

1 **CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF MEETING**
3 **December 20, 2012**
4

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

7 **ABSENT:** Member Kerry Sabanty

8 **RESIGNATION:** Mr. Lindsley resigned from the Board for personal reasons effectively
9 immediately

10
11 The meeting of the Planning Board of December 6, 2012, was convened at 5:00 pm.
12

13 **1. PUBLIC INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**

14 No one came forward to speak.
15

16 **2. MINUTES**

17
18 December 6, 2012

19 Page 2 Line 13: The word “proposes” was changed to the word “propose”

20 Page 2 Line 22: The dimensions of the sign were included in the original packet at Page 3

21 Page 3 Line 28: Mr. Hedstrom had already added the water line to the Plan; it was not an
22 outstanding item
23

24 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Householder** that the Planning Board Minutes
25 of December 6, 2012, be approved with changes.

26 **VOTE: 3-0-0**

27 Note: Ms. MacKinnon had not yet arrived at the meeting when this vote was taken.
28

29 **3. SUBDIVISION: Termination of Condominium – Informational Meeting**

30 **Peter and Naomi Castner: Map 125 Lots 9—1, 9-2 & 9-3: Traditional Village District**
31 **(V): 80 Bay View Street**
32

33 The CEO explained that he had discovered that there had never been Planning Board
34 approval for a division of the property at 80 Bay View Street – this was, in fact, an illegal
35 subdivision. However, the building had never been occupied by more than one owner, and no
36 physical changes had been made within the building to create individual units. The previous
37 owner had been paying taxes on the three properties resulting from the deeds creating Lots 9-1 –
38 9-3, but a new series of transactions will transfer the three lots back to a single owner of one
39 single lot. There is no action required of the Planning Board.
40

41 **4. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Final Review**

42 **Thomas and Carrie Hedstrom/Hedstrom Electric: Map 113 Lot 83: River Business District**
43 **(BR): 24 Mt. Battie Street**
44

45 Mr. and Mrs. Hedstrom represented themselves before the Board returning to complete
46 review of a new 32' x 64' building with his electrical business and a garage at ground level, and a

1 single family residence above. The Hedstroms have submitted a revised Site Plan larger in scale
2 (new Page 7), and revised Pages 8 – 12; the Board reviewed those submissions against the items
3 outstanding from the previous review:
4

5 *Site Plan Content*
6

7 ✓ The North Arrow now points north
8

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

10 ✓ Building setbacks from property lines were added as well as the 75' Shoreland Zone setback
11 line
12

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

14 ✓ Dimensions of the parking area were added
15

16 (k) *The location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal*

17 → The proposed septic tank location will be removed from the Plan – it is not required at this point
18 in the project.

19 This has not been done, but will be shown where it is to be constructed when the set of Plans
20 required to comply with MUBEC are developed.
21

22 (n) *Location, front view, and dimensions of existing and proposed signs.*

23 ✓ The exact location of the proposed sign was shown on the Plan.
24

25 (o) *Location and type of exterior lighting.*

26 ✓ The location of exterior lamps was shown on revised sheets 8, 9 and 10
27

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

30 ✓ A signature block was included on the revised Site Plan.
31

32 A Site Walk was held at 4:30 preceding this meeting: Mr. MacLean, Mr. Sargent and Mr.
33 Wilson attended that walk; Mr. Householder arrived at 4 instead of 4:30 and walked the site
34 alone; and Ms. MacKinnon, who was not available to attend, stated that she was familiar enough
35 with the area to feel confident in voting on the application.
36

37 *Public Hearing*

38 The Chair opened the Public Hearing. The CEO confirmed that abutters had been properly
39 noticed, and informed the Board that he had received a visit from a cross-stream abutter, Jeff
40 Brawn. Mr. Brawn reviewed the Hedstrom's proposal, and stated that he thought that this was a
41 great use for that property; he voiced no concerns, and there were no other contacts regarding
42 this proposal.
43

44 *Site Plan Approval Criteria:*

45 (1) *Preserve and Enhance the Landscape*

46 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder** that the proposal satisfies Item 1,
47 Preserve and Enhance the Landscape, with the creative re-use of the site, and because there will

1 be no significant disturbance to the landscape during construction.

2 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

3
4 *(2) Erosion Control*

5 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder** that the proposal satisfies Item 2,
6 Erosion Control, because the requested building will be placed as far away from the creek as
7 possible. But, because there is no formal Erosion Control Plan, the Applicant will have to meet
8 with the CEO to discuss what controls will be put in place.

9 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

10
11 Mr. Wilson informed the Board that there are new DEP rules going into effect on January
12 1, requiring that any contractor doing work in the Shoreland Zone must be certified in Shoreland
13 erosion control methods; Mr. Hedstrom confirmed that his contractor does have that certification.

14
15 *(3) Relationship of the Proposed Building to Environment and Neighboring Buildings*

16 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Application satisfies Item 3,
17 Relationship of the Proposed Building, because there will be no change from the previous
18 conditions. The new building is going to be placed almost of top of where the old buildings were
19 located; and, an abutter has said that he believes that this is a good re-use of the site.

20 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

21
22 *(4) Vehicular Access, Parking, and Circulation*

23 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that based on the dimensions
24 included on the Town Tax Map included in the packet, the criteria for vehicular access, parking
25 and circulation is met.

26 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

27 *(5) Surface Water Drainage*

28 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Application satisfies Item 5,
29 Surface Water Drainage, because the combined impervious area of the new building and
30 driveways is not too much more that the impervious surface covered by the two previous
31 buildings and driveways; and, there is no history of drainage problems on the lot.

32 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

33
34 *(6) The development shall not impose an unreasonable burden on sewers and storm drains,*
35 *water lines or other public utilities...*

36 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder** that the developer is re-using
37 electric and water utilities so there will be no new burden on utilities.

38 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

39
40 *(7) Special Features of Development*

41 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that Special Features of
42 Development is not applicable because there are no proposed exposed storage areas.

43 Discussion: Mr. Hedstrom was questioned about his intent to store materials outside his
44 building. He replied that he understood that any storage area would require screening, and that
45 he would assure the Board that he will store everything inside until he applies otherwise.

1 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

2

3 (8) *Exterior Lighting*

4 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Sargent** that the criteria for Exterior
5 Lighting are met by the drawing reflecting the locations of proposed lighting and the cut sheets
6 showing shielded lighting.

7 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

8

9 (9) *Emergency Vehicle Access*

10 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that Emergency Vehicle Access
11 is met because the property abuts Mt. Battie Street and the building is right off the road; and
12 because the Fire Chief has indicated in his Department Sign Off that he had no concerns.

13 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

14

15 The CEO reported that letters from Town Officials responsible for roads, fire and safety
16 are on file and indicate no foreseen problems with the proposed project.

17

18 (10) Special criteria for Piers, Wharves, Breakwaters ...

19 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Sargent** that Item 10, Piers and Wharves, is not
20 applicable to this Application because the Application does not deal with piers and wharves.

21 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

22

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

25 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Mr. Householder** that Design Standards is not
26 applicable because the property is not in one of the relevant zones.

27 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

28

29 **MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that because as the Board reviewed
30 the Site Plan Review Requirements they found that the Application either satisfied each
31 requirement or the requirement was found to be not applicable, and the Application should be
32 approved.

33 **VOTE: 4-0-0**

34

35 **5. DISCUSSION:**

36

37 1. *Minor field adjustments:* There were none

38

39 2. *Future Agenda items:* and 3. *Pending Applications:* At this time there are none.

40

41 4. *Signs:* The second business sign was accepted by the Select Board and is ready to be installed
42 within the next day or so.

43

44 There being no further business before the Planning Board they adjourned at 5:45 pm.

45 Respectfully submitted, Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary