

**St. George Planning Board  
St. George Town Office  
December 11, 2018 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present were: Anne Cox, Chair; Brendan Chase, Ray Emerson, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan and Alan Letourneau, (Jane Brown absent). Also present: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Chris Leavitt, and Bruce Hodsdon.

**Quorum:** Alan Letourneau was elevated to voting status. A quorum was present.

**Conflict of Interest:** None.

**Adjustments to Agenda:** None.

**Review of the Minutes:**

**Planning Board Meeting** — November 27, 2018 – The minutes were amended as follows:

Page 2, line 1, delete word **and**, change to read: ...the Planning Board did not have...

Page 2, line 15, change to: ...we do not want people getting the wrong **understanding** from...

Page 3, paragraph 1, line 6, change to: ... the **Planning** Board Manual ...

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan, to approve the minutes of November 27, 2018, as amended. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

**Informational Public Hearing on Amy & Andy Barstow (the Monhegan Boat Line) –**

November 29, 2018 – A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Chase, to approve the informational public hearing minutes of November 29, 2019, as written. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

**Public Comments:** None.

**Building Permits:**

**a. Baker Property Trust** – 32 Allen's Alley / Map 216, Lot 003

Christopher Leavitt of Harbor Builder's Associates represented the property owner, Baker Property Trust, Wilton CT. The Shoreland Zone District is Marine Residential and the Floodplain Designation is VE10. Existing Use: Bunkhouse and storage. Present and proposed use is year-round.

The application is to construct a 12' x 19' bunkhouse at 32 Allen's Alley on the Baker Trust property, Tenants Harbor. Mr. Leavitt said the proposed structure will be located behind and attached to an existing shed on the property that is in the buffer zone. He said the current back line of the shed is at the 75' line and the new building will be behind the 75' line. The structure will have a bathroom and a bedroom. It will not have a kitchen and it will not be a dwelling by definition.

The Planning Board reviewed the application. Chair Cox stated, "It will be attached to the existing shed." Mr. Leavitt said that was correct and it will be behind the 75' setback. Chair Cox asked if the existing two sheds and an attached deck would be removed? CEO Brackett said that was on the original application. Mr. Leavitt said he gave Brackett additional information but he (Leavitt) did not redo the cover sheet, so the application will need to be amended. Mr. Leavitt said the original plan was to eliminate the two existing sheds and build a new shed in their current footprint. But Leavitt said they will not be doing that based on many negotiations and discussions.

Mr. Leavitt said the application can be amended to state: Construct a 12' x 19' bunkhouse attached to the existing 14.3' x 10.4' shed. He said they are not looking to increase the size of the old shed. They are looking to save it and preserve it for years to come.

Ms. Hewlett asked which one did he call the old shed - the smaller one or the larger one? Mr. Leavitt said the little shed is going to stay, also. The plan is to slide the shed over and bump it up against the existing shed so they will abut and the new structure will be built behind it. Mr. Leavitt referred to the photograph and noted that the front deck and ramp will stay and said nothing will change out front. The footprints will be the same. Mr. Leavitt said he did not show the sheds attached on the site plan because it would look as though they were expanding the little shed. He explained that there will be no expansion of either shed in the buffer zone. It will simply slide towards the larger existing shed.

Mr. Emerson asked if the proposed structure will be attached to the larger existing shed. Mr. Leavitt said it will be but there will be no access from the inside to the smaller shed. He said they are simply sliding the building over to eliminate the 13-inch gap between the two buildings. Mr. Leavitt said that building is used for life preservers, paddles and such because the Baker's dock is just beyond the smaller shed. He said the use is not going to change.

Ms. Hewlett asked CEO Brackett if there were floodplain issues. Brackett said he did not believe so because the flood plain is just in front of the original cottage. Mr. Leavitt said the floodplain did not go up as far as these buildings. He said the floodplain stops 2' to 3' shy of the front porch on the gray cottage, and the cottage is 30' or 40' away from the structures, according to the application.

Ms. Hewlett asked CEO Brackett if the septic system had been approved for the additional bathroom and bedroom. Brackett said it has and they will be putting in a new septic system. Mr. Leavitt said they are installing a very elaborate system for all the buildings on the property – the whole compound; so, it will be a fully contained system. Ms. Hewlett asked where the system would be located. Mr. Leavitt said the leach field will go on top of the hill, by Harts Neck Road, and it will be approximately 600' away from the dwellings. Mr. Letourneau asked, "What direction?" Mr. Leavitt said it will be away from the shoreland at the entrance of the property towards Hart's Neck Road.

Mr. Leavitt said the property owners are trying to create a future for the next generation. He said the grandparents, the parents and now the children are realizing that these steps need to be taken in order to maintain the property for their children and their children's children.

Chair Cox asked, "What is the current use of the big shed?" Mr. Leavitt said it is used for storage and it will remain a storage shed. Chair Cox noted the little one and the big one will remain storage sheds, so now the new building will be attached to it and it will be a bedroom with a bathroom - a bunkhouse. Ms. Hewlett asked if there will be a door from the existing shed to the structure or is it going to be outside. Mr. Leavitt said there will be an interior door. He said they are trying to gain the view from the back through the front of the shed to the water. Then there will be a separate exterior door to be used as the outside entrance as shown on the floor plan. Mr. Leavitt said that will be the primary entrance.

The Planning Board reviewed the drawings of the proposed plan with Mr. Leavitt. He said the dotted line represented an overhead loft as there is not much closet space in the building. He said there is only 5.5' from the loft floor to the peak in the very center; it is basically a big shell. Ms. Hewlett thought the drawing plans were somewhat confusing. For clarity, Chair Cox made notations and labeled the shed buildings.

Mr. Leavitt identified the first shed on the drawing and noted that the other shed is called the boat locker where they store the life jackets, etc. He said that their shapes will not be changing.

CEO Brackett asked if there was an overhang on the roof of the new structure. Mr. Leavitt said on the new structure, there is a 12' overhang being proposed and thinks the existing one (by photo) is probably 8 or 10 inches. CEO Brackett said his point was - if this is on the buffer zone line, there should not be an overhang because it is intruding upon the buffer zone. Mr. Leavitt said okay and that can easily be changed as nothing has been built yet. Chair Cox said it looks like their drawings are pretty fluid. Mr. Leavitt said yes, they are pretty conceptual. Mr. Leavitt said they will do a zero profile on trim but they have to have a trim detail there. He said you have to frame in the end because then water becomes the nemesis. Mr. Leavitt asked if the Board was okay with an inch and one-half, so they can have something there. He said, or they can move the building back an inch and one-half, so they can have a little bit of a trim. Mr. Leavitt said they will do whatever needs to be done.

Mr. Letourneau asked CEO Brackett to explain what he meant by infringing on the buffer zone. CEO Brackett said you cannot build new construction in the 75' buffer zone. Brackett said if that building is on the line now and there is a roof overhang, then that is going to cut into that buffer zone. Ms. Hewlett, "Because the pitch goes towards the water."

Chair Cox asked if the application was complete and said the application was contingent upon the installation of a new septic system. Mr. Leavitt said correct and they were going to do the septic in the spring. CEO Brackett thought he had permitted the septic system a few days ago and a copy was in the file.

Ms. Hewlett asked if Mr. Leavitt's photographs, which Leavitt said included the existing conditions, perspectives and angles of the sheds, could be placed in the file. Mr. Leavitt said yes. Mr. Letourneau asked if the bunkhouse had any heating system. Mr. Leavitt said their plan is to have electric baseboard heat. He said it will be used in the summer on those foggy, dewy days to take the chill off. Mr. Leavitt said there will be no boiler system. There will be an on-demand

hot water system for the bathroom. Mr. Letourneau felt after amending the application by removing the sentence "the existing two sheds and the attached deck area will be removed," the application was complete.

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Jordan to delete the sentence "the existing two sheds and the attached deck area will be removed" and to accept the amended application as complete. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Chair Cox asked CEO Brackett if he had any issues regarding the application. He said his only concern is to keep the proposed structure out of the buffer zone.

Chair Cox referred to the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, page 19, # 2, principal or accessory structures and expansions of existing structures shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height. Mr. Leavitt said they do not exceed 35 feet in height.

Chair Cox said there is no problem regarding the floodplain because it is outside of the floodplain.

Mr. Chase asked if there was power to the structure. Mr. Leavitt said there is the wharf power which runs out of that building down to the dock area.

Chair Cox asked if this was considered an addition to the shed. CEO Brackett said the proposed project would have to be considered an addition to the shed but the structure is out of the buffer zone.

Chair Cox asked if the storage shed (when moved) would be dropped because the roof lines did not match up. Mr. Leavitt said they will slide it over and have it fit underneath the existing shed roof line. CEO Brackett said the other larger shed must be going to be raised up some due to rebuilding the floor and leveling the building. Mr. Leavitt said the smaller shed will probably come down because it is a 100-year old outhouse. He said by the time they get everything shored up, that will come over and it may actually work out that it intersects right at that roof line or just below it. Mr. Leavitt said both buildings will be leveled up but was not sure just how much.

CEO Brackett said Leavitt had discussed having work done to the larger storage building. Mr. Leavitt said they have to fix the floor and the floor is coming out right now. CEO Brackett said this is part of what the Planning Board needs to permit. Mr. Leavitt said they are going to be fixing the floor.

Ms. Hewlett, "Installing windows?" Leavitt said yes. There are two windows and a new door. Brackett asked, "Is it two windows going in or one, because we have talked about this." Mr. Leavitt said they drew two and if they can only get one, they will only put one in.

Ms. Hewlett asked if they were at a point where the shed was 50% redone. CEO Brackett said it was close. Mr. Leavitt said he and Brackett had talked about this and it is on the threshold. CEO Brackett said he looked at the floor as being maintenance, but said Hewlett is right. It is going to

be close. Brackett said, "In fact, if you count every hour in it, it could be over 50%." Ms. Hewlett asked why not move everything back and build a bigger bunkhouse? Mr. Leavitt said they do not want a bigger bunkhouse. They want to preserve what has been there with the family. The family built it; they are trying to keep the nostalgic value of it and the location of it.

Chair Cox commented on the floor being gone. Mr. Leavitt said they are using the shed for storage but the floor just needs to be shored up. Chair Cox also asked why not move it back 12' or more feet? Mr. Leavitt said they want to keep it where it is because of its proximity to the dock and everything else. Chair Cox said they are fixing it up and almost at 50% of its value. Mr. Leavitt said they do not intend to use it for anything other than storage. They are just trying to preserve what is there.

Ms. Hewlett, "Except they want to be able to see through it to see to the water. So, they are not going to put that much stuff in it. They are showing that you have doors going out of it. I would think we would be past the 50%. It looks like it is going to fall over." Chair Cox said work will be needed to shore up the shed and Leavitt agreed.

Ms. Hewlett asked if new windows will be installed. Mr. Leavitt said the plan is for two windows and a door. Ms. Hewlett reiterated, "A double door and a new floor. Are you putting a new roof on it? Mr. Leavitt said it will be re-shingled because it has to be connected to the new section of the building.

Ms. Hewlett noted that the roof line was not straight. Mr. Leavitt said the roof line is just following the foundation and once you get the underneath of it flattened out, the roof will come back. Ms. Hewlett asked if it will be on piers or a concrete slab. Mr. Leavitt said piers and they may use helical piers that screw into the ground, as these cause less soil disturbance.

Ms. Hewlett felt this project is over 50% of the value. Chair Cox said especially since a stronger foundation will be put in. Ms. Hewlett feels there is sufficient room to move the project back because the parcel is like a spaghetti lot and setbacks will not be an issue. Chair Cox also felt it could move back.

The Planning Board reviewed the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, C(4) Non-conforming Structures, page 8, Reconstruction or Replacement. Ms. Hewlett did not think this was removal but CEO Brackett said in effect, they are removing the floor to replace it.

Ms. Hewlett then referred to page 9 and read the first full paragraph. She said the biggest question is, is this normal maintenance and repair? Chair Cox said they could make the argument that it is sagging. It needs a good foundation. It needs a good floor. Mr. Emerson said it is a repair as they will be leveling it up and shoring it up. Mr. Jordan said, "Normal maintenance and repair. When your floor starts to sag, you fix it up. So, that is excluded." Chair Cox said adding the windows and the interior finish is going to stay open frame. She said it does sound like normal maintenance. The project description was amended to read, "The sheds will be repaired and maintained as normal."

Ms. Hewlett asked for the height of the structure. Mr. Leavitt said according to the drawing, it scales out to 13' to the peak, assuming minimal leveling in the foundation. He said they will be well under 20 feet.

Mr. Jordan, "If we believe the repair to the floor is normal maintenance and repair, then what we are looking at is what is being done in terms of putting in a new window." Jordan asked what else would be outside the normal (French) doors and the window. Mr. Emerson said everything else would be maintenance because they are not changing anything else.

Mr. Leavitt said the use is not changing. It is just some aesthetics with the building. The footprint is not changing. Mr. Emerson said the floor is basically being changed because it needs to be and would have to be replaced for storage, anyway.

Mr. Jordan said the question is whether the doors and the windows are going to cost more than 50% of the market value of the shed and asked what is the market value of the shed? CEO Brackett thought the price of a shed (in today's market) could be over \$2,000. Leavitt agreed.

Mr. Chase affirmed there was not going to be any interior connection between the two existing structures and Mr. Leavitt said correct. They were simply bringing them together. Leavitt said there will be no access from the large shed into the boat locker interior. Chair Cox said, "But from the large shed into the addition, there will be access." Mr. Leavitt said yes, there will be passage. There was no further questions or discussion.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau to approve the application with the condition that neither of the existing storage buildings within the buffer zone can change their use from storage to living space. Both storage buildings must stay storage buildings as long as they remain in the buffer zone. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

**Other Business:** CEO Brackett said the next Board meeting is scheduled for December 25<sup>th</sup>. The Board proposed changing their meeting date to Tuesday, January 8, 2019.

On a motion by Letourneau, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 to cancel the December 25, 2018 meeting and meet on Tuesday, January 8, 2019 at the regularly scheduled time of 7 p.m.

There was no further business to come before the Board. At 7:40 p.m., a motion was made by Hewlett, seconded by Chase to adjourn the meeting, 5-0. Following the adjournment, the Board went directly into the sign ordinance workshop.

**Sign Ordinance Public Workshop:** A Public Workshop will be held at the town office on Thursday, January 17, 2019 at 7 p.m. to review the draft of the proposed sign ordinance. The public is encouraged to attend.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson  
Planning Board Recording Secretary

