

CAMDEN PLANNING BOARD
Partial Minutes of Meeting
June 1, 2011

PRESENT: Chair Chris MacLean; Members Richard Householder, and Lowrie Sargent; Alternate Members Sid Lindsley and Nancy McConnel; CEO Steve Wilson and Select Board Liaison Deb Dodge

ABSENT: Members Jan MacKinnon and Kerry Sabanty

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm

1. PUBLIC COMMENT on NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Leonard Lookner: Asked the Board if they had been approached by Anne Marie Ahearn regarding an amendment to the Rural District; they had not. The CEO confirmed he had been contacted once by Ms. Ahearn but had not heard back from her. Mr. Lookner asked that he be notified if any request does come forward because he is an abutter to the property that may be involved regarding a request for a new permitted use.

Dorie Klein: Friends of Ragged Mountain came with an update regarding Wind Ordinances: Rockport: At their June 14th Town Meeting Rockport will consider Article V to amend their Wind Ordinance by renaming it Industrial Wind Ordinance, but leaving in place the standards for small wind generators and applying the standards to all turbines: the maximum height allowed will be 100'; there will be just one turbine permitted per lot; and the power generated is restricted to use on the subject property only.

Hope: In advance of creating a Wind Ordinance, and in response to learning that several Hatchet Mountain landowners have been contacted regarding leasing their land to wind developers, Hope is considering a 180-day moratorium on wind turbine development at its June 14th Town Meeting.

The Legislature: There were 17 separate "wind bills" before the Legislature this session. One of them, the one to promote wind development within State Parks, was sent out of Committee with a unanimous "Ought Not to Pass" recommendation. Others were packaged as one bill, L.D. 1466, which will be considered next session (2012).

2. MINUTES:

May 18, 2011:

Page 1: Line: 32: "...meant that she ~~could be~~ was especially helpful."

MOTION by Mr. MacLean seconded by Mr. Householder to approve the Minutes of May 18, 2011 as amended.

VOTE: 5-0-0

**3. SUBDIVISION: Minor Subdivision and Site Plan: Pre-Application Meeting
Riverside Subdivision: Map 113: Lot 84-1: River Business District (B-R):
Mount Battie Street**

The Applicants (Paul Cartwright, Mark Durbin and Jeff Wolovitz) were represented by their agent, Tom Fowler, P.E., Landmark Corporation. They are before the Board seeking approval

for a two-building, seven-unit condominium project on five acres with frontage on Mt. Battie Street that is partially in the Shoreland District along the Megunticook River; the Applicants have a Purchase and Sales Agreement for the property (Attachment 2 dated May 6, 2011).

The lot has 467' of frontage on Mt. Battie Street and 492' of river frontage. Abutters are the residents of the affordable housing development on Madison Way and two former MBNA buildings, and the Camden Interfaith Food Pantry, both off Mt. Battie Street. The proposal is for two buildings: The first at 3600 SF will set back 75' from Mt. Battie Street, and the ground level of this building, which has the same elevation as Mt. Battie Street, is proposed for commercial use per the requirements of the street levels of buildings within this District; the remainder of the building will house three residential units. The second building at 2880 SF, is proposed for three residential units and will be sited 250' upslope from, and 10' higher in elevation than, Mt. Battie Street; the Applicants will argue that this 250' distance combined with the 10' height over Mt. Battie Street level exempts them from the B-R requirement for commercial space at street level.

Siting the Project:

In looking at the best location for this project on this site the Applicants eliminated the low land along the river which is in the flood plain because of the building engineering requirements this location would impose, and because there were other more suitable sites. The remainder of the lot has four fresh water wetlands which were delineated by Mr. Stratton of Augusta. The rest of the lot is partially wooded and partially open field; they chose the corner of the lot up against the woods and want to place the buildings in the field and use the area as common open space. To access this site from Mt. Battie Street a short stretch of the drive will impact one of the wetlands.

Benefits of this site include the fact that there are public utilities (sewer, water and aerial utilities) at the street at the proposed entrance to the subdivision, so there will be little impact bringing them to the site.

The Applicants asked for clarification of three issues and are requesting two waivers:

Requests for Clarification:

1. They understand this will be a Minor Subdivision and that it is allowed in this District: it is not in the RU1, the RU2, or the Coastal District where Minor Subdivisions are not allowed; it has less than 15 units – the maximum for a Minor Subdivision; and it will be served by public utilities – a requirement of Minor Subdivisions.
2. Is Commercial space required in both buildings because they are in the B-R District? The Ordinance states that there will be no residential use on a floor at street level, but the Ordinance the Applicants read shows the definition of Street Level to say that this commercial requirement applies only when that floor is 8' or less above the grade of the street; that is not the case in the second building here where the difference in elevation is more than 10'.

The development is intended to be a Co-housing project where residents live and work on the property as much as possible. The Applicants prefer *not* to have commercial space in both buildings; having to provide two complete floors of non-residential space will stretch the budget.

3. How will the flow of review of this project work? They read the Ordinance as saying that Site Plan Review is required when over 1000SF of new non-residential space is created or when

a multi-family unit of over 1000 SF is built; their project meets this requirement on both fronts. If Site Plan Review is required, will there be a separate or a concurrent review?

Requests for Waivers:

1. They are requesting a waiver of the Subdivision Submission Requirement for a Traffic Impact Study.
2. They are requesting a waiver of the Subdivision Submission Requirement for an Additional Lane Requirement Study.

Permits:

Regarding the requirement to submit all permit approvals: they will need a NRPA (Natural Resources Protection Act) Permits from the DEP and a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers approving the impact to the wetlands; they anticipate no other permits being required. Both agencies move slowly in their permitting process: will the Applicants have to submit approved permits prior to approval? The Board responded that they usually condition their approval of an application on the approval of these kinds of permits.

Questions from the Board:

Mr. Householder:

He asked for confirmation that a small portion of the parking lot will impact a wetland and is the commercial space on large space or multiple uses. Mr. Fowler confirmed that the parking lot in front of the lower building will impact the same wetland that the driveway will cross.

Issue #1: Minor Subdivision:

Mr. MacLean asked Mr. Wilson if he had reviewed the Application, and did he find that this is a Minor Subdivision? Mr. Wilson replied that he had reviewed the packet many times and agreed with the Applicants that this is a Minor Subdivision.

Issue #3: Flow of Review:

Mr. Wilson noted that the Subdivision Approval Criteria include the requirement that the proposal meets all other Town ordinances. When the Board reaches review of that Criterion, they will have to ensure that the Application satisfies the Site Plan Ordinance, and that is the point at which that review will be conducted.

Issue #2: Street Level:

Mr. Sargent asked Mr. Fowler to go through the steps the Applicants took in making their determination that the commercial at street level requirement did not apply to the second, back building.

Mr. Fowler explained:

1. First he reviewed the requirements of the District: Article VIII: Section 13. River Business District B. Permitted Uses: The following residential uses: (3) Multi-family dwellings, except that no residential use shall occur on a floor at street level.
2. Then he looked at Article III for the definition of STREET LEVEL: The floor of a building that opens to a pedestrian or vehicular way. When a floor is not at the level of the pedestrian or

vehicular way, then the floor is at street level when it is less than 8 vertical feet above or below the level of the pedestrian or vehicular way.”

It was obvious that the first floor of the first building had to comply with this requirement: the elevation of this building as it faces the street will be 114' - 115'; the elevation of Mt. Battie Street at the entrance to the property is 114'. The commercial space is required by the District and the Applicants want it there.

From the street face of this first building, the lot starts to rise and the first floor of the second building is proposed to be at the same grade as the second floor of the first building -- about 10' - 11' higher in elevation than the ground floor of the first building and Mt. Battie Street: the Definition of Street Levels says this prohibition against residential use doesn't apply if the first floor is more than 8' above street level.

Further, they believe that the intent of the Ordinance is to require commercial space in any development within this District and they agree with that intent. They designed the first building to be close to the street with parking for the commercial and residential uses, and entrances and traffic flow designed for deliveries and customer traffic. There are two commercial uses proposed for now, a Tradesman Shop and a Food Production Facility - both are permitted in this District. They feel the commercial space in the first building satisfies the street level requirement for the entire project.

Mr. Sargent is not sure the Applicant's argument is persuasive and thinks that the fact that there are driveways and parking areas adjacent to the second building means this provision may apply to the second building as well. Mr. Fowler replied that he had looked for a definition of "pedestrian way", the term in the Definition that would cause this requirement to apply, and could not find one: members agreed there is no such definition; when he could find no definition he assumed that the term "way" implied a public street or public pedestrian way.

Mr. Wilson added that in looking at the Definition of Street Level, you have to look at all four descriptions, and #4 applies here: "When a building is not located in a floodplain, or does not open to a pedestrian or vehicular way, then street level is the lowest floor, excluding the basement, that opens directly to the existing or finished grade."

Mr. Sargent noted that he believes that the intent of this provision of the Ordinance is that land intended for business – land in Business Districts – should not be lost to residential use. He doesn't buy the argument that just one commercial space in the project answers the requirement and will need to be convinced that this is the case.

Other Questions:

Mr. Householder: Asked about the 15' - 20' rise in elevation over the parcel and the existence in the Deeds of several drainage easements: how are they planning on controlling the stormwater and those easements that allow stormwater to run over the property? Mr. Fowler explained that there will be a Stormwater Management Plan required of the DEP that must be approved as part of the NRPA permit. They must present a plan to ensure the safe conveyance of stormwater through the development to the river: this will include erosion control devices and appropriately-sized culverts and drains, etc. Currently the only catch basins in the area are on the former MBNA property.

Ms. McConnel asked why they found it necessary to impact the wetland with a parking lot: surely there was somewhere else it could be located where there would be no impact; and isn't it fairly large?

Mr. Fowler replied that it made sense to keep the building with commercial space as close to Mt. Battie Street as possible and this corner nearest the access from the street made the most sense. They relied on the general rule of two parking spaces per dwelling unit even though the concept of this project would be to limit the need for cars; then they had to provide parking for the commercial space as well. They didn't want to put the parking up the hill, away from the commercial entrances, because they wanted to keep that open space undeveloped since it would be at the same grade as the second floor residential units.

The impact to the wetlands will be fairly small – about 3000SF. DEP usually exempts wetland impact under 4300 SF from permitting, but because this wetland is in the Shoreland Zone, they will have to have a permit. There are also some trees at the edge of the wooded area that will have to be cleared.

The Issues:

1. The Board agreed with the Applicants and the CEO that this is a Minor Subdivision.
2. The Board has not made a decision on the street level/commercial space requirement for the second building.
3. Site Plan Review will be required as a side review when Item 20 of the Subdivision Approval Criteria is considered.

The Waivers:

Traffic Impact Study:

The question of whether or not a Traffic Impact Study is required rests on the anticipated number of vehicle trips per day, and Mr. Fowler is using the figure of 80 trips per day. He reached this number by using the accepted average per dwelling unit of ten – that is 60 trips per day for the condos. The businesses will have a very low traffic use: the food production unit will be a wholesale distributor with a truck in and out occasionally; and the tradesman's shop where models of prototypes are built, will have very few visitors. Mr. Fowler stated that trip numbers for businesses are widely variable and twenty trips per day for these two businesses is probably far in excess of what will actually take place. In any case, the threshold for requiring a Traffic Impact Study is 140 trips/day or more than 28 parking spaces: and that is nearly double his estimate for either. Before the Preliminary Plan stage of review Mr. Fowler will obtain actual trips/day for the businesses proposed.

Ms. McConnel asked if there was any chance that the Food Production business could morph into a restaurant. Mr. Fowler stated that this is not something that is planned, this will be a tofu production plant, but in any case he believes that would be a Change of Use that would require review.

The Chair is satisfied with granting this waiver based on what they have heard today.

Left Lane Study:

Mr. Fowler explained that these studies are reserved for very large developments like the new Wal-Mart in Thomaston, for example, when there would be such a dramatic increase that

traffic will come to a stop; the developer would be required to install a left turn lane to resolve the problem. That is not going to happen with this development.

The Chair did not want to move forward with voting on the waivers if it could not be shown for certain that notices of this meeting had gone to abutters. Mr. Wilson could not locate the return receipts for the mailings, and neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Fowler had seen the notice in the newspaper. The Chair asked if anyone in the audience was there because they had received notice of this proposed development; no one responded. It was also not clear that the Applicant was even required to submit these two studies for a Minor Subdivision.

The Board deferred voting on the waivers until they can be assured that notice was sent to abutters, and won't do so until they are certain the submission is required and that granting a waiver is even necessary.

Pre-Application Review:

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.

Nine copies of the application had been submitted on May 10, 2011 and the fees had been paid.

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

The Application Packet included:

- Cover letter/Narrative dated May 10, 2011 signed by Thomas A. Flower, P.E., Landmark Corporation
- Application for Minor Subdivision Review dated May 10, 2011 (Attachment 1)
- A Site Inventory Map and Conceptual Sketch Plan prepared by Landmark Corporation dated May 10, 2011

→ The CEO will supply a copy of the Tax Map indicating the location of the parcel to serve as the Location Map.

Preapplication Plan Submission Requirements

1) Application

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

Submitted (see above)

b) Evidence of right, title or interest in the property.

Purchase and Sales Agreement dated May 6, 2011 (Attachment 2)

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

Warranty Deed was submitted (Attachment 3). Mr. Fowler stated that there are no deed restrictions or easements that are known that are not shown on the Plan.

2) Site Inventory Map

- Site Inventory Map and Conceptual Sketch Plan prepared by Landmark Corporation dated May 10, 2011

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

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, the submission satisfies the requirement.

- 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.
 - This is a condominium project and there will be no division of the parcel into lots
- 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.
 - Wetlands and floodplains are indicated. None of the other natural features are known to exist.
- e) Vegetative cover conditions according to general cover type.
- f) Ridgelines and watershed boundaries.
 - There are none, but the topo data shows ridges and drainage ways
- g) Geologic formations including rock outcrops, cliffs, etc., based upon published data or more detailed on-site analysis.
 - There is no ledge evident
- h) Soils as shown in the "Soil Survey of Knox and Lincoln Counties Maine.
- i) Existing buildings, structures, or other improvements on the site including streets, driveways, stonewalls, etc.
 - Proposed driveway shown. Stone walls located. There are no buildings, etc.
- j) Locations of all known historically or archaeologically significant buildings or sites within or adjacent to the subdivision.
 - There are none
- l) Location and size of existing utilities or other improvements servicing the site.
 - Location of utilities at street was provided by the utility companies
- m) Potential sources of fire protection water supply within one-half mile of the site including public water mains, existing or proposed fire ponds.

- The water main is shown and the river is available for firefighting as well. It has not yet been decided if the buildings will be sprinkled, but they probably will.

n) Septic system locations for each lot or unit, if applicable.

- This is not applicable.

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

- Cover letter/Narrative dated May 10, 2011 signed by Thomas A. Flower, P.E., Landmark Corporation

→ The Board determined that the narrative provided complies with the criteria.

4. Conceptual Sketch Plan

- Site Inventory Map and Conceptual Sketch Plan prepared by Professional Engineers and Surveyors at Landmark Corporation and dated May 10, 2011

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.

5. Waivers

a) Written requests for any waivers from Minor Subdivision or Major Subdivision submission requirements.

- See above discussions

b) Written requests for any waivers of design guidelines in Article 8, Approval Standards. None were submitted

Public Informational Meeting

The public informational meeting shall be held following the initial presentation by the developer and shall be held the same night or within 30 days, at the option of the developer.

- The Applicant requested this meeting be held this evening, but it cannot be shown that the required notice to abutters had been provided. If notice was sent but no-one came with questions or concerns, the meeting will be considered to have been held. If notice has not been sent, the meeting will be held prior to the review of the Final Plan.

Site Walk

The Board shall schedule a site walk within 14 days, to be attended by the developer and the Board.

- A Site Walk was set for Tuesday June 14, 2011 at 7:15 meeting at the proposed entrance to the site. The proposed driveway and parking areas have been flagged as have the perimeters of the proposed buildings.

Public Hearing

- The Public Hearing will be held prior to Final Plan Review on July 6, 2011

Section 7. Preapplication Determinations

→The Board determined that the Pre-Application was complete.

At the conclusion of the Preapplication Review, the Planning Board will have determined the following:

1. Contour intervals: The 5' intervals shown on the Plan are acceptable to the Board
2. Additional submissions: None are required
3. Date of the site walk: Done
4. Whether the Board wishes to hire an outside consultant: The Board determined none is required
5. Date of the public hearing: Done
6. Waivers: Decision deferred

For minor subdivisions, the Board will also have determined:

7. Any issues relating to approval criteria that should be considered in preparation of the Final Plan.

Resolution of the Street level Issue

Before they go any further in developing engineered plans for this project, the Applicants would like clarification from the Board on this issue. The Board agreed it was necessary to address this before the Final Plan is drawn up, and this requires lead time to prepare and submit the Plan on schedule. Because the Board's normal schedule of meetings would mean that the Public Hearing would not be able to be held until July 20, they moved their second June meeting up to June 8th and will resolve the street level issue at a continuation of the Pre-Application Meeting at that time.

Partial Minutes of Meeting: Part 2

4. Historic Preservation: Amend Article 13: Public Hearing

Mr. Householder, Chair of the subcommittee that prepared the proposed amendment, gave a brief over-view of the drafting process. He noted the article published in the May 25, 2011 *Herald Gazette* which the subcommittee hoped would interest the public in the proposal. The amendment would replace the current Article XIII of the Zoning Ordinance and serve to protect, preserve and enhance, to the maximum extent practical, the historic nature of those properties designated for protection by the Article. An Historic Preservation Commission, consisting of five regular and two alternate members, would be created to review specific changes proposed for the properties covered by the regulation. One of the regular members is to be an architect with experience in historic preservation issues. The Commission has the responsibility for issuing the Certificate of Appropriateness which must be in hand before the CEO can issue a building permit.

Chris Glass, a local architect who also sat on the subcommittee offered his comments on the need for this Ordinance saying that the Town has been very lucky so far because there has been a willingness to cooperate absent any legal structure that would allow the Town to intervene. He also noted that most of the buildings in question have been owned by the same local families for many years and they realize the importance of these buildings. He cited two examples involving two large chain drug stores: LaVerdieres originally erected their trade mark large colorful sign thinking the size was in compliance with the Sign Ordinance – it was not and the “redo” was done in a tasteful black with gold leaf lettering which was a much better fit in the neighborhood; and Rite Aid, whose corporate offices first proposed constructing their traditional big boxy building, turned around and cooperated with local citizens to find a design more residential in scale and design. They both voluntarily chose to go along with citizen’s suggestions, but there is still nothing to require them to do so. This Ordinance will protect the core of the downtown business district.

In the future Camden can ask to have the Ordinance certified if they want to be able to apply for grants for work to these sites. The question before the citizens will be whether they want to take the next step in protecting these properties or if they want to continue to rely on the “kindness of strangers”.

Susan Snead: She has been affiliated with the Historic Resources Committee and thinks this is a wonderful proposal. Creating the Commission is a good step and protecting the historic character of the downtown is important because that character is a major economic asset in Town. She hopes it will encourage those interested in economic development and those interested in historic preservation to work together.

David Dickey: He is a firm believer in the “Rite Aid Theory” – leave everything as it is. He gave a personal example of work being considered for his family-owned building that would be covered by the proposal: the existing old slate roof will have to be replaced sometime in the future and he wonders how a Commission might respond to that situation. Would they require the Dickeys replace that roof with slate – a \$250,000 project – or would they approve the use of a look-alike product that is much less expensive? Could they force the family to spend that kind of money – he thinks they could under this proposal.

He is also concerned about the timeline in case of an emergency. What if the roof is damaged and repairs need to be made to protect the building – how long will that take? He also doesn't like the fact that someone will be dictating to owners of buildings what color they paint their buildings. It is the owner's right. The time frame of ninety days – or longer – holds up business owners who are paying big taxes from renting their property to pay those taxes.

The family has always taken pride in restoring or retaining their properties as historically as possible: they have taken out pre-fire pictures and remodeled with that as a guide. Some of the building facades are old yellow fire brick and he doesn't even know if they can find that brick anymore. But it is getting so the cost of keeping all the original features intact is cost prohibitive.

In addition, the proposed process of review is much too long. They own \$3 million in property in Town and they need to know that they can do work as needed without waiting for this process. This is not the time to add this economic burden to any business in Town, and he can speak for many levels of businesses from building owners, to retailers, to landlords.

Mr. Dickey asked if there was any intention to add more districts in the future. He notes all the things that aren't allowed in the historic district and wonders if in the future there will be more and more areas where these rules will apply.

There are things that need to be taken out of the proposal: if he wants to put a satellite dish on the roof does he have to do a survey of the whole town to see if anyone can see that dish? They do a good job taking care of their buildings and none of them want to have to solicit someone else's opinion on decisions involving expenses especially when it takes time they don't have. They pay a huge amount of taxes – a huge amount. This ordinance is coming from a place of passion and is not based on economics. Times are bad and this is not when you throw restrictions at people. Let the economy settle out before you burden businesses. He sees no economic benefit to this control.

His last concern has to do with the process of developing this ordinance – he thinks that the proposal is a done deal and he will wait until the Selectmen have their meeting and make his presentation there and bring representation. The Chair responded that nothing is a done deal at this point they are going through the amendment process as required legally. There will be more than one public hearing and lots of opportunities for the Board to hear concerns.

Mr. Sargent stated that the Board responded to concerns that they were moving too quickly – pushing things through. The Planning Board now holds two Public Hearings instead of just one; they take lots of time in the drafting process and invite people who would be affected to come speak. But the problem is – just like tonight: the owners of all the impacted properties were invited by mail; CEDAC was invited; and all the members of the Downtown Business Group. No one comes until the very end at the Selectmen's meeting and then they voice concerns the Board never heard – concerns that could have been dealt with. But just like tonight only a few people come. He would like to hold another meeting next month.

Mr. MacLean added that the last thing the Board wants to do is to create an economic hardship. Board has made a conscious effort over the past five years to streamline the ordinances and to show their support of economic development in Town. They are trying to make it better for business owners to do business in Town.

Mr. Householder agreed that it is not the intent of the Committee to create a burden on businesses: but the buildings are a part of the character of the Town and they do want to preserve that. He is sure that if there is an alternative material that still preserves the character and the look of a building the Commission would, he hopes, would approve the use of that material, but they will want to preserve how the building looks. A yellow metal roof, however, may not pass. Mr. Dickey said that the buildings were theirs and it would be their decision. Mr. Householder replied that the buildings were part of the Town. The Chair said that this is a policy question: all Zoning Ordinances and all restrictions are a policy balance between the property ownership and the interests of the community; that is the struggle.

Mr. Dickey believes that making the Commission an advisory board is OK, but the Town wants to take control of these buildings away from the owners and that is not right – they own those buildings, not the Town. He thinks they need to get the word out.

Kit Parker: She was a member of the subcommittee and thinks that maintaining the historic character, and the village character, will help attract visitors and new businesses and residents. It is a draw and Camden needs a draw; this proposal will not hurt economic development, it will help.

Susan Morrison: She owns an historic building and commends the Board for drafting a good ordinance. She has served on a Historic Commission and believes that future generations will benefit from the experience of this review. There are many concerns expressed whenever these kinds of ordinances are proposed, but she thinks that information and education can address those concerns. Good property owners don't have problems with these kinds of ordinances, and in fact, there are benefits that go along with them: tax credits and grants are available – it opens doors that weren't there before especially when a property is on the National Historic Register. These funds are not dependant on a Historic Ordinance being in place, and funds are mostly available to those owning income-producing properties like the ones downtown.

Mr. Glass noted that there are some monies available as CLG grants that are funded by a percentage of the Maine State Historic Preservation Commission's budget to use for planning and emergencies, but obtaining those grants requires the ordinance be certified as a Certified Local Government Ordinance. This certification requires the establishment of a Commission and an ordinance with "teeth" – advisory Boards don't qualify. These funds are 10% of the State's share of federal funding dedicated to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission's efforts (60% of the Commission's funds are federal dollars). He informed the Board of a conference being held this week on the economics of Historic Preservation. Towns like Belfast and Rockland have obtained grants and moved forward with revitalizing their downtowns: they took advantage of the programs when times were slow and are not moving forward.

Beedy Parker: She likes the proposal because it requires notification of demolition. However, she has been trying to get this kind of notice to apply to other historic buildings as well, and that still hasn't happened.

The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Householder asked that a second public hearing be scheduled with the assurance that more members of the Town's business community as well as CEDAC be invited. Mr. Wilson said he would re-invite them, but Mr. Sargent noted that Mr. Dickey had said that he

hadn't received an invitation. Mr. MacLean clarified that Mr. Wilson had said that he was not sure that his secretary had sent out the subdivision notices – perhaps those letters did not go out either. The Chair stated that we need to do a better job assuring that the proper notices are sent out and informed the CEO that Board needs to be able to confirm that notices were sent during a Public Hearing; it should be part of the record that due process was followed.

Mr. Householder asked when the next Public Hearing should be held. He is concerned that it is a long time until November, and the Board should not be silent on the subject for a period of time or people will forget what they heard. The Chair noted that the hearings need to be held within July or by the first August meeting at the latest to meet the timeframe to November. Mr. Lindsley asked that a time-line for the review process, using an actual example, be prepared so all the concerns about the amount of time a review could take can be addressed. In reading the proposal he is not sure what will happen.

Mr. Glass noted that there will be a burden on the Applicant to prepare the presentation before the process can even begin: replacing shingles for example, an applicant would have to get the shingle and prepare his presentation to the Commission - the timeframe doesn't even start until that has happened.

The Public Hearing will be scheduled for July 6th. Notices will be sent to property owners, but not to abutters, for the hearing.

DISCUSSION:

1. There were no Minor Field Adjustments

2. *Signage in the Downtown Districts:*

Mr. Lindsley noted that the directional signs blend into the buildings and can't be seen. Mr. Householder reminded him that the Select Board nixed the original color scheme that had a white background and wanted the signs to blend in. Mr. Lindsley noted that none of those Board members has a business downtown – the signs aren't doing businesses any good. The signs were also to be much larger and that size was also an issue with the Select Board. Mr. Wilson suggested that if there are enough businessmen present, and if there is time, perhaps the group could discuss this issue with the Board.

3. *Sign on French & Brawn*

This issue is not ready for discussion.

4. Planning Board Committee Interest Form and Attendance Policy

The Board will be provided with the drafts prepared by the Recording Secretary for discussion at their next meeting.

5. *Request for a Site Plan Pre-application Discussion:*

Will Gartley has requested a pre-application discussion about proposed work at the Snow Bowl. The matter has briefly been presented to the Board previously, but now they are trying to prepare an actual submission and Mr. Gartley would like to know exactly what the Board will want to see with regard to this mountain bike trail project. Mr. Householder understood that a lot of the trail work would be in areas that would be impacted by the redevelopment work. Mr. Wilson believes that they are concentrating on a different area where reconstruction won't be

necessary. He also believes there is funding for this portion of the project. The Chair suggested that Mr. Wilson tell him that he will be third after two long agenda items. Mr. Householder requested that the Public Hearing be held first, but the Chair thought that Landmark and the subdivision should come first because the Applicants are paying good money for the representation; plus they were the first request. The Chair also suggested they review their policy for meeting times and how late they start a new agenda item.

6. Meeting night change

The Chair has a commitment on Wednesday evenings starting with the new school year this fall. His appointment to the Board is up at the end of June and he will not re-up unless another time for meetings that suits all the other members of the Board can be found. After some discussion members agreed that beginning with the first meeting in September they will meet on Thursday evenings if the two absent members have no conflicts.

There being no further business before the Board they adjourned at 8:30

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Hollingsworth, Recording Secretary