

1 **CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF MEETING**
3 **May 17, 2012**
4

5 **PRESENT:** Chair Chris MacLean; Members Richard Householder, Jan MacKinnon and Lowrie
6 Sargent; Alternate Member Sid Lindsley; Don White, Select Board Liaison to the Planning
7 Board; and CEO Steve Wilson

8 **ABSENT:** Member Kerry Sabanty and Alternate Member Nancy McConnell
9

10 Mr. MacLean called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.
11

12 **1. PUBLIC COMMENT on NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**
13

14 Mr. Sargent: The signage alerting drivers to the presence of pedestrians crossing to the Bog
15 bridge boat ramp have not yet been installed and the boating season is here. In addition, Mr.
16 Sargent has noticed that the parking signs that have been installed are being ignored. Mr. Wilson
17 informed Mr. Sargent that Rick Seibel and Jeff Kuller are waiting for final approval from MDOT
18 for permission to install the signs along Route 105. Mr. Sargent is also aware that ramp users are
19 parking where they are not allowed to park and entering the wrong way. Mr. Wilson said that
20 areas will be stripped and signs posted “No Parking”. In addition, the Police Chief is going to
21 make some appearances with the hope of convincing people to park according to the Plan.
22

23 The Downtown Plan Steering Committee met and Mr. Sargent informed members that the
24 Planning Board will be counting on the Committee for two things: 1) The Steering Committee
25 can help the Board understand how to weave the Downtown Plan into the Comprehensive Plan
26 re-write; and 2) He explained the Board’s work on non-conforming businesses and suggested
27 that they could be a good sounding board for the work on this propos
28

29 **2. MINUTES:**

30 May 3, 2012:

31 Page 1:

32 Line 11: “Mr. Sargent called the meeting ~~was called~~ to order...”

33 Line 38: The sentence now reads: “Maine Farmland Trust (MFT) is the property owner, and
34 Melissa Spear Dove, an option holder, is the Applicant; Ms. Spear is represented by Tom
35 Fowler of Landmark Corporation, authorized agent.”
36

37 Page 2:

38 Line 29: Simonton Corner Road was misspelled.

39 Line 32: Rockport approved Maple Grove Subdivision in 2011.
40

41 Page 3: Line 5: Mr. Fowler’s name was misspelled.
42

43 Page 4: Beginning at Line 30: The summary of the discussion on non-conforming uses within
44 the B3 District was rewritten and now reads as follows: “Comments from the Board:

45 Ms. MacKinnon: She has supported this concept from the beginning; she likes this draft and
46 is pleased that property owners are involved – she wants to hear from more owners and hopes

1 they will become involved. She likes the fact that the maximum expansions are limited to
2 Business Districts, and confined to 30% in the Coastal Residential, Rural and Village
3 Districts. The more liberal approach in the Business Districts is controlled by the ability to
4 place conditions upon the expansions to deal with problems like buffering, noise, dust, etc.;
5 this gives the Board the opportunity to address everyone's concerns.
6

7 Mr. Householder: He likes the proposal and hopes the Board will continue to keep this
8 amendment on the agenda so it can go to a vote in November. The Public Hearing should be
9 held in early August to provide the time to make changes based on feedback.
10

11 Mr. Lindsley: He believes that the purpose of the various districts must be respected by this
12 draft, and goes back to purpose of the B3 of accommodating limited business uses located
13 along main traffic arteries that are residential in nature. He suggests that the B3, which runs
14 parallel to Route 1 on either side, was important in retaining the residential character of the
15 entrance to Town so that it was not turned them into a "strip". He is concerned that the
16 current draft would allow existing businesses here to fill the lot with an expansion, and that
17 goes against the purpose – no expansions were to be allowed. Mr. Wilson said that in this zone
18 non-conforming expansions will be limited to 30% lot coverage; the same as conforming
19 businesses that exist there now – and there are a lot of conforming uses there. The non-
20 conforming uses, however, would face the possibility of additional restraints – like buffering,
21 for example. The concept is to make this balanced – there has to be something gained by the
22 people who are conforming. Reviewing the impact of a non-conforming business and
23 requiring something that will improve the appearance, should benefit everyone. The actual
24 result may be that the impact of the business on the neighborhood could be improved by these
25 changes.
26

27 Mr. Sargent: He believes Mr. Lindsley raises a good point about the B3 – it is an odd duck for
28 a business district. The attempt was to preserve residences, and although there are very few
29 residences left, the buildings still look like residences – that was the idea. He thinks that the
30 B3 should be put in the same category of the Rural Districts and say that no business can
31 expand by 30%, or if they are already maxed out on lot coverage, they get no expansion. He
32 likes this kind of simple and easy to understand concept, and he thinks it needs to be made
33 clear to voters, with specific language, that there is a limit to the expansion. They will see that
34 the B3 is *still* being treated differently than other business districts."
35

36 Page 6: Line 2: Mr. Decker's name is Flint.

37 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** to approve the Minutes of May 3,
38 2012, with the corrections made by the learned members of the Board.

39 **VOTE: 5-0-1** with Mr. MacLean abstaining due to his absence
40

41 **3. SUBDIVISION: PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION REVIEW**

42 Maple Grove Subdivision: Map 229 Lot 5; and Map 230 Lot 9: Rural 2 District (RU-2):

43 Maine Farmland Trust: Simonton Road

44 Maine Farmland Trust (MFT) is the property owner, and Melissa Spear Dove, an
45 option holder, is the Applicant; Ms. Spear is represented by Michael Sabatini of Landmark
46 Corporation, authorized agent. Mr. Sabatini is here for Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan

1 Approval, and the Chair cautioned that no new information can be presented per the
2 Agreement for Joint Review reached by the two towns.

4 **Article 6: Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan Review:**

5 **Section 2. Preliminary Plan Submissions:**

- 6 ✓ Nine copies of the Preliminary Plan application with the appropriate fee were submitted.

8 **Section 3. Escrow Fee**

9 The developer shall pay an escrow fee of \$250 per lot or dwelling unit...

- 10 ✓ The CEO stated that this was one of the items waived by the Board in April.

12 **Section 4. Preliminary Plan Review**

13 The Plan under review consists of:

- 14 • Preliminary Plan for Maple Grove Subdivision dated April 24, 2012
- 15 • Application packet dated May 2, 2012 consisting of:
 - 16 ▶ Attachment 1: Application for Major Subdivision dated May 2, 2012 and narrative
 - 17 letter from Tom Fowler, PE, Landmark Corporation, dated the same
 - 18 ▶ Attachment 2: Location Map dated April 24, 2012
 - 19 ▶ Attachment 3: Title, Right or Interest Documentation: Option Agreement (MFT to
 - 20 Dove dated September 29, 2011; Warranty Deeds (Cripps to Spear and Spear to
 - 21 MFT); Letter of Understanding from Jason Spear, owner of Lot #2 dated April 24,
 - 22 2012; and Letter from Tom Fowler to Camden and Rockport Planning Boards
 - 23 regarding a Proposed Right-of-Way to Benefit Maine Farmland Trust dated May 1,
 - 24 2012

26 **Appendix C: Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan Submission Requirements**

27 **1) Application**

28 a) Nine copies of the application and supporting documents.

- 29 ✓ *Provided as Attachment 1*

30 b) A copy of the most recently recorded deed for the parcel.

- 31 ✓ *Provided as Attachment 3*

32 c) All existing deed restrictions, easements, rights of ways, or other encumbrances.

- 33 ✓ *Contained within the deeds - Attachment 3*

34 d) Proposed deed restrictions, easements, right of ways or other encumbrances.

- 35 ✓ *Provided within Dove's Option Agreement with the MFT*

36 Discussion:

37 Mr. Householder understands there is some question as to the specific location of a
38 proposed right-of way: Mr. Sabatini noted that the Application packet contained a letter from
39 Tom Flower explaining that the location of the ROW as shown on the Pre-application Plan and
40 the Location Map is not where the ROW was anticipated to be located by the Applicant, the
41 MFT or abutter Jason Spear. It was anticipated all along that the ROW would follow an old farm
42 road which lies mostly within Lot 2 owned by Mr. Spear. That location has now been flagged by
43 Landmark, and has been seen and approved by Mr. Spear and Ms. Dove. However, MFT has not
44 signed off on the new location. Once the exact location is agreed upon, the boundaries must be
45 surveyed and easement deeds drawn up; at this time there is no documentation of an agreement
46 between the parties regarding the revised ROW. Mr. Sargent noted that the requirement is
47 simply to show "proposed right of ways", and the Applicant has met this requirement; he has

1 told them that the location might change, but he has met his burden. In addition, this ROW will
2 be within Rockport, and not the Camden parcel.

3
4 → If there is an Easement Agreement in place at the time of the Final Plan the specific location
5 must be shown and documentation provided; if the location is still proposed, what they have now
6 is sufficient.

7
8 e) A written statement from the Camden Wastewater Superintendent that the District has the
9 capacity to collect and treat the wastewater, or:

10 Either Item “e” or Item “f” must be submitted, and the Board agreed that Item “e” is not
11 applicable - there would not have been sewer connections and “f” would have applied instead;
12 Item “f” had been waived.

13 f) Subsurface wastewater test pit analyses, prepared by a Licensed Site Evaluator.

14 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

15 g) A written statement from the water company that there is adequate supply and pressure for the
16 subdivision and a statement approving the design of any extension of the water main.

17 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

18 h) A written statement from the Fire Chief that water supply needs for fire protection have been
19 adequately met and approving the location of any fire hydrants.

20 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

21 i) When the water supply is private wells, evidence of adequate ground water supply and quality
22 by a well driller or a hydro geologist familiar with the area.

23 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

24 j) A written statement from the director of the Midcoast Solid Waste Facility that the proposed
25 subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality’s ability to dispose of
26 solid waste.

27 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

28 k) Agreements or other documents showing the manner in which open spaces are to be retained
29 by the developer or lot owners are to be maintained.

30 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

31 l) If open space or other land is to be offered to the municipality, written evidence that the
32 municipal officers are satisfied with the legal sufficiency of the written offer to convey title shall
33 be included.

34 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no open space or land offered to the municipality.*

35 m) Vehicular trip generation rate.

36 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no development within Camden.*

37 n) Traffic impact analysis by a registered P.E. for 28 or more parking spaces or subdivisions
38 projected to generate more than 140 vehicle trips per day, including expected ADT, peak-hour
39 volumes, access conditions, distribution of traffic, types of vehicles expected, effect on LOS and
40 recommended improvements.

41 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no development within Camden.*

42 o) Left lane study analysis for multi-family or non-residential subdivisions, if required.

43 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no development within Camden.*

44 p) If the subdivision is a condominium or a clustered development...

45 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no development within Camden.*

46
47 **2) Location Map**

1 The location map shall be drawn at a scale of not more than 1-inch equals 400-feet to show the
2 proposed subdivision in relation to the general surrounding area. The map shall show all areas
3 within 1,000 feet of any property line of the proposed subdivision, including:

- 4 a) Existing subdivisions in the proximity of the proposed subdivision.
- 5 b) Locations and names of existing streets.
- 6 c) Zoning boundaries and designations.
- 7 d) Outline of the proposed subdivision and owner's remaining contiguous land.

8 ✓ *Submitted as Attachment 2.*

9 ✓

10 **3) Preliminary Plan**

11 Nine copies of an accurate scale map of the parcel at not more than 1-inch equals 50-feet,
12 containing all the information from the site inventory map.

13 ✓ *The scale of the Plan is 1:200 per the waiver granted April 5, 2012.*

14
15 The following requirements may be shown on multiple sheets when necessary:

16 a) A standard boundary survey with bearings and distances showing the entire parcel and all
17 contiguous land in common ownership within the last five years per MRSA Title 30-A section
18 4401.

19 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

20 b) Names of record owners for all abutting properties.

21 ✓ *Shown on the Plan.*

22 c) Contour lines at the interval specified by the Board, showing elevations in relation to mean sea
23 level.

24 ✓ *At their meeting on April 5, 2012, the Camden Board agreed to accept 10' intervals for
25 the Camden parcel; those are shown.*

26 d) A storm water plan showing ditches, culverts, detention or retention areas.

27 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

28 e) Location of all proposed utilities, including electrical, cable, water and sewer.

29 ✓ *Not applicable: There is no development within Camden.*

30 f) Boundaries and designations of zoning districts.

31 ✓ *Shown on the Plan.*

32 g) Existing streets abutting the subdivision.

33 ✓ *Shown on the Plan.*

34 h) Boundaries of any flood hazard areas and the 100-year flood elevation, as depicted on the
35 municipality's Flood Insurance Rate Map.

36 ✓ *Shown on the Plan.*

37 i) Areas within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision which have been identified as high or
38 moderate value wildlife habitat...

39 ✓ *There are none*

40 j) When sewage disposal is to be accomplished by subsurface wastewater disposal systems, the
41 location of all test pits on the site.

42 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*

43 k) Location of any open space to be preserved and a description of proposed improvements and
44 its management.

45 ✓ *The entirety of the Camden parcel is protected under the MFT's "Forever Farm"
46 designation, and will be managed as farmland for the future.*

- 1 l) All parcels of land proposed to be dedicated to public use and the conditions of such
2 dedication.
3 ✓ *There is none.*
4 m) Provisions for controlling erosion and sedimentation, including measures to capture sediment
5 during construction and measures to stabilize the soil.
6 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*
7 n) Location and method of disposal for land clearing and construction debris.
8 ✓ *The requirement to submit this information was waived by the Board on April 5, 2012.*
9 o) Location, name and widths of existing streets.
10 ✓ *Shown on the Plan.*

11 12 **4) Street Design Plans**

13 Detailed construction drawings showing a plan view, profile, and typical cross-section of
14 proposed street.

- 15 ✓ *The requirement to submit the information required in this Section was waived by the*
16 *Board on April 5, 2012.*

17 18 **5) Additional Information**

19 The Planning Board may require additional information when it is determined necessary to meet
20 the criteria of the State Subdivision Statute Title 30-A, M.R.S.A., section 4401...

- 21 ✓ *The requirement to submit any of the information required in this Section was waived by*
22 *the Board on April 5, 2012.*

23 24 **Section 5. Public Hearing**

25 The Board shall hold a public hearing within thirty days of determining that it has received a
26 complete application...

- 27 ✓ *A Joint Public Hearing was held with the Town of Rockport on May 9, 2012.*

28 29 **Section 6. Preliminary Plan Determination**

30 Within thirty days from the public hearing ... the Board shall approve, approve with conditions,
31 or deny the preliminary plan application.

32 33 Discussion:

34 Mr. Sabatini noted that there is an error in the Tax Map and Lot information on the
35 Camden parcel that will be corrected on the Final Plan to read Map 229 Lot 5. The tree line is
36 also incorrectly represented, and that will be corrected as well.

37
38 The Chair noted that, per the Joint Review Agreement with Rockport, Mr. Wilson should
39 inform the Rockport Planning Board that Camden had received new information about
40 corrections of typographical errors and other changes that will be made to the Plan; the ROW
41 information had been conveyed by letter to both Boards, and did not need to be discussed. Mr.
42 Sabatini informed the Chair that the Rockport Board had been provided with the same
43 information on corrections to the Plan at their Preliminary Plan Review following the Joint
44 Public Hearing on May 9; they approved the Preliminary Plan unanimously. The Chair, using
45 his Executive Authority, determined that the Camden Board did not need to notify the Rockport
46 Board of the new information; they would take the word of the Applicant that Rockport had
47 already received the same information.

1 Mr. Lindsley will be sitting as a voting member during the review of the Application.

2
3 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Ms. MacKinnon** to approve the Preliminary Plan
4 subject to the correction of the aforementioned items.

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

6
7 Ms. MacKinnon noted for the record that she had *not* been in attendance at the Site Walk,
8 but that she was very familiar with the property; nor did she attend the Public Hearing that
9 followed. Her presence at the Hearing is required in order to sit as a voting member during the
10 review, and she will abstain from voting. The above Motion was restated and a new vote taken:

11
12 **MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Sargent** to approve the Preliminary Plan subject
13 to the correction of the aforementioned items.

14 **VOTE: 4-0-1 with Ms. MacKinnon abstaining**

15
16 The Final Plan will be heard by the Board at the June 21, 2012, meeting.

17
18
19 **4. WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY: Public Hearing:**
20 **New Antennas in Existing Building**

21 Brace Management Corporation: Map 120 Lot 156: Business 1 District (B-1): 21 Elm Street

22
23 The CEO confirmed that the Public Hearing had been properly noticed and advertised.

24
25 James Hebert of Black Diamond Consultants, acting as agent for Applicant U.S. Cellular
26 Corporation (USCC), was before the Board seeking approval to install three new sets of
27 antennas (three antennas per set) on the roof of the Brace Building at 21 Elm Street, as well as a
28 10' x 20' equipment shelter inside the building on the fourth floor. The purpose of the
29 installation is to unload (relieve) traffic to the main tower which is 1 ½ miles away so calls are
30 not dropped from the system. The three sets of antennas will face NE, West and South to
31 provide broadband cellular service. There will be no waivers requested.

32
33 They believe the Ordinance requires them to submit the Application under Section 4.2:
34 Location of antennas in existing building. "Approval of the Planning Board is required for
35 location of an antenna in an existing building."

36
37 The Ordinance at 5.3 contains the submission requirements for these installations, and
38 they believe they must satisfy this Section. After speaking with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Hebert is of
39 the understanding that the district restrictions contained in Section 6.1, Site Restrictions, will
40 not apply because this is a co-location installation, which is permitted in the B-1 under 6.2.
41 They also discussed the review process and he asked the Board if they would agree that the
42 Ordinance, at 7.2 says that this Application would be reviewed only under the following parts of
43 the Ordinance: Section 6; Section 7.2, Planning Board Approval Standards; Section 8,
44 Amendment to an Approved Application; Section 9, Abandonment; and Section 13, Definitions.

1 The Applicant had submitted an advanced Draft which required some minor revisions;
2 that revised set of drawings (undated) was submitted to the Board this evening, along with
3 corrected pages 3, 4 & 5 of the Application packet.
4

5 The Chair asked Mr. Hebert to confirm that he found the authority to establish the
6 antennas at Section 6.2 – he did. Referring to that Section, Mr. Sargent questioned whether or
7 not the installation was even allowed. He noted that Section 6.1 prohibits new installations
8 except in the two Rural Districts, and 6.2 reads as follows: “2. In addition to wireless
9 telecommunications facilities in the zoning districts set forth above, a new wireless
10 telecommunications facility shall also be permitted in all other zoning districts for the Town of
11 Camden in the following circumstances: a. co-location as part of a previously approved wireless
12 telecommunications facility subject to issuance of a permit by the CEO as set forth in Section 4.1
13 above;” -- Mr. Sargent does not believe this is the case here – “ or, b. location of an antenna in an
14 existing structure, such as (for purposes of illustration) a church steeple, silo, or multi-story
15 building, with no indication or display of equipment outside that existing structure.” Mr. Hebert
16 has shown the Board plans with the antennas sitting on the roof – clearly on the outside of the
17 structure. Before the Board goes any further, Mr. Sargent wants to understand how this project
18 would be allowed in this location.
19

20 Mr. Hebert replied that he had discussed this with Mr. Wilson, and was informed that this
21 project would be considered an in-building co-location because the equipment shelter is within
22 the building. Mr. Sargent believes that the intent of the Ordinance is to hide the antennas, and
23 that is why they are not to be located on the roof. Because there is already an antenna there, Mr.
24 Wilson believes it may be allowed if there is no greater impact on the outside of the building
25 than the existing facility. Mr. Sargent noted that Section 4.1 Expansion of an existing facility
26 and co-location, says “Approval by the CEO is required for any expansion of a *previously*
27 *approved wireless telecommunications facility* that increases the height of a building or structure
28 for the facility by no more than 20 feet; accessory use for a previously approved wireless
29 telecommunications facility; or co-location of a previously approved wireless
30 telecommunications facility.” Mr. Sargent asked if what is on the roof now is a “previously
31 approved wireless telecommunications facility?” Mr. Hebert suggested that the Historic
32 Preservation folks consider this a co-location when it is located within a building.
33

34 A member of the consultant’s team noted that the antenna on the roof belongs to Mid-
35 Coast Internet, and Mr. Sargent asked if that installation had been approved. Mid-Coast had
36 come before the Board, but, relying solely on memory and without records, it was not known
37 what the purpose was of the presentation made to the Planning Board by Mid-Coast several years
38 ago. The Board discussed whether or not the Mid-Coast installation was a “telecommunications
39 facility”; the Ordinance defines “Wireless Telecommunications Facility” as: “Any structure,
40 antenna, tower, or other device which provides radio/television transmissions, commercial
41 mobile wireless services, unlicensed wireless services, cellular phone services, specialized
42 mobile radio communications (MR), common carrier wireless exchange phone services, and
43 personal communications service (PAS) or pager services.”
44

45 Some members of the Board find this definition very broad, and Mr. Wilson suggested
46 that the Mid-Coast installation could be considered a pre-existing facility if it was there before
47 the Ordinance was enacted; it would not have to be an approved facility. The Wireless

1 Telecommunications Ordinance also contains a definition for “Co-location”: “The use of a
2 wireless telecommunications facility by more than one wireless telecommunications provider.”
3 Ms. MacKinnon understands this to say that the Applicant’s installation would be permitted.
4 The Chair stated that with the growing reliance on wireless technology there is a real need for
5 more service in the area, and he would like to find an avenue to review the Application.
6 However, there are some stumbling blocks that need to be addressed. He asked Mr. Hebert what
7 he thought about being able to resolve these problems. Mr. Hebert believes one resolution is in
8 finding that this is a co-location. The Chair asked if there was a listing of approved
9 telecommunications facilities the Applicant might find to show a similar co-location situation.
10 Mr. Hebert replied that there is information on locations for existing and new installations and on
11 co-locations as well. Mr. Wilson noted that the Applicant’s Application includes the FCC
12 license numbers for near-by wireless facilities; he wonders if Mid-Coast is on that list. Mr.
13 Hebert replied that they are not, and is not sure how to find how Mid-Coast is classified.
14

15 The Ordinance also provides for expansion of an existing facility and defines expansion
16 as: “The addition of towers, increased height and/or increased foot prints of any buildings or
17 structures of the existing facility.” Both co-locations and expansions are approved by the CEO
18 without Planning Board involvement. The Site Plan Ordinance requires review under Site Plan
19 and the TelCom Ordinance if the installation raises the height of an existing installation by more
20 than 20’; Mr. Hebert said their antenna will be 10’ tall. The Chair informed Mr. Hebert that if the
21 Applicant can show that the Mid-Coast installation is an approved facility, and if he can show
22 their installation can be classified as a co-location, the CEO will be able to grant approval.
23

24 Mr. Sargent believes that it comes down to this: 1) The Board cannot approve this
25 Application; 2) If it is indeed an expansion of an existing facility or a co-location, then the CEO
26 approves it. If not, and it is classified as a new installation, the Application cannot go forward.
27 The Chair believes that if the existing facility was permitted as some kind of a communications
28 facility, and that approval pre-dated the Ordinance, this would still be a CEO issue. The Board
29 agreed to defer consideration of the Application so the Applicant can explore whether or not
30 there is an FCC license for the existing facility, and go from there.
31

32 Richard Hood, project manager for US Cellular for the State of Maine came forward to
33 speak. He noted that there are several antennas in the immediate area already: several on top of
34 the Brace Building and some, including the Town’s emergency communications tower, are on
35 top of the Opera House. He was concerned about deferring the application because they are
36 coming into a very busy construction season. The Chair replied that it may be that this will
37 result in a more efficient approval process, and Mr. Hood replied that they originally believed
38 this would be a simple CEO approval like what has been discussed this evening. Mr. Wilson
39 replied that had been his first reaction, but on reading the Ordinance more closely, he wondered
40 if this would be considered a new installation and under the purview of the Planning Board
41 instead. The Chair agreed that it was a close call, and that Mr. Wilson was right in bringing the
42 issue before the Board.
43

44 Mr. Sargent asked if there would be an outside generator in case of power outages. The
45 Applicant replied they would not. The service cells, which this site will serve, do have
46 generators, and will take over when there are outages. The batteries now have much greater
47 capacity and can go longer without being recharged. Mr. Wilson noted the plans do show that

1 there will be an option to add wiring to provide for hooking up a generator outside the building,
2 and Mr. Hood agreed that could be possible if there is an extended outage.
3
4

5 **5. DISCUSSION:**
6

7 1. Minor Field Adjustments:
8

9 There were none. The CEO informed the Board that Mountain Arrow Subdivision is finally
10 in full compliance; there are no more outstanding issues.
11

12 2. Future agenda items:
13

14 June 7, 2012: There is nothing pending for review at this meeting. That date is not good for
15 some members, so they will meet on the 14th instead.
16

17 June 14, 2012: The Board will hold a Worksession (with Pizza) on the Comprehensive Plan:
18 The Board need to come up with a proposal for procedures and recruiting public members to
19 work on the various chapters, as well as starting on the Chapter summaries that will be
20 published in the paper to aid in recruiting.
21

22 3. Other:
23

24 1. The CEO informed the Board that Camden had been accepted into the Maine Downtown
25 Center program; the formal “installation” is in Farmington on the next day (May 18).
26

27 2. The Non-Conforming Use Proposal:
28

29 Mr. Wilson had sent a new draft proposal to Board members for their review, and
30 he asked the Board if they wanted to send a copy to members of the ZBA for their
31 comments since they would be involved in the review process. Once those comments are
32 received, and the Board has a chance to review them, any revisions can be sent to
33 interested members of the public and Public Hearings can be scheduled.
34

35 Ms. MacKinnon liked the concept that perhaps some Applications would go to the
36 ZBA, but others not – it would seem to level the playing field and allow expansions
37 within some of the business districts to go forward more quickly. Mr. MacLean wants to
38 be involved in discussions because he believes the discussions will benefit with the
39 inclusion of an opponent. He still remains concerned about allowing these expansions,
40 but because people in 1992 may have had a different vision for these districts, he is open
41 to being convinced that this is now what the people who live in the various districts that
42 would be impacted want to see happen. He wants as much input as possible, and
43 although it is tempting to be sympathetic to these businesses, the Town needs to look
44 down the road to a generation to see what we want to achieve. Mr. Sargent argues that
45 there has to be a place for the basic services that a town needs, and that is important to
46 keep in mind. He wants to hold a Public Informational Meeting soon so they can have
47 some idea of how people will react. Mr. Lindsley cautioned the Board to be wary of

1 people's reactions; it will be very important how this is presented so people don't get the
2 wrong idea and get nervous without understanding the concept fully.

3
4 The Board will discuss the draft – and any ZBA comments – on June 21 if there is
5 time after other business.

6
7 There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 6:30 pm.

8
9 Respectfully submitted,

10
11
12 Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary