

## Alternative Concurrence Decision

Re: Permit Application 2018-18  
Owner: Town of Calais  
Town Hall on 1662 Kent Hill Road

### INTRODUCTION

When this application was filed, it appears contracts had already been signed for work on the moving the Town Hall and demolition of the 1984 additions.

I asked at the hearing on 24 July if it would not be better to have had all the septic permits required to complete a change of use for the Town Hall to meet the original permit application. The reply given was there was no time, because contracts to do the moving of the building had already been signed. Therein is the rub to members of the DRB, that there was a perceived blatant disregard for the DRB and the time given to study the regulations and issues surrounding this historic building. Now it is perceived that the DRB is unwilling to cooperate, which is not the case.

It is my opinion that there should have been a renegotiation of those contracts to delay the work and complete the new state approved septic system for increased use. My rationale for that is the fact there will be 2 new bathrooms in the structure itself, which should be hooked up to a new system, to meet future change of use. Otherwise will the Town have 2 sets of pipes, one running to the old septic, and then dig for pipes to a new system later?

Given that these contracts were established, the amended permit application was narrowed to accommodate only the move and the demolition of old 1984 additions and construction of new enlarged additions to accommodate ADA compliant accessibility, and other mechanical storage. There was extensive debate around whether this was exempted under section 1.5 (4). No agreement was reached. We could agree that this is a non-complying structure and this narrow-amended permit required conditional use review under section 3.8(B).4).

However, in the 19 July hearing it was stated that the old septic had been discontinued and in fact the old tank had been removed. It was stated that the old septic system was malfunctioning. That leaves the DRB with a dilemma. This is a public building near a waterway, and if the system was malfunctioning how bad was the malfunction? Is there any sewage leakage? To that end, DRB allows the move and new construction, but there can be no use of the building until one of 2 things occur: a confirmed documented inspection from the state that the old septic system is safe and functioning well OR a new permit application for change of use with a new septic system state permit.

I agree with all other findings and conditions of the decision.

Janice Ohlsson  
Alternate DRB member

