that  
29 meeting that would have helped her make a decision – this is all new to the entire Board.  
30

31 Mr. Householder: He noted the drastic change in the shape of Building #1 from the Preliminary Plan  
32 to this version. Mr. Fowler agreed there was a change and described the building with regard to the  
33 new Ordinance requirement requiring a ratio of 1:1 for street-level commercial space vs. street-level  
34 residential space: Building #1: Out of a total of 1670 SF of building area 920 SF is street-level  
35 commercial, 140 SF is street level multi-purpose functional space (stairways/hallways), and 610 SF is  
36 street-level residential. Because it will be built into the hill and both floors and could be from grade if  
37 desired, both floors could be considered first floors according to the CEO, Paul Cartwright joined Mr.  
38 Fowler at this point and disagreed that the 2<sup>nd</sup> level is not at street level. There is no separate exterior  
39 entrance to that floor, and the computations shown on a new insert to the Application Packet show the  
40 calculations based on one street-level floor in which residential space is 2/3's that of commercial space  
41 – the only floor where this restriction applies.  
42

43 Mr. Bernhard: He asked why the Applicants had two separate sewer lines coming in – one to the  
44 residence and one to the commercial building, when it was so much more expensive than teeing off  
45 from one to the other. Mr. Fowler explained that the Town of Camden requires a separate line to the  
46 sewer from each structure.  
47  
48

1 *Site Plan Content*

2  
3 The Site Plan under review consists of:

- 4 • Site Plan dated May 22, 2014 (Page 1 of 2)
- 5 • Details Sheet dated May 22, 2014 (Page 2 of 2)
- 6 • Application packet dated March 7, 2014
- 7 • Site Map dated May 2014
- 8 • Drainage Diagram for Cartwright 2014 dated May 21, 2014
- 9 • Building elevations for Buildings #1 - #4

10  
11 After reviewing the Site Plan Content requirement of Article XII, the following Motion was offered:

12  
13 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** to Find that with the exception of  
14 dimensions for buildings, utilities, driveways and parking areas that the Content requirements of  
15 Article XII Section 3 is met by Page 1 of 2 and Page 2 of 2 of the Site Plan for the Riverside Mt. Battie  
16 Development.

17 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

18  
19 *Public Hearing*

20  
21 The first Public Comment period was opened and closed without comment.

22  
23 Questions from the Board:

24 Mr. Scholz: He notices the Plan calls for a long driveway that meanders up the hill and crosses some  
25 wetlands and comes close to others with steep grades in places in between. He wonders if there is any  
26 value in holding a Site Walk for this property. He was informed that the Board held a Site Walk when  
27 the Applicant first came to them with a proposal a couple of years ago. Mr. Scholz agreed to accept  
28 the opinion of his fellow Board members that the Plan suited the topography of the site.

29  
30 Ms. MacKinnon: She likes the curves in the driveways because they will help slow run-off coming  
31 down the hill.

32 Mr. Sargent asked if the Applicants had any plans to extend either of the driveways or add a new drive  
33 to access the back area of the lot. The Applicants replied they hope to keep the back area just as it is.

34  
35 The second Public Comment period was opened and closed without comment. The CEO noted  
36 that several abutters/neighbors had called or had come in to look at the Plans and were pleased with the  
37 scale of the development being proposed here. Mr. Sargent believes this project is a good use of a site  
38 that is tough to develop and Mr. Scholz offered his support as well.

39  
40 The Public Hearing was closed. After review of the Approval Criteria (see Attachment 2) the following  
41 Motion was offered:

42  
43 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Plan for Riverside Development as  
44 shown on Sheets 1 of 2 and 2 of 2 along with the Site Plan application information meets the Site Plan  
45 Approval Criteria because all the approval criteria have been met or have been found to be not  
46 applicable and should be approved with the Condition that dimensions for driveways, parking areas  
47 and utilities be added to the Plan.

48 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

1 **5. HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE: Discussion regarding signage**  
2

3 Meg Barclay, Chair of the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) was present to begin a  
4 discussion with the Board regarding the creation of a new category of Municipal Signs for  
5 historical/educational purposes.  
6

7 The HRC is considering a project to create signs introducing drivers to the particular historic  
8 district they are about to enter – High Street Historic District or Chestnut Street Historic District for  
9 example. The hope is to introduce the historic nature of Camden and create interest in learning more.  
10 After some discussion the Board decided that it was time to reactivate the Sign Committee. Mr.  
11 Householder served as Chair during their last project and Ms. MacKinnon was also a member; both  
12 agreed to continue serving on the Committee.  
13

14 Regarding the HRC proposal, neither Mr. Householder nor Ms. MacKinnon was optimistic that  
15 a request for more street signs would be well-received. The most common objection to the recently  
16 approved Directional Signs project was that there were already too many signs in Town. The Sign  
17 Committee also ran into many problems when it came to obtaining permission to locate signs on  
18 private property – including on the sides of buildings. Ms. Barclay and members of the HRC are fully  
19 aware of that hurdle and will keep it in mind when they consider the scale of the sign they will propose  
20 if this project continues going forward.  
21

22 The HRC’s second project originated with a request from the Pathways Committee regarding  
23 the development of signage for the Riverwalk that would inform walkers of the history of certain sites  
24 along the Megunticook River. The HRC began a study of the river corridor and realized how many  
25 interesting stories there were to tell about a feature that has been of great importance in the history of  
26 the Town. This is not their project, but these signs would also be Municipal signs and they would be  
27 both historical and educational in nature. In addition to providing historical facts, some signs would  
28 introduce natural areas and wildlife that might be seen at various locations.  
29

30 Ms. MacKinnon suggested that when the group comes to meet with the Sign Committee  
31 regarding either group of signs that they bring a prototype of the size and color they are suggesting;  
32 that is the best way to introduce the project. They should also have a specific list of places they will  
33 want the signs to be located. Ms. Barclay believes there are many examples of the kinds of signs they  
34 are considering and they will start by looking at examples. It was also noted that the development of  
35 the Riverwalk concept included much work by Landscape Architect Sarah Witte on signage  
36 appropriate to Camden, including some proposed designs for directional and informational signs. Mr.  
37 Sargent noted that many groups should be brought into the discussion – the Downtown Business  
38 Group, CEDAC, Pathways, HRC, and perhaps others. The Sign Committee will start to look at the  
39 project in early fall when Planning Board work and work for some of the groups that will be involved  
40 has slowed down a bit.  
41

42 Mr. Bernhard asked to become part of the Committee. He is one who agrees that there may  
43 already be too many signs. He would like to be part of the discussion asking “when is enough  
44 enough?” and hoping to push for moderation. Mr. Wilson noted that meant that since a quorum of  
45 Planning Board members would be present each meeting of the Sign Committee, the meeting would  
46 then become a Planning Board and would have to be noticed.  
47  
48

1 **6: DISCUSSION:**

2  
3 1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments

4  
5 2. Future Agenda Items: Camden Snow Bowl Lighting Plan – it is still being worked on but they  
6 hope to come before the Board early in July.

7  
8 3. Pending Applications:

9 Joint Subdivision Review: The Town of Rockport Planning Board has scheduled a meeting for  
10 Wednesday, June 18 – they will hold their Site Walk prior to the meeting and then open the  
11 Public Hearing which will be jointly attended by both Planning Boards.

12  
13 Mtn. Arrow Subdivision needs to return for a Third Amendment: Evidently there was an error  
14 made in their original submission prior to ever receiving approval and the lot they wanted to  
15 convey could not convey -- the error must be corrected before any change of lot lines can  
16 occur.

17  
18 The Board would like to try to reconvene on the 18 in Camden to hear the new request  
19 from Mtn. Arrow Subdivision. But they realized it would be difficult to know ahead of time  
20 when they might finish in Rockport , and because there has been a great deal of interest by  
21 neighbors in previous requests, they will meet on the 19 as scheduled instead.

22  
23 4. Other:

24 Planning Board five-year plan per Camden Charter: The Chair read from the Charter regarding  
25 the Planning Board’s role in planning. They revisited Mr. Sargent’s statement regarding this  
26 role read during the Public Comment period at the beginning of the meeting. The Chair  
27 suggested that the issue be added to the Agenda for the 19. He has spoken with Select Board  
28 members and they agree that the Planning Board should prepare the five-year Plan which  
29 should include addressing the proposed new Middle School and the lack of oversight and  
30 interface with the School Board and other Committees and Boards in Town. The Town  
31 Manager is being asked to help them understand what the current boundaries are for  
32 involvement in the budgeting process. They need to also understand what options they have to  
33 legally become more involved.

34  
35 Open Space Commercial Zoning: The concept is still under discussion. Recently a sub-  
36 committee of CEDAC met to discuss the issues regarding the Tannery re-use. Brian Hodges,  
37 Camden’s Development Director, served as Chair and Audra Caler-Bell, the Program Director  
38 of the Mid-coast Economic Development District, was invited to explain what impact the  
39 Brownfield classification has on any re-development or re-use proposal for the site. The group  
40 was surprised to learn the extent to which any effort must comply with standards – especially if  
41 the re-use involves a residential component. In addition, nothing can be done until there is a  
42 Phase 1 re-assessment of the site done to see if a Phase 2 clean-up would be required -- the  
43 Phase 1 re-assessment requires no money from the Town.

44  
45 The group also discussed how to approach development of the site with regard to re-  
46 zoning issues. They decided to look to some developers from outside the area to see what they  
47 think would likely be the use of this property. The Sub-committee could then provide CEDAC  
48 with guidance on what steps might be needed to address re-zoning.

1  
2 The Planning Board needs to stay on track to finish the Open Space Zoning proposal so  
3 the amendment can go forward to a vote in November. He would like the Board to consider  
4 whether they want to make the option an Overlay District that would be available in limited  
5 districts on lots of a certain size or whether they want to create a single new District. The  
6 current Overlay Districts can be used as examples of how that concept might be applied.  
7

8 Policy for submitting written testimony to the Board: The Board continued to discuss what  
9 restrictions they might place on submissions and testimony so they have time to review the  
10 information well before a meeting. Comments received within the timeframe will be scanned  
11 and posted to the Town's website so they are available to the public to review as part of the  
12 record that was used in making Board decisions. The Policy in summary:

- 13 ➤ Require all written communications, including emails to be submitted by 4 pm the  
14 Monday before the PB meeting. Submissions must be signed, dated and have pages  
15 numbered
- 16 ➤ All written submissions will be scanned and posted on the Town's website
- 17 ➤ The CEO will send the Chair a draft agenda. The intent is to have the final agenda  
18 available for circulation by Tuesday the week of meetings.  
19

20 Policy for distributing minutes: The Recording Secretary will send the draft minutes to the  
21 CEO who will have them printed and ready for distribution to members on the Tuesday  
22 morning before the meeting.  
23

24 The Board discussed the need for a printed Planning Board manual that would contain  
25 all the policies and practices of the Board. Once Mr. Kelly has prepared his procedural policy  
26 it can be included along with the other already existing policies so everything is available in  
27 one document.  
28

29 The Comprehensive Plan agenda for the June 26 meeting will be discussed on the 19.  
30

31 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 8:15pm  
32

33 Respectfully Submitted,  
34

35  
36 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

## ATTACHMENT 1: Sargent Statement 5/15/2014:

For some time now, the Planning Board has expressed a desire to be more involved in larger issue ideas for Camden. One of the areas the Board has rarely participated in is planning strategies in association with the School Board's efforts to identify the needs of our Town's student population. Is it time to change our actions and become more involved with the schools?

During the current revision to the Camden Comprehensive Plan, we decided to add a chapter on schools, researching information on public schools, alternative schools and schools that provide primarily adult or enhancement type educational opportunities.

Additionally the Camden Town Charter calls for the Planning Board to develop and maintain a five year plan, revised annually, intended to provide long range continuity for capital appropriations of considerable magnitude. The Planning Board has been deficit in satisfying this obligation; but we intend to change that.

Recently MSAD 28 has put forth a proposal to demolish a large portion of the middle school on Knowlton Street and build a new building with an estimated cost of \$23 to \$25 million dollars. This is certainly a capital appropriation of considerable magnitude. I have four major concerns about this proposal:

No one can deny the importance of a quality education, for it will improve our community and give our youth better opportunities in today's world. But, when I look back on my public education, I do not remember how fancy the buildings were. Rather I remember the dedicated teachers that challenged, inspired and guided me along the way. I suspect today's students feel the same.

1. The demographic information available from the 2010 Federal Census states that the number of Camden residents of middle school age is currently about 277 but will drop to 238 in four years and then 162 in four more years. We need to seriously consider why a new building needs to be built to hold a steadily declining population.

3. Since the late 90's, Camden citizens have been asked to help pay for a new, underutilized high school, a new, underutilized elementary school,

an enlargement to the Snow Bowl and now to consider spending \$23 to \$25 million for a new middle school. The cost of the new middle school will likely be larger on a per citizen basis than the cost of the high school. Property taxes are a burden on us all and I wonder how close we are coming to the tipping point where taxpayers say 'enough'. It is important that Camden be tax competitive with other communities so we can attract new residents and reverse a significant fourteen year decline in population.

4. It has been stated by consulting engineers that the current middle school is structurally sound, albeit expensive to heat, but too large for its current enrollment. Instead of tearing it down and building a new building, we should study the possibility of re-purposing the excess space. It could be used as incubator space for young entrepreneurs or perhaps housing. In any case, we should do as the Comprehensive Plan suggests and seek to adaptively reuse existing structures rather than demolishing them and building new structures.

My hope is that the Planning Board can join with the Select Board and the School Board to consider alternative views on the proposed new middle school with the goal of providing a first rate educational experience for a declining population in economically challenging times. I look forward to a time, hopefully soon, when we can all meet to consider the options.

ATTACHMENT 2: SITE PLAN REVIEW – RIVERSIDE DEVELOPMENT: 6/05/2014

Article XII: Site Plan Content and Site Plan Approval Criteria:

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

(a) Owner's name and address

*Shown on Site Plan.*

(b) Names and addresses of all abutting property owners

*Included on Site Plan.*

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

*Provided.*

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

*This is the only lot that applies.*

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

*Listed on Plan.*

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

*Included on Plan.*

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

*Shown on Plan.*

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

*Drawings of the buildings were provided.*

← Mr. Fowler unsuccessfully argued that dimensions of the buildings could be determined using the scale on the Plan – they must be provided.

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

*The location of the driveways is shown on the Plan; there are no loading areas; and there are no pathways shown.*

← Mr. Fowler unsuccessfully argued that dimensions of the parking areas could be determined using the scale on the Plan – they must be provided.

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

*Shown on the Plan.*

(k) The location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal  
*Shown on the Plan.*

(l) the location of open drainage courses, wetlands, stands of trees, and other important natural features, with a description of such features to be retained and of any new landscaping planned.  
*Identified on the Plan – there is no landscaping planned.*

(m) Location and dimensions of any existing easements and copies of existing covenants or deed restrictions.  
*The sewer easement in the NW corner is shown as are the two drainage easements.*

(n) Location, front view, and dimensions of existing and proposed signs.  
*There are no signs proposed.*

(o) Location and type of exterior lighting.  
*An example of the exterior lighting is shown on the Details sheet and a Note on this Plan says the lighting is downward directed.*

(p) Copies of applicable State and Federal approvals and permits, provided, however, that the Board may approve site plans subject to the issuance of specified State approvals and permits where it determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan review.  
Discussion: The Chair has noticed that the visibility along the street is limited by trees over hanging the river. He asked if sight distances have been verified and was informed that trimming these trees is part of the Forestry Plan that has been developed for the property. The CEO added that the lower entrance will require an entrance culvert and part of that permitting process involves meeting sight distance standards. Any issue caused by vegetation on Town property will be addressed at that time as well.

← CEO was asked to send a note on behalf of the Board to the Public Works Director recommending that he look hard at sight distances during the culvert permitting process.

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

Section 4. Supplemental Information  
None was required.

(1) *Preserve and Enhance the Landscape*

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #1, Preserve and Enhance the Landscape, is satisfied because there will a minimum amount of vegetation removed in developing the sites.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(2) *Erosion Control*

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #2, Erosion Control, is satisfied due to specifications on Page 2 and the cross section that shows that erosion controls will be in place during tree cutting.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

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

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** is accomplished by the location of the buildings as shown on Page 1 of 2 and the fact that these buildings shall not interfere unreasonably with the solar access of neighboring buildings.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

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

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** that #4 is satisfied as noted on Page 1 and because the CEO will ask the Public Works Director to verify that there are safe sight distances.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(5) *Surface Water Drainage*

**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that Surface Water Drainage is met as shown on Pages 1 and 2 of the Site Plan.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(6) *The development shall not impose an unreasonable burden on sewers and storm drains, water lines or other public utilities. New utilities shall be sized and existing utilities upgraded to adequately handle the demands of the development.*

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #6 is met by the letters from the Maine Water and the Sewer Department.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(7) *Special Features of Development*

Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installation, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and similar structures ...

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #7 Special Features of Development is not applicable because none of these items are proposed for this site.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(8) *Exterior Lighting*

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #8 Exterior Lighting is met based on Page 2 of 2 which provides examples of proposed lighting and states that they are full cut-off fixtures.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(9) *Emergency Vehicle Access*

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #9, Emergency Vehicle Access is met with the Condition that driveway and parking area dimensions be submitted; because the site is located on the river so there is adequate water for the purpose of fighting fires; and because the site is easy to access.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

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

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** that #10 is not applicable to this site.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

(11) Design standards for new construction, additions or exterior renovations in the B-1, B-TH or B-TR Zoning Districts...

The Chair noted that this criterion does not apply because the property is not located in any of these districts.