

Minutes of the meeting of the TOCI Planning Board, Thursday February 21, 2013 at 7:15 at the Hall.

Members present: Sam Birkett (came late), Chip Corson, Louise Doughty (came late) Jane Frizzell, Charles Hall and Beth Howe (chair).

Absent: Mabel Doughty

Others present: Paul Belesca and Jonathan KomLosy

1. Minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2013

Jane moved, seconded by Chip to approve the minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Planning Board website

Beth said that the text is rather boring, but no one had any suggestions about how to improve it. Someone asked if the Selectmen give their phone numbers and email addresses. Mark said they did. Charles said to include his email. Jane moved, seconded by Chip to approve the material for the website. Approved unanimously.

In relation to the terms of each member, Mark said that at the last Selectmen's meeting they had appointed another person to serve on the Board. Beth and several others said that we have our full complement of 7 people now. Having 8 people could create tied votes, and the ordinance says only 7. The new appointee would only be on the island part of the year. Beth said she would discuss this with Eric.

3. Discussion of the Zoning Ordinance Revision

Since several members of the Board had not arrived, Beth suggested going over the proposed changes to the site plan decision criteria. The group worked through the proposed changes up to section H. Additional changes were made to:

Criterion: A Utilization of the site: Beth argued that it was not useful to include kinds of environmental characteristics or resources of the site that should be protected if the Town has no provisions in their ordinances about having such protection and how it should be accomplished. It was agreed to leave in wetlands, steep slopes and floodplains which the Zoning Ordinance does regulate. Sand and gravel aquifers were also included, as language protecting them may be added to the Zoning Ordinance in this revision.

Criterion: B Vehicular Access and Parking: Jane point out that the island-wide speed limit is 30 mph so only the sight distance for that speed needs to be included.

Criterion E: Parking Layout and Design: the new section about not having parking on the street was discussed at length. This is obviously done by long-time institutions such as the Church and the Hall but these are grandfathered. But it seems to be more of an issue with businesses in the summer, even though they do have designated parking lots. There was a feeling that the proposed wording was too strict. Mark suggested having "The parking area must be large

enough to reasonably accommodate usual business activity, and must minimize the need for on-street parking.” This was acceptable to everyone.

Sam also raised the issue of requiring lighting in parking lots. The lights could be on motion sensors or turn off when the use closes for the night. She said, and others agreed that it is not good to light up the night sky. Mark said that at the Rec they have cut-off fixtures which direct the light downward. Beth said she would work on some language to cover this.

Paul then took the discussion off to the topic of the cut-point between major and minor site plans. He said that he thought the revision of the submission criteria was ok but asked why the cut-point had been changed from a 5,000 square foot building to a 3,000 one. He said this would create great financial hardship for anyone trying to start a small business. He said that Long Island has a better approach and Chebeague should use that. Several people said that the decision had not been made yet, the 3,000 square feet was a proposal. Beth said that the original rationale was that what represents a large project on Chebeague is generally smaller than on the mainland. It would be useful to have a more thorough review of proposals that bulk large in the community such as . Paul asked again why the cut-point had been lowered. He asked how many major site plans have been submitted since Chebeague became a town. Beth said none. Paul said that since the Board has no experience with major site plan applications, it should not change the present cut point.

Beth said that the present cut-point is partly determined by the size of project that an applicant could do on their own, with help only from a surveyor and a soil scientist for the design of the septic system. Paul said he thought that it would be difficult for people to do their own plans. He has had applications for several buildings at the Boat Yard, the largest of which was 4,900 square feet, and he had to hire consultants for them.

Jane suggested that, though this is not related to the size of the building, there may be some uses that are not appropriate. Beth said this is a somewhat different issue that we will get to in the revision.

Beth said it would also be possible to change the way that major and minor are defined by including all impervious surface created rather than just the size of the building. Since we have a height limitation, including the square footage of second floors does not matter a great deal, but management of storm water is more of an issue on Chebeague. So it may be important to include driveways and parking areas. Paul said that Chebeague has very few asphalt driveways or parking areas and that gravel is not impervious. Beth disagreed. Paul indicated that he had a stormwater study for the Boat Yard by an engineer that shows the permeability of different kinds of surfaces and gravel is permeable.

Chip said he was planning to bring a proposal to the Planning Board for a business that he thought would be larger than 3,000 square feet if impervious surface were included. Beth said that if impervious surface were to be included the sizes of the projects that would define the cut-point would be larger than those for buildings alone, to take account of the larger area being included. Beth said that one reason for having another discussion of the cut-point is because

Chip had not been involved in the earlier one. But it is important that all the members of the Board be present for that discussion.

Paul suggested again that the Board look at the Long Island site plan provisions and consider adopting them. It gives the applicant a yes or no answer.

Beth said that since it was 9:15, the Board should finish the rest of the decision criteria at another meeting. The next meeting will have a site plan review. She hesitated to say what it was for, but Jonathan and Paul asked if this were public information, so beth indicated it was for a new place for a CTC office.

She said that the meeting after that, in April, will be the discussion of the cut-point and she will make sure that everyone on the Board is there.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Howe