

MINUTES
FREEPORT PROJECT FREEPORT BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 2020
6 p.m.

This meeting was held online/virtually, using Zoom teleconferencing

Attending: Chair GERALYN Campanelli, Guy Blanchard, Gordon Hamlin, Ford Reiche, Vice Chair Adam Troidl, Suzanne Watson, Tod Yankee and Town Planner, Caroline Pelletier

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Campanelli called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. It is the Board's second virtual meeting and she thanked everyone for attending.

ITEM I: Information Exchange

1) Update on Staff Approvals

Mrs. Pelletier advised that she did a few staff approvals. There was one for a parking recalculation for Clark's and Starbuck's and they did see a reduction in their parking requirement. She also did a staff approval for a sign for Peregrine Acupuncture going into 178 Main Street on the property where Wilbur's of Maine is located on Lower Main Street.

2) Update on actions by the Staff Review Board

Mrs. Pelletier pointed out that the Staff Review Board approved a change of use this week for Peregrine Acupuncture. The building on the site was previously used as a daycare and they are moving their office in there and have no site changes.

3) Update on May meeting schedule

Mrs. Pelletier explained that there have been a couple of things that have come in for May 20th so we will plan on having a meeting on that date. It most likely will be a virtual meeting with two or three agenda items. One is a conceptual subdivision and one or two is for Design Review and she is still trying to finalize details with one of the applicants. She noted that it appears to be a reasonable agenda to handle virtually. We also need to elect a Secretary now that Drew is no longer on the Board. She plans to add that to the agenda as well.

ITEM II: Approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, February 20, 2020 Project Review Board meeting.

Chair Campanelli pointed out that she and Mr. Reiche were not in attendance and Mr. Yankee was not yet on the Board.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To approve the Minutes from the Wednesday, February 20, 2020 Project Review Board meeting as printed. (Troidl & Blanchard) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (4 Ayes- Hamlin, Blanchard, Troidl and Watson. (3 Excused-Campanelli, Reiche & Yankee)

ITEM III: Review of Tabled Items

Hewey Residence – Crab Island

The applicant is seeking approval for a new pier system including a new pier, ramp and float at their property on Crab Island. Since this parcel is in the Island District, Site Plan Review is required by the Board. Zoning Districts: Island District (ID) and Shoreland Area (SA). Tax Assessor Map ISL, Lot CRA. Bartlet and Kristina Hewey, applicant and owner; Carter Becker, Falls Point Marine, representative.

Mrs. Pelletier explained that this parcel is located in the Island District and as the Board knows, anything done in the Island District requires the applicant come in for Site Plan Review. In this application, the applicants are requesting a float system consisting of a pier, ramp and float. They were required to first go to the Coastal Waters Commission which reviews their application for compliance with their Ordinance. They get their DEP permits and their Army Corps permits and then come to this Board for Site Plan Review. She referred to the Island District section of the Ordinance and noted

that Site Plan Review is required and two other references. They need to meet the standards of the Coastal Waters Ordinance and meet the standards of Shoreland Zoning.

Mrs. Pelletier explained the property owners bought Crab Island and wanted to put out a dock and realized they couldn't. They amended the Zoning Ordinance and went through the approval process. Last year a dock got put in. They didn't realize they needed approval so it was removed. They are coming to get the approvals they need to allow this dock to go forward. A haul out is not permitted due to the location in the Island District and the Shoreland Zone. It is not shown in the drawings and is not part of the Board's approval. The length of the dock cannot exceed 125 feet per the Ordinance. She noted the Board could ask the representative tonight to confirm the length of that. There is a proposed condition that the length of the system not exceed 125 feet.

Mr. Reiche mentioned Ordinance Section 507.g and asked what sub part of "g" is triggered here. Mrs. Pelletier explained that it is supposed to be referring to the Shoreland Zoning requirements for the float system. Our Ordinance is not compliant with Shoreland Zoning and the reference to 507 is not correct. She took the language the Board needs to uphold right out of Shoreland Zoning and inserted it in the Staff Report. Mr. Reiche asked if a haul out is permitted under the Army Corps Permit and DEP but not our Ordinance? Mrs. Pelletier explained that it is not permitted in the Island District and Shoreland Zoning. The DEP and Army Corps look at it for different things. The DEP Permit was for the wetland impact and Army Corps looks at it for the impact to the Resource. Locally we cannot permit it under Shoreland Zoning which the Codes Officer has to enforce or in the Island District which has a limited number of structures.

Carter Becker noted he did not have any questions and that Mrs. Pelletier did a fine job answering all the questions.

Mr. Reiche noted he did not have a conflict but wanted to disclose that his wife sold the property to the Heweys. No issues were raised by the Board. No public comments were received.

- a. **Preservation of Landscape: The landscape shall be developed in such a manner as to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and in accordance with good development practice by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. If a site includes a ridge or ridges above the surrounding areas and provides scenic vistas for surrounding areas, special attempts shall be made to preserve the natural environment of the skyline of the ridge. Existing vegetation and buffering landscaping are potential methods of preserving the scenic vista.**

The project consists of the installing a new pier, ramp and seasonal float which will provide access to the property. The first section will include a 5'x55' pile supported permeant pier, which will connect to a 3' x 50' ramp, which will then lead to a (2) 12' x 20' floats, for a total pier system length of 124.9 feet; less than 125 feet, which is the maximum allowed by the Ordinance. The pier will be connected to the land in an area that is currently a rocky shoreline; no vegetation is proposed to be removed or added with this project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- b. **Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment: The design and layout of the buildings and/or other development areas shall encourage safety, including fire protection. Proposed structures shall be related harmoniously to the terrain and to existing buildings and land uses in the vicinity which have a visual relationship to the proposed buildings. Visual compatibility, not uniformity with the surrounding area, shall be emphasized. Special attention shall be paid to the scale (mass), height and bulk, proportions of the proposed buildings, the nature of the open spaces (setbacks, landscaping) around the buildings, the design of the buildings (including roof style, facade openings, architectural style and details), building materials and signs.**

If the structure is in the Design Review District, the Project Review Board shall incorporate the findings of the standards or the Design Review Ordinance in its Site Plan Review findings.

The parcel is not within the Freeport Design Review Districts. No new buildings are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- c. **Vehicular Access:** The proposed layout of access points shall be designed so as to avoid unnecessary adverse impacts on existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns. Special consideration shall be given to the location, number, and control of access points, adequacy of adjacent streets, traffic flow, sight distances, turning lanes, and existing or proposed traffic signalization and pedestrian-vehicular contacts. The entrance to the site shall meet the minimum sight distance according to MDOT standards to the greatest extent possible

No changes to vehicular access to the site are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- d. **Parking and Circulation:** The layout and design of all means of vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives, and parking areas shall be safe and convenient and, insofar as practical, shall not detract from the proposed buildings and neighboring properties. General interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, service traffic, drive-up facilities, loading areas, and the arrangement and use of parking areas shall be considered.

No changes to parking and circulation are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- e. **Surface Water Drainage:** Adequate provisions shall be made for surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties, down-stream conditions, or the public storm drainage system. The increase in rate of runoff in the post development condition shall be held to a zero or less percent of the predevelopment condition unless an engineering study has been performed as described in Section 529.2 above. On-site absorption shall be utilized to minimize discharges whenever possible. All drainage calculations shall be based on a two year, ten year and twenty-five year storm frequency. Emphasis shall be placed on the protection of floodplains; reservation of stream corridors; establishment of drainage rights-of-way and the adequacy of the existing system; and the need for improvements, both on-site and off-site, to adequately control the rate, volume and velocity of storm drainage and the quality of the stormwater leaving the site. Maintenance responsibilities shall be reviewed to determine their adequacy.

No changes to surface water drainage is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- f. **Utilities:** All utilities included in the site plan shall be reviewed as to their adequacy, safety, and impact on the property under review and surrounding properties. The site plan shall show what provisions are being proposed for water supply, wastewater, solid waste disposal and storm drainage. Whenever feasible, as determined by the Project Review Board, all electric, telephone and other utility lines shall be installed underground. Any utility installations above ground shall be located so as to have a harmonious relationship with neighboring properties and the site.

No change to utilities are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- g. **Advertising Features:** The size, location, texture and lighting of all exterior signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall not detract from the layout of the property and the design of proposed buildings and structures and the surrounding properties, and shall not constitute hazards to vehicles and pedestrians.

No signs are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- h. Special Features: Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, similar accessory areas and structures, shall be subject to such setbacks, screen plantings or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to prevent their being incongruous with the existing or contemplated environment and the surrounding properties.**

There are no special features associated with this project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- i. Exterior Lighting: All exterior lighting shall be designed to encourage energy efficiency, to ensure safe movement of people and vehicles, and to minimize adverse impact on neighboring properties and public ways. Adverse impact is to be judged in terms of hazards to people and vehicular traffic and potential damage to the value of adjacent properties. Lighting shall be arranged to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties and the traveling public. For all proposed lighting, the source of the light shall be shielded and the light should be directed to the ground, except in the case of ground sign lighting. In the Village Commercial 1 and 2 Districts, lighting for pedestrian walkways and adjacent public sidewalks shall also be provided.**

No new lighting is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- j. Emergency Vehicle Access: Provisions shall be made for providing and maintaining convenient and safe emergency vehicle access to all buildings and structures at all times.**

All public safety department heads have reviewed the plans. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- k. Landscaping: Landscaping shall be designed and installed to define, soften, or screen the appearance of off-street parking areas from the public right(s)-of-way and abutting properties, to enhance the physical design of the building(s) and site, and to minimize the encroachment of the proposed use on neighboring land uses. Particular attention should be paid to the use of planting to break up parking areas. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. Landscaping shall be provided as part of the overall site plan design and integrated into building arrangements, topography, parking and buffering requirements. Landscaping may include trees, bushes, shrubs, ground cover, perennials, annuals, plants, grading and the use of building and paving materials in an imaginative manner.**

The pier system will be located on the southern end of Crab Island in a rocky section of the shoreline. No additional vegetation is proposed to be removed or added with this project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- l. Environmental Considerations: A site plan shall not be approved unless it meets the following criteria:
 - (1) The project will not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surfacewaters;
 - (2) The project will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat;
 - (3) The project will conserve shoreland vegetation;
 - (4) The project will conserve points of public access to waters;
 - (5) The project will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;
 - (6) The project will protect archaeological and historic resources;
 - (7) The project will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in the Marine**

Waterfront District.

The parcel is within the Shoreland Zone but not within the Marine Waterfront District. The applicant did make application to the Coastal Waters Commission and was granted approval by the Commission for this project on 05/18/19. The applicant has already obtained approval from the Army Corps of Engineers (dated 08/08/19). A permit for the wetlands alteration and impact associated with the project was granted by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection on 07/16/19. The applicant will follow the DEP Best Management Practices for Erosion Control during construction. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.

Float (“Project”) Standards:

The design, location and scale of all float projects are subject to approval by the Freeport Coastal Waters Commission under the following guidelines. **NOTE: Approval from the Freeport Waters Commission does not relieve the applicant from the responsibility of obtaining approval from other town, state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed float.**

- 1. The project shall be no larger in dimension than is consistent with the conditions, use and character of its surroundings; it will not adversely affect water use by adjacent properties; and will remain in general harmony with that of existing activities in adjacent areas within the Freeport Coastal Water Commission’s jurisdiction. The property for which the project will be constructed shall have a minimum of 60 feet of water frontage. The length from the highest annual tide water mark shall not exceed 125’ and must be completed within two years of final approval.**

The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 05/18/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The property on which the project is located on has in excess of 60 feet of water frontage. The project consists of the installing a new pier, ramp and seasonal float which will provide access to the property. The first section will include a 5’x55’ pile supported permeant pier, which will connect to a 3’ x 50’ ramp, which will then lead to a (2) 12’ x 20’ floats, for a total pier system length of less than 125 feet. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 2. The project must not unreasonably interfere with customary or traditional public access ways to, or public trust rights (fishing, fowling, and navigation) in, on, or over the submerged lands; unreasonably interfere with fishing or other existing marine uses of the area; unreasonably diminish the availability of services and facilities necessary for commercial marine activities; and unreasonably interfere with ingress and egress or riparian owners. Project may require accommodations such as steps or pier elevations allowing passage over or beneath the structure.**

The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 05/18/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding accessways, marine uses, commercial marine activities or ingress and egress of riparian owners. In a DEP permit dated 7/16/19, the permit states that “The Department of Marine Resources (DMR) stated that the proposed project should not cause any impact to navigation, recreation, traditional fishing, and riparian access based on the nature of the project and its location.” Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 3. The project will not pose hazard to navigational channels, nor pose a hazard to navigation by obscuring visibility or by the display of distracting lights or reflective material. If appropriate the float will display appropriate warning lights to aid in navigation and public safety at the discretion of the Harbor Master, the US Coast Guard, or the Army Corps of Engineers.**

The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 05/18/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding hazards to navigation and warning lights were not required as part of that approval. An application has been reviewed and approved by the Army Corps of Engineers (dated 07/16/19). Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 4. The project will not encroach into, interfere with, or pose a hazard to: municipal or federal navigational channels; existing mooring or berthing areas (commercial and recreational); public access, public rights of way, public and private launching ramps in any Freeport Coastal Waters.**

The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 05/18/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding navigation channels, existing moorings or berthing areas or public access. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 5. The project will be developed on soils appropriate for such use and construction so as to control erosion.**

The pier system will be located on the southern end of the island on the rocky shoreline of Crab Island. The pier will be supported by six 10-inch diameter timber pilings located in the wetland. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 6. The project will not cause water quality or other coastal resources to be degraded including developed or natural beach areas, marshes, grasses and wildlife habitats.**

No vegetation will be removed with this project. The new pier system will provide safe access to the property while minimizing impact to the resources. Based on this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 7. The project shall not significantly impact fisheries or shellfish harvesting. Prior to approval applications may be reviewed by the Shellfish Commission.**

The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 05/18/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster/Marine Resource Conservation Officer. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding the impact on fisheries or shellfish harvesting. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 8. Registration and Identification will be required on all ramps and floats.**

The applicant is aware that the float will need to have proposed identification as required by the Harbormaster. The applicant has stated that the float is branded and serial numbered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of Article XIII of the Coastal Waters Ordinance.

Proposed Findings of Fact: Chapter 1000.15.B: GUIDELINES FOR MUNICIPAL SHORELAND ZONING ORDINANCES - Piers, Docks, Wharves, Bridges and Other Structures and Uses Extending Over or Below the Normal High-Water Line of a Water Body or Within a Wetland, and Shoreline Stabilization

- (1) No more than one pier, dock, wharf or similar structure extending or located below the normal high-**

water line of a water body or within a wetland is allowed on a single lot; except that when a single lot contains at least twice the minimum shore frontage as specified in Section 15(A), a second structure may be allowed and may remain as long as the lot is not further divided.

The project consists of installing a new pier system on the southern end of Crab Island. This will be the only pier system on the property. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (2) Access from shore shall be developed on soils appropriate for such use and constructed so as to control erosion.**

The shoreline is rocky. The pier will be supported by six ten-inch wide pilings that will be located in the coastal wetland. The applicant has indicated that the float will be hauled off-site and stored in an upland location for the off-season. It does not appear that they would be able to meet the required setback of 125 feet from the water (measured from either the water or the top of the bank) to be able to store the float on site. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (3) The location shall not interfere with existing developed or natural beach areas.**

No existing developed or natural beaches will be impacted by the installation of the pier system. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (4) The facility shall be located so as to minimize adverse effects on fisheries.**

In a DEP permit dated 7/16/19, the permit states that "The Department of Marine Resources (DMR) stated that the proposed project should not cause any impact to navigation, recreation, traditional fishing, and riparian access based on the nature of the project and its location." Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (5) The facility shall be no larger in dimension than necessary to carry on the activity and be consistent with the surrounding character and uses of the area. A temporary pier, dock or wharf in non-tidal waters shall not be wider than six feet for non-commercial uses.**

The parcel is in the Island District which allows "one pier, dock or wharf may be maintained on each Island or lot of record existing as of January 1, 1979." There will only be one pier system on the property. The ramp will not be wider than six feet. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (6) No new structure shall be built on, over or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland unless the structure requires direct access to the water body or wetland as an operational necessity.**

The project consists of the installing a new pier, ramp and seasonal float which will provide access to the property. No new structures are being built on or over the dock. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.

- (7) New permanent piers and docks on non-tidal waters shall not be permitted unless it is clearly demonstrated to the Planning Board that a temporary pier or dock is not feasible, and a permit has been obtained from the Department of Environmental Protection, pursuant to the *Natural Resources Protection Act*.**

The structure will not be located in non-tidal waters. The Department of Environmental Protection issued a permit for the project on 07/16/19. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.

- (8) No existing structures built on, over or abutting a pier, dock, wharf or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall be converted to residential dwelling units in any district.**

No residential units are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (9) Except in the General Development Districts and Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District, structures built on, over or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall not exceed twenty (20) feet in height above the pier, wharf, dock or other structure.**

No new structures are being built on or over a dock. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.

- (10) Vegetation may be removed in excess of the standards in Section 15(P) of this ordinance in order to conduct shoreline stabilization of an eroding shoreline, provided that a permit is obtained from the Planning Board. Construction equipment must access the shoreline by barge when feasible as determined by the Planning Board.**

- (a) When necessary, the removal of trees and other vegetation to allow for construction equipment access to the stabilization site via land must be limited to no more than 12 feet in width. When the stabilization project is complete the construction equipment accessway must be restored.**
(b) Revegetation must occur in accordance with Section 15(S).

The applicant is not proposing the removal of any vegetation associated with this project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- (11) A deck over a river may be exempted from the shoreland setback requirements if it is part of a downtown revitalization project that is defined in a project plan approved by the legislative body of the municipality, and may include the revitalization of structures formerly used as mills that do not meet the structure setback requirements, if the deck meets the following requirements:**

- (a) The total deck area attached to the structure does not exceed 700 square feet;**
(b) The deck is cantilevered over a segment of a river that is located within the boundaries of the downtown revitalization project;
(c) The deck is attached to or accessory to an allowed commercial use in a structure that was constructed prior to 1971 and is located within the downtown revitalization project;
(d) The construction of the deck complies with all other applicable standards, except the shoreline setback requirements in section 15(B); and
(e) The construction of the deck complies with all other state and federal laws.

No decks are proposed with this proposal. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and Site Plan for Bartlet and Kristina Hewey, for their property on Crab Island (Tax Assessor Map ISL, Lot CRA), for a new pier system on Crab Island, to be built substantially as proposed, application dated 04/14/20,

finding that it meets the standards of the Section 602 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, Article XIII of the Coastal Water's Ordinance, and the standards of Chapter 1000.15.B of the State of Maine Shoreland Zoning regulations, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
- 2) Prior to any sitework, the applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) This approval does not include a haul out for the removal of the float. The float will be hauled off-site and stored in an upland location for the off-season.
- 4) The length of the system measured from the highest annual tide water mark shall not exceed 125 feet. (Blanchard & Reiche) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (7 Ayes) (0 Nays)

Chair Campanelli thanked Mr. Becker for his participation.

Hanscome Woods Subdivision – Pownal Road

The applicant is presenting conceptual plans for a six-lot residential open space subdivision on Pownal Road. Access to the lots will be from driveways on Pownal Road. Approximately 10.86 acres of open space is proposed. Zoning District: Rural Residential I (RR-I). Tax Assessor Map 22, Lot 63. Warren Gerow, applicant and owner.

Mrs. Pelletier explained that she did send the Board an aerial photo earlier today. She displayed it on the screen and mentioned this is a conceptual subdivision located on Pownal Road. It abuts Hunter Road Fields and she showed where the Town's landfill is located. She pointed to the front of a parcel which has been surveyed. The way it is drawn on the tax map is not correct. The little sliver of land extends over to Murch Road and the applicant will explain that. This is a traditional residential open-space subdivision with six lots. It is considered a major because it would be private utility and they would be looking at coming to the Board for conceptual review, then going through preliminary and then coming back for final. They are proposing to have driveways off of Pownal Road. The applicant will go into how many and where the locations will be. It is a State road so any entrance permits would actually come from the State in addition to having to meet the standards of local Zoning Ordinances. The applicant is proposing 10.86 acres of open space and is proposing to donate that land to the Town's Conservation Commission. It would be the back portion of the site which does abut the existing town-owned property. The Commission is supportive of this proposal but the applicant will still need to go to the Council to see if they are supportive of that. If the Board decides it wants a site walk, it will need to be scheduled. Based on conversation with the Town Attorney and the Governor's restriction on social gatherings with more than ten people, she feels it would be best to schedule the site walk after June 1 but that could change. If the Board does decide it wants to schedule a site walk, there is a motion in the Staff Report to table the conceptual review and see if the Board is willing to let her schedule it for the Board when we feel it is safe to do that. She would reach out to Board members individually. She will take into account that we can't be in a public setting right now.

Warren Gerow noted he is the owner and is also an engineer and surveyor. He is doing this as his own project and feels it is relatively straight forward in the sense that there isn't any infrastructure to build there. There are six lots shown on the plan and the driveways have been permitted by the State. Their guidelines are slightly less restrictive than the Town Ordinance. He mentioned a note in the Staff Report that Caroline sent out that he was looking for a potential 10-foot separation waiver on two driveways. He is unclear in the Ordinance whether or not the 100-foot separation applies to single-family driveways. His interpretation is that it talks about private roads and driveways for other than one or two-family. This can be discussed later. The open space covers all the wooded wetlands on site and then some additional upland which brings them out to Pownal Road. As Caroline mentioned, the sliver of property goes out to Much Road and it is 30 feet wide. It would be included in the open space and provides open space access for folks off of Murch Road to Hedgehog Mountain without having to go onto Pownal Road. In reviewing the Ordinance, these have to be sprinkled buildings with underground utilities, etc. He offered to answer questions.

Mr. Yankee pointed out that on one of the drawings, it looks like there is a mobile home on the long skinny piece. Mr. Gerow advised that it is not on his piece. Next to the mobile home there is a stone wall which is the boundary to Range C. The mobile home is uninhabitable but is not on his property.

Chair Campanelli mentioned that Mr. Gerow said he would provide access off of Murch Road and asked if he has spoken to anyone about what language that would include. Would it be pedestrian or a bike path. She asked Mr. Blanchard if bikes are allowed on Hedgehog? Mr. Blanchard thinks bikes would be allowed on that loop in that portion because the trails are wider and flatter and that is where the high school does cross country meets. Chair Campanelli is confident that that language will have to be worked out somewhere along the way but she is not sure who will work it out and whether it is the Conservation Commission. Mr. Blanchard offered to talk to the Chair of the Commission. Chair Campanelli feels it is great that Mr. Gerow is providing access off of Murch so people can avoid Pownal Road but that discussion will need to happen.

Mrs. Pelletier asked if Mr. Gerow if he is proposing to transfer ownership of the open space to the Town. Mr. Gerow replied that that is correct and it is his intention. It technically could be an extension of the Hedgehog Conservation and would include that narrow strip. He believes that bikes are allowed on that side of Hedgehog but not allowed on the other side of the landfill road but asked that the Board not hold him to it. He agrees there should be some kind of language about use restrictions for groups that would be coming through there. He occasionally sees atvs and some snowmobiling in the winter time.

Chair Campanelli had questions about the driveways since Pownal Road is busy and drivers go over the speed limit. Will they be paired up? How are they going to look? Mr. Gerow advised that through the State he has permitted six separate drives. The Town's sight line requirement is 450 feet and the State's is a little less. Currently all the permitted driveways meet the 450 feet requirement. What they do not potentially meet in the Town's Ordinance if it applies, is the 100-foot separation between individual driveways. Currently the driveway on Lot 4 and Lot 5 are about 95 feet in separation distance. There is some opportunity to double up on some entrances because he agrees the road is busy and fast. His preference would be to have individuals because there is an issue sometimes about sharing driveways but it is not a deal breaker and he understands it. Chair Campanelli mentioned she would not want to see people back out for sure but this is something to think about down the road.

Ms. Watson asked what kind of houses will be built. Mr. Gerow explained that there won't be any mobile homes or tiny homes. He is envisioning 2,000-2,500 square feet, 3- or 4-bedroom colonials with a 2-car attached garage. They would be a pretty standard type home.

Mr. Blanchard explained that he pulled up the management plan for Hedgehog Mountain for reference. Motor vehicles are prohibited except snowmobiles on designated trails in winter and vehicles for maintenance. Mountain biking is allowed on designated trails but prohibited from the summit trail. Hiking, hunting with shotgun and bows are allowed as well as dogs under voice control or on leash.

Chair Campanelli brought up a potential site walk and asked about access. She also mentioned she has seen some drone work done and it can be pretty enlightening. Mr. Gerow advised that the access to some of it is good but it is a little damp in other parts in the back. Parking for a site walk would be pretty good since Hunter Road Fields are right there if the Board travels separately. He has drone footage with him but is not a Zoom expert and feels it is enlightening. Chair Campanelli noted the Board wouldn't have to do it tonight. She is thinking down the road if it would come to that to keep things moving. Mr. Troidl pointed out that the Board did one by drone in the past and it worked out pretty well. It is really about the surroundings as much as it is the site.

Mr. Reiche thinks the Board should have a site walk. While it looks like a straight forward subdivision, it is a major subdivision.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board table the review of the Site Inventory, Analysis and Conceptual Sketch Plan for Warren Gerow for the Hanscome Woods Subdivision (Tax Assessor Map 22, Lot 63) until after such time that the Board is able to conduct a site walk. Furthermore, the Board gives directive to Staff to schedule a site walk at such time when it is safe to do so and when it is clearly permitted by the Governor. (Reiche & Hamlin) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (7 Ayes) (0 Nays)

Mrs. Pelletier explained that we typically do site walks at the start of our meetings. If the Board is comfortable with that, we could tentatively try to do that at the start of our June meeting. We will have to wait until June 1 and she will reach out to Board members to see if we can do it under the Governor's restrictions at that time but then she will reach out to Board members to see if we would have enough Board members able to participate because we would need a quorum. Board members were okay with this. Chair Campanelli noted there is a possibility we might still be doing virtual meetings. Mrs. Pelletier agreed but explained that they are looking how to reopen Town Hall with a target date of June 1 but it appears there will still be restricted access especially with social distancing. Mr. Gerow estimated it would take less than an hour to walk his site. Mrs. Pelletier noted she would look at abutter notifications and the quantity of people involved as well as the Board and will be conscious about social distancing. She will reach out to everybody including the applicant as we get closer. Chair Campanelli mentioned that at this point, we don't know what our June meeting will be and whether it is virtual. If we do a site walk, we will go back home and do our virtual meeting.

ITEM IV: Persons wishing to address the Board on non-agenda items.

Mrs. Pelletier advised that she heard from a Board member that they are comfortable going to only a digital packet. She asked if there was anyone that would prefer to not get paper packets at this point in time. Chair Campanelli and Mr. Hamlin indicated that they would like a paper packet. Mr. Hamlin offered to pick his up. Ms. Watson reserved the right to reconsider when the Board gets back in business.

ITEM V: Adjourn.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To adjourn at 6:46 p.m. (Troidl & Yankee) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (7 Ayes) (0 Nays)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin