

**St. George Planning Board Meeting
7PM at Town Office and via Zoom
March 28, 2023
Minutes**

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00pm. Planning Board Members present were Chair Anne Cox, Jane Brown, Mary K. Hewlett, Alison Briggs and Michael B. Jordan. Also present were Terry Brackett and Richard Bates.

Present via Zoom was Richard Moskowitz, Phillip Parsons, J. McBride, Rick Moskowitz and Devin Prock.

Quorum:

A quorum was present. Alison Briggs was elevated to voting status.

Conflict of Interest:

There were no conflicts of interest.

Adjustments to Agenda

Review of the Proposed Public Land Ordinance Minutes dated March 21, 2023, was added to the agenda.

Minutes

Jordan moved to approve the February 28, 2023 Planning Board Meeting Minutes as corrected, seconded by Hewlett, and by a 5-0 vote, the minutes were approved (Briggs was elevated to voting status).

Hewlett moved to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the Application of Anne Cox and Julie Wortman, doing business as Hedgerow as written and to authorize the Secretary of the

Board to sign them, seconded by Jordan, and by a 5-0 roll call vote, the minutes were approved (Chair Cox recused herself; Briggs and Moskowitz were elevated to voting status).

Hewlett moved to approve the March 21, 2023 Public Hearing on the Proposed Public Land Use Ordinance Minutes as corrected, seconded by Jordan, and by a 5-0 roll call vote, the minutes were approved (Brown recused herself; Briggs and Moskowitz were elevated to voting status).

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Building Permits:

Philip Parsons - Replace and Enlarge Existing Shed, 38 Wahebe Rd., Map 224 – Lot 034

Chair Cox

We have your application. Could you explain it to us.

Parsons

When I bought this property, there was a camp on the property which we rebuilt and enlarged, and there was also a shed. It is slowly dissolving into the ground and beginning to rot. I need to replace it obviously. I hoped I could make something more attractive and more in keeping with the area, with white cedar shingles, making it comparable to the house and making it a little bit larger, because when I planned the house, I misjudged how much storage I'd need. What I talked with Terry about mostly is whether we're within the Shoreland Zone, with allowance to expand slightly without making the situation any worse or closer to the plan, but also keeping back from the road twenty-five feet. Terry suggested that I rotate the building to meet those conditions. That's the way it's sketched on site plan provided.

Briggs

Did you say that the building was originally a shed?

Parsons

It was an outhouse actually. There was no bathroom in the cabin.

Briggs

How far was it from the water?

Parsons

Probably about sixty feet.

Chair Cox

I have a question for clarification. I think your square footage of the lot tells us this. You only own the section of Wahebe Road where the house is, and not the other side. Is that correct?

Parsons

That's correct. It's a skinny lot. It has over 300 feet of shoreline. Originally it was two lots, I think, way before I acquired it. It's a very small lot, very near the causeway that goes up to the island. The shed had what is called a destroylet, and it was an electric way of incinerating human waste. It was not very nice. There was no running water in the cabin.

Hewlett

A true outhouse. To get it out of the 75-foot setback, has anybody thought about putting it to (inaudible)

Chair Cox

We have the plan of your house. It looks like two buildings, and from the sketch we have it looks like there is a tree. Is there any way that the shed could be located on the other side of the house building, that would be entirely outside of just 75-foot setback?

Parsons

No, it would be too close to the road for one thing. This is really the only place it can be. It's geometrically complicated. We had a lot of discussion with Terry when we were planning the house. I didn't include any pictures of the house. It was a very careful calculation to conform to the Shoreland Zoning and so the shed really couldn't go anywhere else.

Chair Cox

We have to ask you this because anytime you are taking down a foundation and rebuilding something we have to see if there is any practical place, that it could be moved elsewhere on the property.

Parsons

I think we've examined that pretty closely.

Chair Cox

Terry, are you in agreement.

Terry Brackett

I have been there several times and we have gone around and round on this, and I believe this is about the only place he can do it.

Chair Cox

It seems like I recall when this came before us quite a few years ago, with the infill section, there is no way to move things to the other side of the house.

Terry Brackett

I have not measured it in years but if it's twenty-five feet from the road, I would be surprised.

Briggs

I do not understand why it could not be moved to the other side of the house. There is a flat area that is not as close to the water on the other side of the house. There is nothing there. There are no trees there. Is that because of the proposed addition and proposed deck?

Parsons

There is no proposed deck. That was in an earlier sketch, in fact. We didn't do that because we wanted minimal impact. I think what Terry says is correct. We have a well on the other side of the house.

Chair Cox

That is the question. Where is your well and where is your septic here?

Parsons

It says proposed wellsite.

Chair Cox

I do not see that.

Parsons

I think it's not actually on the copy I gave you. I don't know how to describe it exactly. We would not build a shed over there anyway. It's very close to the neighbor across the street and would be kind of offensive to them. I think it would be just insensitive, frankly, and also it gets either too close to the water or too close to the road. It does not fit.

Jordan

We may be talking about different places here. I think what Alison was referring to is the area to the left of the house.

Briggs

Or if you're facing the house, there is an area to the right of the house as now existing that is a fairly flat, broad area that is further away from the water than where the outhouse is right now.

Parsons

Well, it would be really (inaudible) there. I guess that's part of it. You know, we've made a garden there and so forth. The shed is where the shed is. I could rebuild the shed exactly where it is and keep it the same size. We wouldn't want to build it in another place, and plus, I think it would actually aggravate the setback requirements for the Shoreland Zoning.

Jordan

We must be talking about different places.

Parsons

It wouldn't make it better; it would make it worse.

Chair Cox

I do not think we are. Where Alison is talking about would be outside of the 75-foot setback. The question is the setback from the road, and would it be any closer to the road. It looks like there would be room for it to be no closer to the road than it is now, and still outside of the 75-foot setback. That is your question, isn't it, Alison?

Briggs

Yes, it is. Thank you.

Hewlett

In essence, putting it where it says "proposed addition" on the plan that we were given.

Parsons

I'm not going to do that. I would withdraw the application. If you went and visited the site, you would realize it would ruin the house. It's a design question. Terry has been there many times. I don't want to debate this, particularly. Actually, you would make it worse because the only way you can do that is either being closer to the road or, if the dotted line is an accurate description of where the center of the setback is, moving the whole thing to the wrong side of the setback.

Jordan

No. That is not what the drawing shows.

Chair Cox

The drawing shows that there is room within the 75-foot setback and so you would be outside of the 75-foot zone and no closer to the road, aesthetics and your inclination notwithstanding.

Parsons

It really isn't a question to me because it actually doesn't work. You're either too close to the road or you're inside of the 75-foot zone. It doesn't work that way. It's difficult for me to know how you're looking at this, but I can assure you I'm right.

Terry Brackett

Alison is thinking about it going over in this area. It has got to be (inaudible) 25 feet, so it has got to be back in here, basically aligned to the house. Then you have a tree trunk in here and with the width of that building, it is not really going to work well.

Hewlett

We are not showing any trees right there.

Parsons

The trees are no longer accurate. We had them cut down. We had some die off.

Chair Cox

Where I have outlined in red is what we are talking about as a place that would be no closer to the road.

Parsons

I would absolutely not do that. I have no interest in doing it.

Chair Cox

But that is a place that would be possible. If you were interested, it would be possible to do it in that vicinity.

Parsons

I don't think it would actually. I think your 25-foot (inaudible) will be right up against the house where we have the windows look out on the water and everything like that. I'm sort of puzzled about where the question comes from? Do you want to redesign it?

Chair Cox

No. The question comes because when something is non-conforming, like the existing outhouse, when you are going to tear down and rebuild something, then we need to look to see if there is a practical place where it could be moved outside of the 75-foot setback and being consistent with the other setbacks from the road. That is why we are looking at this.

Parsons

I understand what you're saying. My understanding, and tell me if I'm wrong, it is legal to add 30% to an existing building which is nonconforming. Is that correct?

Chair Cox

Yes, you may.

Jordan

That is correct, but as a separate standard, if a building is not being added to, but being destroyed and rebuilt, we are required to make sure that it is setback as far as practical from the water.

Parsons

My understanding of zoning is that if you maintain the footprint of an existing building and rebuild it.

Jordan

Not quite. Not if you are going to tear it down.

Parsons

Maine zoning is different from Massachusetts zoning.

Jordan

In our Shoreland Zoning, there are two separate questions. One is how much can you expand it if it's not conforming? The other is what you are required to do, if you tear it down and build it again. Those are two separate questions.

Parsons

You can force someone to build on a different site.

Jordan

Yes. We're required to do so if it is practical.

Parsons

I have to say I'm withdrawing the application. I think this is a really bizarre conversation. We're not aggravating the existing conditions. I spent a lot of time with Terry thinking about this and how it would work. Honestly, I'm shocked. You haven't looked at the site and yet you're to suggesting a redesign.

Chair Cox

We are following the ordinances we have been asked to follow. You have raised a question and Kate has also raised this. We need to go look at the site then because it appears to us from the material you have provided us, there may be another site that is practical. If there is not, then we can conclude that your design and your placement is the only place for it to go. With the information we have, we need to come and look at the site.

Parsons

I'm saying I'm not interested in doing that. We spent a lot of time and money designing this (inaudible). You're asking me to put a shed, which is totally utilitarian shed, in a place that will have an incredibly negative effect on this and will be built right on top of a waterline and a power line. I recognize your entitlement to do this, but I'm just simply saying, you can go and look at that and decide that it works or doesn't work from your perspective, but I'm not going to do that. We will just rebuild the shed where it is, the same size.

Chair Cox

You cannot rebuild that. If you're tearing it down, then we need to look at other places to move it.

Parsons

I'll keep the bottom half of the shed. I will repair the foundation and build. (Inaudible)

Jordan

The same rule applies to replacing the foundation. Listen, we did not make this up. It is in our ordinance, and it is required to be there by state law.

Parsons

Can you send me a copy of that legislation so I can show it to a lawyer?

Jordan

You can find it on our website.

Parsons

I want the page reference. I want the exact language.

Jordan

It is section 12C of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

Parsons

I read the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

Jordan

You should read this part again. As Anne said, we are perfectly willing to come to a site visit, and if you are right that it is not practical to put the shed where we are suggesting it might go, then we are not going to make you do it, because that is what the ordinance says.

Parsons

You're not going to make me do it anyway.

Jordan

Excuse me. We could approve the application.

Chair Cox

We could approve the application that you have if the site visit reflects it is not practical to move this anywhere else on the property. Right now, we have a question. Is it practical? Is there a way to move it?

Jordan

We do not have enough information to decide that. If you are up for a site visit, we will do a site visit.

Chair Cox

We would be glad to come and look at it and it may end up that you will be able to put it exactly where you would like to have it, and we would have no problem with it. It's a good solution, if it is not practical to move it elsewhere.

Parsons

Yeah, It's fine. Obviously, you are on the Board, and you can do what you want. Terry and I have spent a lot of time talking about this, and he recommended that I submit this in the scheme that we have, and so if you want to go visit, please do.

Chair Cox

Okay. Does April 10th seem like a possible time to do a site visit? Terry does that give us enough time?

Terry Brackett

If you are just doing a site visit, it does not need to be published in the paper. It is just for your knowledge.

Jordan

We have always published them in the paper. Some form of notice has to be given to the public.

Briggs

And to the neighbors.

Chair Cox

We could do it sooner, if we do not need to worry about the paper, but we do need to let the neighbors know. We could do it on the weekend, maybe, Saturday April 8th?

Terry Brackett

There are new requirements at the paper. I think it has to be submitted by Friday, instead of Monday.

Briggs

That would make it for Monday, April 10th.

Chair Cox

We need to let the abutters know. I'd like to get this done, since we already have had a delay.

Terry Brackett

I am not sure why you need to let the abutters know because this is going to be within all the setbacks and it is just a storage building.

Chair Cox

We cannot have an on-site visit without the public knowing. We need to let the public know that we have this on-site visit. If we don't let the abutters know that's fine.

Jordan

So far, the only way we have done that is by newspaper publication. We may change that, but we have not changed it yet.

Hewlett

And don't we draw a circle 300 feet, for notifications?

Jordan

I believe that is what we have always done.

Chair Cox

Most of the circle is in the water on this one.

Chair Cox

Would we be able to do one on Monday, April 10th?

Terry Brackett

I think so, if we can get it in the paper by Friday.

Jordan

It would run in the paper on April 6th, and we could do it on April 10th.

Chair Cox

Mr. Parsons. Would you be able to have us come visit on Monday, April 10th.

Parsons

If you don't need me there.

Chair Cox

We do need you there or a representative of yours.

Parsons

I'll see if my neighbor can do it and it's possible I could do it too.

Chair Cox

Well, let's plan on Monday, April 10th at 5:00p.m. and you need to let Terry Brackett at the Town Office know sometime tomorrow if this will work for you, because we need to get a notice into the paper about it.

Parsons

I can do that.

Jordan

And if your neighbor is going to be representing you, we need something in writing from you, authorizing that person to represent you.

Chair Cox

It can be an email document that authorizes your representative at this hearing. We're not trying to be difficult. We are trying to weigh your concerns with our requirements and with our ordinance. We feel like we need a little more information than we have in the application right now. So that is why we need to do this.

Parsons

That's fine. I'm confused by the process because I've been talking about this with Terry for a long time. (Inaudible). I think we're trying to build something that's attractive and congenial to the neighborhood and to our neighbors. It seems to me based on what Terry said, it was complying with the zoning. You can understand my frustration.

Chair Cox

I understand. We may get there and agree it is not practical to move it to that spot, but we need to understand that entirely.

Parsons

I will try to prepare a map ahead of time that shows where the utility lines run underground.

Chair Cox

That will be important information.

Jordan

And the well and the septic field.

Chair Cox

Thank you.

Hurricane Island Outward Bound School 3 Staff Cabins, 75 Marina Rd. Map 228 – Lot 033

McBride

I just want to start by saying the picnic pavilion we talked about last year has been built and it's swimmingly wonderful. Thank you for that. What we're proposing here are three little basically bunk houses. Like so many businesses, we have faced some significant challenges in the past few years both recruiting and retaining staff, primarily our field staff, the young people that take the kids out on hiking and sailing courses. In exploring this a little bit, we found that one of their grievances is the housing arrangements. When we first built the site out almost twenty-five years ago, we built four cabins that were about 10' by 16' dimension, identical and each cabin sleeps two to four. We have bunk beds in them. Today, people don't want to bunk with two or three or four people. They want their own little space, so these cabins are an attempt to address that housing situation. These are little duplexes. I think you can see from the drawings, 10-feet by 20-feet, sort of split down the middle so you end up with these little studio apartments, 10' by 10' with bunk beds. These will be in sort of a semi-circle, just off of our driveway which is known as Marina Row. They will not be visible from either the road or the water. They're well beyond the 250-foot line of the high water. They will not be attached to any kind of foundation or pilings. This area, as you know, is the old industrial quarry site, so it's a lot of granite rubble with leaf litter on top. So, these will be sitting basically on the ground in there, not permanently attached. If we make some horrible mistakes in the next few years and go belly up, these things could be winched onto a flatbed truck and taken away, so they're not forever structures down there. There's no plumbing. We're talking about some solar panels and some low voltage LED lighting. There's what we call the staff house, which is a couple hundred feet away, where we have the showers, laundry, and kitchen facilities. These are really just sleeping rooms, and a place for these folks to relax between courses or in the evening. When they want to gather, they gather in the staff house. We have sort of a living room arrangement in there, but these will provide them with a little more privacy, which seems to be fairly important to our staff.

Chair Cox

Your scheme here for the existing house that you have drawn an arrow to, is that the staff house?

McBride

It's called a staff house, although there's no sleeping in that house. As I said, there are laundry, kitchen, living room, and bath facilities. Again, we're not really adding capacity. We'd love to be able to say we can hire ten to twenty more staff but it's just not there. We're trying to hold on to the few staff that we have, who have been willing to work for us and have been griping a little bit about wanting their own space. So that's what we're attempting to address for a relatively modest price, with a relatively small amount of hassle on our part.

Terry Brackett

Does that mean you are not going to use the existing cabins?

McBride

No, we'd still use them. We would just take out some of the bunk beds so that there are one or two people in each cabin instead of three or four.

Hewlett

The key words are no kitchens, no bathrooms, and no plumbing.

Chair Cox

Are you saying that your septic system design is sufficient for the eleven bedrooms?

McBride

Yes. I don't remember. Terry, I don't know if you have that original septic design still in your file somewhere. When we moved down here from Rockland, twenty-five years ago, we had more boats and more programs running at that time. It has a pretty big second septic system. It's a twin tank. We probably overbuilt that, just hoping that we could maintain staff. I would say whatever is there is more than adequate for the eleven bedrooms, but you know we've gone from four cabins, with people piled in, down to ten cabins with basically the same number of people.

Chair Cox

Terry, what's your sense on the septic capacity

Terry Brackett

It has been a while since I looked this up, but I did look it up and they are okay on the subject capacity. I didn't stick a copy in the file.

McBride

It was a seasonal system. These folks were only here May through September.

Chair Cox

That was my main question as I looked at this. Where is the leach field and septic system located?

McBride

This is the site plan. This was done before we came down here.

Briggs

There are not a lot of trees in that area.

McBride

I've been taking down some small trees. There are a few nice big hardwoods we're keeping in there for summer shade. There's a big oak and some maple and birch trees, but a lot of this is scrubby and has grown up in the twenty-five years since we've moved down here. These are the granite fields that used to exist and now it has sprouted little spruce trees and birch trees and it's more heavily wooded now than it was. It doesn't have nearly the same sort of industrial wasteland look. Again, that system was designed and built brand new twenty-five years ago, so it's not like we are tying into some ancient engineered system with the two 1000-gallon tanks and the leach field. We've had no problems with it. I've had the tanks pumped out every other year. It's a well-maintained system. We have had no problems with it.

Hewlett

You mentioned solar panels. Do you want to add that to the project description?

McBride

It might not be something that happens immediately, but that's another concern of our staff, zero emissions. The pavilion was meaningful for them because when we have a group of twelve kids come in to start a course, until now they had to basically be out in the rain. Now they have a shelter, so big brownie points for that construction. So little by little things can happen. The roof will be a dark green metal roof, and the siding will be a composite called Smartside, with the effect of a horizontal pine look to it, which is rather attractive. The other cabins that we built have cedar shingles but we're finding they're not holding up all that well. It's a damp environment down there and we get a fair bit of wind blowing down this way with all the storms.

Chair Cox

I saw one thing on the front page. Just to make clear the application, down at the bottom, in the chart where it says number of bedrooms. It says present "5", proposed "3 x 2" for a total of "6" and it should be "11".

McBride

You're right on that.

Jordan

I had a similar question on the other side of the page under number of dwelling units. We have this technical definition of dwelling units, and it has to have kitchen facilities and toilets.

McBride

That's an error because we have the other cabins but if it needs to have a kitchen and a toilet, it's not a dwelling unit.

Jordan

I think the correct answer is one existing and that is the house. None proposed. One total. You can make that change.

McBride

“1” present, “0” proposed, “1” total.

Briggs

Is there one bathroom in the big house?

McBride

There are no bathrooms in these cabins that the permit addresses.

Jordan

Present means on the lot, so however many there are in the house,

McBride

There are two toilets on each side, shall we say, and one urinal on the side for male identifying people. Then there are two showers on each side, for a total of four shower stalls, four toilets, and four sinks.

Briggs

Four toilets.

Chair Cox

Let's say four bathrooms at present; none are proposed.

Briggs

Are each of the four toilets in a separate room?

McBride

In a separate stall; two rooms.

Briggs

If you have a bathroom, for whatever gender person, but it has four stalls, is it just one restroom?

McBride

I would call it two restrooms. Each restroom has two showers, two toilet stalls, and two sinks, and if you go across the hall, it is a mirror image.

McBride

I think it is two.

McBride

“2” present, “0” proposed, for a total of “2”.

McBride

Do we need to adjust the septic system design?

Chair Cox

The septic system design is based on the number of bedrooms as that is the number of bodies you will have using it.

McBride

The existing system is good for eleven.

Chair Cox

So, eleven works. We are good with that. Do we need any more information?

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Hewlett, the Board found, by a 5-0 vote, that the application was complete.

Chair Cox

Do we need to do a site visit?

McBride

It's a high spot, level enough to put these three cabins on. It's not visible from the road, from our neighbors, or from the water.

Chair Cox

Do we have enough information here, given that Terry has been there as well?

Hewlett

It's 48 acres. It's not visible from the road or from the water.

Chair Cox

We don't need a site visit. Let's go to the site plan review.

Section 5A of the Site Plan Review Ordinance

1. Preserve and Enhance the Landscape

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, that the standard has been met as they are small buildings on a large lot and will have a negligible effect on the on the landscape. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

2. Relationship of the Proposed Buildings/Structures to the Environment

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, that the standard has been met as it is in character with the existing environment. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

3. Vehicular Access

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, that the standard has been met as there will be no changes to vehicular access. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

4. Parking and Pedestrian Circulation

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, that the standard has been met as there will be no changes to parking and pedestrian circulation. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

5. Surface Water Drainage

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as the small buildings on a large lot will have no effect on surface water drainage. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

6. Existing Utilities

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, that the standard has been met as there will be no effect on the utilities identified in the ordinance. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

7. Advertising Features

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as there is no signage proposed. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

8. Special Features

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Brown, that the standard has been met as no special features are proposed and no changes to the hours of operation are proposed. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

9. Exterior Lighting

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as no exterior lighting is proposed. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

10. Emergency Vehicle Access

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as there will be no changes to emergency vehicle access. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

11. Municipal Services

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as there will be no changes made. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

12. Water/Air Protection

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as the project will have no effect on elevation, soil slopes, effluents or abutting owners. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

13. Water Supply

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as no water will be used by the proposed development. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

14. Soil Erosion

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as there will be a minimal effect on soil erosion from the project. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

15. Sewage Waste Disposal

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met per the Code Enforcement Officer's review and confirmation that the existing waste disposal system is adequate for the proposed development. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

16. Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met because none are proposed. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

17. Financial/Technical Capacity

A motion was made by Jordan seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met on the basis of the applicant's representation. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

18. Shoreland Zone

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard is not applicable as this site is not in the Shoreland Zone. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

19. Flood Plain

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard is not applicable as the site is not in a flood plain. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

20. Lot Standards

A motion was made by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, that the standard has been met as the setbacks and lot coverage requirements have been adhered to. By a 5-0 vote, the motion carried.

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Briggs, the Board, by a 5-0 vote, approved the application.

Permitting with Prock, Skipstone LLC/Emily Greenwald, 165 Howards Head Rd., Map 206 – Lot 012

Devin Prock

Good evening. I'm representing Skipstone LLC, which is under the care of Emily Greenwald for her family. They'd like to build a recreational pier that measures 5-foot x 154-foot. That 154-foot includes the 24-foot access ramp from shore to the pier, so it's kind of an incline and it goes downhill towards the pier, from up on the applicant's lawn. The property is located at 165 Howards Head Road in St. George on Map 206 – Lot 012. The pier would be supported by three granite cribs, and one onshore granite block abutment. The reason we propose using granite is we don't have to cast concrete or form up for it and construction projects tend to go quicker that way. The pier that they want to go with is an aluminum system. It's all aluminum except for the decking that will be wood, and the handrail may have some wooden caps on top of that just for aesthetics. They have a seasonal 3-foot wide by 50-foot-long aluminum gangway, a seasonal 16-foot by 26-foot floating dock with the associated moorings and chains that will go with it. Other than that, it's a pretty simple recreational pier for the family. There are probably three or four families within that family that will use it and my understanding is they are usually all there at the same time, so they should be able to enjoy it, if it's approved for you guys. You have any questions for me?

Chair Cox

Do I recall seeing that there will be no vegetation removed in the construction of this?

Devin Prock

Yes. (Inaudible) won't be removed. The building of it will all take place from the water by barge, and we may use an excavator to help move the granite blocks a little bit and we would set that on top of timber mats so everything would be by barge. I did have this satellite photo of the pier of the property. I had a

stake down by Little Water and then another stake up on the top of the bank but I may have to run down and re-stake it because that was two years ago.

Chair Cox

We've had some rough weather. It looks like you have both DEP and Army Corps approval.

Prock

Yes, they do.

Chair Cox

Okay, other questions people may have.

Jordan

I have one question that struck me when I was looking at the copy of the application for DEP approval under the NRPA. One of the attachments, Attachment Eight, says the landowners' proposed shoreline stabilization project will take place above the high annual tide line, but I did not see any reference in our application to a shoreline stabilization.

Prock

That was a typo. I accidentally left it in there. The DEP never caught that. You can put a line through that. They actually already have shoreline stabilization there, back when I can't remember who's on the property before. Was it Reinhardt?

Chair Cox

Any other questions about the application?

Jordan

Terry, is this in the marine residential district? It does not have the shoreline zoning district noted.

Terry Brackett

(Inaudible) I did put it in there on the file copy.

Chair Cox

Do we have a complete application and do we need a site visit?

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Hewlett, the Board found, by a 5-0 vote, that the application was complete.

Chair Cox

It is our tradition to have site visits for piers that aren't simply replacements.

Hewlett

Terry, did the Harbor Master approve this, because of the length?

Terry Brackett

He did approve it on March 16, 2023.

Chair Cox

Could we combine this site visit with the other site visit and do it on Monday the 10th?

Prock

Isn't it low tide then?

Chair Cox

We would like to have a floater buoy out there where the float would be so that if it is not low tide, we can tell where the length of the pier is.

Prock

I don't have access to put a boat in yet to do that, but I can at least stake out the outer end of the pier because the pier stops at low water, and then tie a toggle and buoy to that so it would float.

Chair Cox

That would be fine.

Prock

Okay, I'll go down and make sure I get that marked out before the site visit.

Chair Cox

Would Monday, April 10th work for you? It would be around 6:00p.m., maybe a little before, because we are going to do another site visit up the peninsula at 5:00p.m.

Bates

Low tide is at 8:38 that night.

Chair Cox

Then we will be getting towards low tide that night. That will be good. We can get an idea of the relationship to other piers and houses in the area. April 10th, at 6:00p.m. We will see you there.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Briggs, the Board decided by a unanimous vote to adjourn the meeting and at 8:20 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Taylor
Recording Secretary
Town of St. George, Maine