

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
February 20, 2014

10
11
12
13
14

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

15
16

ABSENT: Chair Chris MacLean

17
18

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

19
20
21
22

The Acting Chair announced that the Applicant requesting the zoning change described at Item #5 on the Agenda, has asked that the Board not discuss the request this evening.

23
24

1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:

25
26
27
28
29
30
31

1) Deb Dodge: Ms. Dodge read a letter to the Planning Board dated February 20, 2014, signed by herself and Judy and Dennis McGuirk. Ms. Dodge asked the Board to reach out to neighborhoods as they continue with their rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan. It is the only way to learn what residents of individual neighborhoods do and do not want or need for their specific area. (A copy is attached here.)

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Mr. Sargent informed her that the Comprehensive Plan Committee would begin discussions at a Special Meeting on February 27 about how they should proceed to look closely at each Zoning District with regard to making recommendations in the Comp Plan for future changes to the Zoning Ordinance. They will bring the public in to discuss these recommendations during the process. Ms. Dodge stressed the usefulness of hiring a third party facilitator for public meetings regarding changes to districts. She also asked the Board to consider postponing any recommendations for changes to the Ordinance until this review has concluded.

43
44
45
46

2) Jan MacKinnon: She wanted to acknowledge two of the organizers of the recent Toboggan Nationals -- Holly Edwards and Stuart Young -- for a great job coordinating this event; and to send congratulations to the entire committee for a very successful weekend.

47
48

2. Minutes:

49
50

February 6, 2014:

51
52

Page 1 Line 6 and throughout the Minutes: Mr. Barnhard's name had been misspelled.

53
54

Page 1: Line 19: "...behalf of the ~~owners of the~~ owner of the Knox Mill."

55
56

Page 1 Line 44: "He supports a more in-depth review...and ~~they have~~ has not supported..."

57
58
59

Page 4 Line 20: "Fox Hill review when all they were doing was making sure the language of the amendment was correct."

60
61
62
63
64
65
66

Page 5: Lines 9 – 11 now read: "He believes the main issue will be lighting because there are many lights proposed for the new lift and trails to encourage more night skiing. He informed the Board that residents of Hosmer Pond, including himself, continue to express their concerns that the lighting requirements of the Ordinance requiring shielded lighting should be adhered to. The

1 engineer has discussed LED lighting with the Committee because it would reduce the lumens
2 and the light-spread, but cost is a factor.”

3 Page 5 Line 23: “Select Board will discuss ~~of~~ the creation of a new ~~TIF~~ TIF District...”

4 Page 5 Line 32: “~~Mr. White~~ Mr. Wilson ~~also~~ informed the Board...”

5 Page 5 Line 39: The meeting adjourned at 7:30pm.

6 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** that the Minutes of February 6, 2014,
7 be approved as changed.

8 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

9
10 **3. Site Plan Amendment: Change of Use: Project Review**

11 P.A.W.S. Animal Adoption Center: Map 230 Lot 1: Traditional Village District (V)

12
13 The Acting Chair and Mr. Scholz recused themselves and stepped down.

14
15 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard** to nominate Mr. Householder as
16 Temporary Chair.

17 **VOTE: 3-0-0**

18
19 At their meeting on January 23, the Planning Board had voted 4-0-0 to consider the
20 Change of Use at the new P.A.W.S. facility on John Street an amendment to an Approved Site
21 Plan. Mr. Scholz, a former Board Member of P.A.W.S. in charge of facilities management, and
22 Amy Hutchinson, the current Executive Director, represented the organization for the review.

23
24 Mr. Scholz summarized the project at the former Camden First Aid Association building
25 as making limited modifications to the building. He and Ms. Hutchinson provided the following
26 information:

- 27 ♦ There will be no changes to the footprint of the building
- 28 ♦ The large garage doors and one other entrance door are being removed and replaced by
29 windows
- 30 ♦ Lighting will not be changed at this time: There is more lighting than they need and he is
31 hoping for a significant reduction and a replacement of the remaining fixtures with
32 shielded lighting
- 33 ♦ They will be installing dog runs on the easterly side of the building - dogs will be let into
34 these pens only when the inside pens are being cleaned. They hope to have an outdoor
35 exercise area some day on that same side of the building as well, and they may try to
36 create a path for walking dogs on the property as well. Trained volunteer staff are the
37 only ones walking dogs off the property,
- 38 ♦ Noise: This was the biggest issue of concern when they were before the ZBA for
39 approval as a Quasi-Public Facility. The ZBA asked that they install a buffer –it is
40 included on the Plan submitted to the Planning Board. A conifer hedge is intended to act
41 as both a visual buffer for the dogs from people and cars traveling on John Street, as well
42 as a sound buffer
- 43 ♦ The maximum number of dogs they will house at any one time is 20 and they will have as
44 many as 80 cats. There will be 20 interior runs in the former garage space and several cat
45 rooms
- 46 ♦ They are open during regular business hours 8am to 4pm. They may try 9am to 5pm so
47 people can stop by after work. Evening Board meetings will be the only nighttime

1 activity. After staff leaves at 4:30pm the animals are alone in the shelter - once people
2 are gone and the lights are out they tend not to bark

- 3 ♦ Now that they will have more room, they hope to offer programming like training classes
4 for owners and for dogs
- 5 ♦ They are hard-wired in and monitored for security, fire and other emergencies
- 6 ♦ They are beginning fund-raising in the hope they can begin work this summer

7
8 In reviewing a Site Plan Amendment, the Board looks at the Approval Criteria of Article
9 XII to see which apply. They determine if there will be any adverse impact on these applicable
10 criteria resulting from the proposed change in use. Board discussion and votes on the Criteria is
11 included as Attachment 2 to these Minutes.

12
13 Article XII Section 6: Site Plan Approval Criteria

14
15 After review of the 11 Criteria the following Motion was offered:

16 **MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard** to approve the Amendment to the
17 Site Plan.

18 **VOTE: 3-0-0**

19
20 Police Chief Randy Gagne forwarded a letter sent to him by neighbors expressing
21 concerns regarding the project. The Board declined to accept the unsigned letter into the record
22 because it had been sent anonymously.

23
24 **4. Minor Subdivision: Pre-Application Meeting**

25 Coastal Opportunities Elm St. Residence: Map 119 Lot 273: Business 3 District (B-3)
26 First Congregational Church 61 Elm Street

27
28 *Applicant's Presentation and Finding of Completeness*

29
30 Presenting the Application were Bill Lane of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and Surveying,
31 Joe Curll, Executive Director, Coastal Opportunities, and Chris Glass, Project Architect:

- 32 ♦ The Congregational Church owns two properties fronting Elm Street including an old
33 residence at 59 Elm
- 34 ♦ The building was converted to four apartments that have been leased to Coastal
35 Opportunities for client housing since 1983
- 36 ♦ The building is not up to code, and instead of making major renovations to the building
37 the Church wants it demolished
- 38 ♦ This proposal for a minor subdivision will create one new 12,000SF lot south of 59 Elm
39 and permit the construction of the multi-family unit
- 40 ♦ The new lot will be sold to Coastal Opportunities and they will construct a new building
41 similar in style, and with the same use, as the existing building. The area is currently used
42 for parking
- 43 ♦ Coastal Opportunities' three clients and on-site supervisor will reside in the existing
44 structure until the new 3000SF structure is complete. Once this is done the old building
45 will be demolished
- 46 ♦ The Ordinance defines this use at Article III: "Community Living Use: A state-approved,

1 authorized, certified or licensed group home, or intermediate care facility for eight or
2 fewer mentally handicapped or developmentally disabled persons.”

- 3 ♦ Right, Title and Interest to apply are shown in the Purchase and Sales Agreement dated
4 October 21, 2013
- 5 ♦ This agreement includes an easement to the Church granting access to parking spaces
6 already established at the rear of the new lot – four of those spaces will be set aside for
7 the use of the residents
- 8 ♦ The parking lot entrance will remain the same but visibility will be improved once the
9 current building is gone
- 10 ♦ Trees were planted in the proposed construction area years ago to serve as screening for
11 the existing parking lot – they have outgrown their usefulness for this purpose and many
12 will be removed - major trees along Elm Street will be retained and a new screening
13 buffer will be planted

14
15 After reviewing Article IV and Appendix A of the Subdivision Ordinance, the Board
16 found the submissions of Coastal Opportunities for the Elm Street Residence Subdivision
17 complete. (See Attachments 3 and 4 for details.)

18
19 A Site Walk was set for February 26 at 7:30am and a Public Hearing for March 20 at 5pm.

20
21 *Public Information Meeting*

22
23 Ron Hawkins: Representing Denise Pukas, the owner of the abutting property to the south: He
24 asked the Board to consider the impact to the abutter’s property value that building this house
25 will have:

- 26 ♦ The house on the Pukas property predates the Ordinance and is set just 5’ back from the lot
27 line. The intent of the Ordinance was to maintain a certain distance between structures and
28 siting this new building within 16’ of the line violates the spirit of the Ordinance. The
29 Applicant replied that they have sited the house as far from the abutter’s line as they can
30 without crowding the existing driveway. As an accommodation to Ms. Pukas, they
31 designed the building so the closest section was a single story – the remainder of the
32 building is two stories
- 33 ♦ Mr. Hawkins believes they are at a disadvantage - he has not been given a copy of the
34 proposal and would like time to study the plan
- 35 ♦ Before a demolition permit is issued for the old building he asks the Board to ensure no
36 harm will be done to the neighborhood
- 37 ♦ Is the density in the old building grandfathered? The reply from the Applicants was the
38 building was on a 1993 Site Plan that approved the existing situation. All units are separate
39 with individual kitchens and baths and that will not change. It is the ownership of the
40 property that is changing and not the use
- 41 ♦ Mr. Hawkins believes it is “a stretch” to say that the use will be allowed on a new lot
42 because it is allowed in the current location
- 43 ♦ Mr. Hawkins does not believe the style of the new residence is even close to the older
44 building in design – it will not look like a single family residence as this building does.
45 The Applicant confirmed that there would be four separate entrances to the units instead of
46 the single front door that tenants use currently

1 Lila Vultee: Head of Trustees of the First Congregational Church:

- 2 ♦ The Church purposefully involved Mr. Hawkins and the property owner in the evolution
- 3 of this project from the beginning. They have been kept informed, and they recently saw
- 4 a copy of this Plan when it was formally presented to the Congregation
- 5 ♦ The Church has heard these same concerns from the abutters on several occasions and
- 6 has done their best to address the concerns. She does not believe that the setback should
- 7 be an issue because this is an in-Town lot. Many homes in the area are closer together
- 8 than current setbacks allow – that is part of living in the Village
- 9 ♦ It should not come as a surprise that a vacant part of a lot in this part of Town would be
- 10 developed

11
12 **5. Proposed Ordinance Amendment: Article VII: B-TR District 1stFloor Residential Use:**

13 The Applicant, Kelm Acquisitions LLC, has withdrawn the request for consideration at
14 this time

15
16 **6. Proposed Ordinance Amendment: Article III: Amend the Definition of Inn**

17 Kristi Bifulco: Windward House Bed and Breakfast

18
19 Ms. Bifulco has been working with the CEO on language for her proposal that would
20 permit an Inn within 500' of the B-1 District to serve dinner to guests if granted a Special
21 Exception for a Low Impact Use. (See Attachment 6 for proposed language.)

22
23 In support of her request, she made the following arguments:

- 24 ♦ When she bought the property she could have applied for permission to serve dinner,
- 25 but a 2010 Ordinance Amendment changed that and took away her ability to apply for
- 26 a Special Exception. Later in the meeting, the actual Amendment language was
- 27 clarified and Ms. Bifulco learned that she was mistaken in her belief that a Special
- 28 Exception previously applied to her property
- 29 ♦ Since she bought her property the whole Downtown has been re-zoned to allow
- 30 businesses in the area to thrive and grow – she should be treated no differently
- 31 ♦ They need this change to be able to compete on a level playing ground with Inns in
- 32 other parts of Town and in the region
- 33 ♦ The change is limited to dinner to Inn guests only and not to the general public
- 34 ♦ There are three Inns located within the 500' radius of the B-1 District boundaries:
- 35 The Windward House, Abigail's and the Hawthorne Inn.
- 36 ♦ These changes to her proposal address many of the concerns expressed by neighbors
- 37 the last time she came to the Board

38
39 The CEO added that it is standard planning to offer the opportunity for blending overflow
40 of uses as districts transition from one to another IF the use is permitted by the Ordinance in the
41 first district, and IF the new use in the second district is permitted at a lesser level than in the first

42
43 *Comments from the Board*

44
45 Mr. Barnhard: This request is part of a natural progression for the business to grow

46 He supports the creation of the 3 – 4 jobs Ms. Bifulco suggests could result from
47 the change

1 Ms. Bifulco replied to his questions regarding the changed Ordinance provision that took away
2 her ability to serve dinner: She responded that when she came to Town she knew that other Inns
3 could serve dinner and she assumed she could as well. When she was ready to take that step she
4 discovered the Ordinance had been amended and she could no longer apply for a Special
5 Exception to serve dinner – she is here to reverse that amendment. She added that her Inn has
6 always been commercial and she does not understand why it is classified as residential. They are
7 the first family to make the property a family residence, and they do not live in the Inn itself -
8 she doesn't believe the use should be classified as residential. She also noted that she abuts
9 commercial properties on all sides.

10 Mr. Barnhard asked if there would be any renovations required to the Inn and if there would be
11 provisions made for outdoor dining:

12 Ms. Bifulco replied there would be no renovations but that she had not thought of outdoor dining
13 as a possibility.

14 Mr. Wilson added that the total number of seats must remain the same indoors or out, but that
15 outdoor dining brings with it many additional State regulations.

16 Ms. MacKinnon asked how Ms. Bifulco would enforce the “only to guests” provision of the
17 amendment? What if Inn guests want to have family or friends join them for dinner?

18 Ms. Bifulco replied she hadn't thought of that situation, but she imagines she could classify
19 serving extra guests as one of the eight Special Events they are allowed to host during the
20 year.

21 Ms. MacKinnon to the CEO: How will this be enforced to make sure that Inns are not serving
22 dinner to the general public? What new requirements will apply to an Inn serving dinner?

23 Mr. Wilson replied that he enforces infractions based on tips and complaints – there are many
24 eyes watching what happens in this neighborhood; Ms. Bifulco would need a victualer's
25 license to serve dinner and she already has that. As long as this is not a restaurant open to
26 the public no other requirements will apply.

27 Mr. Sargent asked if there would be any increase in truck traffic for deliveries with the increased
28 use.

29 Ms. Bifulco replied that she imagines that the number of deliveries of food supplies would
30 remain the same – the volume of goods delivered might increase. They do much of their
31 shopping locally themselves. There are no deliveries made by large trucks -- only by box
32 trucks.

33
34

Comments from the Public:

35 Deb Dodge: She recommends adding the word “overnight” to describe the guests to make clear
36 that dinner guests must be lodging there -- Ms. Bifulco agreed with that change.

37 Ms. Dodge also recommends that the Ordinance at Article VIII is amended as well to
38 permit this Special Exception in the Traditional Village District.

39 She asked the Board to review the Special Exceptions/Low Impact Use provisions of
40 Article VI to see if they are enough for this situation, or if additional considerations
41 should be included for the Zoning Board to consider.

42 She responded to Ms. Bifulco's statement that she is surrounded by commercial uses by
43 saying that the abutting apartment houses are residential uses as is the Inn – the entire
44 neighborhood is residential in use
45

1 Dennis McGuirk: He asked the Board to consider the historical context of the neighborhood and
2 the consequences of this change. The code is clear in not allowing an Inn to increase in
3 intensity of use – this proposal is contradictory to the intent of the Ordinance.
4 He asked the Board to be very clear what will be allowed by this change and what will
5 not.

6 This change blurs the line between an Inn and a Hotel which is allowed an unlimited
7 number of Special Events each year -- the closer the two come by definition the more an
8 argument can be made that they should be the same. The language needs to be very tight
9 and much more specific.

10 He asks that the Board look at the Comprehensive Plan and the fluidity of the Ordinance.
11 If zoning changes like this are not envisioned by the Plan, the Board will be entertaining
12 requests like this for special treatment forever.

13 Joanne Ball: Owner of a Little Dream B&B: Ms. Ball wanted to know how many times a
14 property owner can return to the Board to request an amendment to the Ordinance – how
15 many more times could this Inn owner come back to add more and more uses?

16 The process was explained, and she learned that there is no limit to the number of requests can
17 be made for ordinance amendments – the brake on expansions is that the process requires
18 a Town vote. Mr. Wilson noted that there are many factors that limit how much
19 expansion would be allowed in the future.

20 Ms. MacKinnon suggested that, in theory, there was no expansion of use by this change because
21 it is limited to guests already in the house.

22
23 The Board agreed to move forward with the proposal – including the addition of the word
24 “overnight” guests – and scheduled Public Hearings for March 6 and March 20 (providing no
25 language changes are made as a result of the March 6 hearing).

26 27 **7. Discussion:**

28 1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments

29
30 2. Future Agenda Items:

31 March 6, 2014: Public Hearing on High Street Zoning Amendment

32 March 20, 2014: Possible Second Public Hearing on High Street Amendment

33 April 3, 2014: Mountain Arrow Subdivision abandonment of Amended Plan

34
35 3. Pending Applications: Ragged Mountain Phase 1 Site Plan:

36 Mr. Wilson informed the Board that there is a chance that the Site Plan Review for the
37 Snow Bowl will have to be a joint review with the Rockport Planning Board since part of the
38 project is located in Rockport (the mountaintop tower). He is gathering information now.

39
40 4. Other: The Board discussed the joint meeting held with the Town of Rockport Planning and
41 Select Boards and the Camden Planning and Select Boards. They will discuss the development
42 issues that involve the Town of Camden alone at the Special Comprehensive Plan Meeting on
43 February 27; they hope to work toward a recommendation for moving forward on those projects.

44
45 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 8:15pm

46
47 Respectfully Submitted, Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1: Dodge/McGuirk Letter

To: Planning Board

February 20, 2014

I am here to encourage, if not implore the Planning Board to begin holding neighborhood meetings, as you progress through the Comp Plan Process. It would provide the Planning Board and residents with the opportunity to discuss their ideas and concerns in a low-key and constructive environment. The use of a 3rd party facilitator would be even more conducive to open dialogue.

What an opportunity to learn what policies and strategies that could be developed by listening to residents talk about what changes they have seen, envision or desire for their neighborhood. Or do not desire for their neighborhood.

Are there infra-structure projects that a n'hood thinks would improve the safety or livability on their street? Are issues involving traffic, noise or other safety concerns?

Are there ideas for enhancing the vitality of the neighborhood or to minimize impact from any potential development?

It would allow you to draft more fully informed revisions to the comp plan before you hold community wide meetings.

At the same time, I think it is important for the Board not to entertain zoning changes until you have done this work. Why run the risk of making a change now that will not conform to the revised comp plan and zoning ordinance? Hardly any request for a change to the ordinance is minor and doesn't have ramifications beyond its stated short-term goal.

Thank you

Deborah Dodge

Judy McGuirk
Dennis McGuirk

ATTACHMENT 2: Article XII: Section 6: Site Plan Approval Criteria: To see the full language of this Section go to Page XII – 7 of the Zoning Ordinance.

(1) Preserve and Enhance the Landscape

Testimony: A berm planted with evergreen trees is going to be established; the macadam apron will be removed and the area re-landscaped.

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item #1, Preserve and Enhance the Landscape is met.

VOTE: 3-0-0

(2) Erosion Control

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item #2, Erosion Control is met because the area where the macadam apron is to be removed is flat; because the Applicant has testified that appropriate erosion controls will be put in place, run-off is not a concern; and the area will be replanted.

VOTE: 3-0-0

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

MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item #3 does not apply because there is no new construction.

VOTE: 3-0-0

(4) Vehicular Access, Parking, and Circulation

MOTION by Mr. Barnhard seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that #4 is not applicable because the entrance and driveway are already in place.

VOTE: 3-0-0

(5) Surface Water Drainage

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item #5 is not applicable because there will be more permeable surface created as part of this project.

VOTE: 3-0-0

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

MOTION by Mr. Barnhard seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that the proposed changes will not have any impact on water lines, sewers lines, storm drains or other public utilities.

VOTE: 3-0-0

(7) Special Features of Development

MOTION by Mr. Barnhard seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that Item 7, Special Features of Development is met because the Applicant has testified that they will address the issue of noise; there will be no impact.

VOTE: 3-0-0

(8) *Exterior Lighting*

MOTION by Mr. Bernhard seconded by Ms. MacKinnon that the Board accept the Applicant's statement that the intent is to mitigate the impact of the existing exterior lighting by reducing the amount of lighting and using shielded fixtures.

VOTE: 3-0-0

ATTACHMENT 2 Continued:

(9) *Emergency Vehicle Access*

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item #9, Emergency Vehicle Access is satisfied because it already exists.

VOTE: 3-0-0

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

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item 10 does not apply to this Application.

VOTE: 3-0-0

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

MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Barnhard that Item 11 does not apply to this District.

VOTE: 3-0-0

ATTACHMENT 3: ARTICLE 4

PREAPPLICATION REVIEW– MINOR OR MAJOR

Section 2. Preapplication Meeting

Nine copies of the Preapplication shall be submitted with the appropriate fee at least 22 days prior to the Planning Board meeting at which the developer wishes to be heard.

√ Application packet date stamped received January 22, 2014

A location map, site inventory map, site analysis and conceptual sketch plan, satisfying the submission requirements in Appendix A, shall accompany the application.

See Attachment 4: Appendix A

Section 3. Submission of Waiver Requests

√ There are no waiver requests.

Section 4. Site Walk

√ Scheduled for February 26, 2014 at 7:30am. Flags will be placed at the corners of the lot and the perimeter of the building

Section 5. Public Informational Meeting

√ The Applicant elected to hold the PIM at this evenings meeting following a finding of completion.

ATTACHMENT 4: Appendix A
Preapplication Plan Submission Requirements – Minor or Major

1) Application

- a) ✓ Nine copies of the application and any supporting documents.
Nine copies delivered 1/22/2014
- b) ✓ Evidence of right, title or interest in the property.
Purchase and Sales Agreement dated 10/21/2013
- c) ✓ All existing deed restrictions, easements, right of ways or other encumbrances.
There will be easements granted but the language is not final – they are referenced in the P&S Agreement
The Applicants are not aware of other encumbrances

Plan C-1: Preapplication Subdivision Plan dated 1/30/2014, serves as the Site Inventory Map
✓ = Submission provided: N/A = Submission not applicable to this proposal

2) Site Inventory Map

Nine copies of an accurate scale map of the parcel at not more than 1-inch equals 50feet, showing the following:

- a) ✓ Proposed name of the development, north arrow, scale and date.
- b) ✓ Boundaries of the parcel based upon town tax maps or a standard boundary survey if available and the number of acres.
- c) ✓ Tax maps and lot numbers of the parcel(s) to be divided.
- d) ✓ Major natural features of the site, including steep slopes, wetlands, vernal pools, streams, ponds, floodplains, groundwater aquifers, significant wildlife habitats, or other important natural features.
- e) N/A Vegetative cover conditions according to general cover type.
- f) N/A Ridgelines and watershed boundaries.
- g) N/A Geologic formations including rock outcrops, cliffs, etc., based upon published data or more detailed on-site analysis.
- h) ≠ Soils as shown in the “Soil Survey of Knox and Lincoln Counties Maine.”
The Applicant will add a Plan Note regarding the make-up of this “made land”
- i) ✓ Existing buildings, structures, or other improvements on the site including streets, driveways, stone walls, etc.
- j) ✓ Locations of all known historically or archaeologically significant buildings or sites within or adjacent to the subdivision.
- l) ✓ Location and size of existing utilities or other improvements servicing the site.
- m) ≠ Potential sources of fire protection water supply within one-half mile of the site including public water mains, existing or proposed fire ponds. n) Septic system locations for each lot or unit, if applicable.

The Applicant will add the nearest fire hydrant to the Plan

ATTACHMENT 5 Continued:

3. Site Analysis

Nine (9) copies of a brief narrative describing the existing conditions, the proposed development, the required open space potential and the constraints and opportunities created by the site. The narrative shall include a description of the existing road system that will provide access to the project and any issues related to traffic capacity, safety, sight distances. The narrative shall also describe any preliminary studies concerning traffic, marketing, wetlands, etc

The Applicant testified that the existing conditions on the property will be improved by this project and the corresponding changes being made to the Church lot

? Was an actual narrative provided?

4. Conceptual Sketch Plan

Nine copies of a Conceptual Sketch Plan at the same scale as the Site Inventory Map, highlighting the opportunities and constraints of the site. For greater clarity, the Board may request that the Site Inventory Map and Conceptual Sketch Plan be presented in two (2) separate plans. The plan shall show the proposed layout of lots and roads. This plan shall be prepared with the assistance of professionals who have appropriate expertise to enable the Board to determine:

- 1) Which areas are well suited for proposed uses and which are not suitable;
- 2) Which areas are suitable for on-site sewage disposal if public sewer is not available;
- 3) Which areas have potential open space value (scenic areas, aquifers, streambed corridors, wildlife habitat, natural drainage courses, farmland, significant forest stands, and land abutting existing public open spaces, etc.); and
- 4) Which areas may be subject to off-site conflicts or concerns such as noise, lighting, traffic.

√ The Board determined that the information has either been provided on C-2 is sufficient – the additional information required here does not apply to a developed lot

5. Waivers

- a) Written requests for any waivers from Minor Subdivision or Major Subdivision submission requirements. See Appendices B, C, and D.
- b) Written requests for any waivers of design guidelines in Article 8, Approval Standards.

√There are no waivers requested

ATTACHMENT 6: High Street Amendment

An inn located on a nonconforming lot shall be subject to the terms of Article VI, Section 2(2)(c) of this Ordinance.

(2) Lots with Structures

- (a) A structure built on a lot prior to enactment of this Ordinance, which lot does not conform to lot size or lot frontage, may be repaired, maintained or improved, and may be modified in conformity with Section 4 of this Article. If the proposed modification of the structure(s) cannot meet the applicable space and bulk requirements, a variance shall be required from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- (b) If two or more contiguous lots or parcels have the same ownership at the time of adoption or amendment of this Ordinance, if all or part of the lots do not meet the applicable space and bulk requirements, and if a principal use exists on each lot, or if the lots were legally, separately created and an approved subdivision plan for those lots was recorded in the Knox County Registry of Deeds after September 22, 1971, the nonconforming lots may be conveyed separately or together, providing all other State law, including the State Minimum Lot Size Law (12 MRSA sections 4807-A through 4807-D) and the State of Maine Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Rules, and local Ordinance requirements are complied with.

If two or more principal uses or structures existed on a single lot of record on the effective date of this ordinance, each may be sold on a separate lot provided that the above referenced law and rules are complied with. When such lots are divided each lot thus created must be as conforming as possible to the dimensional requirements of this Ordinance, as determined by the Zoning Board of Appeals. *(Amended – 11/2/10)*

- (c) An inn located on a lot that is less than two acres in the Traditional Village District, shall not add sleeping rooms offered for rent beyond those legally existing as of the date of enactment of this ordinance, nor shall it be used more intensely with respect to functions, services, or similar activities otherwise allowed in inns beyond those being routinely and legally offered as of the date of enactment of this ordinance, except an Inn abutting High St and within 500' of a zone where restaurants are an allowed use may be granted a Special Exception and allowed to serve meals to guests only, subject to meeting the standards of a Low Impact Use as determined by the Zoning Board of Appeals.*(Amended – 11/15/05 ??/ ??/ ??)*
- (d) The residential use of a dwelling unit that is discontinued for a period of 24 consecutive months, may not be resumed on a lot that is nonconforming, because the lot does not meet the lot area per dwelling unit requirement for the District in which it is located.