

**Town of Naples
Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday, February 21st, 2023**

Members Present:

Mr. Doug Bogdan
Mr. Robert Fogg
Mrs. Martina Witts
Ms. Susan Fleck
Mr. Larry Anton
Mr. Martin Zartarian

Staff:

Ms. Kate Matthews, CEO
Allison Desrochers, Admin CEO
Logan Capone, NorthStar Planners

Call to Order

Mr. Bogdan called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call= Mr. Bogdan authorized Mr. Zartarian to vote.

Review minutes from 01/17/2023= Mrs. Witts made a motion to accept the minutes as presented, it was seconded by Mr. Zartarian.

Voted 5-0

New Business:

An application for a proposed solar farm located at 245 River Rd (Tax Map R11, Lot 75)

Mr. Robertson and Mr. Boggs with the project company for our sketch plan review application. So, this project is in the original overlay. It's 2.61 Megawatts DC slightly smaller A it's connecting behind another project up the street. The total limit of disturbance is less than 10 acres, 9.6 acres. Access road will be where the existing axis road for the Gravel Pit is, we would just make minor upgrades to that road to accommodate our design standards. No Wetlands will be impacted as you can see on the chart here, we've stayed out of the floodplain and flood way moreover. We have over five feet of elevation head above the floodplain so free board, so these arrays will sit slightly taller off the ground. So right now, we are posing about a 13-foot height and maybe another foot. Cutting down trees of less than an acre total to comply with the ordinance and have this not be visible from River Road for proposing plantings in here. Mr. Anton, in the leasing agreement the plan shows 76 acres and developing the plan says this one says 2.6 megawatts and the leasing agreement is for five to six megawatts. It shows in the plan developing 18 acres and you said 9.2 acres. Mr. Robertson the agreement we have in place with the owners of the land Martins right now is a lease option when we proposed this project, we wanted to be much larger we changed due to floodplain and the interconnection outlook was not as good as we had hoped for, so we downsized. Once we have a plan from the board, we will develop a lease with the landowner.

Mr. Anton, I am not quite sure what you are saying about agricultural fence.

Mr. Robertson, it is a sort of woven style fence a little more transparent, so not a chain link.

Mr. Anton is it secure so people can't go through the fence easily.

Mr. Robertson said it is rough enough to keep people out and allow an agricultural fence, at the height it will be seven feet.

Mr. Anton on 3A you say the project will not be in the dominant feature of the landscape to me that means it's going to be a feature landscape but not dominant.

Mr. Boggs, the idea is that within the parcel itself certainly will mean it's a large parcel will be a large part of it. It'll certainly be a visual aspect of it, the screening that we are talking about here is what's going to sort of decrease it from being part of the landscape. If you stand in the middle of the solar farm, you will see the rays, when answering the questions on the application I was thinking what is the impact of the public that is how the question was answered if more information is needed would be happy to answer.

Mr. Anton are you going to be able to meet the visible requirements and not see anything from the river or from the road, not a slightly visible view period. Without seeing it, it is hard to tell if it is going to be visible or not once done.

Mr. Robertson, the landowner here, has been very open to any type of screening that we propose that achieve for us to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Anton, we need something to say that if the property is going to be transferred by sale or merger the new entity has to be approved by the town.

Mr. Zartarian there are some setbacks in the plan in that very west corner, it looks like it's infringing on the fence area and not set back 50 feet.

Mr. Boggs the fence is outside of the set back of 50 feet.

Mr. Zartarian according to the drawing you have it butt up against the solar panels.

Mr. Boggs will get a close -up that it is 50 foot I asked the engineer last week the same question.

Mr. Zartarian, the noise output of the inverters is there two values that were set, one was that you had with the model what you expected to be in there was a second number is at the ambient number that was measured on site. I didn't know what the second number was.

Mr. Boggs, we have a daytime number and a nighttime.

Mr. Zartarian, what is the nighttime number? Is that the ambient that was measured on site or is that just an estimate someone came up with?

Mr. Boggs no that is the expected noise from the equipment during the nighttime, there is a slight noise still from the equipment even if it is not producing energy.

Mr. Zartarian is that calculations based on having some sort of mitigation plan on those converters or is that just the naked inverters without any mitigation that's negative number without.

Mr. Boggs that is a good question for your ordinance does say that mitigation is necessary we are demonstrating that we are not having sight impacts, I would leave it to the planning board to sort of advise us whether or not this would be another case were if the noise turns out to be different with the modeling was we would need to put in a inverting barrier.

Mr. Bogdan, that is a good idea would be a site walk for this piece of property since we will not be making an approval on this tonight.

Ms. Flecker, when does that deadline so us to have the site walked and be back ready to discuss this?

Ms. Matthews stated that basically we would need whatever updates that were looking for from them to be sent back to the administrator and planner then a date would be set up and might not be until close to the end of March.

Ms. Flecker is their other projects and are they up and running, where.

Mr. Robertson stated Rockport is probably an operational one and the other is in Scarborough that just hit mechanical completions and that CMP has not done their utility stuff yet.

Ms. Flecker aesthetically it would be similar to what we might anticipate your style to be. Mr. Robertson, this one would be slightly different due to the larger size, and they do not have the same fence aside from that, the panels and the racking things, which are fundamentally the same.

Ms. Flecker, is the vegetative boarder the same standard for what you do?

Mr. Robertson, yes, in fact Scarborough had a vegetation proposed as well.

Ms. Flecker, how are you determining your vegetative border size? It states in the paperwork that proposed vegetative screenings species and size to be determined, what determines that?

Mr. Boggs so the size of the tree is going to depend on what the final elevation is for the arrays if we've talked about, we don't want to be visible so the size of the tree will be based on that the type of tree are probably going to be conifers because we don't have openings dure the wintertime there.

Ms. Flecker, do you have projects, maybe not even solar projects that you have completed and would like the presentation of that might be something that could be viewed.

Mr. Boggs will have to check on other projects since he is new to the firm and not familiar with all the projects.

Mr. Zartarian regarding a waiver request for section 907 on site soil investigation, why do you feel you don't need to review section 907 to be done be.

Mr. Boggs, normally soil investigations are done when you are putting on some sort of place a water treatment thing, there are no permanent staff there and no wastewater and no leach field will be added.

Mr. Zartarian so you are basically waving a requirement from the DEP, and close to the Crooked River

Mr. Boggs, I have done many solar projects in the state and even through site law they've never asked for a full soil of classy or other soil investigation they have always been comfortable with the USGS soil data that we have.

Mrs. Witts, I would like clarification regarding the memo we received from our planner. It indicated 9.3 acres of disturbance and today you said 9.6 acres and the map says 10.54. So, which is it?

Mr. Robertson so the disturbance would be 10.54 the other is the 9.6 is what being the modules themselves.

So, we need a motion to table it to our next meeting on 3-7-23 and then we will schedule a site walk.

Ms. Flecker are there some markings out there to help us know when our boots are on the ground out there.

Mr. Robertson, what we have done in the past is we have a tablet that lets you know where you are and digitally walks you around everything, we would be happy to do that in this case as well.

Logan so no external overhead lighting?

Mr. Boggs, there will be lighting associated with the transformer itself so that if someone walks up and needs to do something at night there will be a switch to turn it on.

Other business as appropriate

Mrs. Witts note sure if the board has been following other board committees with the town a lot of conversations about whether or not we need a new comprehensive plan and there seems as you know our is 2006 a bit old, good ordinances should be based on a comprehensive plan. I also completely support paying for it, the costs are yet to be determined. So, I thought it would be helpful if all the board members sign a letter that I drafted and send it to the Select Board and the Budget Committee.

Adjourn motion to adjourn by Mr. Bogdan second the motion Mr. Zartarian
Voted 5-0

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Eddy
Administrative Assistant