

St. George Planning Board
April 25, 2017 – 7:00 p.m.

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present were: Anne Cox, Chair; Noah Bly, Jane Brown, Ray Emerson, Paul Gill, and Mary K. Hewlett. Also present: Terry Brackett, CEO; Richard Bates, Brandon Chase, Nat Lyon, Diana Bolton, Molly Gill and Gary Minery (arrived at 7:06).

Quorum: Paul Gill was elevated to voting status. A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: Paul Gill feels he has a conflict of interest in the Marshall Point Lighthouse application as he has been somewhat involved in the planning of this project.

Adjustments to the Agenda: There were none.

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting - April 11, 2017 - On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gill, the minutes of April 11, 2017 were approved as written. The vote was 4-0-1 (Hewlett abstained).

Onsite Public Hearing – April 24, 2017

- Craig Rackliff, 71 Seal Harbor Road – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the minutes of the onsite public hearing for Craig Rackliff were approved as written. The vote was 5-0.

Public Comments: There were none.

Change in Voting Status: Gary Minery was elevated to voting status. Paul Gill was removed from voting status.

Site Plan Review:

- a. **Craig Rackliff** – Craig Rackliff was present. The application is to construct a 44' x 80' storage building on 71 Seal Harbor Road. The building will be located behind the existing rope factory building. It will store machinery equipment for his business. Rackliff said the building will be put on a frost wall and the septic system may need to be moved. There was an onsite public hearing on April 24.
 - The application was amended to include a 30' extension of the asphalt driveway on the site plan.
 - The project description was amended to include a 14' wide breezeway and one outside light which will be down shielded.
 - Property Information changes: zero (0) proposed bathrooms, total present one (1).

The Planning Board began Site Plan Review.

Performance Standards:

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Emerson, standard has been met 5-0. There will be no change in the landscape. The structure will be located behind the existing building.
2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, standard has been met 5-0. The proposed structure will blend in harmoniously and will have a visual relationship with the existing building.
3. Vehicular Access – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Minery, standard has been met 5-0. The vehicular access is not changing; the black top (driveway/parking area) is going to be increased because of the new structure having a loading dock.
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. The proposed addition of a 30' asphalt driveway extension shall provide for safe and general interior circulation for loading areas and use of parking areas.
5. Surface Water Drainage – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. Applicant has a plan in place to divert surface drainage and it will not adversely affect neighboring properties.
6. Existing Utilities – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Minery, standard is not applicable 5-0. There is an existing well on the property.
7. Advertising Features – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, standard is not applicable 5-0. None proposed.
8. Special Features – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, standard is not applicable 5-0. None proposed.
9. Exterior Lighting – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, standard has been met 5-0. There will be one exterior light installed on the proposed building which will be downshielded.
10. Emergency Vehicle Access – On a motion by Bly, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. There is safe access for emergency vehicles to all the buildings.
11. Municipal Services – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Minery, standard is not applicable 5-0. There is no change.
12. Water/Air Protection – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the standard has been met, 5-0. There will be no impact on water or air pollution due to this project.
13. Water Supply – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the standard has been met 5-0. There is sufficient water available.
14. Soil Erosion – On a motion by Bly, seconded by Brown, the standard has been met 5-0. Best Management Practices will be followed to minimize soil erosion. Stone will be placed around the perimeter of the structure to divert water drainage and to reduce soil erosion of the property.
15. Sewage Waste Disposal – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, the standard has been met 5-0. The sewage waste disposal is adequate.
16. Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – On a motion by Bly, seconded by Hewlett, standard is not applicable 5-0. No hazardous or radioactive materials will be stored in the building.
17. Financial/Technical Capacity – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the standard has been 5-0. The applicant has the financial and technical capacity to complete the project.
18. Shoreland Zone – On a motion by Brown, seconded by Minery, the standard is not applicable 5-0. The project is not in the shoreland zone.

19. Flood Plain – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Minery, the standard is not applicable 5-0. The project is not in the flood plain.
20. Lot Standards – On a motion by Bly, seconded by Brown, the standard has been met 5-0. The proposed project complies with the parking and setback standards.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Minery, it was voted to waive the Performance Guarantee 5-0. The Board has reviewed the 20 Performance Standards and they have been met. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, the application was accepted as complete 5-0. There were no further questions or discussion. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted to approve the application 5-0 in pursuant to the Performance Standards Review, Section V, A1-20 in the Site Plan Review ordinance.

- b. **Tenants Harbor Boat Yard** - Brandon Chase represented the applicant. The application is to repair damaged cribbing/bulkhead with concrete pad located at 3 Boatyard Road. The timbers are old and failing. The bulkhead is shared with Cozy Harbor Lobster. The applicant owns approximately 40% of the bulkhead, with Cozy Harbor owning the remaining amount. Chase stated he would like to repair the entire bulkhead all at once but has been unsuccessful in getting the other owner involved.

Chase said the bulkhead is eroding yearly as the water drains down the hill and material falls into the water. Chase presented a plan that would be a temporary fix to the bulkhead by laying down cement to meet the timbers and repair them to prevent them from falling over.

Chase said he had his property surveyed recently, and his property line is the vehicle (cement) pad as shown in the photo. The line starts at the edge of the bulkhead and extends into the parking area 16'. A pin indicates the property line. Bly asked if the cement pad would be six inches throughout or thicker at the end. Chase said it would be thicker at the end and it would be about 3' tapering back to six inches. Brackett asked if he was going to take the concrete down to the pilings, and if he was going to bring the concrete up above the horizontal concrete, by any amount? Chase said he had not planned on it. He thought they could have a little lip or put bolts in and put a timber there for safety purposes. Brackett said Chase should contact DEP to see if he needs a Permit by Rule as he would be excavating material within the (buffer zone) Shoreland Zone.

Gill asked Brackett if the Planning Board could tell Cozy Harbor it is unsafe. Chair Cox asked Brackett if DEP would do an inspection, prompted by the Chase's request for a permit. Hewlett asked what would prevent anything from rolling down into the water except the dumpster being in the way. Chase said there is nothing preventing that from happening.

Minery asked Chase if he had an engineer draw a plan. Chase said Prock Marine came down and reviewed the area and gave an estimate. Prock said it is mostly ledge underneath. Chase said Prock could pin it which would be exorbitant; or he could do a concrete repair.

Brackett will contact DEP and told Chase to wait to until he heard back from him before applying for the Permit by Rule. Chase said he will try to contact the other owner, again. On

a motion by Minery, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to table the application until more information is received.

- c. **Marshall Point Lighthouse & Museum (pre-application)** – Nat Lyon represented the applicant. The application is to reconstruct a historic 18' x 25' storage barn at 178 Marshall Point Road. The property owner is the Town of St. George. The Shoreland Zone is Marine Residential. The lot size is 5 acres. Proposed use is lighthouse storage, a passive display area and office.

Nat Lyon said he was asking for a pre-application, an informal hearing. He said if there are issues which need to be taken care of, the committee would like to work on those before they come back for a formal hearing. Lyon is the museum director and curator of the Marshall Point Lighthouse & Museum. He said there is desperate need for more storage space.

He said the barn was located at the lighthouse for 74 years and taken down along with the lifeboat station in 1971 when the Coast Guard converted to a LORAN station. Lyon stated in order to add another historical piece to what was there, they would build the barn as an onsite storage area and serve as a passive display area. The lighthouse committee consulted the Maine Historic Preservation Commission about the project. In the letter from MHPC, it stated their office supported the project and was not opposed to the issuance of a building permit, at this time, based on their understanding the lighthouse committee would continue to work in good faith with their office. Remaining verification needed for MHPC: the final window and door sizes and details, landscaping/foundation final appearance, and interior considerations.

Lyon said he and Diane Bolton appeared before the Select Board on April 24 and was told the committee has a conditional agreement to go ahead. There was a lease written in 2007, but it did not get signed.

He said a week ago, a new issue arose. They were contacted by the DEP who said they would like to remove the old aluminum building and asked if they could put their equipment in the (proposed) lighthouse storage barn. Lyon discussed this with the MHPC who said they were okay with it, but the committee needs to know what DEP wants to do to continue testing. Lyon said the committee may be able to work out a financial agreement with DEP to house their equipment.

Chair Cox asked Richard Bates who owned the building. Bates said the building is owned by the town. He said the Select Board discovered there had only been a hand shake agreement between the town and the Historical Society. Bates said the Select Board realized there needed to be a signed lease agreement for the record, especially for historical purposes. The Select Board said going forward on the project, should be contingent upon a completed and signed lease. Bates said it should be made clear to town residents, what is going on and who owns what now and who will own what when it is completed.

The following is a list of items the Planning Board requested:

- A letter stating who is the representative or agent for the town and who can sign the application.
- The ownership and who is paying for the building.
- A site plan drawing that shows where the building is in relationship to:
 - The current parking area.
 - Where it is in relation to the well, the septic, the shoreline, and the tree line
 - Measurements of the building.
 - Handicapped parking.
 - The height of the proposed building.
 - If there is a survey, include it with the application.

CEO Brackett will print off a plot plan on GIS and mark where the building is located. Chair Cox recommended Lyon look over the 20 questions under the Performance Standard in the Site Plan Review.

Minery asked if they were planning to work on the project this year and Lyon said yes. Minery asked if would be a heated or cold storage building? Lyon said there are artifacts that need to be kept at 50 degrees, and they are discussing it with MHPC. MHPC wants all building materials from that era used, including flat head nails. The sliding door in the picture will have to be handmade. Hewlett thought they might want some type of humidity control.

Hewlett asked Brackett if it would need breakaway panels, since it is in a VE-19 floodplain. Brackett said it would not because the building would be above the floodplain stage. Hewlett asked if the Planning Board needed something to prove that. Brackett said he could check with the contours on GIS. Emerson asked if they thought about expanding parking. Lyon said no. Brackett said the storage barn would not create any need for more parking.

Lyon said as far as the survey, the one the lighthouse committee found was from 1898. Minery thought one should have been done when they added the parking lot. Chair Cox said the Board does not need a survey but needs to know the dimensions. Bates said he saw in the town records, a reference to the summer kitchen being done in the early 1990's. Chair Cox said there might be site plan on file.

Minery asked if the Board would need to do an onsite. Chair Cox said yes. She told Lyon they would need a completed application, first. An onsite visit would then be scheduled.

There was no further business to come before the Board. On a motion by Brown, seconded by Bly, the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary