

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

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
September 18, 2014**

5 **PRESENT:** Chair Lowrie Sargent; Members Richard Bernhard, Jan MacKinnon and John
6 Scholz; Select Board Liaison Don White; and CEO Steve Wilson
7 **ABSENT:** Richard Householder

8
9 The meeting of the Planning Board convened at 5:00 pm.

10
11 **1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:** No one came forward to speak.

12
13 **2. MINUTES:**

14
15 August 21, 2014:

16 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Bernhard** to approve the Minutes of August
17 21, 2014, as submitted.

18 **VOTE: 3-0-1** with Mr. Scholz abstaining because he was absent

19
20 September 4, 2014:

21 Page 3:

22 Line 102: "(Parts A and B were not addressed) C. Reduce or interfere ..."

23 Line 108 now reads: "The Harbor Committee believes there will be some changes resulting from
24 a pier; what is impossible to assess is exactly what that impact would be.

25 Line 112 on: "3) That the pier will depreciate the value of the Miller property because they will
26 never be able to build a pier based on the location of the Brace pier¹; and 4) That the
27 Comprehensive Plan..." The associated footnote reads: "At their September 18, 2014, meeting
28 the Planning Board noted the following about Item 3): The Millers actually have a 50'+ strip of
29 property within which a pier could be legally located; they do not agree that the Miller property
30 will be depreciated."

31 Line 128: Mr. Gold's name had been misspelled.

32
33 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Bernhard** to approve the Minutes of September 4,
34 2014, as amended.

35 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

36
37 **3. SITE PLAN REVIEW/NEW WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY**
38 **Northeast Wireless Networks: Map 120 Lot 87: 36 Washington Street**

39
40 Matt Orne, owner of the property where the new wireless facility will be located, was
41 present to update the Board on recent developments with regard to the smokestack. He learned
42 today that the smokestack in the area where the antennae are to be installed is unsound and not
43 salvagable. Engineers recommend the most economical solution is to remove the top 35'. This
44 brings the stack to a height of 135' with the new location of the antennae proposed to range from
45 117' to 127'. He has been in touch with Northeast Wireless and this height will still work for
46 them. With regard to hosting other providers, he has thought of someday adding a prosthetic top
47 section to the stack for that purpose – any antennae installed here would be on the interior. Mr.
48 Wilson reminded him that because the stack will be a non-conforming structure with regard to

49 height, there will be a time limit on restoring the top portion or the option to continue the non-
50 conformity will expire.

51

52 Maureen Hopkins from Northeast Wireless explained their proposal to lease tower space
53 and a 130SF ground area at the base of the stack to install:

- 54 • Six panel antennae and one dish on the stack
- 55 • Two equipment cabinets on a 6' x 9' steel frame

56

57 The Chair read the Public Hearing procedures. The two public comment periods were
58 opened and closed without comment.

59

60 The Application under review consists of the following:

61 Application for Site Plan Review dated August 7, 2014 and submissions binder

62 Plans dated May 7, 2014: T-1 Title Sheet; C-1 Overall Site and Layout Plan; C-2 Tower

63 Elevation & Antennae Plan; C-3 Construction Details

64 S-1: A Standard Boundary Survey prepared by Michael Cummons, PLS dated January 11, 1991

65 S-2: Sheet C-1 dated February 28, 2007 – Knox Mill Properties LLC Condominium Survey and

66 Combined Final Amended Subdivision Plan; Final Re-subdivision Plan; and Final Amended Site

67 Plan

68 Letter with accompanying photos and photo simulations prepared by A&D Klumb

69 Environmental, LLC, dated September 4, 2014

70

71 The Applicant also submitted a document titled: *Narrative Addressing Submission*
72 *Requirements in Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the Town of Camden Wireless Telecommunications*
73 *Facilities Siting Ordinance*. Referencing this document, the Board reviewed the Application
74 against these requirements (see Attachment 1).

75

76 Regarding the submission from A&D Klumb referenced above, the Board made the
77 following decision during their review of the submission requirements of Section 5.4:

78

79 In light of the changes to the location of the antennae, Northeast Wireless will need to
80 revise Submission 5.4 7. The required photo simulations had been prepared by A&D Klumb
81 Environmental, LLC, and using these photos as a guide, the Board determined that there were
82 only two sites from which the change in location should be reviewed with regard to possible
83 impact. Of the 20 photos submitted, the Board asked for six to be redone to illustrate the revised
84 height of the stack: 1, 1a and 1b – as seen from Mechanic Street; and 2, 2a and 2b – as seen
85 from Main Street at the river.

86

87 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Scholz** that based on what the Applicant has
88 submitted to the Board, we contingently find the Application Complete with the exception of
89 Items 5.3 5, 5.4 4, 5.4 5 and 5.4 7. Once this information is submitted the Board will find the
90 Application Complete.

91 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

92

93 The CEO suggested the Board did not have to wait for the submissions to be available to
94 begin review of the Approval Criteria: Much of the information is here and many of the criteria
95 do not apply. They should be able to make a conditional approval with what they have and

96 finalize the process when the new submissions are in. See Attachment 2 for details of the
97 Board's review of Section 7.2.

98

99 **4. SITE PLAN AMENDMENT: Ragged Mountain Recreation Area**
100 **Town of Camden: Map 227 Lots 6, 8, 64, 66 and 67: Map 2238 Lots 3, 4, 6 and 7: Rural**
101 **Recreational District (RR): 20 Barnstown Road**

102

103 The Town was represented by: Will Gartley, of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and
104 Surveying, Engineers of Record for the project; Larry Bartlett of Bartlett Design - Lighting and
105 Electrical Engineering; and Landon Flake, General Manager of the Ragged Mountain
106 Recreational Area.

107

108 The Chair initiated a discussion regarding the changes to the originally approved Plan
109 questioning whether or not the totality of the changes fit within the scope of an Amendment, or
110 whether, when taken together, they should be considered as a new application. The agenda
111 describes the proposing changes: lighting, minor accessory building changes, addition of a 24' x
112 60' temporary building for ski rentals, changes to power distribution, minor grading changes and
113 a reduction in proposed clearing. Mr. Sargent suggests that, except for the temporary building,
114 many of the changes are minor in nature. When considered together Mr. Sargent believes they
115 are beyond what the Board can consider as an amendment.

116

117 Mr. Gartley replied that they did not intend to submit a new application. He argued that
118 the lighting coming back for approval separately was a condition of approval of the original plan;
119 most of the other changes are updating the site to reflect changes that have been made over the
120 course of the summer. They have shifted the locations of some buildings, reduced the scope of
121 cutting and grading for trails and made other minor changes. Mr. Sargent pointed out that the
122 size of the larger building would, by itself, trigger Site Plan review, and he believes it is
123 inappropriate to include something that size in an amendment. After further discussion, the
124 Applicant agreed to remove the temporary building from this proposal so the remainder of the
125 changes could go forward for approval as an amendment this evening. Mr. Gartley confirmed
126 that they understood the building is not part of this review, and that removing it from
127 consideration this evening does not preclude that building coming back as a new application at a
128 later date. It was also confirmed that the 10' x 15' addition to the pump house would remain on
129 the Plan to be considered as part of the amended Plan.

130

131 The CEO reminded the Board that with only three members present, the vote on the
132 Application would have to be unanimous. With the understanding that the Public Hearing would
133 be convened this evening, the Applicant was given the option of asking to have the vote on the
134 amendment deferred; the Applicant decided to go forward with only three members sitting.

135

136

137

PUBLIC HEARING

138 The Application under review consists of the following:

Document:	Date:
Narrative Outlining Changes	9-3-14
Proposed new Ski Trail Lighting Supplemental Information (8 Pages)	9-3-14
Catalog sheets illustrating Spaulding style ARF4 LED lamps	
Sheet E-Oa Photometric Lighting Plan - A (11x17)	9-8-14

Sheet E-Ob Photometric Lighting Plan B (11x17)	9-8-14
Sheet E-Oc Photometric Lighting Plan C (11x17)	9-8-14
Sheet E-Od Photometric Lighting Plan D (11x17)	9-8-14
Sheet E-Oe Photometric Lighting Plan E (11x17)	9-8-14
Sheet E-1 Site Electrical Plan Part - A	9-3-14
Sheet E-2 Site Electrical Plan Part - B&C	9-3-14
Sheet E-3 Site Electrical Plan Part - C(D)	9-3-14
Sheet E-4 Site Electrical Plan Part -D	9-3-14
Sheet E-5 Site Electrical Plan Part - E	9-3-14
Sheet C-1 Ski Trail Improvements Overall Site Plan	Rev 9-3-14
Sheet C-2 Ski Trail Improvements Demolition Grading & Restoration Plan	Rev 9-3-14
Sheet C-3 Ski Trail Improvements Detail Site Plan (East Segment)	Rev 9-3-14
Sheet C-4 Ski Trail Improvements Detail Site Plan (West Segment)	Rev 9-3-15

139

140

The Chair read the procedure for Public Hearings and asked the Applicants for a summary of the proposal. Mr. Bartlett to present the information on the revised lighting plan.

141

That presentation is available to view at <http://www.townhallstreams.com/locations/camden-me> or by linking from the Town’s website at <http://www.camdenmaine.gov/>.

142

143

144

145

Changes to the Approved Plan:

146

Lighting:

147

148

Mr. Bartlett noted that at the close of the previous review the Applicant was directed to consider what alternative lighting options are available and to gather information on impact to the neighborhood by contacting the operators of a ski area where the lighting was actually installed and had a history of use – that information was provided to the Board. He then explained the parameters they used in selecting the lamps they have chosen with safety to skiers being first. Fixtures that could be easily adjusted to reducing off-site glare and maximize on-slope lighting, selecting the best light spectrum that would provide sufficient light while minimizing interference with circadian rhythms, reducing the overall illumination to minimize snow glare, minimizing maintenance and operating costs, and creating safe transition zones for skiers moving from areas with the current lighting to those with new lamps were also important considerations.

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

To address concerns about the entire mountain being lighted during times when crews are making snow all night long, the system was designed with separate zones covering different trail areas – only those trails where work is being done will be lighted. Mr. Flake noted that snow-making occurs perhaps 20 days per season and can continue through the entire night. Trail groomers, who work most nights, have equipment with headlamps. They work more safely with just that light, although they sometimes work at the same time as the snowmakers.

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

With regard to off-site glare, Mr. Bartlett explained that these fixtures can be fitted with larger shields if that is needed to fine tune the lighting in certain areas. A question was raised specifically about the lights along the Northeaster Trail that appear to be aimed toward Hosmer Pond. The Applicant’s representatives explained that they originally had planned on mounting these lamps on the ski lift towers and directed toward the slope away from the pond. However, it

167

168

169

170

171

172 turned out that the engineers installing those towers were not comfortable with that additional
173 weight being added to the structure. They want to avoid having the utility lines cross the slopes
174 whenever possible so they have put the poles all on one side. Mr. Bartlett believes the light
175 thrown from these fixtures can be fine-tuned and contained by shields so that it will not cause
176 problems to the residents of the area.

177

178 *Erosion:*

179

180 With regard to the concern voiced by the Applicants last spring about the need to install
181 new poles in areas as they were worked and before they were stabilized so they could avoid
182 disturbing those areas again, Mr. Gartley noted that the contractor is required to use low-impact
183 tracked rigs to travel the slopes to avoid disturbance.

184

185 *Re-located road:*

186

187 The location of the road to the top of the slope has been changed: They are now using
188 the location of the old T-Bar line and going straight up the slope instead of weaving back and
189 forth across the slope.

190

191 *Tree Cutting:*

192

193 Clearing plans changed near the new triple chair lift. When they were working the area
194 they found many significant trees worth preserving and created tree islands around those trees.

195

196 *Power Lines:*

197

198 All overhead lines are now shown. The new lines to the new poles will bring up-graded
199 power for the lifts and lights.

200

201 *Pump House:*

202

203 They discovered they needed more water capacity for snow making and propose an
204 addition to house a new water storage chamber. Currently they use about 10M gallons of water a
205 season – they anticipate they may need as much as 15M gallons to provide sufficient coverage on
206 for the expanded trail system. When asked how this might impact water levels in Hosmer Pond,
207 Mr. Flake replied that if all the water were to be removed at one time, the water level in the pond
208 would drop by 8".

209

210 *Compressors:*

211

212 They did not anticipate the need for a permanent compressor installation when the
213 original Plan was created – that has been added to this amended plan. The location of the
214 compressors was changed to accommodate the structure needed. Later in the evening an abutter
215 expressed concerns about the proximity of this equipment to her home. It was explained that the
216 new equipment is much more efficient and quiet than the old generators it replaces – they are
217 rated at 76dBA at 20 meters. It will be located within a sound enclosure, and the old compressor
218 building removed from the slope.

219

220 The abutter also noted how much oil the current compressors leak and worried that the
221 new location is close to wetlands. The Applicant replied that the new compressors are oil free.
222

223 *Other changes:*
224

225 The rope tow will be replaced with a conveyor belt to move skiers up the slope
226 The ski patrol building has been relocated from one side of the lift to the other
227

228 *First Public Comment Period:*
229

230 NOTE: Comments of speakers, who are permitted three minutes to speak, are condensed to a
231 few words to illustrate the reasons they either support or oppose the proposal. Those interested
232 in reviewing a complete record of this hearing should view the streamed video at the site
233 provided above, or obtain a copy of a DVD of the meeting from the Codes Office.
234

235 John Scholz: Vice President of the Hosmer Pond Association: He is an architect with
236 experience in reading lighting plans, and he also consulted with another lighting expert, Jim
237 Stockman to review the lighting submissions – they appreciate all the detail that was offered. He
238 had detailed questions for Mr. Bartlett, most of them technical in nature having to do with the
239 lighting along Northeaster – the trail closest to the Pond. Mr. Bartlett responded to questions
240 regarding simulations that would test the amount of light that might be seen from the Pond by
241 saying they have been up the slope, but until poles are set no actual simulations can be done. He
242 repeated that it will be possible to add additional shielding to these fixtures to fine tune the
243 throw.
244

245 Dana Strout: President of Hosmer Pond Association: He addressed the mistrust of citizens in
246 the area when it comes to promises made by representatives of Ragged Mountain. They are
247 extremely concerned about this project, and wonder why, if replacing *all* of the fixtures on the
248 mountain with the new LED lamps isn't being considered in light of the difference the new
249 lighting will supposedly make when seen from off-site. They would rather see the area disturbed
250 one time to do all the work than the continuing piece-meal projects that have occurred so far.
251

252 Mr. Bernhard's suggested that it might not be possible to just swap fixture for fixture on
253 the current poles – new lighting might require different pole locations. Mr. Bartlett agreed
254 changes would have to be made to pole locations, but that study has not been done and he had no
255 estimate of what would be needed. Mr. Flake added that it is simply a matter of cost at this time.
256 Replacing all the lighting is something they want to do – the savings in energy costs alone would
257 be significant.
258
259

260 Peter Kalajian: He discussed lighting spectrums, circadian rhythms, and impact and mitigation
261 on wildlife. Mr. Bartlett will get the information Mr. Kalajian wants, but is not sure that the 12
262 hours per week the lights will be on is significant with regard to impact.
263

264 Mr. Kalajian recommended cell-phone activated switches so snow-makers can easily
265 switch lighting from one area to another without returning to the lodge to do so.
266

267 Bill Bucholz: Is happy with what he has seen so far, but is anxious to see how parking lot
268 lighting is going to be handled since that has the biggest impact to the area.

269
270 Bob Gordon: Chairman Ragged Mountain Redevelopment Association: Thanked the Applicants
271 for a thorough presentation and for the sensitivity shown to those living in the area.

272
273 The First Public Comment period was closed when no one else wished to offer
274 comments. Given the late hour the Board decided not to continue on with the hearing process
275 this evening, but will reconvene for discussion, more public comments and Board deliberation at
276 their next meeting. The Applicant will prepare a revised Site Plan (C-1) with the temporary
277 building removed.

278
279 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Sargent** to continue the Public Hearing to
280 October 2, 2014.

281 **VOTE: 3-0-0**

282
283 **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MEETING of SEPTEMBER 25:**

284
285 The remaining items on the agenda -- 5 Business Opportunity Zone; 7 Select Board List of 5
286 projects; and 8 Planning Board priorities -- will be discussed at the September 25 meeting of the
287 Comp Plan Committee. Mr. Sargent will send a copy of the Agenda to members well in advance
288 of the meeting

289
290 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 8:15pm

291
292 Respectfully Submitted,

293
294
295 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary