

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 17, 2014**

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

12 The meeting of the Planning Board convened at 5:00 pm.

13 **1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:** No one came forward to speak.

14 **2. MINUTES:**

15 July 2, 2014:

16 There were two substantive changes made to the draft Minutes; other corrections and  
17 recommendations for editorial changes have been included in the Final version.

18 Page 5 Line 9: Ms. MacKinnon asked the question of Mr. Kelly, not Mr. Sargent.

19 Page 9 Line beginning at Line 26 the sentence now reads: "...should worry more about what  
20 would happen if a new owner were to buy one of the historic homes in the District – there is  
21 nothing to stop them from making significant changes to the building that would change the  
22 historic character of the neighborhood;"

23 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** that the Minutes of the Planning  
24 Board meeting of July 2, 2014, be approved as noted.

25 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

26  
27 **3. ELECTION of OFFICERS:**

28 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** to nominate Mr. Sargent to serve as  
29 Chair.

30 **VOTE: 4-0-1 with Mr. Sargent abstaining**

31  
32 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Sargent** to nominate Mr. Householder to  
33 serve as Vice Chair.

34 **VOTE: 4-0-1 with Mr. Householder abstaining**

35  
36 **4. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT: Business Opportunity Zone (BOZ)**

37  
38 The Board discussed the 6-30-14 Draft prepared by Mr. Sargent with regard to purpose,  
39 allowed uses and where (which zones) it would be appropriate to use:

40  
41 Mr. Bernhard: He believes this is an opportunity to highlight businesses that are examples of  
42 how the Town wants to "brand" itself and show the importance of protected open space to the  
43 citizens – encouragement for those types of businesses to locate there should be worked into the  
44 BOZ. Being aware of the history of the Tannery site, he would hesitate to offer incentives and  
45 wonders how this kind of development could be encouraged.

47 Mr. Scholz: Although he agrees that certain types of business should be encouraged, including  
48 incentives in the BOZ is difficult; perhaps it can be done within the Comp Plan as they work on  
49 the individual districts.

50  
51 Mr. Householder: The key to encouraging development is to provide specific guidelines and by  
52 referencing this in the Purpose of the zone. Mr. Bernhard offered to work on language to  
53 accomplish his goal for the Purpose for the BOZ and have it for the Board to consider later in the  
54 evening. The Draft has to be finalized this evening so the hearing can be advertised.

55  
56 Mr. Bernhard asked Mr. Sargent and Mr. Scholz what their thinking was in not including  
57 mixed use when they drafted the BOZ. They replied that residential use is already permitted in  
58 many of the business districts and if developers want mixed use they already have plenty of  
59 options. In addition, many of the properties where the BOZ is envisioned to apply are not  
60 attractive for residential use – the Keefe property, for example, is right on Route 1. Mr. Sargent  
61 added that including residential use leads to many additional code requirements that might  
62 discourage development; and residential use at the Tannery brings it to a new level of  
63 Brownfield review that could be very costly. Overall, though, the intent of this new zone is to  
64 create more commercial space in Town and allowing residential use would just use up that  
65 already limited area.

66  
67 Mr. Householder: He is concerned that allowing the use described as “Sit Down restaurants and  
68 fast food restaurants provided there are no drive-through windows” will draw opposition. He  
69 recommends removing the “fast food” portion of the use. Mr. Sargent suggested that the term  
70 was there so sit down restaurants can offer take-out food – workers in these developments are not  
71 going to be interested in taking an hour or more to have lunch so there need to be other options.  
72 There was discussion about the lack of clarity in the food service definitions. Mr. Scholz  
73 recommended that the fast-food terminology is eliminated leaving sit down restaurants as the  
74 only option until the definitions can be rewritten. At that point in time, when the Board can be  
75 assured that there will be protection from chain-style fast food, they can come back and amend  
76 the BOZ.

77  
78 The Board reviewed the listing of permitted uses.

79 Hospitals should be removed from the permitted commercial uses – they require too much  
80 acreage

81 The Board discussed what kind of truck traffic would be created if warehousing and  
82 distribution is included. Mr. Householder asked why the Board would consider allowing a  
83 use that would add this kind of traffic. Mr. Scholz suggested classifying this category as a  
84 Special Exception so traffic could be more closely reviewed; the Board agreed and created a  
85 Special Exception Section.

86  
87 Mr. Bernhard asked if the setbacks were sufficient to contribute to the openness the  
88 Board is seeking – it seemed the buffers intended to screen the property would be fairly small.  
89 Mr. Sargent did calculations applying larger setbacks and found that, on smaller lots, nearly a  
90 third of the land would be lost to setbacks – this would discourage most developers. If there  
91 were very large lots in Town where this would be appropriate, setbacks could be addressed  
92 differently.

93 Implementation: Mr. Wilson recommended changing the language to say: “When the BOZ is  
94 used in the design and development of a parcel, the Permitted Uses, District Regulations and  
95 Standards of the BOZ shall supersede and/or replace the Permitted Uses, District Regulations  
96 and Standards of the overlaid parcels.” This is done to make sure that the Standards being  
97 replaced are not Performance Standards.  
98

99 Screening: The Board discussed whether or not parking areas needed to be screen and agreed  
100 they did not because it would detract from an open appearance and it would use more land that  
101 could be developed. However, the Ordinance requires screening where commercial development  
102 abuts a residential use. The Board quickly reviewed the Site Plan Ordinance and Performance  
103 Standards to see if there were other standards that might impact the BOZ as drafted and found no  
104 other conflicts.  
105

106 A discussion about controlling the coming and going of delivery trucks could impact  
107 businesses like Mid-Coast limo or Needful Things who come and go in vans and small trucks –  
108 they are more a service business than a warehouse. Mr. Householder recommended adding  
109 language that says that trucks performing personal services are allowed, but other members of  
110 the Board don’t want the language to micro-manage situations. To clarify that the architectural  
111 review will be limited to scale, proportion and blending with topography, the term, etc. was  
112 deleted from the final paragraph.  
113

114 The Public Information Gathering Meeting was scheduled for July 31. If there are no  
115 substantive changes to the language, the first of the two public hearings for August 21; if there  
116 are changes that hearing moves to August 28. If there are no changes resulting from the August  
117 21 hearing, the hearing on the 28 will conclude the Planning Board’s work so they can send it to  
118 the Select Board for them to work into their schedule.  
119

120 Mr. Bernhard presented language to the Board to address his revised “Purpose” for this  
121 new zone. After little discussion the following language was accepted: “To create a new zoning  
122 category intended to encourage balanced development, energy efficient, aesthetically pleasing,  
123 cost-effective commercial projects while acknowledging green space protection on small and  
124 irregularly shaped land parcels where site limitations would otherwise make adhering to current  
125 district regulations impractical.”  
126

## 127 **5. PLANNING BOARD PRIORITIES:** 128

129 The Board reviewed the list prepared by the Chair and put them in either “to do now” or  
130 “to do later” category:  
131

132 To Do Now:

133 Comp Plan Update continues

134 Create zoning amendment submission and approval procedures: June 2015

135 The CEO noted that a policy regarding amendments can be adopted by the Board without  
136 Town approval, but the Zoning Ordinance may also require an Ordinance amendment that would  
137 have to go to a vote. Article XV Amendment and Other Interpretive Provisions: Section 4.  
138 Amendment should be changed to reflect the Board’s newly adopted procedure.

139 ← Mr. Sargent will draft a procedure for review

140

141 New commercial zone: Nearly completion: November 2014

142 Possible Ordinance Changes: Will be done incrementally

143

144 1<sup>st</sup>: Review *all* definitions to see if they are in need of updating; add new definitions; delete out-  
145 dated definitions:

146

147 Members were each assigned 4 pages from Article III: Definitions - work will begin  
148 sometime after September starting with the Lodging and Food Service categories including a  
149 new definition for “Function” including how functions will be regulated:

150

151 Ms. MacKinnon: Pages 1 – 4

152 Mr. Scholz: Pages 5 – 8

153 Mr. Sargent: Pages 9 – 12

154 Mr. Householder: Pages 13 – 16

155 Mr. Bernhard: Pages 17 – 20

156

157 Other Ordinance items to Discuss: Ongoing

158 ➤ Reconsider 500 foot ‘transitional zone’ language

159 ➤ Adding technical capacity for site plan approval

160 ➤ Update lighting standards in Site Plan Review – clarify “glare” at Article X Section  
161 25(1)6

162 ➤ Consider establishing noise standards in the Rural Recreation District (RR)

163

164 To Do Later:

165

166 Planning Board Manual:

167 Five –Year Plan per Charter

168 Southern Gateway Proposal: Waiting for direction from Select Board and for Rockport to move  
169 forward

170 Signs:

171 ➤ Rejuvenate Sign Committee to work on Riverwalk and historic sites signage

172 ➤ Work with Historic Resources Committee (HRC) on possible ordinance changes (HRC  
173 will lead.) Consider realtor signs, contractor signs and vocational rental signs among  
174 others.

175

176 Ms. MacKinnon announced that she would like to resign from the Sign Committee. Mr.  
177 Householder and Mr. Bernhard will continue to serve.

178

## 179 **6. JULY 15 MEETING REVIEW:**

180

181 The Board met with the Select Board to discuss several matters on July 15. There was no  
182 report.

183

184

185 **7. DISCUSSION:**

186

187 1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments;

188

189 2. Future Agenda Items:

190 Camden Snow Bowl Lighting Plan: There has been no request for a review of the Lighting  
191 Plan, and members discussed how the project could go forward without the Plan in place if  
192 installing the light poles was supposed to be done before the newly cut slopes are stabilized.  
193 Mr. Wilson replied that he believes there is a plan to go forward without the lighting – they  
194 may open the new trail without night skiing.

195

196 Maine Farmland Trust's subdivision: Camden is waiting for Rockport to finish their review of  
197 the major subdivision before they review a change of lot lines.

198

199 3. Other: The Board reviewed the Comp Plan agenda for the meeting on the 24th

200

201 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 7:45pm

202

203 Respectfully Submitted,

204

205

206 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

207