

St George Planning Board

November 14, 2017

Public Hearing – Shawn Beckett – 40' x 40' addition to garage

The hearing was called to order at 6:45pm with Planning Board members Anne Cox (Chair), Jane Brown, Michael Jordan, Raymond Emerson Kate Hewlett and Paul Gill present. Also present were Town Manager Tim Polky, Chuck Campbell, Randy Cushman and Select Board representative Richard Bates.

The Chair asked for public comments, but did not receive any from those present. There were two letters received – both anonymous authors – that addressed concerns that included noise, lighting and screening. The Chair read both letters into the record.

No further comments were made and the hearing closed at 6:59pm.

Regular Planning Board Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm with Planning Board members Anne Cox (Chair), Jane Brown, Michael Jordan, Raymond Emerson Kate Hewlett and Paul Gill present. Also present were Town Manager Tim Polky, Chuck Campbell, Randy Cushman, Select Board representative Richard Bates, Anita Seigenthaler, Scott Sullivan, Will Gartley and Evy Blum.

A quorum was established. Alternate member Paul Gill was elevated to voting status. Jane Brown noted that she did work for Jim Knowles, but would not be involved with the work described in the permit application. Board members felt that no conflict of interest existed. There were no adjustments to the agenda.

Review Minutes – The draft minutes of October 24, 2017 were reviewed. Cox suggested that a clarification was needed about the garage on page 9 with the additional words “that does not include attaching the house to the garage or refurbishing it at all”. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 to accept the minutes of October 24th with the changes mentioned.

Public Comment – Scott Sullivan of PORT addressed the Board, thanking them for their work and expressed appreciation for their review of the ordinance regarding cable landings. He then presented a document that contained a proposed amendment to the ordinance.

Building Permits

- A. James Knowles – Shoreland Stabilization / 4 Angiers Lane / Map 206, Lot 010
Will Gartley from Gartley & Dorsky was present as agent for the applicant, and gave a brief review of the project. There was discussion about adding further information to the project description – noting that there was 527' +/- of frontage and that there would be replanting with native plants. This additional information was approved by Gartley. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to accept the application as complete with the changes noted in the project description. On a motion by Gill, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to approve the application as it is working to control erosion within the 75' setback and that stabilizing revegetation is planned, contingent upon DEP approval.
- B. Thomas & Nancy Grogan – Shoreland Stabilization / 52 Drift Inn Road / Map 205, Lot 083
Will Gartley was present as agent for the applicant and gave a brief summary of the project. There was discussion about adding further information to the project description – noting that there was 80' +/- of a crumbling concrete block wall to be replaced, 43' long riprap on the west and 25' long riprap on east side, and that the area would be revegetated. It was also noted that the applicant had DEP approval. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 to accept

the application as complete with the changes noted in the project description. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 to approve the application for the replacement of the retaining wall which is allowed per our Shoreland Zoning Ordinance – Section 15(B)(5).

- C. Rob Hamilton – Shoreland Stabilization / 90 Shumaker Lane / Map 206, Lot 040
Will Gartley was present as agent for the applicant and gave a brief summary of the project. There was discussion about adding further information to the project description – noting 157' +/- for riprap and replacing existing stone steps with solid stone steps. It was noted that the Permit by Rule had been received. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the application is complete with the changes noted. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 to approve the application for the riprap/stone steps.

Site Plan Review

- A. Shawn Beckett – 40'x40' addition to existing 40' x 50' garage / 1181 River Road / M238 – Lot 013
Chuck Campbell was present as agent for the applicant. Cox provided current pictures of the site and noted that the gravel lot goes up to the property line and that the trees were on the other side of the fence. She also noted that vehicles are parked right up to the road. Campbell stated that there were no other changes to what has already been submitted and that the applicant was not interested in placing vegetation along Route 131. It was requested that the plan note that the existing tree/bush line is on other side of property line to the north and that the elevation be noted. Campbell said that the building will be located on an existing gravel pad. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to accept the application as complete. The Board then moved on to the Performance Standards:
- 1) Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – Cox read the standard. It was noted that nothing was screening the parking area, and that headlights were not being screened. It was requested that screening be placed from the paved entrance northerly to the existing fence on the applicant's property – not within the road right-of-way. Concern was expressed that the screening not block site lines when exiting the property. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 that it be a condition that either a fence or evergreen planting at a height similar to the fence so as not to obstruct site lines be placed along Route 131 from the entrance northerly to the property line.
 - 2) Relationship of the Proposed Buildings to the Environment – Cox read the standard. There was discussion about the building height, etc. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because the addition would be similar to the existing structure.
 - 3) Vehicular Access – Cox read the standard. There was discussion about complaints regarding squealing of tires. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because there were no changes.
 - 4) Parking and Pedestrian Circulation – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because of the existing condition.
 - 5) Surface Water Drainage – Cox read the standard. It was noted that there was no change in how surface water currently drains. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because there was no change.

- 6) Existing Utilities – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, that the standard had been met because there was no change.
- 7) Advertising Features – Cox read the standard. Campbell said that there were no proposed changes. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because there was no change.
- 8) Special Features and Operations of the Development – Cox read the standard. It was noted that there were no special features proposed and that the hours of operation were from 8am to 5pm Monday through Saturday. There was discussion about sound/noise and it was felt that was addressed by screening and hours of operation. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that no special features are proposed and that the hours of operation for this facility we believe are 8am to 5pm Monday through Saturday, therefore the standard had been met.
- 9) Exterior Lighting – Cox read the standard. It was noted that not all existing lighting is down shielded, and that there is a down shielded light on the utility pole. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that all exterior lighting, existing and proposed, will be down shielded.
- 10) Emergency Vehicle Access – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that access continues to be sufficient.
- 11) Municipal Services – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, that the standard was met because there is no change.
- 12) Water / Air Protection – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 that the standard was met because there was no change.
- 13) Water Supply – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that the standard was not applicable because the site has its own well.
- 14) Soil Erosion – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that soil erosion will be taken care of because Best Management Practices and silt fences will be used during construction.
- 15) Sewage Waste Disposal – Cox read the standard. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because the existing waste disposal system is adequate.
- 16) Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Waste – Cox read the standard. Campbell said that the volume may increase, but any hazardous material will continue to be handled in the same manner. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that there was no change.
- 17) Financial/ Technical Capacity – Cox read the standard. The agent said that Beckett has the capacity to do this project. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met based upon the agent's statement.

- 18) Shoreland Zone –Cox stated that the project is not in the shoreland zone. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that this standard was not applicable because the project is not in the shoreland zone.
- 19) Flood Plain – Cox stated that the project is not in the flood plain. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that this standard was not applicable because the project is not in the flood plain.
- 20) Lot Standards – Lot coverage, building height and setbacks were reviewed. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard was met.

It was noted that performance guarantees were not applicable to this project. Concerns addressed in the letters read at the public hearing were reviewed. A copy of each letter was provided to the applicant's agent. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to approve the application with the contingencies noted in the review process. It was noted that the Findings of Fact would be reviewed at the next meeting in two weeks. It was stated that it would be good to have someone present at that meeting in case there are any questions.

B. ReVision Energy – Install Roof Mounted Solar Panels at Transfer Station / 176 Wallston Road / Map 218, Lot 002

Tim Polky came forward to represent the applicant. It was added to the project description that the panels are going on the existing transfer station recycling building roof. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to accept the application as complete with the changes noted. The Board then proceeded to the Performance Standards:

- 1) Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met.
- 2) Relationship of the Proposed Buildings to the Environment – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the building was still harmonious to the environment.
- 3) Vehicular Access – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that it was not applicable because there were no changes.
- 4) Parking and Pedestrian Circulation – On a motion by Gill, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that there were no changes.
- 5) Surface Water Drainage –On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that there were no changes and that the drainage was not affected.
- 6) Existing Utilities –On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that there were no existing utilities being proposed.
- 7) Advertising Features – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that it is not applicable as there are no advertising features proposed.
- 8) Special Features and Operations of the Development – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 that there were no changes.

- 9) Exterior Lighting – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that there was no new lighting proposed.
- 10) Emergency Vehicle Access – On a motion by Gill, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that the project would not affect emergency vehicle access in any way.
- 11) Municipal Services – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met.
- 12) Water / Air Protection – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that there is no change.
- 13) Water Supply – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that the standard had been met because there were none proposed.
- 14) Soil Erosion – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that there would be no effect on the soil.
- 15) Sewage Waste Disposal – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that there was going to be no change in waste disposal.
- 16) Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Waste – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 that there were none proposed.
- 17) Financial/ Technical Capacity – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that the representative stated that there is financial and technical capacity to do the project.
- 18) Shoreland Zone – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that it was not applicable because the project was not in the shoreland zone.
- 19) Flood Plain – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Gill, it was voted 5-0 that it was not applicable because the project is not in a flood plain designated area.
- 20) Lot Standards – It was noted that the project does not change the lot coverage, and that the panels do not extend above the height of the roof. On a motion by Gill, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 that there were no changes to the lot standards.

On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to approve the application.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,

John M Falla
Recording Secretary