



# Town of Eddington

906 Main Road Eddington, Maine 04428

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**February 22, 2022**  
**6:00 pm**  
**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER:** David Peppard called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

**ROLL CALL:** Members present were David Peppard, Craig Knight, Susan Dunham-Shane and Scott Newhart.

Motion to make Scott Newhart a voting member for tonight.

**By Craig K/Susan DS<sup>2nd</sup>. Vote 3-0**

**MINUTES:** Motion table the minutes of February 8, 2022.

**By Susan DS/Scott N 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote 4-0**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** The Board will continue their work on the Solar Array Ordinance. David P feels they need to spend some time on certain sections of the wind ordinance. He did his homework on operational fees. All of the other towns have their own schedule of fees and we will need to amend ours. (Rumford has an initial payment and then an annual renewal) Our current fees have nothing for solar power and has a reference to the Wind Power Ordinance for wind energy fees. (\$2500 for initial application and then a fee per turbine) The Board will need to address fees at some point.

Craig K worked on setbacks and found that they were anywhere from 10' to 50'. Lars Gundersen of Dirigo Solar explained that in their experience there are a variety of setbacks that are barely more than 50'. Dedham is 100' for the residential zone and 50' for the rural or agricultural zones. They average from 25' to 50'. Often they are set back further from the road than on the side. Craig K's suggested line is the original amount Lars G had presented. Lars G said for their proposed project, not related to the ordinance, they plan 50' setback through the trees that they will not touch, then a row of evergreen trees in a cleared 50' section, the fence and then the panels, totaling about 125' from the property line. David P noted that some have berms. Lars said it depends on the site. (near residents they may build a berm and plant trees) If they do a berm, they could reduce the setback so the Planning Board could specify when they require a berm for specific projects. Susan DS said they would be useful for cleared areas. Scott N said they could require a berm if the proposed location could not meet the setback requirements. He continued that not all proposals may be able to meet a 150' setback while others could. Scott N suggested reviewing the current setbacks for each zone and possible adding a certain amount to current amounts. Susan DS said they need to consider what is contained in a large solar array and how it will affect the surrounding area.

Scott N worked on Purpose and Intent, Applicability, Definitions and Exemptions. He presented the Board with wording for these sections. He reworded the first two sections, 101 and 102, from the Wind Ordinance, just updating the wording to Solar where needed. The definitions he got from the State Model and then added any from other ordinances that were missing. (He has about 30 other words he can add if needed.) The Solar Energy System definition contains descriptions of the five different sizes recommended by the State. They are Roof mounted; Ground mounted-less than 1000 square feet; Small is more than 1000 square feet to 15,000 square feet-1/3 of an acre; medium is 15,001 to 87,120 square feet-less than 2 acres; large scale is over 87,210 square feet-over 2 acres. These sizes can be adjusted as needed. Scott N added that most of the ordinances did not specify if they were residential or commercial arrays. The last page contains a Permitting Chart for each of the different Eddington Zones. Section 104 is Exemptions.

Motion that for the premise of writing this ordinance under size of Solar Energy Systems we accept that Section with Subsection 1 through 5 as the definition we will use for Solar Energy Systems.  
**By Susan DS/Craig K 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote 4-0**

David P wants to make a note to look at what regulations to use for projects over 20 acres at a later time. Susan DS said that in reference to the Site Plan Review, the size of the project will determine what is required of the applicant. She continued that in regards to the fee, they could add that any project over 20 or 25 acres should see the Schedule of Fees

Craig K continued his research on fencing. He explained that fixed knot agricultural fencing is 3 times stronger than welded agricultural fencing. The highway system uses fixed knot. Craig K said IFWL likes the openings to be as large as possible, he feels that 8" fencing would work the best. Some agricultural (AG) fencing is graduated up from the bottom. Susan DS said that the State Model has graduated AG fencing that is larger at the bottom and smaller at the top. Scott N explained that sometimes they made a wooden box at the corners of the fencing that would allow larger animals to escape the fencing. Lars G said that if they use chain-link fence they raise it off the ground a few inches. Scott N and Craig K are 100% for agricultural fencing. Craig K said that many states are moving from the chain-link fence to AG fencing because of problems they have had with smaller animals. Lars G said that they prefer AG fencing. He continued that some towns require chain-link. Lars G also said that some towns have maintenance plans in their ordinance requiring twice annual inspections to fix any problems with the fencing, etc. The Board agrees with using the 12" x 8" AG fixed knot fencing at least 6" from the ground. Lars G said that they usually use metal posts and put them in cement dependent of the ground in the area and raise the fence 3" to 8" off the ground. (Lars G explained that if 5 inches space is required below the fence, it will average 3" to 7".)

Motion to tentatively go with the Solar Energy System Fencing from the State Model.  
**By David P/Craig K 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote 4-0**

In regards to vegetation, David P likes the Rumford Code, Section 311.3.E. with a few changes:

E. Land clearing, soil erosion, and habitat impacts. Clearing of natural vegetation shall be limited to what is necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of ground-mounted solar energy systems or as otherwise prescribed by applicable laws, regulations, and bylaws/ordinances. Ground-mounted facilities shall minimize

mowing to the extent practicable. Removal of mature trees shall be avoided to the extent possible. Native, pollinator-friendly seed mixtures shall be used. Herbicide and pesticide use shall be prohibited. No prime agricultural soil or significant volume of topsoil shall be removed from the site for installation of the system.

The Board agreed to go with this wording with their changes.

Scott N recommends not allowing medium or large scale arrays in the Conservation or Shoreland Zones. Susan will look into the soils of statewide significance.

Craig K asked Lars G what they use for vegetation to limit the view of the fencing. Lars G said that the buffer depends on the town, but they have used native evergreens spaced at intervals.

David P's next subject was storm water. He did not find much guidance in the sample ordinances. The Board's homework is to read over the Dedham Ordinance, Section 6. 2 C) & D) and 5.B), and Section 802 of our Zoning Ordinance and decide on the wording they want.

Susan DS will update her information on Performance Guarantee and work on Purchase of Power for the next meeting.

Moving Panels: If the project proposes moving panels, the setbacks should be required to be larger because of possible noise and glare. Lars G said their project does not have moving panels. Scott N asked if Dirigo Solar had looked into panels that would melt off the snow and Lars G said right now they are mostly for residential projects but may be more available for commercial projects soon. Craig K asked where the panels are made and Lars G said some are made in China, but the current tariffs result in them being taxed at 100%. They purchase theirs from Thailand and 1<sup>st</sup> Solar, a company in Ohio. Scott N said there was a company in Buffalo New York that made panels also, possible just residential. Craig K asked is any place was recycling panels and Lars G said it depends on the state and their requirements. There are companies that do recycle panels, not in the state of Maine. Maine require that they be recycled and about 95% of the components are recyclable.

#### **AGENDA FOR FUTURE MEETINGS – HOUSEKEEPING:**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting will be, March 8, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

**PUBLIC ACCESS:** Lars G appreciates being able to speak during the process and the Board thanked him for working with them as they develop the addendum.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Motion to adjourn at 7:33 pm.                    **By Susan DS/Scott N 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote 5-0**

Respectfully Submitted,

Denise M. Knowles