

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
May 25, 2021 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom. Present were: Anne Cox, Chair; Jane Brown, Anne Cogger, Ray Emerson, Mary K. Hewlett, and Michael Jordan. (Alan Letourneau was absent.) Also present were via Zoom: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Loreen Meyer, Van Thompson, Mark Munger, Jeff Schroeder, Loreen Meyer, Ryan LeShane, John Kneurr, Amanda Devine, Anne Bardaglio, Marguerite Wilson, Marshall Cole, and Will Gartley.

Quorum: Anne Cogger was elevated to voting status. A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Adjustments to Agenda: None.

Review of the Minutes:
Planning Board Meeting – April 27, 2021

A motion was made by Jane Brown, seconded by Cogger, to approve the Planning Board minutes of April 27, 2021, as written. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Public Comments: None.

Site Plan Review:

a. Jeffrey Schroeder – 162 Drift Inn Road / Map 203, Lot 040

The applicant was present via Zoom. The application is to construct three luxury style tenting platforms approximately 600 linear feet from the applicant's home to be used as vacation rentals. The tents are cabin style and will sit on wood decks supported by concrete piers. The tents will be located adjacent to a wetland.

Schroeder explained the proposed project. He and his wife own a house and garage on a three-acre lot on Drift Inn Road. At the back of the property, they want to construct three luxury style tenting platforms that will be used as vacation rentals. The tents will be in a secluded area and will not be visible from the road. Schroeder stated he has been working with Gartley and Dorsky on a septic system plan and with other contractors on laying the infrastructure to support the tents. The tents are similar to an upscale safari style tent. Each tent is 400 square feet with a loft area and will have a toilet, a shower, and a sink. Schroeder stated this will be a seasonal business, but he is not sure if they will do Airbnb or rent the tents out privately.

The Board reviewed the Property Information on page one of the application. Chair Cox explained the property information needs to be amended to show the footprint of all the buildings that are presently on the property, the proposed buildings (tents) and the total square feet of all the buildings. Jordan asked Schroeder to indicate the road frontage and the setbacks of the existing buildings and the proposed buildings (tents). Schroeder stated the total square footage

of the impervious surfaces will be 8,712. Jordan asked CEO Brackett if he could check on that, and Brackett stated he would. The Lot Size was corrected to 3.2 acres.

Chair Cox asked Brackett if he could summarize the emails included in the application packet that discussed wetland and septic system issues.

Brackett explained that Schoeder came into the office and asked a lot of questions about septic tanks and if effluent lines had to be buried from the tank to the leach field. Brackett stated he contacted DEP asking some of those questions because the septic system pipes are going through wetlands. DEP contacted the state plumbing inspector who diverted them back to DEP, and we finally got the answer in an email.

Chair Cox asked if DEP is willing to give Schoeder a permit for the alteration of the freshwater wetlands and Brackett said yes, they will do that.

Hewlett: It seems as though the tents are in the middle of the wetlands according to one of the diagrams. It is showing wetlands all the way in the back end of that property.

Schroeder: It is hard to tell from that map. When you walk back to that area, there is no standing water. It just gets a little muddy when it rains, but it is in a transitional area where there is a wetland that does have standing water and plant life. The tents will be in a higher area, a little bit out of the wetland and in more of a transitional area.

Schroeder: We did get a wetland delineation done by Gartley & Dorsky. We also got a septic plan done because of the wetland; and because of the poor soil back there, we are not able to do a septic or a leach field in that area. So, all the effluent from the sewage has to get pumped to the front of the property where there is good soil and where you can put a leach field. That has all been laid out in plans. The State of Maine did approve the alteration and gave me the permit for the wetland alteration based on that plan.

Hewlett and other Board members had not received the Gartley & Dorsky wetland schematic in their packet, and Schroeder stated he would get that out to them. Hewlett said they would like to see the schematic as the plan they were given shows Schroeder is directly in wetlands. Jeff stated yes.

Chair Cox asked what the Board thought about the tents that are dwelling units (seasonal tents) with the septic system. It is like adding three additional units to this property.

Jordan: I had the same question but are they dwelling units? Are there cooking facilities in them?

