

MINUTES
Planning Board
January 14, 2009
7:00 PM

Members Present: William Horton – Chairman; Donna Hovey; David Fowler; Lynne Potter; Elwin Thorpe – Code Enforcement Officer; James Seymour – Planning Board Consultant; Owens McCullough – Alternate Planning Consultant and Sandy Fredricks – Secretary.

Members Absent: Susannah Swihart and Frank Braman

Public Present: Pat Troy, Sue Witonis, Larry Chute, Ingo Hartig and David Rolfe

7:00 P.M.

Bill calls the meeting to order.

Minutes from October 8, 2008

Donna moves to approve the Minutes of October 8, 2008 as written.

Lynne seconds the motion.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no

Chute, M 6, L 6-5

Bill states Land Services, Inc. has submitted a Final Plan on behalf of Larry R. and Elizabeth M. Chute for a 4-lot Subdivision. The property affected is a portion of Map 6, Lot 6-5, known as 42 Lilac Lane and is located in a Residential Zone. This matter was tabled at the October 8, 2008 meeting. He asks for a motion to have it removed from the table.

Donna moves to remove this matter from the table.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no

Bill asks Larry Chute if Pat Cayer of Land Services, Inc. is coming to this meeting. Larry states he is not. James states he received the package for this evening's meeting and reviewed the DEP application. He continues he wants to ensure that the appropriate notes are made per DEP.

James next addresses the waiver requests, stating that three (3) of the items requested to be waived have been taken care of as part of the DEP application and he would like to see copies submitted to the Town.

James continues that there are issues he believes were worked out with the Road Commissioner to accept the road width of 16' with 3' shoulders.

James states he also has questions regarding whether or not underground water storage tanks are required by the Fire Department and he would like to see written input from the Fire Chief on this issue.

Larry states there are two or three issues that he thought had been worked out previously. First is the sprinkler issue which James spoke about. Second is the road issue, it is to be 18' including the shoulders. A review of the Town's file contains an email from David Morton indicating that a total width of 18' include shoulders is acceptable to the Road Commissioner for this project.

Larry states he is only proceeding to divide off Lot 1 and Lot 2; he is eliminating Lot 3 and Lot 4. He continues that regarding the monuments, he spoke with Pat (Cayer) who said that the number of monuments required was excessive. Further, Larry states that Doug Webster had stated he would probably only require two monuments on a project the size of this one.

Donna asks what is considered excessive. Is it excessive with just Lots 1 and 2 or excessive including Lots 2 and 4? Larry states it is excessive either way. He continues that all the property has been surveyed; his property as well as the abutters and all the information was taken from the existing lines of the abutters. He further states he doesn't see the need for the monuments; there is one on the main road (Route 121) as far as a reference point.

Pat Troy states she would like clarification of the lots. The papers from DEP state there are houses on Lots 2, 3 and 4. Elwin states the DEP letter is in error; there is no house on Lot 4.

Larry states he wouldn't mind putting in one monument. He continues they can put one in a central location. Dave states they should have two markers. James states that something on the curves would be most clear. Larry again states there is a monument on Route 121 as a reference point. Dave states he is in favor of a minimum number of monuments, but not to waive all monument requirements.

The Board discusses with Larry that there are three lots not two as the leftover land from the second lot becomes a third. Elwin explains how the land division came about. Larry states he bought two parcels on his left and right. Elwin asks if Lot 2 will be the vacant lot. Larry states Craig's house is Lot 2. Bill clarifies that the leftover lot will remain with

Larry's lot. The Board discusses that this cannot be part of Larry's lot as it is separated by a road. Further discussion ensues and James ascertains that Lot 3 as well as the road is owned by Larry Chute, therefore the leftover lot can remain with his parcel.

Discussions take place among the Board and Larry Chute regarding Lilac Lane/Larry Chute's driveway etc.

Discussions return to the monument issue. Bill states he would like to put this issue to bed.

Dave moves to reduce the number of monuments to three and permit the surveyor to determine the locations.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no

Next item addressed in reviewing James' Memo to the Board is the ownership of the road. Larry states it is contracted to take care of the road. Pat Troy asks who is responsible for the contract. Larry states the road owner (himself) is responsible for the contract.

James states a note should be added on the plan that the road is built to private road standards and the owner is responsible to maintain the road.

Bill asks if the road has a public easement. Larry states it does not. Bill asks how many homes are located beyond the turn of Lilac Lane. Larry states that only Dick Willey's house is beyond that. Bill asks if Dick Willey has enough property to subdivide. Larry states Dick has 20 acres.

Bill asks James if we need any other notes on the plan. James states there should be a note that if there is any further subdivision or development the road will be required to be upgraded.

Dave asks Larry why he is going to three lots rather than four. Larry states it is monetary.

Returning to items in James' Memo to the Board, the Board will address the waiver requests at the time the Final Plan will be approved.

Elwin explains to Larry Chute that the plans need to show his (Larry's) house lot and the leftover parcel.

The Board addresses additional information needed on the plan. There is no indication where the pavement ends on the plans. Larry states the pavement runs 380' in; it ends just past the driveway for Lot 2. James states this needs to be indicated on the plan. James reiterates that there also is a note required that if Lot 4 is developed, the road has to be paved to Lot 4.

James states we also need the Engineer's Report regarding the infrastructure.

Larry states he may stay with the four lots. He will discuss this with Pat and have him correct the drawings with the notes requested by the Board. Elwin reminds Larry that when he takes a permit for Lot 4, he will then have to complete pavement of the road.

Donna moves to table this item to the next Board meeting.

Dave seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no

B & F Land Development, M 4, L 12

Bill states this matter was tabled at last Board meeting and was slated for this Agenda.

Bill asks Mr. Rolfe and Mr. Hartig if they wish the Board to remove the matter from the table and discuss it. Mr. Rolfe and Mr. Hartig indicate they were only present to listen to the Board this evening.

Bill states that Mr. Baudo has requested the matter be postponed to the next Board meeting as he had a medical issue preventing him from traveling here tonight.

Bill further informs Mr. Rolfe and Mr. Hartig that the Board has a lot of questions on this project. The materials received have been piece meal and we have no cohesive plans to date. Dave states that there has only been sketch plans and conceptual information submitted to the Board. He continues that Sweet Associates prepared the wetlands and this is the first engineering information we have seen.

James states that one question he has and would like clarification on is that a number of the proposed lots are less than 60,000 s.f. Even if you provide for a 25% reduction as permitted in Planned Residential Development, the numbers are not correct.

Bill asks if the parcels in this application will be affected by the proposed new Zoning Ordinance. Elwin states it will be affected. James states the applicant has no application of standing at this time.

James continues and refers the Board to Page 107 of the current Zoning Ordinance and states in this case the minimum lot size could only be reduced to 60,000 s.f. and the majority of the proposed lots are non-conforming.

Donna moves to adjourn.

Dave seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no