

St. George Public Planning Board Meeting

7:00PM at Town Office and via Zoom

October 24, 2023

Minutes

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm. Planning Board Members present were Chair Anne Cox, Anne Cogger, Richard Moskowitz, Michael B. Jordan, Jane Brown, and Elaine Taylor. Also present in person were CEO Terry Brackett, Wendy Carr, Will Gartley and Chuck Campbell.

Quorum:

A quorum was present.

Conflicts of Interest:

There were no conflicts of interest.

Adjustments to the Agenda

The minutes for the October 10, 2023 Site Public Hearing regarding 175 Island Ave. were removed from the agenda.

Minutes

Brown moved to approve the October 10, 2023 Planning Board Meeting Minutes, as corrected, seconded by Moskowitz, and by a unanimous vote, the minutes were approved.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Building Permit – Install New Piers Under Boat Boathouse, 222 Harts Neck Rd., Map 216 – Lot 025

Chair Cox

Are there any questions regarding the revised application?

Cogger

How many piers will there be?

Chuck Campbell

I haven't designed it yet.

Jordan

What diameter?

Chuck Campbell

I haven't designed it yet. They are not going to be very tall, not going to raise it.

Chair Cox

Help me understand what the difference is between a foundation and piers.

Brackett

A foundation has continuous walls and piers are just posts.

Jordan

That sounds odd to me. I always thought a pier was something that supports a building.

Brackett

Piers are the same as what you approved down at Dorr's Cottage Rd. They raised a whole cottage.

Chair Cox

But there was no other place they could move it.

Brackett

I walked that property and most of it is wetlands. There is a stream running across it and it does not look like there is anywhere to move it.

Jordan

That is not marked on the site plan.

Chair Cox

I totally get it and I understand what you are trying to do. Where I get conflicted is it sounds like a foundation.

Chuck Campbell

I included the letter from the DEP, the correspondence.

Jordan

In your professional opinion, as an architect, is it a foundation or not?

Chuck Campbell

I don't want to answer that because I don't want to influence it.

Will Gartley

The definition is in the Shoreland Zoning.

Chair Cox

Right. It states, "...the supporting substructure of a building or other structure excluding wooden sills and post supports, but including basement slabs, frost walls or other base consisting of concrete block, brick or similar material". It is not clear. For post supports and wooden sills, I'm wondering if that was intended to be wooden as opposed to a base consisting of concrete block, brick or similar material. I don't know. I've been looking at it since Friday when I got this and I'm wondering if this is in here because wooden sills and wooden posts, if that's allowed. It is a foundation in that it is supporting the structure.

Brackett

A post is not a foundation.

Jordan

These piers are a form of post support. Is that the position?

Chuck Campbell

Yes.

Chair Cox

What I worry about for us, and it is a very small thing, but I worry about setting some precedent. You say that there is no place that it can be moved to but it is a pretty big piece of property. I think there might be no place they want to move it to.

Brackett

It is mostly wetlands.

Jordan

The purpose of this foundation rule from the standpoint of the DEP is to find a way to get rid of things that are closer to the water and grandfather things that are closer to the water than they could be now. They made this rule in Section 12 C that says if you are replacing the foundation, then you must move it back if you can. I do not understand the policy reason why they would make a different rule for piers

than they would for any other kind of structure if the object was to get buildings out of the immediate shoreland area.

Brackett

They want buildings and dwellings moved back but this boathouse can be left where it is. This building has probably been around since the 1940s or 1950s from looking at the construction.

Jordan

So, the distinction is between a dwelling unit and an accessory structure.

Brackett

It is a boathouse.

Jordan

The ordinance does not say a boathouse is okay. If the definition of a foundation means that it is acceptable if it is on piers, then according to the ordinance it would work for any kind of structure.

Chair Cox

It does not make a distinction in the ordinance.

Jordan

Would that be the position if this were a house?

Brackett

Yes. If it can't be moved back.

Jordan

Let's just say this could be moved back, and not we have some other decision to make (Inaudible) Let's just assume that there is. They could still keep the boathouse there so why couldn't they keep any other kind of building there.

Brackett

If you were storing boats in it, and it does have a boat in it, it can be on piers?

Jordan

No. Not for recreational boat storage. It specifically says recreational boat storage is not a functional water dependent use.

Brown

You can store a boat in Rockland away from the water.

Jordan

Probably at one time it was.

Brown

There is no railway. If there were a railway going into it, I would think it has to be there because if a railway goes to it that you haul on the boat there isn't.

Jordan

I just don't understand what the DEP's thinking is. It seems to be totally inconsistent, but that said, I guess now that we have been pointed to the definition of foundation as something that that apparently excludes...

Chair Cox

...wooden sills and post supports. It does not say the material of the post supports. Is that wooden? Maybe we just say it is not specified, so it is a post support, and any material of the post support is permissible even though it very specifically includes a base consisting of concrete block, brick or similar material.

Jordan

The foundation excludes post supports. It does not specify what kind of material the post is.

Chair Cox

And wooden does not modify both sills and posts?

Jordan

I don't know.

Chair Cox

The reason it stuck with me that it may modify both sills and posts is that we are talking about concrete block, brick and similar material in the other, as opposed to wooden. I do not know and maybe it is not that sort of thing. I will say that it feels like it should be able to be moved someplace and that it shouldn't be allowed. The fact that somebody from DEP said on piers that would be all right, without explaining it, I flippantly wondered if that means that we have to state in our ordinance, "...unless the DEP says it is okay." This is very small, and already exists, but I do not want to set precedent either.

Cogger

The reason that the foundations were not allowed was because of sea level rise and the idea of putting something within the Shoreland Zoning. Is that correct?

Chair Cox

No. This was written before sea level rise was on people's horizon. It has to do with wanting to keep structures 75 feet back.

Cogger

But if something is replaced with either concrete or stone, it is going to be there a long time.

Chair Cox

Yes. Will, do you have some insight?

Will Gartley

Yes. I've talked to Colin about this ad nauseam for quite a few years. His explanation is that the goal is to move structures back, and so they picked a full foundation because in their minds it was a cost threshold. If you were going to lift the building up, dig a hole, put a whole new foundation with walls, then you kind of went to a point where you can pick it up and move it. A lot of camps are supported by posts. We deal with this a lot with cottages and camps on lakes. If you have posts that are leaning and are going under there and putting in new posts, whether concrete or wood, they didn't want to make you move it back because going in there and putting in posts is something somebody can do on a weekend with a jack, You're not tripping what in their mind was a cost and project size threshold, making somebody move it back. That's what he explained to me as the reason why that's defined the way it is and I think this definition is exactly the definition out of Chapter 1000, which is the state model ordinance, and you've adopted the exact ordinance. He has been really consistent, and Colin's been the head of Shoreland Zoning for twenty years now so a lot of times when I'm doing one of these projects, I send it to him before I go to the Planning Board because a lot of times CEOs will send whatever I submit to him anyway to get their opinion. I want to know if he agrees that we've interpreted it right. We've done a lot of projects like this where we replaced existing posts with new posts, and he says it doesn't trigger the foundation definition to make you move it back.

Chair Cox

The other project related to that was the project you were involved with on Horse Point Road, where there was absolutely no place to go with that structure and there was the environmental impact of putting a foundation on it. We would like them to get rid of that building. We would like them to move it back but there was no place to move it back to. The environmental impact, in terms of impact on the resource, would not be any different from this one. That was the other side that I was thinking about. So, maybe we do say wooden does not modify post supports and it just means a post support of whatever material.

Will Gartley

That definition could be much better.

Chair Cox

We have an opportunity to modify that. Let's return to our application. I would like to add, "to place on concrete piers".

Chuck Campbell

Concrete piers are going to be much more stable than wood.

Chair Cox

Right. And I think I would also like to include, as Cameron Dufour's note mentions, "as long as it's in the same footprint". Can we just say, "repair existing boathouse structure and place on concrete piers keeping the same the existing footprint"?

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Cogger, the Board found that the revised application was complete, and by a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

On a motion by Brown, seconded by Cogger, the Board approved the application, and by a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

Chair Cox

Thanks for changing it. We will see what happens.

Building Permit – Build a 30' x 102' Pile Supported Pier, with a 3' x 40' Aluminum Ramp and (2) 8' x 20' Wood Floats with Skids, Build a 20' x 84' Boat Ramp – Atwood Quarry Rd., Map 222 – Lot 086

Will Gartley

We started this about five or six years ago for Ratcliff but didn't get very far. We got it permitted but just didn't build much.

Chair Cox

I think that was there when we did the site visit.

Will Gartley

The septic system?

Chair Cox

It did not change an iota since then.

Will Gartley

We have included a letter from CTL outlining what they do. Gavin McClain is the owner, and they do a lot of timber harvesting and land clearing. They have a kind of a niche with helping a lot of islands get rid of dead wood and do forest management. They struggled to find locations to be able to bring wood ashore, so that's his goal with this property. Knowing that there had been a pier approved there before, he felt like it was a good bet that we could make something work here. We've submitted all the permit applications. I have an email from the DEP saying that the permit was drafted and went out for signature on October 10th. I had hoped to have it by now and haven't been able to get them to let me know where that is at. I should have that soon and will make sure I get copies for you. Otherwise, access is going to be the same. We didn't put a turnaround down there just because of how close it is to the water, so he's going to back down that road with his trucks to get material in. It would have been really difficult, and it would have been blowing up a lot of land area to create a spot to turn around those timber trucks. He said at that location, backing up won't be an issue.

Chair Cox

Wide open practice.

Will Gartley

We did look at it quickly with the Board when we were on site looking at the subdivision, but you are certainly welcome to have another on site. The Harbormaster has reviewed it and after we met down there, the Harbormaster actually met with Gavin on site to look at everything and we've included the letter from the Harbormaster.

Jordan

I am not sure what I am looking at on the drawings. There are two things sticking out of the water. The pinkish one I think is a pier. Off to the side of it, there is a connected ramp and a float and then to the southwest of that was another thing sticking out which is a boat ramp. What are the two things that are different?

Will Gartley

Okay, so there's the fixed pier, which you can see marked with all the dots that you referenced as pink. That's going to be a permanent solid structure. And then to the northeast of that there's a gangway and a float and then to the south is a boat ramp. With the ramp, they'll be able to bring a barge and load and unload from the barge and bring a timber truck down that has the grapple right on the truck. They'll be able to bring the barge in and load onto the truck. The truck will back onto that wooden pier and the float allows them to use a normal-size passenger boat to bring their staff to and from the islands.

Jordan

Does this taper down into the water or is it above the water?

Brackett

It is just a pier like we permit all the time.

Will Gartley

There are two sections in the application labeled Wharf Section and Boat Ramps Section. All of this is over the top of and within the area that's all granite. That whole point was filled with granite, I don't know how many years ago. For the boat ramp, we actually have to remove some of that and reshape it, and then we're going to put the precast concrete planks down for the wharf or pier. We'll be manipulating some of that granite in order to set those piles and probably anchor the piles to some of that granite. And then once we get past the slope of the granite, we'll be able to drive the piles.

Jordan

Is the use of the boat ramp to pull boats out of the water?

Will Gartley

They actually have a barge that they bring timber in on and so they'll be able to bring it up onto that boat ramp and unload from there.

Chair Cox

Our ordinance says you can have one structure that extends over the water, over the high tide line per lot. Why is the boat ramp not a structure that is extending beyond the high tide line?

Brackett

They have different functions.

Chair Cox

But they both still extend past the high tide line. They're two different structures.

Brackett

That is like Ten Cold Storage.

Will Gartley

It's hard to have a boat ramp without a pier and float system because when you launch it, you've got to have something to tie it to.

Chair Cox

I get it. I want to make sure we're within it.

Jordan

I think the pinkish structure and the attached gangway and float are all one thing but then there is this other thing.

Will Gartley

There's the boat ramp next to it. What section is that?

Jordan

15C1 on page 24.

Chair Cox

I think in CFMA districts we allow as many docks and things as you want.

Jordan

We will as soon as the new Shoreland Zoning Provisions take effect, but this is Marine Residential.

Will Gartley

This is a section that allows no more than one pier, dock, wharf or similar structure, extending or located below the normal high waterline of a water body or wetland allowed on a single lot. I would say that the boat ramp is not a similar structure to a wharf and pier. They have totally different functions.

Brown

That is how I interpreted it.

Chair Cox

I just want to make sure we are clear about that. When we dealt with the ramp on Mosquito Island, we treated it in the same general way that we normally treat a pier but that was just a ramp, and we treated it as such. Would they be allowed to put a pier on it as well? Maybe.

Jordan

What makes it a similar structure to the other ones described is providing access between the land and the water, which your boat ramp certainly does.

Brackett

If you look at all the state boat ramps, it does not matter if it is salt water or fresh water, but they all have float ramps and boats beside them.

Chair Cox

Sure, and I think areas like the town landing, are CFMA districts, aren't they?

Brackett

I believe that is Marine Residential.

Will Gartley

Does it matter? Doesn't this apply to everything?

Chair Cox

Yes, it says every lot.

Jordan

That is right. In the new ordinance it will. Chapter 1000 allows multiple structures, without having double the shoreline, for everyone except CFMA districts. With those, since the required shoreline is basically zero in a CFMA district, the result is that you can have as many as you want but our ordinance does not state that now. It does state that in the new Land Use Ordinance but that hasn't taken effect yet because of some back and forth with the DEP.

Chair Cox

Which is why he doesn't want to mess with the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

Will Gartley

Every time we've ever done a boat ramp it's always had a pier and float system next to it.

Jordan

This one does not because you put the float and pier as a part of the pier.

Will Gartley

The pier is next to it. There is a gangway and float on the other side of the pier also. I guess I wouldn't read that to mean that the boat ramp is a similar structure to a pier or a wharf. They are two totally different things. They are constructed differently, and they serve different purposes.

Cogger

It is all part of the same project though, working together and supporting the forestry project.

Chair Cox

I just want us to be really clear. The section is, "Piers, Docks, Wharfs, Bridges and Other Structures and Uses Extending Over or Beyond the Normal High Waterline. The ramp seems like a use.

Environmentally, this ramp is not a whole lot different from the granite that is currently there. It is just reconfigured. It is not as if we have a forested shore that has been cut, and a ramp being put in. It is almost as if you were just rearranging the granite that is there. It is not different from shoreline

stabilization projects that often go along with piers. That is another way to think about it. Are we tripped up by having two structures?

Brown

I do not see them being the same structure, so I do not have a problem. They are two different things.

Jordan

If you just move this one over and attach it to the pier, then there is only one structure.

Will Gartley

The only reason there's a separation, looking at the boat ramp section, is because of that existing granite, it has to drop down, and so we need space for that return slope to get back up to the elevation that's underneath the pier.

Chair Cox

So, Michael, do you think this trips us up?

Jordan

I think there's enough wiggle room.

Chair Cox

I agree. We need to let the neighbors know about the dock and have a site visit, even though we saw the location as we did not know about the ramp at the time. There has been a lot of industrial work going on there for many years. It could be very noisy. It would be better for the neighbors to know.

Chair Cox

I agree.

Moskowitz

Will this be in operation seven days a week?

Will Gartley

No. When they're really busy, they could come in two or three times a week but it's not seven days a week and they're willing to have reasonable hours. I think I noted 7am to 7pm in the application.

Moskowitz

Right, but it didn't say how many days a week.

Will Gartley

I think it's pretty inconsistent.

Brackett

It could depend on the tide.

Will Gartley

It definitely will depend on the tide. They could have a busy week and go out every day and then they could have a break and not be there for two or three weeks because it takes time to do the work on the island, to load and then bring it to the shore. I know in the past he has tried to do it in Tenants Harbor and that is a challenge. There are so many people and cars around that makes it really difficult.

Chair Cox

This seems like a good location for that given the use of the surrounding area.

Will Gartley

There has been a lot of interest. He has received calls from other people asking to use it.

Chair Cox

Our next meeting is not going to be until the 14th of November. We should be able to have a site visit between now and then and notify the abutters.

Brackett

Is this going in the paper or not?

Chair Cox

I do not think it has to go in the paper. I also am thinking evenings are not going to work anymore. It will need to be probably a Saturday.

Chair Cox

What about Saturday, the 11th of November?

Will Gartley

I'm out of town. I could have somebody else be there though if need be.

Chair Cox

Would we be able to notify people in time to have it by the fourth?

Brackett

That is too soon. How about Wednesday at 4:00 or 4:30pm?

Chair Cox

What is your sense about having it so that the public is able to be there?

Brackett

There are not that many people that are going to be notified and many are out of state.

Will Gartley

We've talked to some of them.

Jordan

I am not sure when sunset is going to be two weeks from now, but today it was 5:30pm.

Chair Cox

On November 5, we move to daylight savings time so that puts us a little darker.

Chair Cox

Terry, could we do it by the 6th of November?

Brackett

That will be perfect.

Chair Cox

Then we will schedule it for Monday, November 6th at 4:00pm.

Building Permit – Build (4) 600 Square Foot Cabins, Atwoods Quarry Rd., Map 222-Lot 086

Chair Cox

We have not dealt with a subdivision in quite a while and some newer members have not dealt with any at all. Will has a very detailed application and will be able to walk us through it. We are at the point where we have the preliminary plan, a preliminary meeting/pre-application in June, and we had a site visit. We have received the application for preliminary plan approval. That is what we will look at today. Section 6 on Preliminary Plan Submission Requirements lists quite a few things that we need to make sure are in this preliminary plan that he has submitted.

I printed it out so that I can keep a checklist, but we need to make sure everything is here, including the date it was done, the name of it, and the type of sewage disposal method. We need to make sure we have that. After we have decided whether the preliminary proposal is complete or not, we have thirty days to deal with it and call a public hearing, so I am trying to keep track of the dates on that. Will presented it to us. I believe we must issue you a dated receipt for October 24th, confirming we have received the preliminary plan. We will put that together. Within thirty days from today we have to decide whether we accept it as complete or not. I want to get that out there to get us thinking about this because it is complicated.

Jordan

After that, we have to hold a public hearing within thirty days after accepting this as complete. Within thirty days of the public hearing, we have to approve the preliminary application and if we approve it, you have six months to file the final application with any changes from the hearing that come up as a result of that process.

Chair Cox

We are going to be approving it or not or offering some changes, and then it will be at least six months from now before we potentially receive the final plan.

Will Gartley

All the heavy lifting is right here in the preliminary plan.

Chair Cox

Unless we find something that was forgotten. There is a lot to digest, take in, look at and figure out and a lot of details that we will need to pay attention to.

Jordan

I have looked at the listing of things in 6E that are required to be here, and I looked at the application and their checklist which was very helpful. I'm pretty sure that we have something that is responsive to each of the requirements. We are not missing anything in 6E, but I have not been able to read through all that material to make sure that what needs to be in there is in fact there and doubt anybody else has been able to either, so I don't think we are in a position to decide completeness tonight. It is complete in the sense that all the items are there but whether each of the items itself is completely responsive to the requirement, we have to spend some time reviewing.

Will Gartley

Aren't those two different things?

Jordan

A detail may be missing. The sewage disposal application may not contain everything it is supposed to or an item in the soil erosion sedimentation control plan might be missing. We have not read them so I do not see how we can decide completeness tonight. I would expect we would do that at our next meeting, which because of the calendar is three weeks away on November 14th.

Chair Cox

Let him talk and then see where we are at the end and decide if we feel like we need to take more time.

Jordan

Before we do that, I would like to raise one other thing that is not listed in Paragraph E but back in the list of subsequent requirements, and that is fire safety which basically requires a fire pond or sprinkler system. I didn't see that.

Will Gartley

That is mentioned here.

Jordan

Like I said, we have only had this since Friday.

Will Gartley

We had to submit it 21 days prior.

Chair Cox

We did not get it until Friday and have not had the chance to thoroughly get into it. We did not even know it was coming until Friday. Do you want to talk about anything we should know about?

Will Gartley

Sure. You have the list and we have quite a bit of material in here. Our cover letter was intended to go through those preliminary plan requirements just to make clear where those were found in the application with regards to completeness, and then we have the application and an abutters map, which I think is also helpful in that it shows the property and how the subdivision is laid out on the property and what's around it with regards to the abutting properties.

We have some site photographs, the tax map, the soil survey from the county, the septic system or HHE 200 forms. For septic we have one existing system that's already installed and two potential new systems. We're hoping that we're just going to use the one that's existing and the new one. That will still leave one location if for some reason he wanted to build a house down the road.

Chair Cox

How would you decide whether you can use the existing for all of these or not?

Will Gartley

We've got a copy of the existing design and we're going to have common septic tanks for two cabins and a common septic tank for the other two cabins. For the two cabins to the north, we will be able to gravity to that one existing system. We may need some pretreatment in order to make the numbers all work, so we've got to work through that, but that's all going to come to Terry anyway, once we get the final design.

Brackett

The existing system is 270, right?

Will Gartley

Right, three bedrooms. We could either expand that or add pretreatment to make that all work. For the other two cabins, we would have to pump to the one new system that's just inside the radius of the road. We've plenty of capacity because we have three different locations. It's just figuring out what's the most efficient way to utilize those three locations as we have a total of eight bedrooms, two bedrooms per cabin.

Chair Cox

It sounds like most likely you will need to have a second field.

Will Gartley

We'll definitely have two. We can't get all of it into one.

Chair Cox

You cannot expand it.

Will Gartley

No. We are either going to have to expand the existing system or add pretreatment, which then allows us to have the four bedrooms go to that one existing system, or we need to design the new system to be a six bedroom system and only have two bedrooms go to that existing system, or we could put another system down here and gravity everything. I'm still working with Gavin on what he wants to save for later and what he wants to do now. He has some options but I think for subdivision purposes, all we need to do is show that we have capacity. We don't have to have the details of exactly how that's going to happen. Like most subdivisions, all we're doing is showing a test pit and a potential location.

Brackett

Do you have the test pit data?

Will Gartley

Yes. We have the data in the package. We have the forms for both of the two new locations, and I've got a copy of the design for the existing system. I think with septic, we're in good shape and have the materials there. Like I said, ultimately, before he builds it and gets the permit from Terry, we have to finalize those designs. Then, for the erosion control plan, we've actually got a narrative in here and some details. This is a tricky site in that the cabins are going to be built on ledge and rock so the silt barrier below that, if there really is much soil disturbance, is going to have to be a bark mulch berm, because we can't put a silt fence in there. Most people are doing that now and for Gavin, it is easy because that's what he does. He has plenty of bark mulch berm material. The road is pretty simple. We all walked it

that day. It's a pretty easy path. There was some sort of access there previously, historically. It's not going to be too difficult to construct.

Chair Cox

What about the question about the firetruck radius?

Will Gartley

We have software that we can use to model a truck and show the travel lanes. I sent that to Chief Smith back in June. I meant to bring a copy of it, I think I left it sitting on my desk, but I'll make sure that I provide that to you. It shows the travel and turning of the truck and even how it would pull into the turnaround and backup. It shows the tires all around the road and that it fits without a problem, and the truck that we used was based on what the chief told me to use. I'm pretty sure that he's happy and when I sent this to him originally, he just said as long as it works, he is fine with it. I think I did tweak the turnaround a little bit when I ran that model to make that radius. There's an arrow that shows 35R. I had to make that a little bigger for the size truck he wanted fit in there. A typical radius is more like 20 or 25. Both of those radiuses were widened; otherwise, everything worked fine.

I've got the profile of the road that shows the existing ground and the slope and typical sections for construction of the road and then the well location. We'll have a little wellhouse that will be where the water gets distributed to each of the buildings and that's going to be seasonal because we won't be able to get that below grade, enough to have it insulated.

Chair Cox

And these are seasonal cabins.

Will Gartley

Yes. If you wanted to make them year-round, you potentially could. We would just have to insulate that waterline a little differently and he may choose to do that right from the beginning. They make insulation and then a lot of times we'll dig the trench and then put BlueBoard on the sides and over the top to help.

Otherwise, it's relatively straightforward. The road is a total of about 800 feet and there's a little parking space at each cabin for two cars. You can see that we tried to minimize the grading and the clearing in the road construction. He wanted to keep it as natural as possible.

Chair Cox

And there's a little bit of road easement along Atwoods Quarry Rd.

Will Gartley

Yes. That heavy blue line shows the 20-foot-wide access easement conveyed to Atwood Brothers Inc.

Chair Cox

Was there an old power line there?

Will Gartley

It's still there. Some of it's hanging on the ground. The intent is to is to remove that.

Moskowitz

Who owns that power line?

Will Gartley

That's a good question. I'm not sure. I don't know if Gavin has done the research to try to figure that out. It was abandoned. I'm not even sure if there is power. I think that the lines that are left there were an old cable line of some sort.

Chair Cox

The power is going to come in lower.

Will Gartley

On the plan, we're showing the existing power that comes down Atwood Quarry Road and then the power for this. We're talking about coming off of pole number seven and then bringing in a new overhead line. Do you see that?

Chair Cox

Yes, and then I see it will be underground.

Will Gartley

Overhead to the road and then underground to the to the cottages.

Chair Cox

I believe somewhere in the subdivision requirements, it says "preference for underground".

Will Gartley

It is all rock to get up there.

Chair Cox

Yes. It has to happen the way it is, and it goes underground once it gets there.

Will Gartley

Otherwise, it is really pretty simple and straightforward. We're not creating new lots. It's all going to still be one property. He's got enough acreage for four units.

Jordan

How far apart are the units going to be?

Will Gartley

They are thirty feet apart.

Jordan

They have to be twenty-five in the ordinance. I have some questions about things that are not on the 6e list. These are in section four.

Chair Cox

The performance standards.

Jordan

Yes. One of them is in Section 1. They put a bunch of requirements there. If you look at 1h, one thing we have to determine is that it won't have an undue effect on significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. I think we need to get something from the DIFW. They probably have maps.

Will Gartley

They do. I can provide you with a map of all the wildlife habitat stuff. That's easy enough to do.

Jordan

What is the source of the map?

Will Gartley

DIFW. It's available online. It's the same database that has the wading bird habitat, eel grass, deer wintering yards, etc. I can print that off for you.

Jordan

Here is a really important item, 4h6. We are supposed to look and see what the road sign is supposed to look like.

Chair Cox

On Pg 12, Roads Names and Signs.

Jordan

Road name signs shall be furnished. I do not know if we need to look at it or not. The subdivider has to put them up. You are going to do that I suppose.

Will Gartley

Yes. I think for E91 we are probably required to anyway. You have a **(Inaudible)**.

Chair Cox

We know you have a stop sign.

Will Gartley

I didn't even think of a road sign.

Brackett

We are always away from naming that road.

Chair Cox

We have a name on it.

Will Gartley

We picked a name, Ocean View Rd. We need to get it approved.

Chair Cox

The road and the numbers for each of those cabins.

Chair Cox

Who picks that for the town? These are all on the same side of the road.

Jordan

The only other item I have is about stormwater drainage in Section 4e. I'm sure you are paying attention to stormwater issues. I did not immediately notice where it was covered in the materials. I saw the erosion control.

Will Gartley

Right. We have the ditch line on the north side of the road. We've got a culvert with stone inlet and outlet and otherwise most of the water, once you get to where the cabins are, is going to make it towards the ocean.

Jordan

And most of that is probably going to keep flowing away.

Will Gartley

Yes, we're not changing the direction where anything is going and there are a lot of rocks there already, so we're not getting much infiltration.

Chair Cox

The only stormwater control is around the road with the ditch going down to the culvert.

Jordan

Have a look at all that and advise if there is anything we need to know.

Chair Cox

Michael has raised the issue of having thirty days and taking some time until our next meeting to have a chance for everybody to spend time with this and look at it.

Will Gartley

So, the intent would be at the next meeting you would, from my perspective hopefully, find it complete and approve the preliminary plan and then you would schedule a public hearing.

Jordan

We would find it complete and then schedule a public hearing and then after the public hearing is when approval would be considered.

Chair Cox

I ran the possibility of that. If we accept it as complete at our November 14th meeting, then the public hearing has to be within thirty days, so that would be December 14th. Then we have up to thirty days to approve it but it could be sooner. We would have until January 14th.

Jordan

We do not have to have the public hearing thirty days after, but within thirty days if we can manage it sooner. We have to advertise it. That is in the ordinance. We could probably get the advertising done and the notification to people within three weeks instead of four weeks.

Chair Cox

Yes. Before our next meeting, I will come up with a schedule for that.

Will Gartley

At the meeting for the 14th, we will be looking at both the pier and the preliminary plan for the subdivision.

Chair Cox

Yes.

Will Gartley

Is it okay if I attend remotely for that one? I can have somebody else come but I certainly know this more than anybody else in my office.

Chair Cox

That is fine.

Will Gartley

That would be great. I'm going to be out of state on that night. But I'll be available. Thank you, as always. I will see you at the site visit on the 6th.

Chair Cox

And then our next meeting is scheduled for the 14th of November.

Adjournment

On a motion by Jordan, seconded by Brown, the Board decided by a unanimous vote to adjourn the meeting and at 8:14 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Taylor
Recording Secretary
Town of St. George, Maine