CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
October 2, 2014

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

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

1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:

Jane LaFleur, Friends of Mid-Coast Maine: On October 30 and 31, The Community Institute will meet in Camden to discuss planning – the program is "Streets, Places and People" (http://www.communityinstitute.org). There are a series of discussions and workshops on Thursday; Friday is a hands-on-training day to implement some of the concepts. The model project will be to implement Design Concept #3 submitted as part of a report on options for changes to the Public Landing. Students at the Institute will layout the design for the day using temporary markings and other moveable features to try to determine *if* the design will work as proposed. Discussions have started about keeping the design in place for the evening and inviting the public down for a Halloween Party – this would be a good test of how the design works when many people are using the Landing. Ms. LaFleur invited the Board members to attend either one or both days. Further details of Ms. LaFleur's presentation can be seen at the web links above.

2. MINUTES:

September 18, 2014: The Minutes were not complete and were not reviewed.

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

Northeast Wireless is still developing their proposal.
MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Scholz to continue the Public Hearing on the Northeast Wireless Application to October 16, 2014.
VOTE: 5-0-0

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

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

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 9-19-14
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

Changes to Revised Plan C-1 dated 9/19/2014:

The temporary building that was discussed at the 9/18 meeting has been removed from the Plan under review this evening. The as-built underground utilities have also been removed from the Plan to make it easier to read. A new Site Plan Application will be submitted that includes the addition of this building to the site.

CONTINUATION of PUBLIC HEARING

The First Public Comment period has been closed. The Board moved directly to comments and questions: Ms. MacKinnon asked if any of the Board members had gone out to look at the sample light fixture mounted on the Lodge – no one else had. Pete Kalajian had distributed a 2010 publication by International Dark Sky Association, and Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Bartlett if he had a chance to review the information, and if so, if any of the discussion gave him pause about the lighting he has proposed for the Snow Bowl. Mr. Bartlett replied he had reviewed the information. He does not believe that the Dark Sky information is relevant to this application and calls nothing in the design into question.

SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

John Scholz: He asked Mr. Bartlett if any changes had been made to the lighting as a result of the comments heard at the last meeting. Mr. Bartlett replied that LP3 – which had been aimed northerly – had been adjusted based on the concerns of an abutting neighbor. Once installed, he will make on-site adjustments to the lighting and will pay particular attention to those poles with lamps aimed toward Hosmer Pond – LP30 and LP45, and any others where concerns have been expressed about off-site impact. He appreciates hearing of possible problems like these so he

can makes adjustments as he is working out the light pattern. He will also be looking at these lights from off site to see if there are any problems with glare.

Mr. Scholz also asked about the concerns expressed by Mr. Kalajian at the previous meeting regarding the color spectrum of white lights and the impact on circadian rhythms. Mr. Bartlett replied that Mr. Kalajian's concerns had applied to light with wave lengths far below that generated by the lamps he is using. That combined with the fact that the slopes will not be lighted more than a few hours a week, and never – except for snow making – late into the nighttime, make him remain comfortable with his choice.

Mr. Bartlett believes that LED lighting is the state of the future for exterior lighting, and feels that more and more ski areas will be implementing the new lighting as fixtures become more affordable. He does not know of a technology that is "waiting" to replace LED and is confident that there will be even more options to fine-tune lighting to suit the situation in the future.

Mr. Scholz notified the Board that after discussing the matter with Town Manager Pat Finnigan, he had asked Mr. Bartlett to price out a retrofit of the existing lighting – the subject of many comments at the previous Public Hearing. That estimate, which includes fixtures, additional poles and installation – including new wiring circuits – is in the $150K - $200K range. Even if the money was in hand, coordinating and scheduling all the contractors to do this work before the coming ski season would be impossible. For the sake of the project, it does not make sense to put the current work on hold so that all the lighting could be done simultaneously. Mr. Scholz believes that it would be a worthy project and that funds could probably be raised just to complete re-lighting the entire parcel. But, he believes the retrofitting project should be deferred for now and only hopes that it will move forward in the near future.

Dana Strout, President Hosmer Pond Association: As far as residents of the area are concerned the lighting, and the sounds that accompany activities at the Snow Bowl, are not an enhancement to their properties. Although Mr. Bartlett did not know the exact percentage of lighting that would be new versus old style, he could say that there would be more new lights than old. The questions moved to a discussion of the Kelvin ratings resulting from this new light source and the reason – safety -- for going with a higher number versus one that would give a warmer appearance. In support of selecting new lighting for the slopes even though more light would be produced by each fixture, Mr. Bartlett offered the following reasons:

- Lighting will be more uniform across the slopes
- Dark spots between poles will be eliminated
- There will be better contrast between surface irregularities (moguls will be easier to discern)
- The overall average light at vertical planes – the most important for better sight at night – is increased
- This is cooler light that diminishes quicker over distance than warmer (sodium)
- Per fixture, the peak intensity is far less which works to reduce astronomical light pollution

However, he noted that there will be two new trails lighted – large areas that have not been lighted before – and there will be more light generated overall., and that must be kept in mind when people form their expectations regarding the impact the new lighting will have.

In response to Mr. Strout's question if this is the best that can be done to minimize the impact, Mr. Bartlett believes that this is the best design they can have. He does not believe he can meet the goal to greatly improve safety with fewer fixtures or different fixtures.

Michael White: He has heard discussions focused on detailed and is pleased that the issue has been researched and discussed so thoroughly – the result will be better and safer night skiing with a plan that fits into the budget.

No one else came forward and the Public Hearing was closed.

BOARD DELIBERATION and REVIEW

- There will be eighteen sodium lamps removed leaving between thirty and forty remaining
- The costs of the LED lamps is about $700 each – sodium run about $450 each
- The lamps will be shielded and aimed so skiers looking up will not be blinded by the glare unlike drivers who look directly into oncoming LED lamps
- Lamps will all be aimed downward and down slope
- It is important that the Applicant is willing to tweak and adjust and add additional shielding if necessary
- Light management, which has been problematic in the past, sounds like it will be greatly improved with additional circuits and the ability to switch off unnecessary lighting
- The impact of the remaining sodium lights – and whether or not to replace them – is not germane to this review

MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder that the Board finds that because the changes to the approved Site Plan are relatively small in scale, the Application qualifies to be considered as an Amendment.
VOTE: 4-0-0

MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that the Board finds that they can approve the Amendment because of the nature of the changes and all the information provided in support.
VOTE: 4-0-0

A revised C-1 will be generated with a signature block that contains language that the changes were approved as an amendment on October 2, 2014.

5. ZONING AMENDMENT: Business Opportunity Zone (BOZ):

Jane LaFleur participated in the review of the changes to the proposed amendment. She raised the issue of the permitted use of a convenience store with gas pumps and asked the Board to consider requiring that the tanks be located behind the store or, if that is not possible, to the side. She referenced a station in Freeport where this was done very successfully. Noting that this change would permit gas pumps in districts where there is residential use nearby, she added that requiring the right front-yard treatment can further mitigate the location of this kind of business in districts where they are not otherwise permitted. With an acre of land required for a BOZ proposal to go forward, Ms. LaFleur believes a property owner would have lots of room to make this layout work.

Some members of the Board did not want to add another layer of regulation to the use, but Ms. LaFleur argued that zoning should balance public versus business uses. This would be a high intensity use and should, therefore, be moderated to the greatest extent practical. Mr. Bernhard supports looking into this idea in more depth. He thinks the Board should start off with what they want in this regard – if they want the tanks out back or to the side that's what they should ask for. The proposal has this use categorized as a Special Exception which means that a proposal must undergo strict review. Some members of the Board feel that is sufficient protection for abutters, so for now there will be no changes to this item except that "convenience store" – which is not defined in the Ordinance – will be replaced by the term "neighborhood store" which is.

←The CEO and Recording Secretary will research the language of the BOZ to try to find any other changes that need to be made so the Draft can be finalized.

6. SELECT BOARD WORK LIST:

The Board discussed the recommendations for items they will send to the Select Board for work in the coming year. Mr. Sargent will draft a memo to the Chair and send it on behalf of the Planning Board. In no particular order of importance the six items are:

- The Planning Board wants to understand the Select Board's role in decision making – how do they assess the Planning Board's work on Ordinance Amendments?
- The Planning Board will ask that their members be treated with civility and respect – especially during joint meetings or when appearing before each other's Boards
- There is a State program that evidently provides tax relief to town's board and committee members – the Planning Board would like the Select Board to authorize that relief for their members n the hope that it would attract new members
- The Planning Board will request that the quarterly joint meetings of the two boards is re-instated
- The Planning Board would appreciate the Select Board being better informed about Planning Board issues. They will ask that the Select Board members come to their review of ordinance amendments informed of the Planning Board's decision-making process *before* making their decision on proposed amendments

Don White, Select Board Liaison, had presented a tentative list from the Select Board to the Planning Board:

- Review the Zoning Ordinance to modernize and clarify
- Be more proactive
- Sagamore Farm property

7. PLANNING BOARD PRIORITY LIST

The Board reviewed the list of priorities, changed the priority category for some items and assigned the following items so members can begin work

Possible Ordinance Amendments:

- Re-do descriptions of various lodging categories and associated allowed uses: Mr. Bernhard and Mr. Scholz

- Re-consider the 500' “transition zone” for Low Impact Uses in the V and VE Districts
  Mr. Bernhard and Mr. Scholz
- Work with Historic Resources on possible ordinance changes
  Mr. Householder will update
- Rejuvenate Sign Committee to work on Riverwalk Signage
  Mr. Householder and Mr. Bernhard with Sign Committee and Historic Resources
- Planning Board Manual
  Mr. Sargent
- Zoning Amendment Procedures
  Mr. Sargent

8. DISCUSSION

1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments
2. Future Agenda Items – Pending Applications:
   Maple Grove Subdivision –time frame to review still uncertain
3. Other:
   The Appleton Pier Plan should be ready for Board signatures at the next meeting

   Mr. Sargent informed the Board that Ms. McIntosh is still willing to work with the Comp Plan Committee and to work on redrafting Chapter 20 with Mr. Scholz and the Downtown Chapter by herself. She will be able to attend the November 13 Planning Board meeting and to discuss her work if there is time on the agenda.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary