

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
November 10, 2020 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom. Members present were: Anne Cox, Chair; Jane Brown, Ray Emerson, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan, and Alan Letourneau. Also present: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Michael Felton, Randy Elwell, Jeff and Lisbeth Thalheimer, Jeff Senders, William Torpey, Veronika Carlson, and Amber Libbey.

Quorum: A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Adjustments to Agenda - The following adjustments were made:

- Added Under Other Business: Chair Cox Announcements and Questions from CEO Brackett
- Under Review of Minutes, add Findings of Fact, St. George Municipal School Unit

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting — October 27, 2020 – The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 6, paragraph 1, line 2, change to: ... a 20-foot by 30-foot storage shed.

Page 14, last paragraph, line 3 delete the word sign

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan, to approve the Planning Board minutes of October 27, 2020, as amended. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

St. George Municipal School Unit, 65 Main Street, the Findings were corrected as follows:

Page 1, under Project Description, line 1, correct to: ...a 20-foot by 30-foot wooden...

A motion was made by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, to approve the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law for the St. George Municipal School Unit. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Public Comments: None.

Building Permits:

a. Jeff and Lisbeth Thalheimer, 219 Otis Point Road / Map 217, Lot 039

The applicants were present. The application is to remove angled NW corner of deck, add 21 feet SF of deck on North side, install an outdoor shower connected to the septic system, add stairs from front deck to grade on North side, install new walking surface material and railing on front deck, install roof overhang at front door. The Shoreland Zone is Marine Residential, and the Floodplain Designation is VE-13.

Jeff Thalheimer stated the project will have no increase in square footage or volume to the structure of the cottage. The work focuses on decks, ramps, and roof overhangs. They purchased the house in September 2019 and at that time it had a front deck at the water, an entry platform, and two ramps that went from the ground up to the platform and the deck. He stated the previous owner extended the gravel driveway from the garage to the front door of the house. He stated that their phase one plan was to remove approximately 600 sq. ft. of the gravel and planted grass.

J. Thalheimer referred to the drawing and explained that on the existing front deck, the material finish of that deck is a combination of cedar and treated wood. There is evidence of rot and it is not in good shape. They would also like to put a new walking surface on the front deck, wood, and change out the railing.

J. Thalheimer stated there is an odd corner on the deck of about 3 sq. ft. They want to straighten that corner out and there will be no structural change to the deck. When they add the stairs going down to the property on the side of the deck, the plan is to lay the stringers directly on the ground.

The applicants want to add about 4 sq. ft. of deck area by extending the existing deck and install an outdoor shower. The outdoor shower will have a prefabricated base underneath it, collect all the shower water, and tie it into the wastewater system. A privacy wall screen will be installed around the outdoor shower.

Thalheimer's plan is to install a roof over the existing front door. Most of the roof will be over the existing entry platform and only about 7 or 8 sq. ft. will be over the landscaped area (which once was a wooden platform). The plan is to remove a good portion of the wood platforms that were on the property and are proposing to add in a little bit of deck area. Jeff stated, "The net result will be a loss of wooden deck area when the construction is completed."

Chair Cox, "When you did your total square footage, did you include the square footage for the stairway to the deck?" Thalheimer stated he did not include that. Chair Cox, "Even though it may not be on a foundation that is still covering an area?"

J. Thalheimer, "The addition for the deck: There is a ledge outcropping in the far corner that we are going to be installing one of those prefabricated concrete footers on top of the ledge and anchor it to the ledge, so there will be no disturbance on the ground."

Chair Cox asked CEO Brackett if he concurred with the 19.2 percent lot coverage? Brackett stated he reviewed it, came up with 2,013 for square footage as of this year (2020), and the lot coverage to be about 9 percent. Chair Cox said they are still well within the 20% allowance. The Planning Board amended the application, under Property Information: Lot coverage - plus or minus 9%. Total sq. ft of all buildings, Present Total - 2,013 square feet. Hewlett noted this project is within 25' of the water.

Chair Cox asked about the proposed stair from the deck. "How far from the side property line are they?" Thalheimer stated the existing side line is about 26 feet and that the area is heavily wooded. Chair Cox noted that would put his stairs at 20 feet.

Jordan, "The square footage of buildings shows no increase, but this application adds about 29.5 sq. ft. I understand that is offset by the reductions from getting rid of the ramp on the one side of the house and other things that were done on the last application. So, in total that is all a net decrease." Thalheimers stated that was the idea. Jordan, "Is that the way the ordinance works or are we supposed to treat each permit by itself?"

CEO Brackett, "It would be cumulative for the structure." Cox noted the structure cannot increase more than 30% over the lifetime of the structure. Brackett said if you take some structure away and put a little bit back then that will give you a net loss.

Hewlett stated the Board needs a new site plan drawing because on drawings one of two, the far-left hand side, it was a 40 square foot ramp. "However, they only removed a portion of it, so they removed 24 sq. ft. and then the front ramp, they took out 29 feet. Someone needs to put all this math together."

The Planning Board reviewed Thalheimer's cover letter for net square footage, and Jordan came up with 29.5 square footage of net additions for this application. Brackett will document this information on the original application.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, to accept the application, with the stated changes, as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Hewlett, "We are going horizontally for the addition of the stairs and then backward for the addition of the shower, and it just meets the side setback at 20 feet."

Chair Cox stated that the project is not increasing the non-conformity. Hewlett and Jordan indicated that was correct. Jordan noted that the drawings suggest that the edge of the deck is about 25' from the water and asked if that was correct. Hewlett looked at the second photo and noted the deck is on the edge of the water. Jordan did not think the site plan hand drawing was quite right but did not think that mattered; there is no increase in the nonconformity. He noted the stairs are going out sideways and the new part of the deck is going away from the water.

Chair Cox stated this project is not increasing the non-conformity. Planning Board members agreed. Jordan stated it is not an expansion. Hewlett stated that on the third photograph where the outdoor shower will go, there is an overhang on the house which is not in any of the other plans; it is not showing. J. Thalheimer stated that on his drawings he did not indicate the roof overhang. The Planning Board referenced the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, Section 12(C). Chair Cox thinks there is plenty of room within the allowable footprint for the overhang.

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan to approve Jeff and Lizbeth Thalheimer's application based on their work to keep the plans without an increase to the overall

coverage or square footage and has not made the plan to be more non-conforming based on 12(C) of the Shoreland Zone. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

b. William Torpey, 159 Cline Road / Map 229, Lot 047

The applicant was present. The application is to lift an existing 22-foot x 22-foot garage off its current slab and temporarily move it to an adjacent area on the property. Remove the existing broken slab and replace the concrete slab with a new 36-foot x 22-foot slab. Place the old garage on the new slab and add 14 feet of new garage to the existing structure to create a 36-foot x 22-foot garage. The Shoreland Zone District is Marine Residential, and the Floodplain Designation is VE-18.

Torpey stated he has a 45-year old garage he would like to salvage before it becomes a safety hazard or collapse. The slab underneath the garage is the primary problem. There are multiple cracks and cervices as wide as four inches over the floor of the garage. It is causing the garage to tilt in some places so he cannot open the garage doors on occasion. He noted that despite the age of the building, the interior wood is in very good shape, and has been told by contractors that it is more economical to lift the garage, put it over on another part of the property, tear up the slab, put in a new slab, and reset the garage on the new slab. The second part of the project will be to extend the garage another 14 feet, going from south to north.

Chair Cox asked if the edge of the expansion will be 22 feet from the water. Torpey stated no, the south side of the garage is about 30 feet from the water's edge. He wants to extend the garage north by 14 feet if they reset it on a new slab.

Chair Cox, "You want to expand it?" Torpey said away from the water. Chair Cox and Hewlett stated that is not clear and not what the drawing says. Torpey said okay. Hewlett, "The expansion is towards the water." Torpey, "My mistake. I am not going towards the water, at all. It is going north. I would tear up paved road to expand the slab." Hewlett, "Then this drawing is erroneous."

Letourneau, "Not if we cross out water and put the word north."

Hewlett, "You really need to move the whole expansion to the right-hand side of the drawing because it is going to be in front of the existing garage?"

Torpey stated that is correct but to the north.

Chair Cox, "We don't have a scale showing north so that means you are headed towards the house?"

CEO Brackett, "On the GIS that I printed out, the north would be towards the road." Torpey stated there is a road that runs right into that garage.

Chair Cox, "So, that would be straight up and the road that is coming in and if I look at the GIS, it looks like we are going to be right on the side property line. Is that correct?"

Torpey, "We are close to the property line, but the paved road is on my property and we are going to put a slab right over part of that paved road."

Hewlett, "It looks like the side setback, which hasn't been filled out on the application, is the property line."

CEO Brackett, "At the garage, he might have 4 or 5 feet to the property line."

Chair Cox, "Because the property line is at an angle, if he moves closer to the road, he will get even closer to the property line."

Torpey, "What I thought I would do is to maybe tilt the slab a little bearing toward the west, so I get a little further away from the property line. It is still running straight into the road."

Hewlett, "One of the questions for the Planning Board is because this is all within 75 feet if he is moving the structure, to begin with, does he have to move it out of the 75-foot setback?" Chair Cox and Jordan said, "as much as practicable." Hewlett, "It looks like there is plenty of room on the beginning of the loop (on the drawing), and I do not know which way is north, south, east, or west."

Torpey, "The road running into that garage runs north to south with the back end of the garage being the south side and the road coming in from the north."

Hewlett, "In the northeast corner of the property there is a vacant space." Jordan, "That still looks like it is within the 75-foot setback." Hewlett, "But if he went up to that one corner between the road, the blue line and the white line?"

Chair Cox said she was running into side setbacks issues. Hewlett, "He'd have to bring it down a little bit." Chair Cox asked if the Planning Board understood what it is Torpey is asking for. Hewlett said the graph page should be changed and put the entire expansion on the right-hand side away from the water. Chair Cox said why don't we just call it north and cross out water.

The Property Information under side setback was amended to add: the existing garage corner is 4 feet from the side property line.

Jordan, "We have a non-conforming structure, and it is proposed to be expanded by 63%. That is more than 30 percent." Chair Cox, "Is it for the one structure, or is it for the total of the structures on the property?" Jordan, "No, it is for everything within the 75 feet."

Jordan, "Which is the existing garage building?" CEO Brackett said the existing garage is 484 sq. ft., and he is proposing to add 308 sq. ft. to it. Jordan, "So, that is a 63% increase. But there's actually an absolute amount of sq. ft. you can have anyway, right?"

Chair Cox, "You can have 1,000 sq. ft." Chair Cox referenced 12(C)(1)(c)(i) and said Torpey is within the 1,000 sq. ft. Letourneau noted that is the same for all structures; Jordan said it is all

structures within the 75-foot setback. Hewlett said it looked like there was one other structure to the west within that 75-foot setback. CEO Brackett said that structure is no longer there.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau to accept the application as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Chair Cox had a question about the side setback. If the garage is going to be lifted and a new slab poured, can he move it 20 feet from the side property line? Hewlett asked if he would also need to move it outside of the 75 foot as much as is practicable. Jordan said he read it that way. Chair Cox asked Torpey if there is a way he can move the garage to a different location?

Torpey said the garage has been there longer than most of us. He stated there is no other place on the property that he can move it and is concerned about moving it but the contractors say they can pick it up and move it over for a day, put a new slab in which is essentially what he is trying to accomplish. The answer is there is no other place on the property that this would work.

Torpey said on the left side of the garage, the road is coming in from the north on the west side of the garage, there is about a 3-foot drop, so it sits up on a hill. Chair Cox asked if there is any way the garage could be moved quite a distance to the north of the beginning of his circular drive? Torpey felt that would be impractical because there is a well there and didn't seem like it would fit in there.

Jordan asked about the location of the well. Torpey, "The well is, as you come down the road then the circular drive starts to the right. The well is right there on that corner." CEO Brackett asked if that was the well, he used now? Torpey said the well they use now is by the mailbox and they have two other wells on the property.

Hewlett asked if he owns the property next door where the camper is situated. Torpey said no. Hewlett asked if he owns the camper. Torpey said he did not.

Jordan cited Section 12(C)(2) Foundations. "If you are replacing the foundation of a building that is non-conforming (and this is because it is within 75 feet from the water) it has to be placed behind the 75-foot setback to the greatest practical extent, taking into account the topography, land, slopes, where the well is, etc." Jordan said it seems to him as the Board has done on a couple of other occasions about replacing foundations, that an on-site inspection should be done.

Chair Cox explained to the applicant that the whole purpose of Shoreland Zone is not to have buildings in the 75-foot setback, but we know that is the hand you have been dealt. When you tear it down, that there is an opportunity then to get it out further from the buffer zone, so maybe going and seeing it, could better determine the situation. Jordan felt the Planning Board did need to insist that it goes back as far as practicable and does not know how to judge that without seeing the property. Hewlett felt the side setback was an issue, especially if the camper does not belong to him.

Since this application does not require any public notification, Board members agreed that for their purposes, they hold an on-site visit of the property. An on-site has been scheduled for November 14th. The Planning Board could be at Torpey's about 9:30 a.m.

c. Tenants Harbor Moonlight, LLC, 9 Mouse Island / Map 105, Lot 017

The applicant, Veronika Carlson, represented the property owner, BREH, LLC. The application is to remove and replace all siding, roof shingles, trim and rotted sills around the back door. Siding and roofing will be replaced with the same style and colors. New trim and will be painted to match existing colors. The bottom of the deck will have a privacy windscreen and cedar lattice wrapped around it. The doors and windows on the shed will be replaced and a new ramp will be added. Existing and Proposed Use: Seasonal rental.

Carlson explained the application. The cottage is within the 75-foot setback. On the underlining of the deck, the plan is to add lattice to clean up underneath the deck with a screening material. There is a side door on the cottage which they plan on replacing the sill which would require some siding, trim, shingles, and a new door. There is a small shed which is located further away from the water, closer to Barter's Point Road, and plan to replace the siding, the ramp, the trim, the roofing shingles, and the windows.

Letourneau asked if that would change the square footage? Carlson said no change.

Jordan, "In the email which included the pictures there was some suggestion about adding some other items which I think are included in the application like the latticework under the deck. So, the things you were wondering about whether to do, you are actually including them on this application?" Carlson stated yes. Jordan, "My only question on the front page of the application there seem to be some corrections of the square footage. Looks like it was filed with 596 sq. ft. and corrected to 1212 sq. ft. What is that about?"

Brackett, "I did this quite some time ago, but I think with the deck and the storage building and things like that, all the square footage had not been added in." Jordan asked if 1,212 was right? Brackett said he believed so.

Hewlett, "Is this all within the 75-foot setback?" Brackett stated it is all within the 75' setback. Hewlett thought this should be a commercial application, but Brackett said no because it is a rental and we do not treat them as commercial.

The application was amended to: Number of Stories, Proposed: 0; Dwelling Units, Present: 1, Proposed: 0; Septic System Design, Bedrooms, Proposed: 0.

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Hewlett to accept this application as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Chair Cox explained that the application is before the Planning Board because the estimated cost is more than \$10,000 worth of maintenance and repair and is within the 75-foot setback zone. There is no change to the footprint, and it is replacing what is already there.

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Brown to approve the Tenants Harbor Moonlight, LLC application. The project largely consists of repairs to the existing property. There is no change in lot coverage and no change in total square footage. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Piers:

a. Janie and Don Ed Holmes, 87 Haupt Road / Map 217, Lot 011

Jeff Senders, PhD PE of Camden, Maine represented the property owners, Janie and Don Ed Holmes. The application is to construct a pier system with a fixed pier and seasonal ramp and float and a set of 4 feet wide by 6 feet long stone steps to access the ledge where the pier starts from the house. The pier is a 58-foot granite supported pier with a 3-foot by 50-foot seasonal aluminum ramp, and a 12-foot by 18-foot seasonal float. The Shoreland Zone District is Marine Residential, and the Floodplain Designation Zone is AE-13.

Chair Cox said an on-site inspection was held on October 12, 2020, and a Public Hearing was held on October 13, 2020. Hewlett asked CEO Brackett if the complete DEP application had been received and placed on file. Brackett said he received all the information, and it is on file. Hewlett asked if the Planning Board had received any notice from the Harbor Master regarding this application. Brackett stated that the Harbor Master had approved it.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau to accept the application as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

The Board then reviewed the standards under Section 15(C) of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

C. Piers, Docks, Wharves, Bridges and Other Structures and Uses Extending Over or Beyond the Normal High-Water Line of a Water Body or Within a Wetland and Shoreline Stabilization.

1. No more than one pier, dock, wharf, or similar structure extending or located below the normal high-water line of the water body or within a wetland is allowed on a single lot. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. There is only one pier being proposed.
2. Access from shore shall be developed on soils appropriate for such use and constructed so as to control erosion. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The pier starts on ledge and does not affect soils, and the steps will cause minimal disturbance to the soils.
3. The location shall not interfere with existing developed or natural beach areas. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The Board did not observe any natural or developed beaches in the area.
4. The facility shall be located so as to minimize adverse effects on fisheries. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met, 5-0 based on the Findings of Fact made by the Department of Environmental Protection.

5. The facility shall be no longer in dimension than necessary to carry on the activity and be consistent with the surrounding character and uses of the area. A pier, dock, or wharf in non-tidal waters shall not be wider than (6') six feet for non-commercial uses. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The proposed pier will be located at the low tide line and the float will not bottom out at low tide; and there are other similar piers in the area.
6. No new structure shall be built on, over, or abutting a pier, wharf, dock, or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland unless the structure requires direct access to the water body or wetland as an operational necessity.
NOTE: A structure constructed on a float or floats is prohibited unless it is designed to function as and is registered with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, as a watercraft. – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable, 5-0. No new structures are being proposed.
7. New permanent piers and docks on non-tidal waters shall not be permitted unless it is clearly demonstrated to the Planning Board that a temporary pier or dock is not feasible, and a permit has been obtained from the Department of Environmental Protection, pursuant to the Natural Resources Protection Act. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard is not applicable, 5-0. This pier is not in non-tidal waters.
8. No existing structures built on, over, or abutting a pier, dock, wharf or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall be converted to residential dwelling units in any district. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard is not applicable, 5-0. No structure is being proposed.
9. Except in the Commercial Fisheries/Marine Activities District, structures build on, over, or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall not exceed (20') twenty feet in height above the pier, wharf, dock or other structure. – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard is not applicable, 5-0. No structure is being proposed.
10. Vegetation may be removed in excess of the standards in Section 15 (P) of this ordinance in order to conduct shoreline stabilization of an eroding shoreline, provided that a permit is obtained from the Planning Board. Construction equipment must access the shoreline by barge when feasible as determined by the Planning Board.
 - (a) When necessary, the removal of trees and other vegetation to allow for construction equipment access to the stabilization site via land must be limited to no more than 12 feet in width. When the stabilization project is complete, the construction equipment access way must be restored.
 - (b) Revegetation must occur in accordance with Section 15(S).
– On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. Construction equipment for the pier will access the shoreline by barge and the applicant will adjust the proposed vegetation to fit the area with the following condition: Three spruce trees will be replaced by three native spruce trees.

The Planning Board then reviewed the following section of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance:
SECTION 16(D) – Procedure for Administering Permits

1. Will maintain safe and healthful conditions. – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, standard has been met, 5-0. With the addition of a ramp, float and pier safety conditions will be enhanced by allowing safe access to the water.
2. Will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters. - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, standard has been met, 5-0. Best Management Practices (BMP) will be used for this project and it will not cause water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters.
3. Will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater. - On a motion by Letourneau, seconded by Hewlett, standard is not applicable, 5-0.
4. Will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish aquatic life, bird, or other wildlife habitat. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0, based on the DEP Findings of Fact, Habitat Considerations.
5. Will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual, points of access to inland and coastal waters. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. Three trees will be removed and replaced with three trees, and the view from the water is well covered.
6. Will protect archaeological and historic resources as designated in the comprehensive plan. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The Planning Board is not aware of any archaeological and historic resources in this area.
7. Will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in a Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard is not applicable, 5-0. This project is not located in a CFMA District.
8. Will avoid problems associated with flood plain development and use. - On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, standard has been met, 5-0. The construction plan of the proposed project has taken into consideration sea level rise issues.
9. Is in conformance with the provisions of Section 15, Land Use Standards. – The Planning Board has approved Section 15(C), #1-10 of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

No approval shall be granted for an application involving a structure if the structure would be located in an unapproved subdivision or would violate any other local ordinance or regulation or statute administered by the municipality.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, to approve the Janie & Don Ed Holmes application. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Site Plan Review:

a. St. George Municipal School Unit, 65 Main Street / Map 105, Lot 074

The applicant, Superintendent Michael Felton, and employee, Randy Elwell, were present. The property owner is the SGMSU and Town of St. George. This is a commercial use project. The application is to lay a 60-foot by 30-foot concrete slab for an outdoor classroom area which will be located behind the school next to the soccer field.

Felton explained that at the end of September, the MSU received a federal grant of approximately \$170,000 and there were a lot of restrictions on how this grant money could be used. He stated the use had to be unbudgeted and whatever the use was had to be delivered onsite, completed, and operational by December 30, 2020.

In using the money, they first looked at items they already bought and had been unbudgeted for related to Covid-19 items. They then looked at things that would be of long-term benefit to the school and community. One item they discussed was to create an outdoor classroom, so it meets the criteria of being related to their Covid-19 response. Felton said one of the school's biggest limitations now, is space and to have additional space outside where children can go and learn, and play would be very beneficial.

The proposal is to install a 60-foot by 30-foot concrete slab behind the school to the right of the access road that goes to the soccer field, do some ditching work to improve drainage and improve the road to the soccer field. Felton stated the long-term goal is to build a post and beam roof structure on the slab but that cannot be accomplished by December 30, 2020; but the school feels they can use the slab in some way by December 30, and that will give them some time to do planning on what they would like on the slab and that it is done correctly.

Chair Cox asked if the setbacks were 20 feet from the property line. Elwell stated the setback is well over 20 feet. The Property Information on page 1 of the application was amended as follows: Under the side setbacks was corrected to: greater than 20 feet. Project Description: Ditching to tie into existing drainage around the soccer field. Commercial Use: Yes.

Jordan asked about the proposed ditching work. Elwell stated that Juniper St. which runs behind the school and the area becomes basically like a river when it rains. There has never been adequate drainage there and when the water comes off by the playground, it flows down to the soccer field. The location for the proposed slab and the stumps for children to sit on gets extremely muddy. So, to improve the road going down and for the propane tanks, they thought they should build a better drainage system.

Chair Cox asked where would the run-off water be diverted to. Elwell noted there is already a ditch around the soccer field so it will be diverted up into the woods. Chair Cox stated the plan is to do ditching around this to tie into the existing drainage around the soccer field. Elwell stated that was correct. Elwell stated there is drainage there, but this will improve the water run-off.

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan to accept the application as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried. The Planning Board began Site Plan Review.

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The project will not cause any appreciable change to the landscape.
2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The structure is a concrete slab, has no height, and will be generally unobtrusive.
3. Vehicular Access – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met, 5-0. The project will not have any interference with vehicular access to the property.
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met, 5-0. The project does not occur in an area on the property where there will be vehicular or pedestrian circulation and will not affect the parking lot.
5. Surface Water Drainage - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. The concrete slab will have minimal effect on surface water drainage. Additional work will be done to the existing drainage which will improve water run-off.
6. Existing Utilities - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met, 5-0. The concrete slab will not use utilities.
7. Advertising Features - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable, 5-0. No signs are proposed.
8. Special Features - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met, 5-0. Future construction plans upon the concrete slab will be no more obtrusive to neighbors than the property's existing use, i.e. the playground.
9. Exterior Lighting - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable, 5-0. No lighting is proposed for the slab.
10. Emergency Vehicle Access - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable, 5-0. The concrete slab is not located in an area requiring emergency vehicular access and will not interfere with vehicular access.
11. Municipal Services – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0. This project will not affect municipal services.
12. Water/Air Protection - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0. The project will not generate pollution.
13. Water Supply - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable, 5-0. The slab does not require water.
14. Soil Erosion - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0. With the improved drainage for stormwater run-off, less erosion should occur.

15. Sewage Waste Disposal - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard is not applicable, 5-0. The area will not generate sewage waste.

16. Hazardous, Special, and Radioactive Materials - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0. There will be no hazardous, special, and radioactive materials stored on the concrete slab.

17. Financial/Technical Capacity - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, standard has been met, 5-0. St. George MSU has funds from a federal grant to complete this project and J.K. Kalloch has the technical capacity to install the concrete slab.

18. Shoreland Zone - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard is not applicable, 5-0. The proposed project is not in the Shoreland Zone.

19. Flood Plain - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, standard is not applicable, 5-0. The proposed project is not located in the floodplain.

20. Lot Standards - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met, 5-0. Based on the information stated to the Planning Board, the setback standards, lot coverage, height requirements, and parking standards have been met.

The Planning Board has reviewed the 20 Performance Standards and they have been met.

On a motion by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 to approve the St. George MSU application pursuant to the Performance Standards, Section V, A1-20 in the Site Plan Review ordinance.

b. Amber Libbey, 26 Sawmill Road / Map 235, Lot 046

The applicant was present. The application is to open a repair business for commercial vehicles and trailers. This is a commercial use application.

Libbey explained that she plans to open a garage at 26 Sawmill Road. The property is owned by Justin Long. Long will rent a building to her so she can work on heavy-duty trucks and trailers.

Chair Cox asked if the building is an existing garage. Libbey stated yes. Chair Cox noted that Libbey has an advertising sign that she plans to hang over the garage door. Chair Cox asked if Libbey will be operating the business daily? How much traffic volume does she expect? Libbey stated she did not think it will be any crazy volume because the shop is not big and cannot do a lot in the shop size-wise. She stated business hours will be Monday – Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Jordan asked what the property is now being used for. Libbey said Justin Long works on other vehicles in Austin Long's shop and Justin Long was using his building to store some of **his stuff**. CEO Brackett said the buildings were built around 2005 and the permit was a non-commercial permit. Jordan, "From the pictures, it looked like auto repair." Brackett, "You might get that

impression by looking at the pictures, but I think it is for a hobby auto repair.” Jordan, “So this is a conversion from non-commercial to commercial.” Chair Cox stated this will be a Change of Use application.

CEO Brackett said that the building that Libbey is looking at leasing is on the right in the photograph, and Austin Long’s building is on the left. She is just going into one building. Chair Cox stated it is the building further away from the property line. Brackett stated correct. Chair Cox will forward a copy of Libby’s drawing of the advertising sign to Planning Board members.

An on-site inspection has been scheduled for Saturday, November 28, 2020, at 9 a.m. Abutters will be notified.

Other Business:

Chair Cox reported the Select Board appointed Anne Cogger to fill the alternate vacancy on the Planning Board. Cogger will join the Board in December.

Chair Cox discussed the upcoming MMA workshop on December 15. The workshop is for the Planning Board and Board of Appeals members dealing with procedure and let CEO Brackett know who wants to attend. This conference will be held via Zoom.

Chair Cox reminded the Planning Board of the Kohl on-site scheduled for November 14, 2020, at 9 a.m. and the Torpey on-site to follow.

There was no further business to come before the Board. On a motion by Letourneau, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary