

**St. George Planning Board
St. George Town Office
February 12, 2019 - 7 p.m.**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Members present were: Anne Cox, Chair; Jane Brown, Ray Emerson, Mary K. Hewlett, Michael Jordan (absent: Alan Letourneau and Brendan Chase). Also present: CEO Terry Brackett, Richard Bates, Bruce Hodsdon, Noel Musson, Adam Wolfrey, Dan Morris, Mike Cushman, Ben Norton, and David Schmanska.

Quorum: Ray Emerson was elevated to voting status. A quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest: None.

Adjustments to Agenda: The following items were taken up prior to the reading of the minutes.
Site Plan Review for Centerline Communications LLC
Town of St. George, 10 Cold Storage Road

Site Plan Review

a. Centerline Communications LLC – 74 Wallston Road / Map 215, Lot 022

Adam Wolfrey represented the applicant American Tower Corporation. The application is to modify equipment located at 74 Wallston Road. The proposed project is to remove six (6) radio heads and replace them with six (6) new radio heads; remove six (6) coaxial cables and replace them with one (1) hybrid line and install new brackets. No antennas are being added to the tower.

Wolfrey said there are no additional tower antennas proposed. The height of the tower will not increase and they are not expanding the footprint of the equipment area. Wolfrey said they will place an OBP amplifier on the antennas. Project updates are being done to handle capacity and more consumers, and to provide better service.

Ms. Hewlett asked why they are taking the coaxial out of one building and putting the fiber optics in the other building. Wolfrey said he does not know why they are relocating the wires but knows the scope of work is being done for capacity management. Chair Cox noted this did not affect the footprint. Ms. Hewlett said her worry was the wind load but that has been addressed.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 to accept the application as complete.

Chair Cox informed Mr. Wolfrey that this is a non-residential project and many of the standards may not be applicable, but the Planning Board is obligated to review the Performance Standards. There was no further discussion. The Planning Board began Site Plan Review.

Performance Standards:

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape – On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Jordan, standard has been met 5-0. There will be no change to the landscape.
2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structure to the Environment - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Emerson, standard has been met 5-0. No change proposed.
3. Vehicular Access - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard has been met. The proposed project does not change the existing vehicle access.
4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. The proposed project does not change the existing vehicle access.
5. Surface Water Drainage – On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Jordan, standard is not applicable 5-0. No change.
6. Existing Utilities - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable 5-0. No change. This project does not place any undue burden on sewers, sanitary and storm drains, or water districts as none are being used.
7. Advertising Features - On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met 5-0. No change. There are no advertising features at this site.
8. Special Features - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. There is no change to the existing features on the site.
9. Exterior Lighting - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable 5-0. There is no exterior lighting proposed.
10. Emergency Vehicle Access - On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Hewlett, standard has been met 5-0. No changes are proposed.
11. Municipal Services - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. The proposed changes will enhance public service and safety functions, i.e., the ambulance service.
12. Water/Air Protection - On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Jordan, standard is not applicable 5-0. No change.
13. Water Supply - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable 5-0. There is no water being proposed.
14. Soil Erosion - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable 5-0. The project will not cause soil erosion as the work will be done on the tower and not at ground level.
15. Sewage Waste Disposal - On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Jordan, standard is not applicable 5-0. No change.
16. Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, standard is not applicable 5-0. No change.
17. Financial/Technical Capacity - On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. The applicant's representative states the applicant has the financial and technical capacity to carry out this project.
18. Shoreland Zone - On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, standard is not applicable 5-0. The proposed project is not located within the Shoreland Zone.
19. Flood Plain - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard is not applicable 5-0. The project is not in a flood plain.
20. Lot Standards - On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, standard has been met 5-0. There are no proposed changes to the lot standards.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Emerson, it was voted to approve the American Tower Corporation/Centerline Communications LLC application pursuant to the Performance Standards Review. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

b. Town of St. George – 10 Cold Storage Road / Map 102, Lot 084

Noel Musson represented the applicant. The application is to repair bulkhead, construction of new pier extensions, new floats, site utilities, resurfacing, improvements to launching ramp and other site improvements for commercial and recreational waterfront access. An on-site visit was held on January 26, 2019.

Noel Musson reviewed the Site Plan for the 10 Cold Storage Road Improvement Project. The project will connect the two wharf areas into one contiguous property by filling in between the two wharfs. The soil conditions and the subsurface ledge profile in the area make driving piles extremely difficult if not impossible therefore filling is the best option. There are two or three different ledge profiles and soil analyses have been done throughout the property area.

Musson states several other elements have been added to the site plan. There will be two walkways. On the water side of the property there will be a raised 10' wide paved area at the water's edge. This transitional area will be 6 to 8 inches above the remaining area of the property and will have a rolled type curb to blend the two areas. The water side of the paved work area will have a concrete cap over the sheet pile and will be flush with the paved working surface. There will be a 12" x 12" whales back bolted to the wood pilings slightly above the concrete cap. The pilings will be 4' above the concrete cap.

The ramps to the floats will be 4-foot-wide, 2-sided ramps; one side being used for moving large objects to and from the floats; and the other side designed to walk to and from the floats.

The plan calls for four (4) lights mounted on 12' poles to be down shielded to provide the safety needed at the edge of the pier and on the floats.

There will be underground utilities, water, and electricity at the property. The porta-potties and dumpster may be located next to the pile supported wharf on a concrete pad with a fence around the area.

The ramp will be lengthened about 20' towards the water and back about 10' on the upper side and lower the grade so they are coming at it at a lower angle. That allows the water to come up higher on the ramp. Musson said they are reorienting it slightly so they can get around the ledge outcrop at the top of the ramp to make it a better approach. Building the new ramp will require additional fill to provide a more stable ramp surface.

Musson said one of the objectives is to provide better circulation in the area by allowing the cars to drive in, loop around and park. The other benefit is designed to be flexible in terms of being able to have larger trucks or tractor trailers drive in and turnaround. He believes the improved circulation plan will provide some relief to this area during the summer months as well as improving safety.

He explained there is a need to think about how storm water will flow on the site. The area is currently gravel but will be paved and re-graded to focus the water into catch basins that will be placed on the property. Part of the plan is to get the sediment into the catch basins and not in the ocean. CEO Brackett asked how often the catch basins will need to be cleaned out. Musson thought it will depend on what is done to the surface in wintertime. He thought they may have to be cleaned annually or at the very least to look at them annually. CEO Brackett said he is concerned they may not get cleaned out because the town does not have a maintenance department or highway department.

CEO Brackett asked if they have plans for handicapped accessibility and parking, Musson said he did not know if any handicapped spaces have been designated or there are ADA requirements for this site but he will check. Musson notes this is not a DOT funded project, so requirements may differ.

Ms. Hewlett asked if dinghies will be allowed to tie up at the floats. Musson said that is a policy question and will defer that question to the Harbormaster and Harbor Committee.

Ms. Hewlett asked if there will be overnight parking. Musson stated they are trying to maximize parking availability and usable space. Mr. Schmanska noted a lot of (policy) questions would have to be answered by altering the town's ordinance. But usage questions, such as what can be allowed, will be drawn out slowly/those will be slowly answered when the plan gets approved.

Musson said they have not received the DEP permits yet but are working on those.

As part of the application process, Musson said he would like to add a photometric plan – a visual of the lighting. He believes the plan would enhance the public's understanding of the project. He added that the lights are wind tolerant and there would be no motion detectors at the site. Chair Cox thought it would be helpful to see a visual on how a large truck could drive in and turnaround. Musson said he would create a graphic as to what that would look like.

Jordan asked if the lights and the stormwater drainage plans were needed to accept the application. Musson thought these items could be supplemented. Chair Cox felt there was sufficient information on the lighting to make a decision but added there may be more information to come in. Musson said in order for them to move to the next phase, he wants to make sure they have a complete application and supplementing other materials as the process continues.

On a motion by Emerson, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to accept the application as complete.

A Public Hearing on 10 CSR was scheduled for Wednesday, March 6, 2019 at 7 p.m.

Review of the Minutes:

Planning Board Meeting — The minutes of January 22, 2019 were amended as follows:

Page 1, under Building Permits, paragraph 3, line 2, change to read: She said the **old** house...

Page 1, under Building Permits, paragraph 3, line 3, change to read: ...than the **new** house.

Page 2, 2nd paragraph, line 3, correct word to **silt**

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, to approve the minutes of January 22, 2019, as amended. The vote was 5-0. The motion carried.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

Meadow Brook Preserve – On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, it was voted 5-0 to accept the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on the Meadow Brook Preserve project as written pursuant to the Performance Standards Review, Section V, A1-20 in the Site Plan Review ordinance.

Herring Gut Learning Center – On a motion by Hewlett, seconded by Jordan, it was voted 5-0 to accept the Findings of Fact and Conclusions on the Law for the Herring Gut Learning Center as written pursuant to the Performance Standards Review, Section V, A1-20 in the Site Plan Review ordinance.

Public Comments: None.

Other Business:

Draft Sign Ordinance – Town Manager Polky was unable to attend the meeting but had concerns and recommendations regarding the draft sign ordinance which CEO Brackett conveyed to the Planning Board. Mr. Polky recommended deleting the section on Political Signs because of enforcement issues. Brackett said political signs are covered in state law. After discussion, the Board agreed to delete the statement regarding one week and six weeks and keep the size as seven (7) square feet. Chair Cox said this will be reviewed by counsel who might have a different legal opinion on this.

The Planning Board and CEO Brackett reviewed Mr. Polky's recommendation regarding Section I. pertaining to signs, private property, charitable and civic organizations. The Board agreed to reword this section on temporary signs but to keep the wording "the time limit of 24 hours after the event has taken place."

Mr. Polky had concerns regarding Section N. but Mr. Jordan explained that section was about private events, weddings and garage sales, etc. and not about charitable organizations such as the ambulance. Mr. Jordan said Section N does not have the restrictions.

Chair Cox thought the Sign Ordinance was easier to reference, having the exemptions listed at the beginning. Ms. Hewlett felt the ordinance was well drafted. Select Board Chair Bates thought legal counsel should be consulted first on the draft (before the Select Board) in case the town attorney had comments or made changes to the draft ordinance. CEO Brackett said the Select Board would need to approve appropriating funds to send this to the town's attorney.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, it was voted 5-0 to submit the newly amended Draft Sign Ordinance to legal counsel for review and legal opinion.

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, to submit a copy of the amended Draft Sign Ordinance to the Select Board to authorize funds for legal counsel to review the draft ordinance and give legal opinion. The vote was 5-0. Motion carried.

Chair Bates said there had been inquiries about having meetings live streamed and asked the Board's opinion. Consensus of the Board: They are not in favor of live streaming of the meetings.

Update on Federal Preemption of the Communications Tower: Mr. Jordan asked CEO Brackett if there had been any updates on the T-Mobile issue. Brackett said he contacted MMA and legal counsel explained to him that the Planning Board did have the right to review the T-Mobile & American Tower application under Site Plan Review, as it was in the town's ordinance.

There was no further business. At 8:10 p.m., a motion was made by Brown, seconded by Hewlett to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Planning Board Recording Secretary