

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
June 8, 2021 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in person and via Zoom. Present in person were: Anne Cox, Chair; Jane Brown, Anne Cogger, Ray Emerson, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan, Alan Letourneau, Van Thompson. Also present in person were: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Ann and John Snow, Raelan Marton, Sandra Perry, Jane Matthews, William Reinhardt, Paul LaPorte, Fred Morrell, Jocelyn Paquette. Present via Zoom: Will Gartley, Michael Mullins, Adele Welch, Kate Bourne and Mark Munger, Anne Bardaglio, Michael Felton, Liz Matthews, Alane Kennedy, Margot Kelley, Sue Ferra, and Anita Siegenthaler.

Quorum: A quorum was present. Regular board member Alan Letourneau stepped down and alternate member Anne Cogger stepped up for the review of May 27, 2021, minutes, the MCHT Findings of Fact, and the Blueberry Cove Findings of Fact. Letourneau then returned to his regular voting status.

Conflict of Interest: Alternate member Anne Cogger recused herself during the Site Plan Review pre-application on Cranseport, LLC, stating she had a conflict of interest.

Adjustments to Agenda – None.

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting – May 25, 2021 – The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 1, under Site Plan Review a., change to read: The applicant was present **via Zoom**. The application is **to** construct...

Page 2, 6th full paragraph, correct affluent to **effluent**

Page 6, under #4, line 3, replace vehicular access with **parking and pedestrian circulation**.

Page 6, under #7, line 2, change to read: ...sign will be no **larger than** ...

Page 6, under #10, line 3, insert **emergency** vehicular access.

Page 8, paragraph 3, line 3, change to read: ...it **is** within 75'...

Page 10, paragraph, last paragraph, line 1, change to: ...a permit is **not** required from...

Page 13, 1 paragraph, line 4, change portable to **potable**

A motion was made by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, to approve the minutes of May 25, 2021, as amended. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

Blueberry Cove, 22 Blueberry Cove Road. The following corrections were made:

Page 1, under #4, line 3, replace vehicular access with **parking and pedestrian circulation**.

Page 1, under #7, line 2, change to read: ...sign will be no **larger than** ...

Page 2, under #10, line 3, insert **emergency** vehicular access.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, to approve the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law for Blueberry Cove as amended, and authorize Chair, Anne Cox, to sign the Findings of Fact after the revisions were made. The vote was 5-0 in favor. The motion carried.

Maine Coast Heritage Trust, 105 Long Cove Road.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, to approve the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law for Maine Coast Heritage Trust as written, and authorize Chair, Anne Cox, to sign the Findings of Fact on behalf of the Planning Board. The vote was 5-0 in favor. The motion carried.

Public Comments:

Cranesport, LLC submitted a pre-application which was discussed at the last Planning Board meeting. Chair Cox explained the pre-application process and noted it was a chance for the Planning Board to listen to the applicant's pre-application plan, to give feedback regarding their concerns, and to ask preliminary questions about the project. Chair Cox noted the Board raised quite a few concerns at that meeting but has not received any further information about the project in question. She stated that Mr. Mullins asked for a second pre-application meeting and the Planning Board is honoring his request.

Chair Cox stated should Cranesport, LLC decide to go forward with this application, the Board would then require a complete application and potentially an on-site visitation that would be open to the abutting landowners (within 300)' and to the public. A Public Hearing would then be held and at that time, any member of the public could raise questions and concerns about the project. Then the next step would be for the Planning Board to evaluate the proposal based on the town's Site Plan Review Ordinance.

Chair Cox stated she received three pieces of correspondence regarding the project and read the letters/notes into the record:

Jane Matthews:

"We have just learned about the pre-application to the Town of St. George Planning Board by (Michael) Mullins to erect an event center in the midst of property and quarries previously owned by George Hall. The whole proposal strikes me as absurd. It is completely out of character for this Long Cove and for this series of quarries that truly are the heart and soul of most St. George residents and visitors. Other than Mullins's personal desire to replace these beautiful spaces with his own complex of buildings, roads and parking lots, I cannot see any possible advantage to the town of St. George and certainly not to the many individuals and families that call this peninsula home. The objections are infinite and will be presented if this proposal shows any sign of passing. I am hoping that it will be evident that this project does not belong in this town and that the proposal will die a quick death at your meeting. Thanks for always for listening."

Kate Johanson, 46 Long Cove Road:

"Hello, Planning Board. In response to the May 25 Planning Board meeting regarding the pre-application for Cranesport, LLC to move a building to the property surrounding Long Cove Quarry. As a neighbor of the quarry (I live on Long Cove Road), I have many concerns not necessarily in a particular order: A massive amount of earthwork would be required to prepare a suitable site for such a large building and associated parking areas. That construction would involve rock crushing which would be very noisy and dusty. How long would that take place? Weeks or months? Would blasting be necessary? If so, what about the foundation of my house and that of my neighbors? Most of the land surrounding the quarry where tons of chunks of discarded granite was placed during the operation of the quarry is wetland. There is a brook to

be considered. I wonder about the construction of a suitable system and what would that involve, and how it would affect me and my neighbors' wells? Of great importance is the scale of the building. The largest building was within view of the proposed site would be Sue Ferra's house. I'd estimate it as around 2,500 sq. ft. at the most. The proposed building is 20,000 sq. ft.; that is eight times larger than Ferra's house. It is not just the building but the parking areas and driveways. It is just so huge. Lastly, an 'event center' is not needed in St. George or Long Cove. What is needed much more is housing on a modest scale. Housing that is possible for a working family to afford. Does St. George have to be a location for events? I don't think that idea is in the town comprehensive plan."

Sandra Roak:

"In addition to all the standards which must be met, I am particularly concerned, re. potential destruction of ambiance of this lovely area of the town. Another concern is potential impact on the water table."

Chair Cox asked if there were members of the public who wanted to make a statement.

Fred Morrell: I don't know if you mentioned traffic or not, but I was just at the quarry today and the road would have to be widened and cause a lot of disturbance, and I haven't even seen the picture of how they will assemble a huge building, etc. I think it is an awful idea.

Ann Snow: I think if something like this does proceed, it should come to a town vote, and it shouldn't be decided by the Planning Board. That they ought to make it an open process to make sure that everybody should have a chance to voice their opinion.

Jocelyn Paquette: I agree (with Ann Snow). I think the townspeople and community should voice (their opinion).

There were no other comments at this time.

Site Plan Review:

a. Michael Felton, St. George MSU, 28 Juniper St. / Map 104, Lot 074

The applicant, Superintendent Michael Felton, was present via Zoom. The property owner is the St. George Municipal School Unit (the Town of St. George). The application is to install a 28' x 52' modular classroom with two bathrooms adjacent to the existing school building. This project is not in the Shoreland Zone District or a Floodplain Designation area.

Felton explained the project. The plan is to install a 28' x 52' modular classroom. The structure will have two classrooms and two bathrooms. The modular structure would be installed between the gym area and the entryway by the lower parking lot. They have been working on this for six to seven months to make sure they can connect the modular most effectively and efficiently to the utility and septic system. Some federal grant money was received through the COVID Relief Funds and will be used for this project. Felton stated it is the school's short-term solution for addressing the space needs the school has been facing but are working on other long-term solutions. Felton said he and Randy Elwell worked on this in conjunction with the school's facilities and programming group. They hoped to get the modular installed this summer and have it ready to go next year to relieve some of the space pressures they have been dealing with for the past two years.

Chair Cox asked if the septic system design could handle two more bathrooms. Felton stated yes. They had their septic company check that out and as they were not adding any more people to the building, they did not have any concerns about septic demands.

Hewlett asked if the modular building would be permanent or temporary. Felton stated they have a three-year lease on the modular structure and have been actively looking at how to do renovations and/or do a more permanent addition to the school to meet the space needs. That will be a longer-term effort, but they currently have some short-term needs. They need the space sooner rather than later. This year, one of the kindergarten classes did their math lessons in the gym equipment room because it was the only space available. Felton hoped that within three years they can have a longer-term solution developed.

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

There were no other questions, and the Planning Board began the Site Plan Review.

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed building will fit in with the adjacent structure.

2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the scope of the proposed building will fit in with the environment.

3. Vehicular 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 proposed building will not affect 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 proposed building will not affect parking and pedestrian circulation.

5. Surface Water Drainage – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because this is a small addition to the impervious surface around the building and will have minimal effect on surface water drainage, and there is plenty of undisturbed lawn area to absorb run-off waters.

6. Existing Utilities – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard is met because the addition of the two bathrooms will not be increasing the number of people on the premises, there will be no increase in the water usage or the other specified utilities.

7. Advertising Features – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because no advertising features are proposed.

8. Special Features – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because no specified special features are proposed.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 the standard is met because there is no change in the hours of operation.

9. Exterior Lighting – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because no exterior lighting is proposed.

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 proposed building will have no significant 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 is met because there will be no adverse effect on municipal services as specified in the standards.

12. Water/Air Protection – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed building will not have an effect on the production of air and water pollution.

13. Water Supply – On motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the building and two bathrooms will have minimal effect on the water supply.

14. Soil Erosion – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed building will not have an effect on soil erosion and will be built on a level area of the property.

15. Sewage Waste Disposal – On motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the building and two bathrooms will have minimal effect on the sewage waste disposal.

16. Hazardous, Special, and Radioactive Materials – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard is met because no hazardous materials are proposed.

17. Financial/Technical Capacity – 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 this project is within the school budget's means and the contractor has the technical capacity to carry out the work.

18. Shoreland Zone – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because this project is not in the Shoreland Zone.

19. Flood Plain – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because the project is not in a Floodplain.

20. Lot Standards - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because all the setback requirements and height restrictions are complied with and will not result in excess lot coverage.

On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board approved the application by a vote of 5-0, under Section V, A1-20 of the Site Plan Review Ordinance.

b. St. George Community Development Corporation (CDC), 47 Main St. / Map 104, Lot 074 Margot Kelley, owner of the property, was present via Zoom and represented the CDC. The application is to invite regional food trucks to set up in the CDC gravel lot, 1-2 days a week during the summer. Only one truck will be there at a time. This project is not in the Shoreland Zone District or in a Floodplain Designation area.

Kelley explained the application. When it became clear that Luke's Lobster was not reopening for the summer, they brainstormed about ways to create other interesting alternatives for the community and proposed they would invite some food trucks to come 1-2 days a week from 11 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays and possibly one other day. Given the short prep time for it, they think they can only do this one day a week.

Chair Cox asked if the food truck would be parked in the upper level of the parking lot and about vehicular circulation. Would there be a "jam up" in that lot? Kelley did not see that happening. Hewlett asked if they planned to have picnic tables. Kelley said they were grading the lower part where the container was, putting in some gravel, and would have three picnic tables down below, but it would be easy in and out access if people just wanted to pick up and leave.

Hewlett asked if there would be any bathroom facilities or a porta-potty available. Kelley said they had a bathroom facility on-site, but she did not anticipate that being part of what they needed.

Chair Cox asked if they would be trying to get this up and going as soon as possible if approved. Kelley thought they would plan for 15 weeks for the food truck from July, August, and maybe into September.

Hewlett asked about having trash cans or dumpsters at the site. Chair Cox asked if the CDC would have a trash can, or would the food truck have a trash can? Kelley stated the food truck would.

Kelley stated they had not reached out to food trucks until the CDC heard from the Planning Board. Hewlett asked if this became popular, would the CDC come back to the Planning Board to request additional hours of operation, or did they want to wait to discuss that. Kelley stated if it became popular and nothing happened at the Miller's landing next year, they might ask for additional hours next summer. She stated that it would be preferable to have Miller's landing being a site.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a vote of 5-0, to accept the application as complete.

Jordan asked if the food truck is considered a structure. Kelley stated it is not; it is not even a temporary structure. Chair Cox stated it is a vehicle. Hewlett noted that the truck will leave the site. Jordan agreed and asked what the Planning Board has to approve as he does not think this is considered a structure. Letourneau stated it is a commercial activity which is why CEO Brackett sent it to the Planning Board, yet it does not seem to fall under any of the town ordinances.

Jordan stated it could be considered a change of use, but Kelley stated except it really was not. Chair Cox said there will potentially more traffic coming and going at the parking lot area. Kelley said yes except it is just more traffic on a different day as there already is a lot of traffic at the parking lot.

Jordan said he did not have any issues with the application; he just did not know if the Planning Board had any jurisdiction over this project. Chair Cox agreed. Jordan, "Is there a different kind of license that is required to have a food service operation?" CEO Brackett said food prep would need a food license from the town. Jordan asked if the license was obtained through the Select Board? Bates stated yes; a victualer's license would need to be approved by the Select Board.

Chair Cox: Then all we can say is that given the limited hours of operation, one food truck, one day a week, from 11 a.m. to 8 p.m., the Planning Board can determine they see no conflict with the standards, but it does not fit under the Site Plan Review.

Jordan: Unless we think it is a change of use (uses as well as structures) are covered by the ordinance. If we think of it as expanded use, then that would be the only reason we would need to go through the standards.

Ann Snow thought they would need at least four trash cans strategically located and maybe make arrangements for someone to pick up the trash as it might be too much for the food truck to do. Emerson said the food truck vendor should be responsible for the trash, and Chair Cox thought the CDC would be overseeing this because it is on their property. Letourneau asked Kelley if the CDC could make a point to put out the trash cans. Kelley said they would.

Jordan asked Bates about the license from the town. Select Board Chair Bates directed the Board to the victualers license application on the town website and noted it was incumbent on the food truck (more than the CDC) to apply for the license from the town of St. George. Letourneau asked if that meant the Planning Board would not be issuing a permit, and Cox and Emerson stated the town Select Board would have to issue a victualer's license.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Letourneau, it was determined by a vote of 5-0 that a visiting food truck is neither a structure nor a change in use as defined by the Ordinance, and therefore, the Planning Board has no jurisdiction over this issue.

Hewlett asked if the application fee would get refunded. Chair Cox suggested Kelley talk with CEO Brackett about this.

Chair Cox introduced Van Thompson who was approved by the Select Board to serve as an alternate on the Planning Board, effective July 1, 2021. Alternate member, Anne Cogger, stated

she has a conflict of interest with Cranesport, LLC, and Thompson was asked to step up as the alternate to hear this application.

c. Cranesport, LLC (pre-application) – Mussel Farm Road

The applicant, Michael Mullins, was present via Zoom. The application is to relocate Hedges Hall from Point Lookout in Northport to a parcel of land on Mussel Farm Road in Long Cove and create an event center.

Chair Cox started the pre-application meeting by asking Mullins why he requested a second pre-application as no new information was received and two weeks ago the project was presented by Will Gartley. Mullins stated he missed the last meeting and wanted to introduce himself to the Board and the public. Mullins stated they had debated presenting additional information but wanted to get before the Board sooner rather than later. Mullins stated he received several emails, and feedback from Gartley. He felt people may have misunderstood his intent and wanted to get the facts out on what was being proposed and to understand peoples' assumptions about what it was or was not going to be.

Mullins gave a brief introduction and history regarding his purchase of the former Crockett's Quarry in Rockland where he now lives, the work he has done on the quarry, and how he has tried to enhance and preserve it. He stated he discovered the Long Cove quarry about five years ago.

Mullins explained that on August 14, 2020, Hedges Hall, one of several buildings of the Point Lookout facility in Northport was being auctioned off. He stated the building is 25-27 years old and built as part of the MBNA sweep. He stated he placed a bid with the plan to salvage it but wondered if there was a way he could save the building. Mullins stated that it did not make sense a building that young and that splendid on the inside, would just get scrapped. So, he started a company and hired twenty people to disassemble it. Mullins noted in one of the emails he received, it asked how he was going to bring a 20,000 sq. ft. building on a barge. Mullins's answer, they are not. Mullins stated they are taking it down and have over 200 pallets in storage in a warehouse in Northport and then they are breaking the larger building down into sections that can be transported over the road or by boat.

Mullins stated that he has been looking for a site and use for the building. He loves the Long Cove quarry area and thinks an event center is the best use. He stated it did not have to be an event center, but it is definitely not going to be a convention center. The building use will be for wedding venues, though there could be some ancillary events. He wants to find out from the Board if there are any perceived negatives and why.

Chair Cox said she hoped Gartley communicated some of the Planning Board's concerns. Mullins said his biggest concern is that people are upset we are just even having the conversation (about this project). He stated he briefly reviewed the zoning ordinance, didn't see an ordinance that prohibited this, but would like to understand what the perceived negatives are. Mullins, "If this Board has said it is not going to happen, what I would like to do is just come back with a different use of the building at this location and maybe that would be more productive to talk about that."

Chair Cox suggested that Mullins review the Site Plan Review criteria and the 20 Performance Standards in the Site Plan Review Ordinance. She stated the Board also reviews environmental issues and traffic patterns, and she would have questions such as would a large wedding venue or other events, fit with the residential and rural character of the town as referenced in the St. George Comprehensive Plan?

Mullins asked how many events did they imagined would occur there? Chair Cox stated she had no idea because he did not have a business plan or detailed information about what he was planning and that everything would be based on speculation at this point.

Jordan, "It is not that we have made any decision or have any particular hostility towards the project, but this is a much larger development than the Board is used to seeing. Therefore, we expected a lot of community concerns, but also the size and scope of it means there is a premium on finding out exactly how it is going to affect the surrounding area, run-off into the cove. How is it going to affect the water supply for the neighbors? This is a densely populated residential area for St. George, so there are many things that the ordinance requires us to make findings about. And although we can do that fairly quickly in some cases, we are not going to be able to do this quickly without significant information from you and from professionals that might need to be hired to do hydrology or other areas." Jordan stated he was not throwing obstacles out but was trying to tell Mullins what the process was and also recommended he review the Site Plan Review Ordinance. Mullins said he understood.

Hewlett thought the water table was a huge issue on Long Cove. "There are people who run dry during the summer and if you are thinking of altering the quarry in any way, it could affect other people's wells," and she added that there were no municipal sewage plants in town.

Mullins said one of the problems they encountered at the proposed site was limited soils and they had to select the location based on where they could find the right soils. He said when he looked at Long Cove, he thought it would be perceived as an industrial site because of the seafood plant below and the fishing wharf. He thought between the industrial waterfront development and the residential neighborhood, the building (which is about one-half acre in size) on a 30-acre site would be acceptable as a transition.

Mullins discussed potential activity at the site. He estimated about 44 weddings a year, with 100-150 in attendance at each wedding. He expected most of the weddings to occur during the summer months on Fridays and/or Saturdays, and very few if any the rest of the year. Mullins, "Where this center would fit in with other wedding centers is it is a bigger facility and would accommodate more people, but at the same time the price is on the high end, so you would have fewer events." He stated he would like to talk with people about this as he thought this venue fitted a different kind of role. Mullins stated they could look at the sound issue but there would be no outdoor tents; this would be an all-internal event center.

Chair Cox explained the Board must look at how the building fits in with the natural and cultural environments. Mullins stated he was looking to find a home for this building and thinks the obvious thing to do is to find a use that uses less parking. He said for example, would the Board be amenable to something less intensive with the same building in that location? Chair Cox stated she did not believe the Board could answer that until they had a complete application

proposal. Mullins stated he could put together more information and come back for another pre-application or the regular application process.

Hewlett thought one of the hurdles would be noise. "If you look through our past applications, we are very strict with shutting down properties at certain hours for noise and we have all been to weddings. They all end up outside, smoking and drinking. And people there looking at the beautiful quarry, the sound will carry due to all the rock." Mullins said he could see that.

Hewlett, "Then it is a how do you control hours of use? How do you shut things down when time ends? How do you control noise and things like that?"

Chair Cox thought it seemed like the question he asked is could he come back? Chair Cox suggested Mullins put together an application packet and come back to Board for a decision rather than do another pre-application. Planning Board members agreed. Jordan said the role the Planning Board plays is interpreting and applying the ordinance not collaborating on the plan for the project, so he (Mullins) would have to decide what he wanted to do.

Mullins said that made total sense. "I do not want to anger people. I looked at it and did not see a prohibition on this. I thought it would be good. I think I should go back in conference with Gartley and talk about this. We have a couple of different ideas and if I need to, I can talk with the CEO."

Jane Matthews (an abutter), From responses that we have all had here, we would prefer that you (Mullins) look at it like a snowball. Mullins stated he would have a conversation with an abutter or anyone else. He said he knew some people had already written to the Board to say they did not even want to have a conversation, but Mullins said he would like to engage with people if they wanted to.

LaPorte: They have to make money. That is all I have to say.

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 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary