

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
June 22, 2021 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. in person and via Zoom. Present in person were: Chair Anne Cox, Jane Brown, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan, Alan Letourneau, Anne Cogger, and Van Thompson. Also present in person were: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Polly and Dennis Davis, Linda Duncan, Karen Hardy, Sandra Perry, Matthew Epple, Trina and Jeffery Schroeder, Andrew Hedrich, and Joe Richardi. Present via Zoom were: Bill Hall, Kimberly Lehmann, Sandra Roak, Paul Amos, Patty and Lee Tredway.

Quorum: A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Adjustments to Agenda - The following adjustment was made:

- A Discussion Regarding Meeting Format was added to the agenda under Other Business

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting — June 8, 2021 – The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 5, #5, line 4, correct unserved to **undisturbed**

Page 4, #7, line 2, change to read: ...because **no advertising features** are proposed.

Page 5, #9, line 2, change to read: ...because **no exterior lighting is** proposed.

Page 6, under b. St. George CDC, line 2, change to read: Margot Kelley, **owner of the property**, was...

Page 7, paragraph 8, line 2, change to read: ... food truck **is neither a structure nor a change in use as defined by the Ordinance**, and...

A motion was made by Letourneau, seconded by Brown, to approve the minutes of June 8, 2021, as amended. The vote was 5-0 in favor.

On-Site Inspection – Jeffrey Schroeder, 162 Drift Inn Road, June 14, 2021

The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 1, paragraph 3, line 5, delete the word **be**

Page 2, paragraph 8, line 2, change the word cookies to **footings**.

Page 3, paragraph 7, line 2, delete the word **and**

Page 3, paragraph 1, line 1, change the word quarter to **corner** and change the word fence to **tent**.

Page 3, paragraph 4, line 1, delete the word be and insert the word **have**

A motion was made by Brown, seconded by Letourneau, to approve the Schroeder On-site minutes of June 8, 2021, as amended. The vote was 5-0 in favor.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

St. George Municipal School Unit, 28 Juniper Street. The following corrections were made:

Page 1, #5, line 4, correct unserved to **undisturbed**

Page 1, #7, line 2, change to read: ...because **no advertising features** are proposed.

Page 1, #9, line 2, change to read: ...because **no exterior lighting is** proposed.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett to approve the Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law for the St. George MSU, as amended, and authorize Chair, Anne Cox, to sign the Findings on behalf of the Planning Board. The vote was 5-0 in favor.

Public Comments: Chair Cox received two letters. One was pertinent to tonight's meeting and the other letter was pertinent to the Long Cove Quarry. The letter regarding Long Cove Quarry will be given to CEO Brackett for the file, and Chair Cox will read that letter if an application comes before the Planning Board.

The following letter was sent electronically to Anne Cox, via the town's website, and read the letter into the record.

To the St. George Planning Board: We would like to start by saying that we are not at all opposed to Lehmann's desire to make improvements to their property on Riverview Lane on Otis Point. We believe in the importance of individual property rights and know that those kinds of investments are beneficial to the broader community as well.

At this point, the Lehmann's have only approached us via email with regard to their dock aspirations. Our response was and is that we do not oppose their desire to build a dock as long as it doesn't require any concession on our part or infringe in any way on our own current and future property and riparian rights.

Our lot is next to Lehmann's and is the smallest parcel on Otis Point. Consequently, we would be especially sensitive to any claims that might restrict access to our cabin. The mention of blasting by Joe Richardi to expand their basement is also a concern given the very close proximity to our foundation pilings which are not pinned and our septic system. Both of our places were originally built by Leland Overlock around 1960. Our recollection is that Lehmann's cabin was renovated and expanded by Sally Landsberg when she returned from California sometime in 1989 to 1990.

We appreciate the Board's diligence and look forward to staying involved in the process. Best regards, Raelani and Russ Marton, Sondra Perry

Matthew Epple was present and commented on Schroeder's application for a luxury camping area. "I have not heard much public opinion on this, but my concern is what we are looking at is a proposal to establish (three) tents within the area. There are a number of multi-acre lots there. My concern is that if the town approves this, we are going to have quite a population of tents down there within the next five years, and just the pedestrian traffic alone on the roads going out to the lighthouse. I have property down Cottage Road. We are constantly impacted by people walking private roads. I just have a concern that this thing will blossom once it is permitted like letting the cat out of the bag where you can't say no to the next guy. As I said, there are a number of large lots in that center area between Rt. 131 and the Drift Inn Beach Road. That is my concern. The town is going to see quite a development of this type which I oppose."

Paul Amos via Zoom spoke. "I would just concur with the gentleman who has just spoken before. My concern as someone who is living outside of the community but has property on Drift Inn Road that there could potentially be a run on these properties and a continuation of this type of a tent city being put forth. I do not know what the long-term plan for the community would be, but it is something that I would want to understand. "I was not informed of this. I was not on the original mailing the city sent out despite the fact that our property is almost contiguous to this property. It has been something that I only found out about via text today

thanks to one of the citizens in the community. I would want to better understand what is happening and what this plan to execute is before I made any type of decision. So, in that case, I am not necessarily opposed but I am certainly questioning what is happening there and this potential for this tent camp."

Lee and Patricia Tredway spoke via Zoom. Lee, "We have property at 10 People's Road. We have great concerns over this. If nothing else, just the traffic increase on Drift Inn Road. The parking of vehicles on Drift Inn Road. Everyone knows that Drift Inn Road in the summertime and any time in good weather is a great pedestrian way. I am concerned that what we are going to see is campers, RV vehicles, and it is just going to, we think, have a detrimental effect on the whole character of that area."

Patricia Tredway, "As my husband just said, there is a lot of pedestrian traffic on Drift Inn Road heading down to Marshall Point. Heading down to the Port and in the summertime, it gets quite busy on Drift Inn Road. There is a lot of congestion. A lot of trucks, cars traveling much too quickly, and I am just concerned about additional cars down there. And real concerns about parking. It does not seem like there is sufficient room on their property for parking. We have concerns. And I think it is going to change the character of our lovely community."

There were no other public comments.

Site Plan Review:

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

The applicants, Jeffrey and Trina Schroeder, were present in person. 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, one and one-half stories with a loft, and will sit on wood decks supported by concrete piers. The tents will be located adjacent to a wetland.

Chair Cox reported an on-site visit was done on June 14, 2021. No further information was received from the applicants on this project other than what was submitted with the application.

The Schroeder's explained their application proposal. This business is being called a luxury camping business. It will involve having two to three tents on the back of their property. The tents are 400 sq. foot tents with shower, toilet, sink, a loft space up above. There is a deck out front. These are meant to be upscale dwellings, upscale tents catering to families and other visitors to Port Clyde and St. George but focusing on families. Up to four people can stay in each tent.

On the larger scale drawing, Mr. Schroeder pointed out the main wetland area. He noted the tents will have very minimal impact on the community in terms of visuals, as to being able to see them from the road. "You cannot see the tents from the road as you saw during the walkthrough. I do not believe you can see the tents from any property adjacent to our property. The only question was on the Cushman property. Potentially they could see that third tent, but I do not think so.

"It is pretty constricted back there in terms of where you can place these tents because here (and he referred to the visual) is standing water and mud. This is really the only high ground area

there where you could put them, and the other adjacent property is all wetlands. You are up to your ankles in mud and water walking through there. In terms of being able to put more tents back there, it is just not possible. This would be the maximum that we would be able to put on our property, and that is all we want to manage, ... are the tents.

"They are going to be off-grid tents. They will be run by solar panels. They will have toilets, so we will have to put a septic system in. The septic leach field will be at the front of the property. It will be where the good soil is. Back there, that land does not offer good enough soil to put in a leach field. The tents will be supplied with fresh water via a water tank. They will be filled by a water truck.

"We are not planning on having any signage out there or creating any additional parking. We have a small parking area that can accommodate up to three vehicles. We are not going to expand on that. If you were to walk past that house, you probably would not be able to tell there are tents back there just because of the way they are oriented on the property and the blockage from the trees.

"We think the business will offer a little bit more diversity to the community that is available in St. George. It will offer something different to visitors that already come to Port Clyde in the summer. I understand in talking with some folks who work for Linda Bean that there is sort of a shortage of rental properties in St. George. So, we hope to slightly alleviate that issue and we are going to encourage our guests to take advantage of local businesses, restaurants, the general store, the Monhegan Boat Line, and other (businesses).

"We are not going to provide food. There is no cooking allowed in the tents. We will have a fire pit there for guests to have fires and down the line, we may add a barbecue back there, a wood barbecue, or charcoal barbeque. Other than that, there is no cooking in the tents."

Planning Board members comments and questions.

Hewlett requested a parking schematic.

Cox noted the plot plan is not to scale and it did not show: the parking; where the water tank will go; where the solar panels will be placed; the route of the above-ground septic line; the walkway; and the stairs to each tent.

Mr. Schroeder acknowledged that and noted the space between the tents is 45 feet.

Hewlett: We would want to know exactly where the tents are going, where the wetlands are, and also where the walkway will be.

Hewlett: With regards to emergency access, the four-foot (4') wide walkway would not be (wide) enough. If we have to carry someone out in a Stokes stretcher/basket, we will need at least a six (6') wide walkway especially if we were carrying somebody 700 feet.

Cox stated the Planning Board had Schroeder's verbal descriptions and visited the site but need a written plan and a full-scale site plan documenting items such as the location of the above-ground septic line, how it will be insulated, and how high will the leach field mound be?

Mr. Schroeder: The leach field will be two feet (2') above ground. The pump line is two inch (2") pipe and there will be a few inches of fill over the top of that. The pipe has to be insulated. Even though we will not be operating in the winter, the code says it has to be insulated, so we will be insulating the pump line.

Cox stated a six (6") size bump would be noticeable. In the diagram, the pipe is running between the pond and the stone wall where the guests/people will be walking which raises the question of safety. Hewlett said it could cause tripping hazards.

Cox: And at night even though there might be solar lights, the pond is right there.

Mr. Schroeder: It (the pipe) is not going to be on the walkway at all. It will go along that wall and then it will go underground into the septic tank. That is the way the contractor described it.

Cox explained to the Schroeder's the Board needed to review the town's Minimum Lot Size Ordinance and the Site Plan Review Ordinance as to the nature of the tents. Cox and Hewlett, "What are they? Buildings, structures, dwelling units, bunkhouses, or luxury camping projects?" Cox, "It is not a pup tent that can be taken down. It seems like a canvas building."

The Planning Board reviewed the Site Plan Review Ordinance, Section XIII, Definitions (page 22), RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNIT: A room or group of rooms designed and equipped exclusively for use as permanent, seasonal, or temporary living quarters for only one family. The term shall include mobile homes, but not recreational vehicles. Jordan, "Seems to me we are looking at that definition."

Mr. Schroeder: Somebody mentioned RVs. There will be no RVs, just the tents.

Jordan: In this case, I think, temporary is the right word because it is not the whole season we are dealing with in residential dwellings. This took me back to the Minimum Lot Size Ordinance definition of Multi-unit Residential which is a residential structure containing three or more residential dwelling units. We have one dwelling unit on the property now, that is the house. Then you are proposing to add three more. From there you go back to page three (3) of the Minimum Lot Size Ordinance, Section 9, Land Use Standards (applicable throughout the town). In Section 9(A)(b) there is a provision that multi-unit residential shall be located on lots or parcels of land which contain a minimum of five (5) acres.

The Planning Board and the Schroeder's discussed what was meant by multi-unit as well as what a dwelling was. Mr. Schroeder thought of a multi-unit as a condo or something similar which had one building with multi rental units, and Mrs. Schroeder thought a dwelling was more permanent.

Jordan: If we are talking about multiple dwelling units, which means more than one dwelling unit, and a dwelling is defined in our ordinance as seasonal. This is not a campsite; this is not a pup tent. You do not have five (5) acres.

Letourneau referred them to Section 9(B)(a). "It also says for each residential dwelling unit there shall be at least one acre of lot area."

Cox read: "Exclusive of public and private rights of way and land not suitable for development in accordance with current state and town ordinances.: She stated, so it would be there is a limit to the amount of the wetland that could be tampered with, so we would have to look at how much of the 3.15 acres is buildable. Because there is a limit to how much you can tamper within the wetland.

Mr. Schroeder asked how the one-acre rule works because there are a lot of lots in St. George that are a one-quarter acre or one-half acre. Chair Cox and Jordan explained the lots were in place before the ordinance was changed and adopted in 1989 so there are nonconforming lots from that time.

Chair Cox: Wetlands are of great concern and a huge concern not to encroach on those. You bought the property where somebody has encroached by building a pond. It seems that you are going to have less than three acres of buildable land given the wetlands.

Chair Cox felt the most that could be permitted was one more dwelling unit on the parcel of property.

Mrs. Schroeder: I am still not clear on that. Even though it is not a pup tent, it is not a permanent structure. It is not like we are building a foundation with a house, so even though it is not considered a tent, it is not a cabin with a foundation.

Cox stated they were putting footings down of some sort. (Jeff stated pads that could be removed.) Hewlett explained that people would be sleeping there, and it was considered a dwelling unit. Cox also explained that it was a dwelling unit according to the town's definition, and they had mentioned the possibility of putting heat pumps in to extend the season.

Mrs. Schroeder asked if the difference between the tent and a dwelling was that it was a permanent, seasonal use. Hewlett stated it was not permanent. It was that they would have a structure on their property where someone was going to be sleeping. Cox explained that they could construct something like a bunkhouse on concrete pads. "This is essentially a canvas bunkhouse which in this definition is a dwelling unit."

Mr. Schroeder asked what the implication of that was. Cox stated that it seemed to her that given the size of their lot, they would be able to build only one structure, not three. Mr. Schroeder asked about a piece in the ordinance that talked about coverage and stated they were well under the 20% lot coverage by a building. Jordan explained they had to comply with all the standards.

Mr. Schroeder: What is the standard we are not complying with?

Chair Cox stated the number of units, and Hewlett noted it was their acreage because the town ordinance states a minimum of one acre per unit. Jordan, "One acre per unit and five acres if you have three or more. Three acres is not enough. You have to have five."

Jeff: I don't know if I agree with the multi-unit definition you stated because we need to clarify what that means.

Jordan: If you get three or more dwelling units on a lot, the lot has to be five acres.

Hewlett: And don't forget your house. That counts as one.

Letourneau: Our job is simply to let you know what the ordinances say that have been put into place and whether or not your particular project is in compliance with those ordinances. And in this case, what we are running into is this language which is suggesting that you need more land than you currently have in order to do the plan as is as you have proposed.

Jeff: You are saying one tent is allowable?

Cox: Based on that definition that is possible, but various issues have emerged, and we have begun to enumerate those. "Questions in terms of the standards. Will you be able to meet the safety standards? Can rescue and/or ambulance rescue get back there safely? Setbacks from the property lines."

Cox recommended they evaluate whether they want to go forward with the project knowing the ordinance restricted them to only one tent. If they wanted to pursue having one tent, then the Planning Board would need to know all the actual measurements. She noted that they have already delineated the wetlands and have a plan for the septic system.

Chair Cox explained the Planning Board would also need to know the following: Where does the septic system run? Where the profile of the bump is? Show where the grinder pump will be on the site. Where are the showers to be installed? Where will the solar panels be placed? Do they have a battery backup for the solar panels? Delineate the walkway.

Mrs. Schroeder stated they had looked through several of the documents, answered the 20 Performance Standard questions and that was great. She asked where they could find the best list or a checklist of what the Planning Board needs to have included in their plan as they mentioned several other things. Jordan suggested they start on page four (4) of the Site Plan Review Ordinance, Section IV(B).

Mr. and Mrs. Schroeder asked if what the Planning Board needed was the layout of the walkways and the positioning of everything. Hewlett stated the drawing/plan needed to be to scale and referred them to the septic sketch plan done by Gartley & Dorsky. Hewlett noted that before they invested a lot of money into the project, to be aware that they are restricted by their acreage. Schroeder stated, "Exactly, and that was why we wanted to confirm how many tents we would be allowed to build because they have three acres." Cox thought they had less than three buildable acres.

Jordan stated the application would need to state what the acreage was of the wetland, so the Board could deduct and find out the net amount. "If that leaves you with two acres, you could build one unit."

Mr. Schroeder asked what the Board meant by buildable? Hewlett said it was one additional unit because their home was one dwelling unit. "If it turns out you come up with one more acre then you could build one tent."

Mr. Schroeder: If the property is three acres, doesn't that mean three buildings?

Hewlett: No, it is not buildable. You cannot put a tent in the middle of your pond so the pond is going to have to be subtracted from buildable acreage, and the wetlands cannot be infringed upon. It is a certain percentage that you were allowed to infringe on.

Mrs. Schroeder: All that deducted and whatever is left, it has to make sure that there is one acre.

Mr. Schroeder: You can get a permit to develop a wetland and I am not saying I want to do that, but I could apply for a permit and develop more of the wetlands. So, that buildable definition is like a sliding scale depending on what the state approves in terms of how much land can be developed. I just wonder how close we are to get a second tent; if it is worth trying to get a new permit from the state to develop more of the wetland.

Jordan read from Section 9(B)(a) of the Minimum Lot Size Ordinance. He stated that the Board suspects that much of that wetland falls under that exclusion whether it is less than .15 acres or whether that leaves them with three acres, he did not know.

Jordan stated the other constraint was they did not have five acres so they could not put up two more dwellings. Cox agreed. Jordan explained that for three dwellings, they would need to have five acres as their house would be one dwelling.

Mr. Schroeder: What if it was one big building with three units? Jordan stated the same rule would apply.

Mr. Schroeder: What if we downgraded to cheaper tents, smaller campground style setups, yurts, or something like that? Hewlett stated the size did not matter. It is one acre per dwelling.

Mr. Schroeder stated that they would move forward with the one tent and would revisit their application. Chair Cox referred them to the beginning of the Site Plan Review for what the Planning Board would need to have. Mr. Schroeder asked if they should have an architect walk the area and have a professional blueprint done.

Cox: You could. Anybody could. You already have a scaled drawing so if you need to hire somebody to do drafting, sure. But you could run your line and measure how far the septic field is from the road, include the parking, and draw it in on the plan.

Letourneau: You should be aware that within the Standards it does point out that there is a minimum size for each parking space.

Cogger: When we did the site visit, there was a question about how far the units needed to be from the property line. Is it 20' or 10'? What is that number?

Jordan: In the Site Plan Review Ordinance, it is Item 20 under the Performance Standards and the requirement is 20 feet as this a Commercial use.

Cox explained they would need to decide if they wanted to continue the application process for one tent knowing that the Board might have more questions as they work through the 20

Performance Standards. She said there may be some roadblocks as the Planning Board goes through those. Mr. Schroeder asked if the Board knew what the roadblocks might be.

Cox stated safety issues and Hewlett added if you put a tent 700' on the backside of your property, you are asking the emergency staff to walk 700' to go get your person/patient.

Chair Cox read Performance Standard #10. Emergency Vehicle Access. Provisions shall be made for providing and maintaining convenient and safe emergency vehicle access to all buildings and structures at all times. She stated that is a big question. Hewlett noted that they recently had to use a Stokes stretcher, and it took the entire width of the ramp; so, a minimum of six-foot width.

Hewlett: A fire truck will not be able to get back there so they would be pulling hoses which is a time delay, but they will get there.

Chair Cox stated that the Board may need to have a representative of the fire department say whether they can access the site with their hoses and if the Schroeder's plan is sufficient.

Chair Cox stated the Schroeder's should think about their hours of operation if they plan to be open from April through October since the water still freezes (here) in April. The Planning Board would also want to know the plan for removing the water from the hot tubs.

Cox: Our job is to administer the ordinances the best we can and protect the environment; a lot of the standards have to do with the environment. Also, how much of an impact would the business cause on municipal services? And there are questions about increasing density. How would it impact traffic? Maybe one would not, but three or more would.

Hewlett: The property map needs to be included as part of the application. It is a unique area you happen to live in as your property abuts three additional properties. When you look at your property, it looks like you go from front to back, but it turns out, the back is someone else's property. Four other properties are touching it which may make the environmental impact more important.

Mrs. Schroder asked if they should include their discussion with Clifford Sherman, an abutter, who asked how they would manage the fire pit with it being dry.

Cox told them to figure out whether they wanted to continue the process, knowing that one tent would be the most allowed. If so, they need a large-scale drawing/plan and to include as much information and detail as possible.

Building Permit:

a. Robert & Kimberly Lehmann, 3 Riverview Lane / Map 217, Lot 042

Andrew Hedrich, Civil Engineer from Gartley & Dorsky, and Joe Richardi of Richardi Construction represented the applicants. The application is to remove and replace the existing residence from the edge of the shoreline to the fullest extent possible and construct a 6-foot wide by 30-foot-long pier with a seasonal 3 foot wide by 40-foot-long ramp and an 8 foot by 10-foot float. Shoreland Zone District: Marine Residential.

Hedrich explained the project. This is a building relocation project on a nonconforming lot located on Riverview Lane off Otis Point Road. On the visuals, Hedrich noted the area of the existing structure. He stated the deck on the waterside is within two feet (2') of the Highest Annual Tide (HAT) line. The Lehmanns would like to rebuild a new structure. It would be a smaller footprint than the current structure and they are going to move it back to try to meet all the setbacks to the greatest extent. It is nonconforming because it is within 75' of the HAT, and they cannot get outside of that. The entire lot is in the 75' buffer. It will be moved behind the 25' setback and in addition, they will try to pick up some room along the abutter's setback. Hedrich stated that right now, the distance between the abutting properties, the building, and the abutting boundary line is about five feet (5'), and they are going to improve that to about 17' to make some room there.

A new house will be constructed on a new foundation. They will slide the entire structure back trying to maintain their existing parking area and slide it as close to that property line as far as they can. They will be encroaching in the right of way setback, but they felt that was a better compromise. By sliding it back, they get it outside the twenty-five feet (25'), outside the abutting property owner's sight line.

Hedrich stated a new septic tank is being proposed and on the visual pointed out the area of the existing tank. He said the new tank location will be moved and have a new pump station. Where the existing septic field is, it prevents them from moving the structure back.

Hedrich explained the Martons, who are abutters, have a pier. The Lehmanns have been careful and do not want to impact the Martins' pier, so are looking for something simple. The proposal is to construct a small pier in front of their property to get it above flood elevation and then install a seasonal ramp and float. Hedrich stated because they are on an inner cove, the intertidal boundary line intercept, they are in the odd situation that by law they have the ability to get to the low water with a pier or structure but that would involve working with some of the abutters and potentially impacting some of these things. The Lehmanns decided to leave it all within their intertidal boundary, so they did not have to worry about having to get out beyond that and deal with the abutting landowners, and the rights, etc. They do have rights there, but they did not want to get a lawyer involved.

This project would require a Permit-by-Rule from DEP and that application has been submitted.

Hedrich stated there are a number of trees that will be impacted to accommodate this project. Some are in good shape; some are not in good shape. There are thirteen trees all along the perimeter and photos are included in the packet. Some need to be pulled off the roof; they are already overhanging. They are proposing to plant thirteen brand new trees in a very similar location.

Hedrich stated at this time, he will only submit the pier as a Permit by Rule just to get the building process started. They are still on the fence with the pier. They hope the Planning Board will be receptive before we present it. If everyone is in agreement with the pier, they will go forward and submit the full permit application with DEP. We are doing this application in a couple of steps.

Hewlett: Is the pier part of this project?

Hedrich: They would like to include that as part of this project.

Chair Cox: You are reducing square footage?

Hedrich: Correct. They like the building design of 2-A Architects. It is small and quaint. The Lehmann's are very happy with it. With the elevation changing and they will be able to get a little daylight basement in there, I think they have satisfied all their needs.

The Planning Board reviewed the Property Information on page 1 of the application and made changes to the Project Description and corrections were made under Property Information.

Total Sq. Ft. of all buildings - Present: 1528 sq. ft. Proposed: -39 sq. ft

Setbacks – Side: 17'

Hewlett: The shed is over the property line. Has that been resolved?

Hedrich: It is not being resolved. We are leaving it as is but that is included in the calculations as well, and we made sure we included that in there.

Chair Cox asked if an on-site visit needed to be done. Jordan recommended they do one.

Hewlett: Could you stake out the four corners of the new structure?

Hedrich: Yes, they could get three of the corners staked. (Richardi thought he could stake it out.)

Hewlett: The only question to the Planning Board is that typically we do not have piers starting right next to the house.

Cox noted they have had some. Hewlett said yes, but when they see it, they will realize why it is a safety issue?

Hedrich: Yes, we are trying to get above that flood elevation.

Richardi noted the area is very rocky and has a lot of sharp ledges, so that is why the pier starts at the house. It makes it easier for them and their children.

Letourneau: This sounds like a two-part application. If the Planning Board does not accept the pier, do they want to continue with the house?

Hedrich: I have a site plan in my bag without the pier on it.

Jordan asked if he was planning to go forward soon with the DEP and the pier.

Hedrich: We wanted to go through this process with the Board to make sure everyone is on board with it, and then they were going to proceed with the permitting.

Chair Cox stated the Planning Board wanted to wait until they got the DEP permitting back because DEP does a lot of good work especially on what the environmental impacts may be. Jordan said the DEP permit includes a lot of information the Board needs and is in those applications, so this Board finds it a lot easier to wait for DEP.

Hedrich: If we pull the pier tonight, can we avoid the site walk and move forward with the building expansion? The Planning Board said no, they want to see the site.

Richardi noted the Lehmanns wanted to start construction after September, and Chair Cox said that will give everyone a little time then.

An on-site visit was scheduled for July 12, 2021, at 5 p.m.

Hedrich stated it looks like they will eliminate the pier so they can do the house. He stated they most likely are not going to go through a conditional approval because if they submit the permit for DEP, it is a four to five-month process for them to review that. He thinks they will move forward on the building relocation, will pull the pier from the application, and simplify it.

Other Business:

Meeting Format: Chair Cox asked Jordan to speak on this issue. Jordan said municipal Boards such as Planning Boards have been able to meet via Zoom instead of in person because of the law that was passed at the beginning of the pandemic. That ends when the order is no longer in effect.

Select Board Chair Richard Bates and liaison to the Planning Board spoke and said the Governor signed LD32 today which will continue to allow remote meetings. Bates explained that the Board needs to get a policy written as soon as possible which will allow hybrid meetings to be held. The Planning Board will work on a policy statement as soon as possible.

There was no further business to come before the Board. On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary