

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
August 24, 2021 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:18 p.m. Present in person were: Anne Cox, Chair; Jane Brown, Anne Cogger, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan, and Van Thompson. Also present in person were: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Ryan Cline, Brian Rayback, Stephen and Nancy Watt, Neva Joseph, Deborah Rogers, Gary Darby, Emily McCauley, Tom and Claire Moses, Kevin Lipson, Jane Cashell, Paul Barns, Judy and Charles Crudell, Greg and Lauren Soutiea, Carl Danielson, Steve Thomas, Jerry Cushman, Donald Wilson III, William "Bill" Lane, Leslie Noble and David McNaughton. Present via Zoom was: Loreen Meyer.

Quorum: Van Thompson was elevated to voting status for review of August 10, 2021, Planning Board minutes, and the Findings of Fact for Fort Point Trail, as Jane Brown and Anne Cogger were absent for that meeting. A quorum was present.

Jane Brown and Anne Cogger then assumed voting status for the remaining meeting. A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Adjustments to Agenda: None.

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting — August 10, 2021 – The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 1, paragraph 1, line 3, delete the words **the alternate**, Anne Cogger,

Page 3, paragraph 1, line 3, correct to **7.5** percent

Page 3, paragraph 1, line 4, replace word floatation with the word **location**

Page 5, #1, insert the word: roll **call** vote

Page 5, #7, line 2, delete none, change to read: because **no advertising features** are proposed...

Page 5, #14, delete the word **apply**

Page 6, #15, line 3, change to read: ...not **generate** sewage waste

Page 10, 5., line 3, add to sentence, ... **and because the width limit does not apply in tidal waters.**

Page 10, 7. last line, delete **and is a ramp not a pier.**

Page 10, 8., line 5, add to last sentence, ... applicable **because there is no existing structure.**

Page 10, 9., line 1, correct word to **Maritime**

A motion was made by Thompson, seconded by Jordan, to approve the minutes of August 10, 2021, as amended. The roll call vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law - Town of St. George, Fort Point Trail

Delete Jane Brown and Anne Cogger and add Van Thompson as the Planning Board members.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Thompson to accept the changes as noted in the minutes as they apply to the Findings of Fact, and authorize the Chair of the Planning Board to

sign the Fort Point Trail Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on behalf of the Board. The roll call vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

On-Site Inspection – 19 Hupper Island, August 12, 2021 - The minutes were corrected as follows:

Page 1, second paragraph, line 3, change gangway to **ramp**

A motion was made by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, to approve the 19 Hupper Island the On-site Inspection minutes of August 12, 2021, as corrected. The roll call vote was 5-0, in favor.

Public Comments: None.

Site Plan Review:

a. Craignair Inn, 5 3rd Street / Map 106, Lot 016

Greg and Lauren Soutiea, property and business owners were present. The application is to add an 8' wide x 12' long x 8' high walk-in cooler, supported by concrete posts.

Greg Soutiea explained his application request. He sent an email to CEO Brackett explaining their plan to install a new walk-in cooler for the restaurant because the current walk-in cooler was not sufficient for the business and had been there since 1973. They hired a contractor earlier this spring who said he could not do the project until October or November. In late July, Soutiea had a call from the contractor who said he had a job fall through and he could squeeze the project in the following week.

Soutiea stated he jumped at the opportunity to get the work done because they desperately needed the cooler space to function as a restaurant. The contractor poured the two concrete foundation tubes, and Soutiea called and talked with CEO Brackett who went to the Craignair and looked at the area where the tubes were poured.

Soutiea stated he applied for the permit the very next day and was told there was a fine which he immediately paid. The fine was double the permit fee because he had started construction before getting approval. Soutiea apologized for that occurring but said he really did not have much of a choice as he had the building contractor, the refrigeration workman, and the electrician squeezing him in between other jobs.

Several current photographs of the newly installed walk-in cooler were provided by Soutiea. He stated the contractor did a nice job adding the cooler and blending it in with the building.

Soutiea stated there was one pre-existing structure that housed the propane tanks that were supplying the building. He said the propane tanks would have to be moved and buried as soon as he could get the plan done and approved, but the tanks had been temporarily moved.

Chair Cox: Am I to understand, there was a structure in exactly the same spot?

Soutiea: Not exactly the same. It was smaller but it was the same difference from the road. You can see the wooden structure (referring to his drawing) that housed the propane tanks before, and we just widened that structure to where the cooler is now.

Thompson asked Soutiea if he knew how long the propane tanks had been there. Soutiea did not know how long, but Neva Joseph stated a very, very, very long time.

Soutiea: I have tried to move them on a number of occasions along with our propane company and we just could never find a good location for them. We are hoping to convert our heating system from oil to propane before winter. Therefore, we need more propane capacity and I need to buy a larger tank.

The Planning Board reviewed Soutiea's photographs.

Chair Cox: It looks like from your photograph that the structure around the propane tanks was about in the center.

Soutiea: Yes, about in the center.

Chair Cox: If you look at your plan, the structure was about in the center of the additions that they have done.

Soutiea: We kept the new structure the same distance away from the existing building. But because the road goes at an angle, now that corner is closer than it was before even though we kept the structure the same distance; 10' away from the wall of the building.

Jordan: So, the corner is closer to the road than the propane structure.

Soutiea: Yes. If you look in the other photo, the road turns in there.

Hewlett asked: I am assuming that it is a right-of-way setback that we are worried about? (Chair Cox stated yes.)

Hewlett asked Soutiea if the Board could keep the photographs for the file. Soutiea stated yes.

Chair Cox: On your application, it states that your side setback is N/A (not applicable).

Soutiea thought that meant the side of the property, the building. He stated he read it to mean the side of this property line and he said, "Which the building is not getting any closer to that property line."

Chair Cox noted he wrote right of way as 10 feet; it was actually less than 10 feet from the road. Soutiea stated yes, and he had forgotten to measure it. Chair Cox explained that he had written 10' but on the application the Board had, it stated 7'6".

Soutiea: Okay, 7 feet. Which is further away than the approval for the deck I was granted last spring.

Chair Cox: That is because of the existing corner. I think this is what we will be talking about, but we just need to make sure we have a complete application.

Hewlett asked to be shown the location of the propane tanks on Soutiea's drawing, and Chair Cox pointed that out.

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

Soutiea: We always try to do things by the book. We always call when we have questions and try to get the right approval but just in this instance, I had to act quickly because the contractor only had a limited window to do the work.

Chair Cox: I get that. It is just a little bit, but you are closer to the right of way than the previous structure was. (Referring to the Minimum Lot Size Ordinance) Chair Cox: nothing prevented strengthening and restoring, etc., but under #6, "A nonconforming building or structure may be repaired, maintained, or improved but any expansion of the building or structure shall be in conformance with the provisions of the ordinance."

Chair Cox: You have expanded it beyond the provisions of what the ordinance says you can do. My question to the Planning Board is can we approve the application? I have a feeling you might have a case for hardship to get a variance from the Board of Appeals. Does anyone have any other ideas?

Jordan: I do not think the ordinance gives us any discretion.

Chair Cox: If you go to the Board of Appeals and there are undue hardships, they are the body that can grant a variance.

Jordan: That is who you would have to go to for discussion. It is a tough standard. It basically requires them to find that you can't make economic use of the land without the variance. Your argument is that you have to have a walk-in cooler to have a restaurant and the one that is there now, is old and not good. The question they may have for you is, "Could you put it somewhere else without encroaching on the right of way?" But that is not something for the Planning Board. We are not given the power to do that.

Thompson asked: This is already a nonconforming lot?

Soutiea: Right. There was already a pre-existing, nonconforming structure there.

Chair Cox: It is nonconforming there.

Thompson referred Soutiea to the Site Plan Review Ordinance, Appeals Procedure #1. Chair Cox noted he could appeal the Planning Board's decision. Hewlett explained that the Board had to abide by the setback ordinance, and Soutiea said he understood.

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

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on preserving and enhancing the landscape.

2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on the relationship of the proposed buildings and structure to the environment.
3. Vehicular Access – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on vehicular access.
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on parking and pedestrian circulation.
5. Surface Water Drainage – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on surface water drainage.
6. Existing Utilities: On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on existing utilities.
7. Advertising Features – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call 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 Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because no exposed storage areas, exposed machinery, service areas, and other specified features are proposed.
9. Exterior Lighting – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call 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 roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on emergency vehicle access.
11. Municipal Services – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on municipal services.
12. Water/Air Protection – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure has no effect on water and air pollution.

13. Water Supply – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met based on the applicant's representation there is sufficient water available to meet the needs of the proposed existing new structure.
14. Soil Erosion – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure does not affect soil erosion.
15. Sewage Waste Disposal – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the proposed existing new structure does not affect sewage waste disposal.
16. Hazardous, Special, and Radioactive Materials – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because there are no hazardous, special, and radioactive materials proposed.
17. Financial/Technical Capacity – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because the applicant had the project completed.
18. Shoreland Zone – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because the property is not within the Shoreland Zone.
19. Flood Plain – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard does not apply because the property is not in a flood plain.
20. Lot Standards - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard not been met because the project would have increased the nonconformity of the setback from the right-of-way.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board, voted by a roll call vote of 5-0 to deny the Craginair Inn application because the project would have increased the nonconformity of the setback from the right-of-way.

Neva Joseph asked to comment. "I spent 32 years of my life in that building. Where he put that walk-in cooler is the only place that he could put it. When you have a Code Enforcement Officer that comes out and looks at it and thinks it is okay, then you continue; you go for it. He has been struggling. And the work that Greg and Lauren have done on that Inn makes me beyond happy. They have put their heart and soul into that, and they have done so much to help this community with what they have done."

Chair Cox: I totally understand. I think it is awesome and if we had the power, I would advocate for it. It is very minimal, and he has done something that fits with the building, with the environment. It totally makes sense.

Hewlett to Soutiea: I would recommend that if you appeal, you bring the photographs to the Board of Appeals hearing.

Wharf:

a. Abaco, LLC – 19 Hupper Island / Map 201, Lot 019

Bill Lane of Gartley & Dorsky Surveying represented the applicants. The applicants, Leslie Noble and Evan McNaughton were present. The application is to remove an old pier and to construct a new fixed pier, seasonal ramp, and seasonal float. The Shoreland District is Marine Residential. An on-site inspection was held on August 12, 2021, at 4 p.m. A Public Hearing was held at the St. George Town office on August 24, 2021, Chair Anne Cox opened the public hearing at 7 p.m. for comments and after no further comments, she closed the hearing at 7:18 p.m.

The Abaco Public Hearing Minutes of August 24, 2021, will be posted separately on the town website.

Lane displayed an aerial image of the existing cove depicting the home at 19 Hupper Island, the adjacent home and pier at 20 Hupper Island, and the proposed configuration of the pier. Lane pointed out that the aerial photo offered a good visual indication that there was not a navigational issue. Comments made by experts indicated there was not a navigational issue.

Lane: "To recapitulate the same points I made at our previous meeting and not to trespass on your time too much, the applicants who I believe you have also heard from tonight, are Leslie and David and they own 19 Hupper Island through Abaco Property Holdings. It is a 2.07-acre property with 360' of frontage. It is situated in the AE-11 Floodplain Zone. The proposal is to construct a safe way of accessing the property with a fixed pier ramp and float. The dimensions of the pier are 6' x 170' including the portion that extends onto land, a 3' x 60' for the ramp (gangway), and 12' x 24' float. The ramp (gangway) overlaps the float to some degree.

"In our prior meeting on July 27, 2021, we presented that we had received DEP approval, Army Corps of Engineers approval, and had submitted that with you combined with a missive that enumerated how we met the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance, Section 15 and Section 16 as well as your pertinent sections of the Flood Ordinance.

"I think that we have addressed all the substantial issues that are before you and also clarified that we have heard comment and made modifications to the plan to improve the alignment to the pier along the way. So, by the time that we brought it to you, this has been a fairly mature application that has been brought forward with thoughtful consideration of the neighbor's concerns and addressing every item that had been raised. If I could draw your attention to the DEP Findings which are more extensive than our usual because they took careful consideration of all those public input comments and resolved that there were no deleterious impacts to natural

resources, coastal wetlands, public access, visual impacts as a result of the construction of the float, ramp (gangway) and fixed pier.

"Then my last summary was, we attended a site walk on August 12, 2021, and you just read minutes regarding that. If there are any particular items of interest I or the owners can answer, we would be happy to do so."

Thompson: For clarification, the aerial view you have up there, that is showing low tide?

Lane: Mr. Thomas took that photo.

Thomas: It's about mid-tide.

Chair Cox: Do we have a complete application?

Cogger: Mr. Moses spoke. His dock is the one that is on the left-hand side of this photograph?

Lane: Correct.

Cogger: I just need clarification on this. It looks like those docks do not hit one another. She asked: They would not hit one another at low tide?

Lane: That would be accurate, yes. Referring to the visual, Lane said: That is the fixed portion of Mr. Moses's pier. If I switch to the drawing which will be a little more difficult to see. The float is here, right within his littoral line. So, this is the Abaco littoral line; this is the Abaco littoral line setback. We are 25' plus 67' from our littoral line.

Jordan: In the materials we received (that I just got before this meeting), there was a version of your Plan C-2. Is it any different from the one that was with the original application?

Lane: We have made no changes to the "big sheets." That C-2 is here and that is unrevised.

On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board vote 5-0 to accept the application as complete with the inclusion of the items submitted and a copy of the aerial photograph that is to be submitted by the applicant for the record. The roll call vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Hewlett: In our packet, we have abutting landowners and in one of the letters you read (Cox), one of the landowners had a right to access. Which landowner? Cox: Jane Cashell, 13 Hupper Island. Hewlett: That is not even an abutting landowner.

Cashell: I am not abutting to that property, but I have access rights in my deed to the shore.

Hewlett: Where on the map are you? Cashell pointed out her lot.

Hewlett: So, #2 would be owned by Judith Crudell; #1 would be Karen Lewis; #3 is Thomas Moses.

Planning Board Discussion:

Cogger: It sounds like it is intertidal with the shoreline. But people can walk under that dock?

Lane: Yes, we have demonstrated that, and the DEP commented on the fact that we have provided an adequate clearing height from underneath it for people who have a right to fish, fowl, and navigate to migrate through and utilize the intertidal area. Lane also added that the site location for the fixed portion of the pier would be located over rock and rockweed and would not interfere with any sand and cobble beach.

Cogger: It seemed some people were concerned about those issues but also some fishermen said that it was tight in Port Clyde (the harbor) and people navigated around those impediments all the time.

Chair Cox: Also, the concern about dealing with the fisheries is to avoid eelgrass as much as possible since that is important; this has minimal impact on the eelgrass.

Jordan: Most of what I heard was more about navigational issues than about fisheries.

Cogger commented: I just think it is hard for people to see change happen especially on shorelands as once building happens it doesn't become less developed. I was listening to the applicant. I think they are well-meaning and will do the best they can; and I know it is hard for people, too.

Section 15(C)

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

1. No more than one pier, dock, wharf, or similar structure extending or located below the normal high-water line of the water body or within a wetland is allowed on a single lot. - On a motion by Cogger, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no more than one ramp is proposed.
2. Access from shore shall be developed on soils appropriate for such use and constructed so as to control erosion. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met based on observing the area at the on-site visitation that the ground on which the structure will be built appears to be appropriate, and has a stable lawn area with some sand and stone below but shall not create erosive conditions.
3. The location shall not interfere with existing developed or natural beach areas. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because there is no existing developed or natural beach area and in addition, the applicant has moved the position of the dock and pedestrians can pass/migrate underneath in the intertidal area.
4. The facility shall be located so as to minimize adverse effects on fisheries. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met based on the DEP Findings and Order, both on the basis of its views

and the basis of the views of the Department of Marine Resources and the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife.

5. The facility shall be no longer in dimension than necessary to carry on the activity and be consistent with the surrounding character and uses of the area. A pier, dock, or wharf in non-tidal waters shall not be wider than six feet for non-commercial uses. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the length standard has been met because the pier is no longer than necessary to provide access at low tide, and standard for the surrounding character has been met because there are other similar, existing piers on the Port Clyde side (east side) of the island.
6. No new structure shall be built on, over, or abutting a pier, wharf, dock, or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland unless the structure requires direct access to the water body or wetland as an operational necessity. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no such structures are proposed.
7. New permanent piers and docks on non-tidal waters shall be permitted unless it is clearly demonstrated to the Planning Board that a temporary pier or dock is not feasible, and a permit has been obtained from the Department of Environmental Protection, pursuant to the Natural Resources Protection Act. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no such structures are proposed, and the pier will be in tidal waters.
8. No existing structures built on, over, or abutting a pier, dock, wharf or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall be converted to residential dwelling units in any district. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no such structures are proposed.
9. Except in the Commercial Fisheries/Marine Activities District, structures built on, over, or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall not exceed twenty (20) feet in height above the pier, wharf, dock or other structure. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because no such structures are proposed.
10. Vegetation may be removed in excess of the standards in Section 15(P) of this ordinance in order to conduct shoreline stabilization of an eroding shoreline, provided that a permit is obtained from the Planning Board. Construction equipment must access the shoreline by barge when feasible as determined by the Planning Board. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the standard has been met because minimal vegetation will be moved, this project does not involve shoreline stabilization, and the construction work will be done from the barge.

SECTION 16 (D)

Procedure for Administrative Permits

After the submission of a complete application to the Planning Board, Code Enforcement Officer, or Local Plumbing Inspector, the application shall be approved, or approved with conditions, if a *positive finding is made* based on the information presented that the proposed use:

1. Will maintain safe and healthful conditions. - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the project will enhance the safety of the property owners getting on and off the island, and according to the Findings and Order of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the Department of Marine Resources (MDR), and the Harbor Master (who DEP says are most familiar with the area) stated any navigational issues in that area are resolvable.
2. Will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters. - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0, the applicant stated they will use Best Management Practices (BMP) in the construction of this pier. A condition of approval is the applicant shall use BMP, as also requested by the DEP in their Findings and Order.
3. Will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewaters. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the project will not generate any wastewater.
4. Will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish aquatic life, bird, or other wildlife habitat. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the DEP Findings, the Department of Marine Resources, and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife stated there will be minimal disturbance.
5. Will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual, points of access to inland and coastal waters. - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that based on Gartley & Dorsky's application and statements, studies by the Department of Environmental Protection and maritime concerns have also warranted this, and based on the Planning Board's observations on-site does not reflect that any change in the way the place looks is proposed in this project.
6. Will protect archaeological and historic resources as designated in the comprehensive plan. - On a motion by Brown, seconded by Cogger, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that the applicant confirmed there are no archaeological or historic resources identified in this area.
7. Will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in a Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District. - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that this is not applicable because this project is not located near a Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District.

8. Will avoid problems associated with flood plain development and use. - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Planning Board determined by a roll call vote of 5-0 that no part of this structure is covered by the flood plain ordinance.

9. Is in conformance with the provisions of Section 15, Land Use Standards. - This standard was approved by the Planning Board under Section 15(C).

A motion was made by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, to approve the Abaco Property Holdings, Inc. application for a pier, float, and dock on the condition that Best Management Practices will be utilized as required by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection and by the St. George Planning Board. The roll call vote was 5-0, in favor. The motion carried.

Other Business: Chair Cox said the Board would be holding future workshops to review and discuss areas of concern, including conforming and non-conforming structures.

There was no further business to come before the Board. On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, it was voted by a roll call of 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary