

**Town of Rockport Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, October 13, 2010 – 6:45 p.m.
Rockport Opera House Downstairs Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22**

Present: Kerry Leichtman, Chairman
John Alexander
Terri Mackenzie
Thomas Murphy
Sarah Price

Also Present: Thomas M. Ford, Planning Director
Nancy Ninnis, Recording Secretary

AGENDA

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Rocknak's Yacht Sales, Inc.**, P.O. Box 339, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Revision to a previously approved site plan for a 5,000 sq. ft. boat storage building. Represented by W. Scott Rocknak.
Property: 10 Camden Street – Tax Map 27, Lot 143
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

OTHER BUSINESS

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m.

Chairman Leichtman: We would like to introduce and welcome new Planning Board member Sarah Price.

I. ROCKNAK'S YACHT SALES, INC.

Representation: **W. Scott Rocknak**, Vice President
P.O. Box 339, Rockport, ME 04856
Tel: 207-236-3149; Fax: 207-236-9641
Property: 10 Camden Street – Tax Map 27, Lot 143
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Revision to a previously approved site plan for a 5,000 sq. ft. boat storage building.

PRESENTATION:

Chairman Leichtman: We are just back from a site walk for this minor revision to an approved site plan that will be reviewed in accordance with a new revision to the Land Use Ordinance, Section 1304.3 “Minor Revisions to Approved Site Plans:” Per No. 2, “Application materials shall consist of the amended site plan as proposed and supporting documentation for all Written Statement and Standards applicable to the revision.” Per No. 5, “Minor revision applications are exempt from the pre-application process.” Accordingly, the Board will discuss only the actual revision, not the entire site plan.

Scott Rocknak: We propose to build a 50’ x 100’ covered boat storage building that will replace outdoor space with indoor space. The building will be of saltbox design in keeping with the style of our current buildings that will be deep red in color with dark tan architectural shingles matching our other buildings. We are not increasing the capacity of the yard, but taking the boats that are currently shrink-wrapped and putting them under cover, as customer demand and more green practices have moved winter storage of boats from shrinkwrap outdoors to covered cold indoor storage. Since customers are asking for this type of storage and it is offered by several of our competitors, we feel the need to add it to our facility. We will also store loose items inside the buildings. Water runoff will be the same as currently exists and current building runoff will not be affected. Site work will be minimal, as there is no granite underneath the site and some existing pipes will not be disturbed. There will be outside lights on the building, but no sewer or water service to the building. The roof pitch will match our other buildings and existing vegetation will not be disturbed. We have located the building site for minimal impact and hope its traditional appearance will provide a pleasing visual appeal on this approach to Rockport. Construction will take six to eight weeks. This indoor storage will result in less use of shrinkwrap, which is cumbersome to dispose of, and accordingly less impact on the transfer station.

Ms. Mackenzie: Is there a definition for the phrase “minor revision?”

Planning Director Ford: No, but at the site walk the applicant indicated that there will be no appreciable change in use or intensity of use, so I think this project qualifies as a minor revision.

Chairman Leichtman: There is an existing site plan that was created in 2003 and the applicant is amending and adding to it.

Mr. Murphy: As an example, a 5,000 sq. ft. restaurant would not be a minor revision.

Chairman Leichtman: Nor a car sales facility, both of which would create a lot of traffic, among other issues. We will review the application per Section 1305 – Performance Standards.

Ms. Price: With regard to No. 5. Surface Water Drainage, the applicant has stated that water runoff will not change. However, it seems contradictory that a roof would result in the same degree of runoff as gravel. No new plan has been provided, and I assume that because the

applicant is building on a former plan, all that information was previously provided, but thought we should clarify that.

Chairman Leichtman: I had the same concern.

Scott Rocknak: The longer section of the shed roof is facing Route 1, so it will drain onto Route 1 and flow almost immediately into the ditch area, which is where the majority of rain and snow drain as well. Because there is a small swale at the front of the building, water will continue to drain in the driveway area as it does now and run toward Route 1. We were concerned about that as well and this site is perfect for maintaining the current runoff pattern. There is a large drainage area where the lupines grow which is where the water goes now and we will be maintaining the current system.

Chairman Leichtman: You are not eliminating parking because the building will be located where boats are now being stored, and you are not increasing the number of employees.

Mr. Alexander: You say you have no plan to include water at this time. If you did want to add water in the future, would it make any significant difference?

Scott Rocknak: The way we run water is to string a bunch of hoses together. It would be nice to have a spigot somewhere else, but if means adding a septic system, we wouldn't want it. Our only problem now is that we have to replace the hoses because people run over them all the time.

Chairman Leichtman: If you do add a spigot, that will be an issue between the applicant and the Code Enforcement Officer.

Planning Director Ford: With cold storage and a gravel base, it is not logical to have water, but if the applicant adds heat and water, he would need to see the Planning Office about those plans. You should also note that the applicant references adherence to the Department of Environmental Protection industry standard Boatyard "Brightworks" manual.

Scott Rocknak: We can live without water for now.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

MOTION – John Alexander/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the application of Rocknak's Yacht Sales, Inc. for a revision to a previously approved site plan for a 5,000 sq. ft. boat storage building as shown on marked-up Final Site Plan Sheet C-1 prepared by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying dated October 28, 2003 on property at 10 Camden Street located at Map 27, Lot 143 in District #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION – Thomas Murphy/SECOND – Terri Mackenzie: To approve the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of August 11, 2010 as presented. The motion was passed 4-0-1 with Sarah Price abstaining because she was not yet a member of the Board.

Chairman Leichtman: I would like to let the public know that we still have two openings on the Board, although two people have expressed interest in serving. When we have a full complement of seven members, the number of new members will make it appropriate to schedule a training workshop on how to conduct meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Planning Board has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

Nancy Ninnis
Recording Secretary