

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**Wednesday March 19, 2014**

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

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

13 **1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:**

14 No one came forward.

15 **2. Minutes:**

16 February 20, 2014:

17 Page 1 Line 7: Attorney Kelly did not attend this meeting

18 Page 4 Line 37: “Is the density in the old building ~~is~~ grandfathered?”

19 **MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** to approve the Minutes of February  
20 20, 2014, as amended.

21 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

22 March 6, 2014:

23 Page 1: There was no election for Chair and the first paragraph under Item 3 now reads: “The  
24 Select Board has accepted Chair Chris MacLean’s resignation effective March 4, 2014. As Vice  
25 Chair, Mr. Sargent has the option of automatically moving up to Chair and he chose to do so.”

26 Page 2: There was no discussion of Future Agenda Items and all references have been removed.

27 **3. Minor Subdivision: Final Review**

28 Coastal Opportunities Elm St. Residence: Map 119 Lots 273 and 274: Business 3 District  
29 (B-3): First Congregational Church 61 Elm Street

30  
31 The Board has the option of holding a Public Hearing for a Minor Subdivision. One had  
32 been advertised for this evening’s meeting, but no one in attendance had any interest in speaking  
33 to the Application and a hearing was not convened.

34  
35 Presenting the Application were Bill Lane of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and  
36 Surveying; Joe Curll, Executive Director, Coastal Opportunities; and Chris Glass, Project  
37 Architect. Mr. Lane explained that this is a “sub-division by construction” which is required to  
38 create a four-unit apartment building on this lot.

- 39 ♦ The use is on-going in a new location: Residents of the existing four-unit building at 59  
40 Elm Street will be relocated to the new structure at 61 Elm Street and the current building  
41 will be demolished. 59 Elm is old and not up to code – the new building will be safer  
42 and more habitable
- 43 ♦ The scale of the new building will be the same as the old
- 44 ♦ The same driveway that is currently used by 59 Elm Street will be used
- 45 ♦ The new two-story building meets the setbacks and is designed with a one-story wing on  
46 its southerly face to be less intrusive to the nearest abutter
- 47 ♦ There will be a new sewer connection and two new water connections are needed – one  
48 for domestic water and one for fire suppression
- 49 ♦ The property to the rear will remain parking. The Church will have an easement to  
50 continue to use the area - four spaces will be set aside for residents

1 Ms. MacKinnon walked the site on her own time; the remaining four members were all  
2 present at the February 26 Site Walk.

3  
4 *Final Plan Review*

5  
6 The Plan under review consists of the following:

7 C-1: Final Subdivision Plan dated March 5, 2014

8 C-2: Civil Details dated March 5, 2014

9 SV-1: Boundary Survey and Lot Split dated March 4, 2014

10  
11 Article 8: Approval Standards. The Board voted unanimously to either approve each standard or  
12 to find the standard did not apply. See Attachment 1 to these Minutes for details.

13  
14 Appendix B: Minor Subdivision Final Plan Submission Requirements

15 Because the Board had sufficient information to make a final determination regarding the  
16 applicable standards of approval, they did not review the submissions listed at Appendix B of the  
17 Subdivision Ordinance for completeness. The Final Plan Submissions that accompanied the  
18 Application are listed at Attachment 2 to these Minutes.

19  
20 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Subdivision Plan submitted by  
21 Coastal Opportunities for The Elm Street Apartments involving Map 119 Lots 273 and 274 be  
22 approved, subject to the change of elevations as discussed, because the Board has reviewed  
23 Approval Standards 1 – 20 and found they have either been satisfied or are not applicable.

24 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

25  
26 Mr. Lane will make the FFE Note changes and return to the Board for signing of the Plan.

27  
28 **4. SUBDIVISION: Abandonment of an Approved Plan**

29 Mountain Arrow Village Green: Map 123 Lot 4-9 (Village District) and Map 121 Lot 138  
30 Rural 2 District): 38 High Street

31  
32 The Chair read the procedure for Public Hearings and asked the Applicant to summarize  
33 the request. Will Gartley of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and Surveying was present to  
34 represent the Applicant and to request approval to abandon the Third Subdivision Amendment  
35 approved by the Board in July of 2013. That amendment changed the boundaries of one lot (#9)  
36 by removing a portion and returning it back to the mother lot. Subsequent to that approval, the  
37 developer decided to abandon that amendment and revert to the Second Amended Plan as  
38 approved by the Board in December of 2011. This requires Planning Board approval; documents  
39 required by the Registry of Deeds have been prepared for signature.

40  
41 The Board had no questions, but Mr. Bernhard added that he believes this is a good  
42 change as the original lot configuration offered the best locations for siting a home. The first and  
43 second public comment periods were opened and closed without comment. No one from the  
44 Board had comments and the Public Hearing was closed.

45  
46 **MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** to approve the Order of  
47 Abandonment as written; and to approve the Second Amended Plan for Mountain Arrow  
48 Subdivision as submitted.

49 **VOTE: 5-0-0**

1 **5. SITE PLAN REVIEW: Ragged Mountain Redevelopment - Phase 1**

2 Town of Camden: Map 227 Lots 6, 8, 64, 65 and 67 and Map 228 Lots 3, 5, 6 and 7: Rural  
3 Recreation District (RR): Ragged Mountain Recreation Area 20 Barnstown Road  
4

5 Mr. Scholz, who has recused himself from review of this Application, stepped down.  
6

7 The Town was represented by Will Gartley of Gartley and Dorsky Engineering and  
8 Surveying; Landon Flake, Ragged Mountain Facilities General Manager; and Electrical Engineer  
9 Larry Bartlett.  
10

11 The Town has approved funding to supplement the private money raised by the Ragged  
12 Mountain Redevelopment Corporation in their effort to make major improvements and upgrades  
13 to the property. The Applicant is here for approval of Phase 1 which involves improvements to  
14 the mountain including:

- 15 ♦ Expanding and widening ski trails
- 16 ♦ Installing one new chair lift and relocating sections of the existing lift
- 17 ♦ Installing additional water lines to provide for expanded snow making capabilities.  
18 Where there is a lot of “foot traffic” the lines will be buried – otherwise they will be laid  
19 over ground in the tree line as they have done in the past
- 20 ♦ Installing new electrical supplies to allow for additional trail lighting – all existing  
21 lighting will remain as is for now. New lighting will be installed where new trails are  
22 built or expanded with wires taken overhead as is done now. Wires that provide power to  
23 the lifts will be buried. Larry Bartlett spoke to the new lighting proposal later in the  
24 presentation.
- 25 ♦ Relocating and improving the tubing hill
- 26 ♦ Relocating, adding and/or removing utility buildings. These buildings, except one at the  
27 top for the lift attendant, will all be located at the base of the various lifts
- 28 ♦ Re-grading the lower trail section of the all-purpose trail to make it more accessible to  
29 cross-country skiers and snowshoers  
30

31 Mr. Gartley went over the Plans included with the application starting with Plan SV-1  
32 which shows the existing “as built” situation. Also referring to C-1, which shows the  
33 infrastructure improvements, he explained the changes that will be made to the existing two T-  
34 Bars, rope tows and chair lift. SV-1 shows these new locations as well as the location of an  
35 entirely new chair lift that will take skiers 50' to 70' higher up the mountain to new and expanded  
36 trail sections.  
37

38 Mr. Householder asked about the areas that are shown for tree removal on Plan C-2 – the  
39 Clearing and Forestry Management Plan. He is concerned about the possibility of severe  
40 erosion. Mr. Gartley explained the erosion controls shown on the Plan and noted that they have  
41 completed a Forestry Management Plan and have a licensed forester on the site supervising the  
42 cutting that has already begun. As they did when the last Snow Bowl project involved severe  
43 cutting, Gartley and Dorsky will visit the site daily to inspect the work so immediate action can  
44 be taken to address concerns, and work can be stopped if time is needed to engineer solutions to  
45 problems. The process for clearing is the same as last time as well. Each segment is cut,  
46 stumped, graded and stabilized as the team moves down the mountain. Stabilizing as they go  
47 avoids creating a huge swath of graded area running straight down the mountain -- it is the most  
48 important tool they have to reduce the potential for erosion. As they cut, whole trees are being  
49 brought down the mountain to be re-used locally in some way or another. He responded to Mr.  
50 Householder’s concerns about wetland impact by informing the Board that they have received

1 notification that the DEP has approved their wetlands impact plan – they will have a permit in  
2 hand prior to review of the Plan.

### 3 4 *Lighting*

5  
6 Larry Bartlett’s company will be submitting a Lighting Plan for review at the next  
7 meeting and he had prepared a Power Point presentation to illustrate the lighting concept that is  
8 in the final stage of design.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bartlett provided a great deal of technical information to  
9 explain the combined impact of the existing high pressure sodium lighting installation and the  
10 proposal to use LED lighting in the new fixtures. By creating a design that combines strategic  
11 placement of fixtures and tightly controlled aiming of the light source, LED lighting can reduce  
12 the lumen output by up to 75% from that coming from traditional lighting fixtures providing the  
13 same coverage. The goal is to keep the off-site impact of additional lighting to a minimum.

14  
15 He has not done the final calculations, and has no other ski area installations to rely on  
16 for working designs. He needs to provide sufficient light as well as a safe transition from the  
17 current lighting to the new lighting - and back - for skiers, while minimizing the impact of “sky  
18 glow” from all the additional lighting. He is attempting to keep pole spacing the same as existing  
19 – perhaps even expand the distance between poles – but he won’t know until he can plot out  
20 light throw that is sufficient to provide for safe night skiing. He spoke of light shields he is  
21 considering that are designed to concentrate the light throw and to eliminate the side glare that  
22 can cause problems to those off site, but those details won’t be available until the Plan is  
23 finalized.

24  
25 There was discussion about the current lighting – there are no plans at this time to replace  
26 the existing trail and lift lighting – and the fact that there are many in the area that do not like the  
27 sodium lamps and the resulting light coming off the mountain. Mr. Sargent believes there may  
28 be pressure to make changes once people see the difference LED lamps could have on the  
29 overall impact. Mr. Sargent also suggested that the Applicant finds some ski areas that have  
30 installed LED lighting to see what the local opinion is of the change. He believes that kind of  
31 information may be helpful to address concerns locally.

### 32 33 *Traffic and Parking*

34  
35 They hope to add up to 5,000 more “ski-visits” over the current yearly average of 35,000.  
36 Mr. Sargent believes it will be irresponsible of the Planning Board to approve this Plan to  
37 increase visits without addressing whether or not there will be enough parking to handle the  
38 additional visitors. Mr. Gartley explained that new parking is being created during Phase 2 of  
39 this project which will come before the Board later this year. In order to apply for the DEP  
40 permits they will need to make changes for parking, they must have a completed design – that  
41 design is not ready. They will show what the proposal looks like so far and the Board can  
42 determine if they have enough information to go forward.

### 43 44 *Public Comments*

45  
46 John Scholz speaking as a citizen: He has worked professionally with Mr. Bartlett and knows  
47 how very qualified he is to do this work. He, along with other residents in the Hosmer Pond

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bartlett’s Power Point can be seen by accessing the live-streamed video of this meeting from the Town Website or going directly to the producers of the video at: [www.townhallstreams.com/locations/camden-me](http://www.townhallstreams.com/locations/camden-me)

1 area, has long expressed concerns about lighting at the Snow Bowl. He believes that when  
2 neighbors are given the opportunity to learn more about this design, the proposal will be  
3 positively accepted. He supports the use of the shields Mr. Bartlett is considering because they  
4 control side angle glare that can be seen far away from the mountain.

5  
6 *Site Walk*  
7

8 The Snow Bowl crew will shuttle those attending the Site Walk to the top of the  
9 mountain and the location of the new lift using snow mobiles or the Snow Cat. The walk will be  
10 held on March 28 at 7:30am with a snow day of April 2; anyone attending should meet up at the  
11 ski lodge.

12 *Review of Submissions*  
13

14 The submissions are outlined on the Submission List submitted with the Application –  
15 see Attachment 43 to these Minutes for details.

16  
17 The Board reviewed the Submission Requirements of the Ordinance. See Attachment 4  
18 to these minutes for a summary of the Applicant’s submission narrative -- Applicant’s comments  
19 are shown in italics here and in the summary. Referencing the Site Plan Review Letter provided  
20 by the Applicant the Board found the following items outstanding:  
21

22 (h) the location, dimensions, front view, and ground floor elevations of all existing and  
23 proposed buildings in the site.

24 *The only proposed buildings are small utility buildings.*

25 ← The Chair noted that the Ordinance requires elevations of the utility buildings: Photos of  
26 existing buildings will serve the purpose – those slated for demolition included; elevations  
27 (drawings) of new buildings are required; and locations and dimensions of all must also be  
28 provided.

29 ← Buildings need to be labeled - including the “proposed bathroom.”

30  
31 (i) the location and dimensions of driveways, parking and loading areas, and walkways .

32 *See Sheets C-1 and SV-1.*  
33

34 ← Existing information will be clarified when the Plans are revised and missing information will  
35 be added.  
36

37 (k) the location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal  
38

39 ← Final locations of water and underground electrical lines are to be included in the “As Built”  
40 Plan required before the CEO can issue building permits. The locations of aerial electric lines are  
41 not required because they are visible.  
42

43 (n) location, front view, and dimensions of existing and proposed signs.

44 *No changes are proposed.*

45 ← Photos of signs with a total dimension of 6SF or more need to be provided and the locations  
46 identified.  
47

48 **Section 4: Supplemental Information**

49 The Board reviewed the Applicant’s comments:

1 The Planning Board may require any or all of the following submissions where it  
2 determines that, due to the scale, nature of the proposed development or relationship  
3 to surrounding properties, such information is necessary to assure compliance with the intent  
4 and purposes of this Ordinance.

- 5  
6 (1) Existing and proposed topography of the site at two foot contour intervals, or such  
7 other interval as the Board may determine, prepared and sealed by a surveyor  
8 licensed in the State of Maine.

9 *See sheet C-1. The existing topography is provided at 10' intervals on the Site Plan with*  
10 *topography in 1-2' intervals in select development areas where grading is needed. Due to*  
11 *the size of the project Aerial Photography was used to acquire the topography for a*  
12 *majority of the project site. The only grading proposed is minimal re-shaping of the new*  
13 *and enlarged trails.*

14 ← 10' topo intervals are fine for the Phase 1 project.

- 15 (2) A storm water drainage and erosion control plan prepared by an engineer or  
16 landscape architect registered in the State of Maine, showing:

17 (a) the existing and proposed method of handling storm water runoff.

18 (b) the direction of flow of the runoff through the use of arrows.

19 (c) the location, elevation, and size of all catch basins, dry wells, drainage  
20 ditches, swales, retention basins, and storm sewers.

21 (d) engineering calculations used to determine drainage requirements based upon a  
22 25- year storm frequency, if the project will significantly alter the existing  
23 drainage pattern due to such factors as the amount of new impervious surfaces  
24 (such as paving and building area) being proposed.

25 (e) methods of controlling erosion and sedimentation during and after construction.

26  
27 *Currently the existing stormwater runs off the site through the steep forested mountain*  
28 *side. The proposed improvements will minimally impact the stormwater runoff. The*  
29 *stormwater runoff will traverse across the improvements as it would have in prior to*  
30 *construction. There is a minimal change to the existing impervious area as part of the*  
31 *infrastructure improvements.*

32 *The proposed project will not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns.*

33  
34 Mr. Gartley added that they had not provided arrows showing the direction of flow because  
35 everything runs downhill and no drainage patterns are being altered and no stormwater is  
36 being captured.

- 37  
38 (3) A utility plan showing, in addition to provisions for water supply and wastewater  
39 disposal, the location and nature of electrical, telephone, and any other utility  
40 services to be installed on the site.

41 *See sheet C-1. The only proposed change to utility service is power to the new*  
42 *lights and to the new lift locations.*

43  
44 ← The Lighting Plan will provide much of this information. See “k” above regarding other  
45 requirements.

- 46 (4) A planting schedule keyed to the site plan and indicating the varieties and sizes of  
47 trees, shrubs, and other plants to be planted.

48 *Not Applicable.*

1 ← The Applicant will be adding landscaping and that will be shown on the Plan.

2  
3 (5) Applications for Piers, Wharves, Breakwaters and Boat Ramps shall include...:  
4 *Not Applicable.*

5  
6 The consensus of the Board was that the Plan was sufficiently complete to proceed to  
7 review. All new and corrected submissions must be received no later than March 31.

8  
9 A Public Hearing will be scheduled for the April 3 Meeting.

10  
11 **6. DISCUSSION:**

12  
13 1. There were no minor field adjustments.

14  
15 2. Future Agenda Items:

16  
17 The only item on the April 3 meeting agenda will be the Snow Bowl

18  
19 April 17:

20 Paul Cartwright is coming for Site Plan Review for a project on his lot in the B-R  
21 District – this will be his pre-application meeting

22  
23 Mr. Vangel is returning for Private Way approval. The original was never recorded and  
24 the approval has expired; the CEO cannot issue a building permit until this has been  
25 done. Mr. Wilson was notified that members have seen work taking place on this site  
26 already – he will check.

27 c

28 Kristi Bifulco's Ordinance Amendment request will go to the first Public Hearing. The  
29 Chair wants to complete work to this proposal by the end of May.

30  
31 3. The Comprehensive Plan Committee will hold a Workshop on March 27. There is a  
32 ZBA meeting that same evening – the CEO and Recording Secretary must attend that  
33 meeting instead.

34  
35 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 7:30pm

36  
37 Respectfully Submitted,

38  
39 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1: Subdivision Ordinance Article 8 – Approval Standards – Coastal Opportunities:

**1. Pollution.** The proposed subdivision will not result in undue water or air pollution  
**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that Section 1.A has been satisfied.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**2. Sufficient Water.** The proposed subdivision has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the subdivision;  
**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 2, Sufficient Water, is met because there is a letter from Maine Water stating that there is adequate water to supply the project and because the Applicant is installing a new 4" water line for fire suppression.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**3. Municipal Water Supply.** The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used;  
**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 3, Municipal Water Supply, is met because of the letter from Maine Water.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**4. Erosion.** The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results;  
**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that the Applicant meets Item 4, Erosion, based on the information supplied in the submission packet and the controls that are annotated on the Plan with accompanying notes.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**5. Traffic.** The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed;  
**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Householder** that these standards are met because the present driveway is being used and not changed; as observed on the Site Walk, the relocation of the building will allow for improved sight lines; and there is no net change in the number of dwelling units so traffic will not increase. In addition, a letter from the Town Highway Department acknowledges the standards have been met.

Discussion: Mr. Bernhard is concerned that siting the new building less than 3' from the abutter's driveway is not good planning. The Applicant explained that they chose not to relocate the current driveway further north on the street for several reasons. The CEO suggested that the DOT would probably not have allowed any relocation that moved the entrance closer to the Free Street intersection; they want as much distance as possible between that intersection and any driveway.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**6. Sewage disposal.** The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services if they are utilized;  
**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that #6, Sewage Disposal is satisfied as noted on the Plan; by a letter from Waste Water Superintendent Ross Parker; and because there will be no net change in users.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**7. Municipal Solid Waste Disposal.** The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be utilized;  
**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that #7, Municipal Solid Waste, is satisfied because there is no net increase in residents and because there is a letter [from Jim Guerra].  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**8. Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values.** The proposed subdivision will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline;  
**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #8 is met through virtue of the property description provided with the Application; by the Applicant's desire to keep the new building similar in design to the old; by the reduction in height from two stories to one in the area adjacent to the abutter; and by the letter from the DIF&W provided by the Applicant indicating there are no rare or irreplaceable natural areas on the property.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**9. Financial and Technical Capacity.** The subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section;  
The original Motion offered by Mr. Householder was amended to address the fact that because this subdivision requires no new infrastructure, the requirement for surety does not apply.  
**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** that #9, the Applicant's Financial and Technical Capacity, is satisfied by the letter from Bangor Savings Bank stating such. Because no public infrastructure improvements are being made, there is no need for additional surety.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**10. Surface Waters; Outstanding River Segments.** Whenever situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250' feet of any wetland...  
**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 10 does not apply because there are no Surface Waters or Outstanding River Segments nearby.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**11. Ground Water.** The proposed subdivision will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water;  
**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Householder** that #11 is satisfied according to the Plan for Erosion Control that has been submitted.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**12. Flood Areas.** Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood-Insurance Rate Maps, and information presented by the applicant, whether the subdivision is in a flood-prone area.  
**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Mr. Bernhard** that this Item is not applicable due to the fact that the property is not in a flood plain area.  
**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**13. Freshwater Wetlands.** All potential freshwater wetlands within the proposed subdivision have been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands. Any mapping of freshwater wetlands may be done with the help of the local soil and water conservation district.

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 13, Freshwater Wetlands, is not applicable because there are none.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**14. River, Stream or Brook.** Any river, stream or brook within or abutting the proposed subdivision has been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application. For purposes of this section “river, stream or brook” has the same meaning as in Title 38, Section 480-B, Subsection 9.

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that Item 14 does not apply because there are no Rivers, Streams or Brooks on or abutting the property.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**15. Storm water.** The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate storm water management.

Discussion: Mr. Householder asked for information on how the Applicant planned to handle the run-off from the new building to keep water from collecting at the building foundation. Mr. Lane replied that the building will occupy the small amount of high ground on this part of the property and provided details on grade and elevation. The roof line splits the middle of this high point and will shed water equally to the street drains and the parking lot and existing catch basins there. Mr. Scholz and Mr. Lane discussed the Finished Floor Elevation (FFE) with regard to the existing conditions; Mr. Lane agreed an adjustment can be made to raise this elevation so to improve drainage. The FFE shown in a Plan Note will be changed by Mr. Lane before the Final Plan is signed.

Although the Board does not review design elements like entry pathways, Mr. Sargent recommended that an alternate walkway be provided coming in from the Elm Street sidewalk since most of the residents of the apartments do not drive and will generally be walking in from Town. Mr. Glass replied that the building was intended to serve for aging in place and steps, which would be required for an Elm Street entrance, had been avoided. Mr. Sargent suggested that it would be safer for the residents because they could avoid having to walk down the driveway to reach the walkway as proposed. Mr. Curll suggested that perhaps an alternate walkway could originate in the parking lot instead of the driveway. The Applicant will make both changes -- the changes do not have to be approved by the Board.

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #15, Storm Water is met with condition that the FFE raised appropriately per the engineers recommendation to be significantly above the surrounding topography of elevation 81.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**16. Spaghetti-lots Prohibited.** If any lots in the proposed subdivision have shore frontage...

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 16 is not applicable.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**17. Lake phosphorus concentration.** The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will not unreasonable increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration...

**MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Mr. Scholz** that #17, Lake phosphorus concentration, does not apply.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**18. Impact on adjoining municipalities.** For any proposed subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries...

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 18, Impact on adjoining municipalities does not apply.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**19. Lands subject to liquidation harvesting.**

**MOTION by Ms. MacKinnon seconded by Mr. Scholz** that Item 19 does not apply.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

**20. Conformity with local ordinances and plans.** The proposed subdivision conforms with this subdivision ordinance, comprehensive plan, and zoning ordinance. In making this determination the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans;

**MOTION by Mr. Scholz seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** that #20, Conformity with local ordinances and plans is met by the Applicants as represented on Subdivision Plan C-1 and the written materials and plans accompanying the application.

**VOTE: 5-0-0**

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 2: COASTAL OPPORTUNITIES FINAL PLAN SUBMISSIONS

March 5, 2014

Town of Camden Planning Board PO Box 1207  
29 Elm Street  
Camden, ME 04843

Coastal Opportunities: The Elm Street Apartments Final Plan for Minor Subdivision

Subject Parcel: Map 119 Lot 273 & 274

Project No. 2013-334

FINAL PLAN FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION

<u>Description</u> of Document	<u>Document Date</u>
1. Minor Subdivision Final Plan application and fee	March 5, 2014
2. Minor Subdivision Final Plan Letter	March 5, 2014
3. Article 8 Approval Standards	March 5, 2014
4. Site Location Map	March 2014
5. Deeds Book 1623 Page 226 & Book 570 Page 25	Various
6. Purchase and Sale Agreement	October 21, 2013
7. FEMA Floodplain Map	May 4, 1988
8. MIFW Habitat Letter	March 4, 2014
9. Soil Survey	February 25, 2014
10. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Notes	
11. Abutter List (From Town of Camden)	
12. Abutter Map (from Town of Camden)	
13. Water Availability Letter	March 3, 2014
14. Solid Waste Availability Letter	
15. Sewer Availability Letter	March 5, 2014
16. Financial Capacity Letter	
17. Concept Plans from Christopher Glass, Architect	November 12, 2012
18. Boundary Survey and Lot Split Plan Sheet SV-1	March 5, 2014
19. Minor Subdivision Final Site Plan Sheet C-1	March 5, 2014
20. Civil Details Sheet C-2	March 5, 2014

ATTACHMENT 3: RAGGED MOUNTAIN SITE PLAN SUBMISSIONS

**Ragged Mountain Recreation Area Infrastructure Improvements  
SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**SUBMISSION LIST**

<u>Description of Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. Town of Camden Application for Site Plan Review	February 20, 2014
2. Site Plan Review Letter: Article XII Sections 3 (Site Plan Content), 4 (Supplemental Information) and 6 (Approval Criteria)	February 20, 2014
3. Deeds	Various
4. Abutters List	
5. Location Map	February 2014
6. Plans	
Aerial Plan Sheet AE-1	February 20, 2014
RMRA Infrastructure Improvements Preliminary Existing Conditions Plan Sheet SV-1	February 20, 2014
RMRA Infrastructure Improvements Site Plan Sheet C-1	February 20, 2014
RMRA Infrastructure Improvements Clearing/Forestry Management Plan Sheet C-2	February 20, 2014
RMRA Infrastructure Improvements Site Details Sheet C-3	February 20, 2014

#### ATTACHMENT 4: RAGGED MOUNTAIN SITE PLAN CONTENT FROM NARRATIVE

When the owner of the property or his authorized agent makes formal application for site plan review, his application shall contain at least the following exhibits and information:

- (a) owner's name and address.

*See Sheet C-1.*

- (j) names and addresses of all abutting property owners.

*See attached Abutter List and the Standard Boundary Survey SV-1*

- (k) sketch map showing general location of the site within the Town.

*See attached Site Location Map.*

- (l) boundaries of all contiguous property under the control of the owner or applicant regardless of whether all or part is being developed at this time.

*See Sheets C-1 and SV-1.*

- (m) zoning classification(s) of the property lines of the property to be developed and the source of this information .

*See Sheet C-1.*

- (n) the bearing and distances of all property lines of the property to be developed and the source of this information. The Board may require a formal boundary survey when sufficient information is not available to establish on the ground, all property boundaries.

*See Sheet SV-1.*

- (o) the location of all building setbacks required by this Ordinance.

*See Sheet C-1.*

- (p) the location, dimensions, front view, and ground floor elevations of all existing and proposed buildings in the site.

The only proposed buildings are small utility buildings.

- (q) the location and dimensions of driveways, parking and loading areas, and walkways .

*See Sheets C-1 and SV-1.*

- (r) location of intersecting roads or driveways within 200 feet of the site.

*See Site Location Map and Aerial Plan AE-1.*

- (l) the location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal

*There are no changes to domestic water. Water for snow making is from Hosmer Pond. The intake from the Pond will remain. A new septic system was recently installed. The only proposed change is to add a bathroom to the Maintenance Building and connect it to the new septic system.*

- (m) the location of open drainage courses, wetlands, stands of trees, and other important natural features, with a description of such features to be retained and of any new landscaping planned.  
*See Sheets C-1 and SV-1.*
- (m) location and dimensions of any existing easements and copies of existing covenants or deed restrictions.  
*See attached Warranty Deeds and sheet SV-1.*
- (n) location, front view, and dimensions of existing and proposed signs.  
*No changes are proposed.*
- (o) location and type of exterior lighting.  
*The existing lighting is likely to remain. The proposed additional trail lighting is shown on Sheet C-1. Additional lighting detail will be provided prior to approval.*
- (p) copies of applicable State and Federal approvals and permits, provided, however, that the Board may approve site plans subject to the issuance of specified State and Federal approvals and permits where it determines that it is not feasible for the applicant to obtain them at the time of site plan review.

The following state and federal applications are being completed for this project (the Town of Camden will receive a copy of each of the full applications under separate cover):

1. MDEP NRPA Tier 1 application for wetland impact.
2. MDEP Chapter 305 Permit by Rule Stream Crossing
3. MDEP Stormwater Permit: Basic Standards (erosion and sedimentation control); General Standards (for watershed most at risk and phosphorus standards)

*The proposed Snow Bowl improvements will be located in the watershed of a water body most at risk to new development. However, the proposed site plan will not create more than 20,000 s.f. of impervious area or 5 acres of developed area, therefore no Stormwater Management permit will be required other than the Basic Standards.*

4. Army Corp of Engineers Programmatic General Permit Category 1 application for fill in wetland.

- (q) a signature block on the site plan, including space to record a reference to the order by which the plan is approved.  
*See Sheet C-1.*

#### **Section 4: Supplemental Information**

The Planning Board may require any or all of the following submissions where it determines that, due to the scale, nature of the proposed development or relationship to surrounding properties, such information is necessary to assure compliance with the intent and purposes of this Ordinance.

- (1) Existing and proposed topography of the site at two foot contour intervals, or such other interval as the Board may determine, prepared and sealed by a surveyor licensed in the State of Maine.  
See sheet C-1. The existing topography is provided at 10' intervals on the Site Plan with topography

in 1-2' intervals in select development areas where grading is needed. Due to the size of the project Aerial Photography was used to acquire the topography for a majority of the project site. The only grading proposed is minimal re-shaping of the new and enlarged trails.

- (2) A storm water drainage and erosion control plan prepared by an engineer or landscape architect registered in the State of Maine, showing:
  - (a) the existing and proposed method of handling storm water runoff.
  - (b) the direction of flow of the runoff through the use of arrows.
  - (c) the location, elevation, and size of all catch basins, dry wells, drainage ditches, swales, retention basins, and storm sewers.
  - (d) engineering calculations used to determine drainage requirements based upon a 25- year storm frequency, if the project will significantly alter the existing drainage pattern due to such factors as the amount of new impervious surfaces (such as paving and building area) being proposed.
  - (e) methods of controlling erosion and sedimentation during and after construction.

*Currently the existing stormwater runs off the site through the steep forested mountain side. The proposed improvements will minimally impact the stormwater runoff. The stormwater runoff will traverse across the improvements as it would have in prior to construction. There is a minimal change to the existing impervious area as part of the infrastructure improvements. The proposed project will not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns.*

- (3) A utility plan showing, in addition to provisions for water supply and wastewater disposal, the location and nature of electrical, telephone, and any other utility services to be installed on the site. *See sheet C-1. The only proposed change to utility service is power to the new lights and to the new lift locations.*
- (4) A planting schedule keyed to the site plan and indicating the varieties and sizes of trees, shrubs, and other plants to be planted.  
*Not Applicable.*
- (10) Applications for Piers, Wharves, Breakwaters and Boat Ramps shall include...:  
*Not Applicable.*