Jeff: No there is no cooking facilities. It is considered a campground, so it is not like a single-family home. I think the state water rules said they are rated for 75 gallons per day (seasonal). So, at the end of the season, we would pump out the hose that goes to the leach field. The leach field is 11 ft x 22 ft. It is a bit smaller than a normal house, but it is classified as a campground.

Chair Cox and Jordan thinks there is nothing outside of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance that deals with campgrounds. Cogger noted that each tent has a hot tub and asked what the legal limitations of a campground are.

Schroeder: The classification that I am referring to is the wastewater rules for the State of Maine that determines how many gallons of water are used per dwelling. Our house is a three-bedroom house, and it is rated for three hundred gallons a day for our house. The state looked at this as a campground because they are seasonal tents, but I do not know why they designated it a campground and not a normal dwelling. I know that in terms of the NRPA application (the wetland alteration) is how they classified it and that is how the septic plan is designed. It is based on those rules that classify it as campground.

Schroeder: A hot tub is an amenity that we are going to add. It is a wood fired hot tub. Requires no electricity. I forgot to mention this project will all be off grid. The electric will be supplied by solar with very minimal impact. It should not require any permanent footings, so we are trying to keep this off grid and environmentally friendly.

Cogger: It does have running water, but it does not have a kitchen?

Schroeder: Correct, no kitchen. We will encourage our guests to use the local restaurants. I think the power requirements would be too great for cooking. The idea being at some point in the next three to five years, we might cook food for our guests, like a bed and breakfast; but right now, we do not have any plans to do that. There will be no kitchen in the tents. Cogger asked if there will be a washing machine and Schroeder stated no.

Jordan: In the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, a residential dwelling unit is defined as having facilities for cooking, sleeping, and toilet. You are not a shoreland zone, so you fall within the Minimum Lot Size Ordinance and that ordinance does not specify those three components or any components. It just says a room or group of rooms designed and equipped exclusively for the use of a permanent, seasonal, or temporary living quarters for only one family.

Hewlett: If it is a residential dwelling unit, are we thinking minimum lot size of one acre per dwelling unit? Jordan stated yes, and a minimum of five acres for the whole thing.

Hewlett: When you mentioned campground, I looked up the definition in our Site Plan Review Ordinance and a campground is "an area devoted to overnight recreational or educational use where the land area is divided into sites or lots for which a charge is made either on a short-term or long-term basis by sale, rent or lease or condominium type financing." The question is when it says specifically divided into sites or lots are the lots supposed to be minimum lot sizes?

Cogger said a campground would not have that, and Chair Cox stated no. Hewlett stated this site is not divided into separate lots. It is one site with three tents.

Hewlett asked where the camper's parking will be. Schroeder stated there is an additional parking area in front of their house and there is an additional parking lot that the previous homeowners had put in that can accommodate three to four cars. Chair Cox asked if that is right

next to where the leach field will be, and Schroeder stated correct. Hewlett asked if the campers would hike in with flashlights to get to the tents. Schroeder stated exactly. They would park by the street and walk back on the trail to the tents. He stated they would probably put a walkway in as it gets muddy. but it will have a lighted path leading to the tents.

Chair Cox noted that if there was a boardwalk that would need to be delineated because of the wetland. Jordan added that they would want to know the DEP had considered that as part of what is being done in the wetland.

Schroeder: Yes, it is all part of the wetland alteration permit they did. They were accounting for the path, accounting for the three tent sites. They had accounted for the footprint of the solar panels which will be mounted on the ground. It had to include that the previous homeowner had dug a pond in the wetland (I do not think was permitted), so we also accounted for that pond in the square footage of that permit, and for the septic system. The pipe that is going to run through a little bit of the wetland to the front of the property was also accounted for in the square footage.

Cox stated the DEP said the cumulative total wetland impacts 8,004 sq. ft. Jeff stated right. About 6,500 of that is from the pond that was dug. Chair Cox said that is the size of the wetland and then your alteration is 1,804 sq. ft. Jeff stated he had to resubmit that application to add the pond in. He then added 6,500 sq. ft. and 1,804 sq. ft. to get a total of 8,004 sq. ft.

Jordan: When I did the math on the property information, you describe the proposed additions to be 1,633 feet. The dimensions of the tents themselves come out to only 1,530 feet. What is the rest of it? Is it the pathway? Hewlett: Or the solar panels? Jeff stated, yes, exactly. Chair Cox stated it is the pathway, the solar panels and the pipe (which will be above ground). Jordan stated it does not include parking because he already has a parking area.

Chair Cox explained to Schroeder the application needed some changes made under the Property Information section, and they needed the Gartley & Dorsky's wetland delineation plan. The Board also scheduled an on-site visit for June 14, 2021, at 5 p.m. Hewlett asked if the tent locations and the boardwalk could be staked out for the on-site visit. Schroeder stated yes.

Hewlett recommended Schroeder review the Site Plan Review Ordinance, Section V, Performance Standards, 1-20 as the Board will need answers to all the questions concerning his proposed project.

b. Blueberry Cove Associates, 22 Blueberry Cove Road / Map 216, Lot 001

John Knuerr and Ryan LeShane represented Blueberry Cove. The property owner is Tanglewood Camp and Center, d/b/a Blueberry Cove Association. The application is to replace the "Crow's Nest" cabin with a new building that will have two classrooms and two bathrooms on the first floor and a winterized storage space on the second floor. Shoreland Zone District: Marine Residential. Floodplain Designation: VE-12.

Knuerr explained that the new building will assist in the camp's ability to provide more space and be able to offer students educational programs year-round. LeShane explained the organization has been researching and working with a couple of different firms for the last few

years to see what can be done with the "Crow's Nest" and it was decided the building would not serve their needs or meet any of the building codes. Gartley & Dorsky prepared the Site Plan and Silverio-Architecture & Design designed the proposed building. The footprint of the new building will be 2,300 sq. ft., slightly less than the old building. It will be a two-story building which will fit in better with the history, the site, and the other buildings on the property.

The Planning Board reviewed the Property Information on page 1 of the application. Brackett noted that he had documented in red 24.82 acres under Lot Size as he had gotten that information off the town tax cards and did not know where the camp got 22.684 acres. LeShane did not know either as the property had been subdivided and split over the years. He stated it was hard to read through the deeds for an exact number.

Jordan asked about the setbacks. They need the right of way and he suggested they get the water setback. LeShane stated it is at least five hundred (500) feet back from the water and will get the actual number on that. LeShane asked if the right of way meant off Blueberry Cove Road or the setback off Hart's Neck Road. If it was off Hart's Neck Road, it was 767 feet, and Brackett said that was good for him.

Hewlett asked if they had the State Fire Marshal's approval. LeShane stated they did not have it in hand yet. They originally sent this project to the Fire Marshal in 2019 but put the project on hold last spring because of the pandemic. The permit was approved in 2019 but they were not able to just do a renewal because there had been changes in the Code in 2020. The State Fire Marshal acknowledged receipt of the camp's application on April 4, 2021, and they hope to hear from them by Friday, May 28, 2021.

The Planning Board discussed whether an on-site visit was needed. The Board determined there was no need to do a site visit because the application was clear in the request; it was essentially a replacement building in the already developed area; it was not near any critical setbacks; from the arial photographs and google maps none of the project appeared to be visible from any occupied abutter, as area appeared to be all wooded. LeShane stated that there are ample setbacks, and the building will be along the tree line as shown on the site plan.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, to accept the Blueberry Cove Associates application as complete. The vote was 5-0, in favor.

Hewlett asked why the application was checked as not commercial use. Brackett stated it is commercial use and he corrected the application to reflect that. There were no other questions at this time. The Planning Board began the Site Plan Review.

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the architectural drawing of the building and its location fits into the area as it exists now.

2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met as the drawing of the building and its location fits into the area as it exists now.

3. Vehicular Access – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building that will replace the old building will have no effect on vehicular access.
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building that will replace the old building will have no effect on parking and pedestrian circulation.
5. Surface Water Drainage - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building that will replace the old building will not cause any changes to surface water drainage.
6. Existing Utilities - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because none of the specified utilities will be affected by the new building.
7. Advertising Features - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the sign will be no larger than three (3) sq. ft. The determination was stated to be subject to the condition that the sign be no larger than three (3) sq. ft.
8. Special Features and Operations of the Development - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no such features have been proposed in the application.

By a vote of 5-0, the Planning Board found the applicants hours of operation are satisfactory because they are not changing.
9. Exterior Lighting - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the lighting will be down shielded. The determination was stated to be subject to the condition that the lighting be down shielded.
10. Emergency Vehicle Access - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building that will replace the old building will have no effect on emergency vehicular access.
11. Municipal Services – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the addition of the building will have no effect on any of the specified services; the building will enhance the school's use.
12. Water/Air Protection - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building that replaces the old building will not have any effect on water and air pollution.

13. Water Supply - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met based on the applicant's representation that there is sufficient water available.
14. Soil Erosion - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building will not cause any erosion, and based on the applicant's representation, they will adhere to the requirements of the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Construction: Best Management Practices.
15. Sewage Waste Disposal - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met based on the applicant's representation that there is no increase on the load to the septic system.
16. Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because there is no storage of hazardous materials proposed in the application.
17. Financial/Technical Capacity - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the applicant states Blueberry Cove Associates has the financial and the technical capacity to carry out the project.
18. Shoreland Zone - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the new building will be located so far away from the shoreline it will not affect the body of water.
19. Flood Plain - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because the building will not be located in the floodplain.
20. Lot Standards - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed project complies with the setbacks, lot area coverage, and other specified standards.

On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board approved the application by a vote of 5-0, Section V, A1-20 of the Site Plan Review Ordinance with conditions:

The advertising sign be no larger than three (3) square ft.

Best Management Practices will be required.

Receiving permission from the Maine State Fire Marshal's Office.

The exterior lighting will be down shielded.

c. Maine Coast Heritage Trust, 105 Long Cove Road / Map 225, 037

Amanda Devine represented Maine Coast Heritage Trust (MCHT). The application is to add a 30-foot extension to an existing 30-foot-long boardwalk that bridges a wet and muddy section of the trail at the Bamford Preserve on Long Cove. Shoreland Zone District: Marine Residential. Floodplain Designation:

Devine explained the preserve has a 30-foot long and 4-foot-wide wooden boardwalk that extends over a wet section of trail which was permitted three to four years ago. There is 30 feet of the trail just west of the section of boardwalk that is quite mucky. People have been throwing rocks and logs in it and it is unsightly. This project would extend the existing boardwalk another thirty feet.

The Project Description was amended to say a 4-foot-wide wooden boardwalk. Cogger stated the existing bridge is nice and appropriate, strong and sturdy, fits in with the landscape, and that the extension to the boardwalk would be a good improvement.

Chair Cox reviewed the visual scale. Devine stated the boardwalk is about 400 feet from the shore of Long Cove, and it is about 85 feet from the perennial stream that runs through there, but it is within 75 feet of the nearest wetlands. Jordan noted it is sitting in the middle of a wetland, and Devine stated that is correct. Jordan stated the application says this is not in the Shoreland Zone, but it is sitting in the middle of a wetland. CEO Brackett stated he changed the Shoreland Zone District on this application, crossed out no and put in Marine Residential, not Stream Protection. Jordan asked how far it was from the stream. Devine stated it is about 85 feet from the stream.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Jordan, the Planning Board amended the application to state it is a 4-foot-wide boardwalk and that it is 85 feet from the stream then determined the application as complete. The vote was 5-0 in favor. The motion carried.

Jordan noted though this project is 75 feet from the stream, it is within a freshwater wetland, and he asked what the basis is for concluding that was okay four years ago. Hewlett thought it was a safety issue. Cox stated it was following the old wood road and having minimal impact as it was crossing through the thinnest part of the wetlands. DEP has not been triggered on this as it is below the thresholds because the project will not disturb vegetation/soil. Hewlett stated it is 120 sq. ft. if it is 30 feet by 4 feet, and some of basis has to do with its minimal vegetation and soil disturbance.

Devine explained there will not be any propane tanks or hazardous materials involved, no signs will be put up, and no lights will be installed. Cogger felt the proposed project will make the preserve more accessible for everyone.

Site Plan Review Ordinance, Section V, A1-20:

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape
2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment
3. Vehicular Access
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation
5. Surface Water Drainage
6. Existing Utilities
7. Advertising Features
8. Special Features
9. Exterior Lighting

10. Emergency Vehicle Access
11. Municipal Services
12. Water/Air Protection
13. Water Supply
14. Soil Erosion
15. Sewage Waste Disposal
16. Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials
17. Financial/Technical Capacity
18. Shoreland Zone
19. Flood Plain
20. Lot Standards

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board approved the application by a vote of 5-0 as all the Performance Standards are met because the addition of 120 sq. ft. of bridge will not affect any of the specified Performance Standards in Section V, A1-20 of the Site Plan Review Ordinance.

d. John and Leslie Malone, Mosquito Island / Map 202, Lot 001

Will Gartley of Gartley & Dorsky Engineering and Surveying represented the applicants. The application is to remove the existing concrete boat ramp and construct a new boat ramp 500 feet west of the existing boat ramp. The proposed boat ramp will have the same use as the existing boat ramp, access to the island for residential use. Shoreland Zone District: Marine Residential. Floodplain Designation: Zone VE-19.

Gartley included photographs with the application. He pointed out that the existing concrete boat ramp is not in good condition and is in a location that gets beaten by the wave action from storms. The existing ramp is a "cast in place" concrete ramp, has been undermined, and it has moved and shifted. The proposal is to remove that boat ramp and replace it with a new boat ramp around the point from its current location. The new ramp will be built using more traditional pre-cast concrete planks.

Gartley referred to the photos and stated it is in a nice location with regards to the existing slope. "It is easy to come up onto the island and the beach area in the new location is a little sandier, not the large cobbles that are at the other location. It makes the construction of this ramp easier. This is the only access on the island. It is important for them to have a way to get on and off."

Gartley: "They have a total impact below the high-water line that exceeds 500 sq. ft., and that threshold is important because both the Army Corps of Engineers and the DEP look at any project that has an impact below high water with a level of scrutiny. If it is more than 500 sq. ft., then the process is a little more scrutinized. So, we need to have this meeting with you and it be a public meeting prior to being able to submit our permit application to the DEP. I do not expect that we will have any difficulty because they have a boat ramp that we are removing and putting this one in a new location with similar impact. If we can get to an approval, it would need to be pending getting those permits."

Hewlett asked about the rip rap. Gartley stated he did not mention much about it because it is so far above High-Water Line. "You can see on the cross sections that we are above the High-Water Line. There is a section near the boat ramp that is not very tall, 3½ feet high, but it is eroded, and they want to fix that at the same time. Normally, I would not have had to come to the Planning Board, I could have just dealt with Brackett for that, but since we are here, it is on our plan."

Jordan asked if the stabilization rip rap will go to the DEP. Gartley stated will go to the DEP because it is within 25 feet. "Any construction like that that disturbs soil within 25 feet requires a full permit."

Chair Cox: When the existing concrete ramp is removed, you will have to do some re-grading?

Gartley: There is not a lot of re-grading that will need to happen. If you look at Picture 1 and Picture 2, you can see that they are large concrete blocks sitting right on the shore. It is a very shallow shoreline there, so it is just a matter of taking the old concrete out and removing it. You can see in the photos the far side of the ramp; the ground elevation comes out beyond. On the near side of the ramp, it has all been washed away. That is why you see that funny angle on the plan where the high-water mark juts in. It is because of the way this lays out and the way the waves come in there. In those photos the Shoreland Stabilization would be to the left. So that whole dynamic has not worked out well. The location of that ramp has made things worse there.

Gartley: Going around the corner, you get a totally different wave action, and you can see in the next set of photos that show where we are placing it. It is just a totally different situation. It is protected and it is going to be a nice gradual coming out and much easier to use at that location.

Jordan explained to Gartley: We can approve subject to the DEP approval but to make the findings in the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, Section 16(D), it is really useful for the Planning Board to read the DEP approval. Gartley stated he would be willing to come back, whatever works best for the Board. "As soon as I know I am going to have that in hand, we can schedule to come back if you want to do the final findings then. I can get the DEP permit to you as soon as I get it. That does make sense because part of their review is that they send it to IF&W, and DMR so you have both departments looking at it and commenting."

Chair Cox asked if the Board felt an on-site visit was needed; she felt the project seemed to be clear and did not need a site visit. Jordan asked if the Malones owned the whole island. Gartley stated they did.

Jordan: One of the things I discovered is that a permit is not required from the Planning Board to do shoreland stabilization, rip rap, etc. It only says that if shoreland stabilization is going to result in the removal of vegetation in excess of what you can otherwise cut down, then you need a permit from the Planning Board and revegetate. But we have always wondered what we were supposed to be doing about shoreline stabilization. "I believe the answer is nothing unless there is vegetation involved and there is no vegetation involved here from the pictures. I just urge all the members of the Board before this comes back to us again to take a closer look at the existing ordinance in the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, Section 15(C)(10) and see what you think."

Chair Cox stated the application will be placed on hold as it is not yet complete until the Board has the DEP approval, and Gartley will notify CEO Brackett when he has their approval.

e. Michael Smith, 50 Shipyard Road / Map 216, Lot 024

Will Gartley represented the applicant. This is a revision to the original site plan that was approved in August 2020. The footprint of the original plan has changed slightly but the proposed new footprint is no closer than what was approved last year, and the area within the 75-foot setback is 42 sq. ft. less than had been approved.

Gartley explained that after they got the approval last year, Bryan Austin of 2-A Architects was retained to finalize the plans. As Austin worked through the plans and was trying to finalize everything to get them to construction documents, they made some revisions. Austin has been working with Gartley to make sure they kept within the approval that was received in August 2020.

Gartley stated the footprint is slightly different, but they were able to reduce the overall area that was within the 75-foot setback by 42 sq. ft. and none of it was any closer to the water. "It is a different footprint but relatively in the same location. But because it was different, I want to make sure the Planning Board knew it and that it had happened. We will be submitting a full set of plans to CEO Brackett for a building permit soon and we are making sure the height meets the requirements and all the other issues with the building. But the footprint was such a big discussion with the Board last summer, I just wanted to make sure the Planning Board was okay with the minor changes."

Chair Cox said the changes seemed minor. Jordan and Hewlett asked about the dashed red lines. Gartley stated it was the view easement. Cox thought the new footprint had moved closer to the well. Gartley stated it was slightly closer to the well but thought they were going to be okay. "That section of the building is going to be on a frost wall with a slab. There is no basement, so we are not excavating very much there."

Chair Cox thought it seemed reasonable that it was not making any incursion closer to the water than what had been approved. Gartley stated it reduces the footprint within the 75-foot setback by 42 sq. ft. Cox stated this change has not increased the nonconformity and has reduced the square footage within the 75-foot setback. There was no further discussion.

On a motion by Cogger, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 to accept revisions made to the original, approved site plan for Michael Smith because the proposed new footprint has not increased nonconformity and has reduced the square footage within the 75-foot setback.

f. Cranesport, LLC, Mussel Farm Road / Map 222, Lot 028 (pre-application)

Will Gartley represented the applicant. The property owner is George C. Hall & Sons. The application is to relocate Hedges Hall from Point Lookout in Northport to a parcel of land in Long Cove to create an event center and construct several parking areas for the center.

Gartley explained the Site Plan Review pre-application for the Long Cove Event Center. Michael Mullins is the principal for Cranesport. Last year he purchased Hedges Hall from Point Lookout. It is about a 20,000 square foot building. He is in the process of taking it apart, piece by piece, and cataloging it with the idea that he is going to put it back together somewhere. He now has the Long Cove Quarry under contract from George Hall, and he is thinking this would be a "really cool" place to put it.

Chair Cox asked what Mullins wants to do with the 20,000 square foot building. Gartley stated Mullins's intent is to run it as an event center. Chair Cox asked what is an event center? Gartley stated to use for weddings, meetings. Cogger asked if there would be residential capacity there.

Gartley: No. Right now, there is no intent for residential. We would be looking at having an entrance off Rt. 131 that would come in through the parcel and to the edge of the quarry. The idea is that the building would be built at the top. There is a fairly good size water body in there and then there is an area above it that has a lot of piles of granite that have been scattered around there. The intent would be to clean that all up. Use a lot of that granite. Crush it and utilize it for constructing roads and parking and drives and build the building so it would have a neat look down into the quarry and clean up the quarry.

Mullins owns property on Cedar St. in Rockland, and it had an old quarry and does quite a remarkable job cleaning it up and drained the entire quarry, cleaned it all out and built a new dam, and entry and created a beach area.

Gartley: The other advantage to this site is because it is so close to the water, we are working on the potential of bringing this in by barge. Across Route. 1 in Northport, we are working with a property owner to build and access down to the water, work with Prock Marine to load this building on, come down to what was the Great Eastern Mussel Farm. Mullins talked with the new owners of the property about using their bulkhead to come in and unload this building, piece by piece and put it back together.

Hewlett asked if Mullins existing project is the one that can be seen on Route 17. Gartley said yes, on Maverick Street.

Cogger: I live on Long Cove Road. When you talk about draining the quarry in Rockland, Rockland people live on city water. Down here, we all have wells, so we are all plugged into that waterbody in some way.

Gartley: Right. Understood. The good thing about this one is that the water is really clear. Cogger: There is an old car in the quarry. Gartley: The idea is to clean that out, but I do not think that draining this is the plan. For storm water purposes, quarries are unique when it comes to permitting. Because of the quarry rules, there is some Natural Resource Protection exemptions but all the other rules and site law and storm water law, we do still need to go through significant permitting process with the DEP. That will be part of how we are going to deal with the storm water for this. A lot of this water is just filling up the holes and depressions that are out there. We are going to be filling that all in and smoothing it out. So, we will need to

create new detention areas for storm water management. As far as potable water, the intent is to drill wells.

Hewlett: Would you be doing rock crushing onsite? Gartley: Yes, that is the thought. There is so much material there that rather than haul material in, we should be able to just make it right there onsite.

Chair Cox stated that “plopping” something rather large down in the middle of what is a residential neighborhood would be a huge change. The drive into the area off Rt. 131 would be going by several houses and an event center where there are weddings, signals a lot of activity at night. Noise and increase of traffic would significantly impact that neighborhood. Then there is the impact on solid waste and the transfer station, and environmental concerns. Cox felt the whole use of this large building raised concerns.

Hewlett thought because of the noise issue, they would end up severely limiting use of the outside in the evening hours because the location was right in the middle of a neighborhood. She said as much as people do not want to tell you, sound travels, especially if you have an outdoor band.

Cogger felt light pollution had been an issue when the mussel farm was in operation and all that light going across the cove. She said it not only impacted people on Long Cove but on State's Point. Cogger also thought the sounds created by all the crushing of rock would be an issue. She stated there were people who lived in very modest homes along that road, and they would be significantly impacted by whatever went on there. Gartley stated okay.

Chair Cox said the Robinson property seemed to be an island in the middle of the whole property, and they would be impacted significantly. Cogger said they were not there much of the time but yes and they could be impacted. Cogger added that even though the plan was to put in a road from Rt. 131, it looked like there were plans to use the Mussel Farm Road to access it and there are a lot of people on that road; it is not a public road. She was not sure what the limitations of that were.

Gartley: We would look into that. The big use for that access would be getting the building there to begin with. Because we would be coming in from the water. The intent is to have the Rt. 131 access to be the main access for use and if there was an access maintained up Long Cove Road then it would probably be gated and only for a secondary emergency use thing.

Chair Cox stated if they had a lot of weddings back-to-back, the Board would want to know what the volume of traffic would be. How much traffic would that generate? “You are going right by John Bailey and Jane Matthews' house and Bobbi Jo and Elaine Polky's house. A drive-in (road) right there is going to be a concern.” Gartley, “Understood.” Cogger said there was another issue in that another event center was being built on Rt. 131 in So. Thomaston. “So, how many event centers could the area support?”

Cogger: I have walked around where rocks have been moved around. It is an unbelievable concept of a project. There would have to be landscaping and I know he has done all that in

Rockland, but it is tough for local people. We have swum there for years and to have that all change and to also have the noise and disruption; it is a big thing.

Chair Cox asked if the information Gartley got for the pre-application was what he needed. Gartley stated it was good to get the initial feedback and to learn what needed to be focused on. He stated they had already been talking to traffic engineers and Mullins was big into outreach so he would be talking to everybody, all the neighbors before they ever came back to the Planning Board again.

Cogger stated she had a concern regarding traffic coming over the hill from Tenants Harbor where they planned to put in the road off Rt. 131.

Gartley: Sight distance is definitely a concern there. We have had survey crews out there in the last week. One of the first things we were doing was checking sight distances. I have not gotten those results back yet but that is definitely a critical issue.

There was no further business to come before the Board. On a motion by Cogger, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary