

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

**CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 2, 2013**

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

ABSENT: Member Kerry Sabanty

The meeting of the Planning Board of May 2, 2013, was convened at 5:00 pm.

1. Public Input on Non-agenda Items:

No one came forward to speak.

2. Minutes:

April 4, 2013:

Page 1 Line 31: The word “building” was replaced by the word “buildings”

Page 3 Line 9: Maryann Shanahan’s name had been misspelled

Page 4 Line 12: The last two sentences of the paragraph were replaced by these: “They also want to allow something like the Market Basket, but that use is covered under the umbrella of “take out restaurants,” and they definitely don’t want any of those. The problem is that the categories of uses as defined by the Ordinance are not narrow enough to allow them to pick and chose only the specific uses they want.”

Page 7 Line 7 now reads: “Mr. MacLean noted that these trailers exist and they cannot eliminate them because they are grandfathered. Mr. Wilson agreed they are grandfathered, but they can be regulated by requiring permits.”

Page 8 Line 1: “...the owner of the sSmoothie sShack...”

Line 9: The first sentence of the paragraph now reads: “Mr. MacLean suggested that, as an informational courtesy, Mr. Wilson share this information with Mr. Shirley and inform him that the Board is not interested in putting this issue on the agenda for discussion at this time.”

MOTION by Mr. Sargent seconded by Ms. MacKinnon to accept the Minutes of the Camden Planning Board of April 4, 2013, with the changes made.

VOTE: 4-0-0

April 22, 2013:

Page 2 Line 16: “...someone to develop the lot_he is interested...”

Page 4 Line 12: “...~~near-by~~ nearby...”

Page 5 Line 26: The word “incubators” was made singular.

MOTION by Mr. Householder seconded by Ms. MacKinnon to approve the Minutes of the Camden Planning Board of April 11, 2013 as changed.

VOTE: 4-0-0

3. Proposed Future Zoning Amendments

1) Northern Gateway District (B-5): POSTPONED

1 The group is looking at their proposal again wondering if moving into the B-4 and
2 allowing those uses in buildings that existed at the time is a better solution than creating a new
3 district. Mr. Wilson added them to the agenda of the May 16 meeting to be heard when the
4 Board is finished reviewing the River Business proposal. Mr. Wilson will inform them that there
5 is a chance that the Board will not have time to consider their proposal that evening; they will
6 just have to wait and see.

7
8 **2) Storage Containers:**

9
10 Mr. Wilson had not had time to put together a proposal.

11
12 **3) Demolition:**

13
14 → Mr. Wilson is to notify the parties who have expressed interest in the subject that the Board will
15 hear comments on a Demolition Delay Ordinance on June 6.

16
17 **DISCUSSION:**

- 18
19 1. Minor field adjustments: There were none.
20
21 2. Future agenda items:
22 May 2: Discussion of High Street Gateway District proposal
23
24 3. Pending Applications: There are none
25
26 4. Other:

27
28 Mr. Wilson informed the Board that The Insurance Services Organization, an
29 independent certification agency, has started their audit of compliance with and enforcement of
30 building codes as well as other factors that affect Camden's rating. Mr. Wilson has to gather a
31 great deal of data that the ISO then provides to insurance companies who use this in setting their
32 rates. Now that MUBEC is in place, Camden has the opportunity of having their risk rating
33 lowered, and new home builders could be in line to benefit with lower home insurance
34 premiums.

35
36 Mr. MacLean informed the Board that he had a discussion with Martin Cates about
37 membership issues and was informed that the Select Board had discussed the problems with
38 filling Planning Board seats. They discussed a suggestion that the Planning Board terms be
39 shortened from five years to three because that longer commitment might be keeping some
40 people from applying for the seats.

41
42 Don White clarified that the Select Board was looking for comments on this suggestion,
43 and confirmed that there have been people interested in serving who have declined the position
44 because of the five-year term.

45
46 Members weighed in with comments:
47

1 Ms. MacKinnon: She thinks five years is a long term. She also thinks that people may have the
2 perception, because members serve for so long, that the same people are serving over and over
3 again.

4
5 Mr. Sargent: He doesn't think the five-year term matters because people can just resign if they
6 want. In addition, the Alternates serve for one year and it has been rare lately that there has been
7 a full Board.

8
9 Mr. White said that the Charter would have to be amended and changed back to three
10 years. If approved by voters, each time an appointment (or renewal) came up the new term
11 would be for three years – the others would then fall in line as they were re-appointed.

12
13 Mr. Sargent believes that the five years is necessary because it takes a long time to learn
14 the Ordinances and the skills needed to conduct reviews. If someone just can't finish the term
15 they can leave, but in the end the five year terms mean that reviews are conducted more
16 efficiently and knowledgably.

17
18 Ms. MacKinnon thinks the five-year term may affect someone's interest in serving.
19 Many people don't really understand what the Planning Board does and they might be willing to
20 give it a try if the term were shortened.

21
22 Mr. Sargent referenced the Board's membership letter describing the work required of
23 members; that should provide people with enough information to make a good decision.

24
25 Mr. White thinks that most people, except for reasons of health perhaps, would serve out
26 the term they agreed to. The Select Board's concern is that there may be people interested in
27 serving who don't because of the length of the term.

28
29 Mr. Sargent thinks that unless someone has previous experience in the kind of work the
30 Planning Board does, that three years isn't enough time to come up to speed. Mr. White
31 disagrees and feels it is no different than someone being elected to the Select Board who has
32 never served – their terms are three years and it works.

33
34 Mr. MacLean: He thinks the five-year time is suggestive of what is an appropriate time
35 to agree to commit. Even though someone could leave early, he believes that with the five-year
36 term members who agree to serve will be perceived to be someone willing to make that kind of
37 commitment, and having that commitment in place is healthier for a well-functioning Planning
38 Board than having people who commit for a shorter period of time. The end result will be a
39 more mature and experienced Board and this, he believes, is a wise policy.

40
41 Mr. Sargent also believes that longer terms give members the ability to look long-term
42 instead of coming onto the Board in reaction to a "hot" issue in Town and then moving on. Mr.
43 MacLean agrees and believes that there may be people with "agendas" willing to serve if there is
44 a three-year term so they can try to accomplish their goal. A five-year term would transcend any
45 particular agenda issue, but might discourage "agenda-seekers".

1 Ms. MacKinnon finds the problem with the five-year term comes when a member is in
2 line to be re-appointed. They may think twice about making that commitment. Perhaps the
3 Board could consider a re-appointed member to set a shorter term as a heads up to other
4 members that they are winding down and the Board needs to start looking for a replacement.
5 Mr. Sargent agreed with that concept, but still believes the initial term for members should be
6 five years.

7
8 Mr. Wilson suggested that shorter second terms could put two or three terms in line to
9 expire the same year. Mr. MacLean agrees that because of staggered terms the shorter second
10 term concept probably won't work. He thinks the terms should stay five years and someone
11 being re-appointed can simply be straightforward and let the Board know they will be leaving
12 early. Mr. Wilson noted that the position of Alternate is important because that means someone
13 can be "trained" and ready to step in.

14
15 Don White will report to the Select Board that the Planning Board recommends keeping
16 five-year terms.

17
18 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 5:45pm.

19
20
21 Respectfully submitted,

22
23
24 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary