

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

September 10th, 2018

CASCO COMMUNITY CENTER

7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ted Beckner, Ray Grant, Jim Macklin & Lynne Potter

MEMBERS ABSENT: Stan Buchanan & Edward Phipps

STAFF PRESENT: Alex Sirois, CEO; Jim Seymour, Town Planner & Sandy Fredricks, Planning Assistant

PUBLIC PRESENT: Nick Maynard, Jeff Hacker, John Carver, Jayson Haskell, Wm. Mark Michaels, Dan Bannon & Morgan Clements

Lynne calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Lynne states the first item on the Agenda is approval of the August 13, 2018 Minutes.

Jim moves to approve the August 13th, 2018 Minutes as submitted.

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Lynne states the next item on the Agenda is Camp Cedar has filed a Site Plan Application to allow construction of a 72' x 120' indoor rec center on an existing hockey rink area. The property is known as Map 6, Lot 16 and is commonly known as 112 Camp Cedar Road. The property is located in the Residential, Stream & Wetlands Protection, Watershed and Limited Residential Recreational Districts.

Nick Maynard states he is the architect for Camp Cedar and he is here tonight with Jeff Hacker of Camp Cedar. He states that the location currently is a rink for field or roller hockey. Camp Cedar is proposing to enclose the rink in a shed-like building. This is located in the middle of 75 acres of land. The existing property line is 300' away from the structure, 970' from Coffee Pond and 1000' from other properties. He continues that topographically, it is on a hill and not accessible to the public. Nick continues to review that this is strictly utilized by summer campers at the property in season; there is no daily access to anyone which removes the need for parking at or near the facility. He further states that Lot 15 is also owned by Camp Cedar.

Nick states he feels they should review Jim Seymour's Review Memo.

He states A & B have been fully addressed in the Plan. C, the Vehicular Access is well established, however, the road will be improved during construction. D, they have received the Fire Chief's Memo stating that with the Camp having received a construction permit from the State Fire Marshal's Office, he has no additional

requirements. E is sufficient per the Planner's Memo. F, the utilities for electrical are already existing on the site, however, it is understood that the final septic design will need to be approved by the Code Enforcement Officer. G, there are no advertising features. H, there are no special features and concern of trash will be dumpsters as the rest of camp. I, there will be one light over each door to the facility; there are four (4) egress doors and an overhead door. J, they have received the Fire Chief's Memo regarding Emergency Vehicle Access. K, Landscaping is the tree line and no further landscaping is proposed. L, Lynne asks about the erosion control. Nick states there will be silt fencing around the construction area. Ted states, just to confirm, there is an existing rink; will that be taken out. Nick states it will be taken out and there will be an asphalt floor to the new structure. Ted continues that it looks like it is a pretty steep grade. Nick shows on the plan where the structure will be and it is not on the steep grade.

Ted reiterates the question of parking; as he understands it they do not currently have parking in that area nor will this change require parking. Nick states that is correct as the campers live in cabins on the camp property and walk to activities. Jim S. states he would like to see some kind of stabilization where they are coming in for the construction entrance. Nick states the stabilization wall is existing. Ray ask if he is correct that the actual road into camp from Route 11 is still a dirt road. Jeff states that is correct, it is all dirt and is about 1/2 mile long.

Jim S. states we have no information how the access road to the facility will be built. Jim S. continues that a Note needs to be placed on the Plan that existing vegetation will be preserved and no additional landscaping will be done.

Jim S. states that reviewing the Memo from the Fire Chief, the Fire Department requires some detail on the access road and also need this building to tie into the fire panel. This needs to be noted on the Plan or be a Condition of Approval. Nick states that is also on the State Fire Marshal's Office approval.

Jim S. continues that we either need a narrative or Note on the Plan that no additional parking is required as this is for camper use only. Without some sort of narrative it is also difficult to see what is happening with the building. He goes on to state that he would like to see what is being done with the runoff from the roof; will there be gutters, a drip edge or some other method to regulate it. To Ted's point, it does look like the facility is located at the bottom of a steep slope and run off from the soccer field will run down toward this facility.

Jim S. states it appears all utilities will be overhead as rest of camp. He continues he would like a plan showing silt fence, swales and some kind of erosion control plan.

Alex states we do need a signature block on the Plan as well. Jim S. states we also need a professional seal on the Plan by either an engineer or an architect. Alex points out that a recreational facility is not an allowed use in a Residential Zone, however, we are considering this an accessory structure to the primary use. He continues that he

contacted Natalie Burns (the Town's attorney) who stated this interpretation is no problem as the structure is solely for camp use.

Lynne asks if they do any plowing of the roads in the winter. Jeff states they do plow all the access ways to all the buildings. Lynne asks if we need to know where the snow will be plowed relative to the lake. Jim S. states typically we don't worry about it unless they are putting down a lot of sand or salt.

Jim S. reviews what the Conditions of Approval would be should the Board move this matter forward for approval:

1. Note on Plan addressing preservation of the landscaping and natural vegetation
2. Emergency Access Details to be set out on the Plan and be approved by the Fire Chief
3. Note on Plan stating there is no need for parking as this is for use by campers only
4. Further information to be provided showing how the roof runoff will be directed and impact the existing drainage swales and natural depressed wet areas
5. Note on Plan that this is an Allowed Use
6. Final Erosion Control Plan Notes
7. Plan must be stamped by either an architect or engineer

Lynne opens the Public Hearing on this matter. There being no one who wishes to speak, Lynne closes the Public Hearing on this matter.

Jim M. moves that the Board accept and approve the Site Plan with the following conditions:

- a. Note on Plan addressing preservation of the landscaping and natural vegetation
- b. Emergency Access Details to be set out on the Plan and be approved by the Fire Chief
- c. Note on Plan stating there is no need for parking as this is for use by campers only
- d. Further information to be provided showing how the roof runoff will be directed and impact the existing drainage swales and natural depressed wet areas
- e. Note on Plan that this is an Allowed Use
- f. Final Erosion Control Plan Notes
- g. Plan must be stamped by either an architect or engineer

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) - 0 no - 0 abstain

Lynne states next is D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers has filed a Site Plan Application on behalf of J & L Carver Properties, LLC to permit improvement of Map 15, Lot 8-2 of

the Murch Estates Subdivision to expand the trailer sales use with additional gravel parking for inventory. The property is commonly known as Roosevelt Trail. The property is located in the Village and Limited Residential Recreational Districts.

Ray recuses himself from this application as he is the previous owner of the property. Ray leaves the Board table and sits in the audience.

Jayson Haskell of D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers introduces himself to the Board and states he is there on behalf of John L. Carver. He also states John is also present to answer any questions the Board may have of him.

Jayson states the parcel is Lot 8-2 of the Murch Estates Subdivision and is being utilized for a commercial facility of trailer sales. The use has been previously approved by Staff Review for the building, driveway entrance, lighting and sign. They are before the Board to request Site Plan approval to expand the area for trailer display. Jayson continues that they have added additional plantings to the Plan. The front buffer will have plantings of varying heights as well as additional depth. He continues that they have also added additional plantings along the side and rear boundaries to provide screening to the residential abutters.

Jayson next wishes to address the concern of dust control in the gravel surfaces areas. The applicant expects the only dust generated by the expansion would be when a vehicle drives through the display area. He continues that per the Board's concerns expressed in August, no vehicular traffic will be allowed in the display area and a Note has been added to the Plan indicating no vehicular traffic will be allowed in the display area. The applicant will place trailers angled so as to block vehicular access to the display area. Jayson further states that the dust will be mitigated by the proposed evergreen trees screening the property. Additionally, the applicant will place boulders along the edge of the gravel parking areas to keep customer parking from encroaching onto the grass areas.

Jim S. states, that to Jayson's point, based on what we have received and heard as well as report from the Fire Chief who had no concerns, they have added the Knox Box; they have done a much better job on the landscaping and buffer requirements per the Ordinance; vehicular access had MDOT approval, reclaimed asphalt will definitely help the dust issue. He further states that we want to see detailed information of the depth of paved parking in front of the building; they are showing handicapped parking as well as the required number of parking spaces. Jim S. asks if there are computations for the infiltration pump; Jayson says he will get that. He continues that the issue of lighting detail had been previously addressed in the Staff Review approval. Further, Jim S. states that this plan will not require DEP review, however, if they put any more along the side, DEP review will be required. He continues asking if there will be any advertising or signs. Alex states sign was previously approved during Staff Review. Alex also states that a signature block is required on the Plan.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing on this matter. There being no one wishing to speak, Lynne closes the Public Hearing.

Jim S. states the only Conditions of Approval he would recommend would be:

1. Signature Block on the Plan
2. Submission of computation of the run-off expectations and Reclaimed asphalt details

Lynne moves to approve the Site Plan Application with the Conditions noted.

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 3 yes (Ted, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Ray returns to the table.

Lynne states the next agenda item is D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers has filed an Application on behalf of Bear Point, Inc. to permit design and construction of a backlot driveway to serve a new dwelling to be constructed on Bear Island. The property is commonly known as 74 Bear Island Road. The property is located in a Limited Residential Recreational District.

Jim S. states that the access is a private road to the Island. He continues, per Natalie Burns (the Town's attorney) Bear Point, Inc. could cut a lot off of the parcel without coming to the Board; they are here trying to create frontage. Further, looking at this as a backlot driveway, if the Board is comfortable with it, is the best way to attain this. He continues that it all comes down to health and safety and this may be a site the Board needs to see.

Jayson states he is here on behalf of Bear Point LLC also present tonight is Mark Michaels, one of the owners of Bear Point, Inc. He states the private road provides access to several buildings, only two of which are dwellings. He continues that they wish to keep moving forward with the backlot driveway scenario. He goes on to state they wish to produce the access and frontage for the new lot "A" and create an additional parcel on the island. Parcel "A" will be sold off including one of the existing dwellings. He goes on to say that at the last Board meeting, most of the discussion focused on the Causeway; there are two options here (1) the backlot development with waivers (2) to make access better. He states that they understand the Fire Chief has some concerns about the Causeway access and they have also noted the Fire Chief's concerns of the tighter corners on the access road. Further, Jayson states that Mark has received permission from the State Park to widen the access by cutting a few trees on the turns. Additionally, the construction of the new dwelling will max out what is allowed on the backlot driveway. Jayson further states that due to the Town's Shoreland Zoning and the DEP Rules, it is hard to widen things in that Shoreland.

Jayson continues that on August 31, 2018 they submitted to DEP for an NRPA Permit by Rule, but haven't received a response as yet. Additionally, he states that no ACOE approval is required and they can coordinate with IFW.

Mark Michaels speaks regarding the Causeway. He states they had an electrical fire a few years back and the Fire Department was on scene. The Fire Chief was concerned about getting to their property. He continues that they tried to do some more rock and stump removal trying to create more turn radius; the Causeway is what it is. He states they had a Greyhound Bus on the island once and it had a radius problem. He continues that they have propane and septic tank trucks that have to pull in their mirrors. Further, by removing some of the shoulder and removing some of the trees we will get a bit more access and better site line. Mark states that when they do the backlot, the road curls around, it will create a much better site line and radius turn. He continues they looked at trying to do something to the Causeway, but there are problems with the DEP along the shoreland. The lot with the existing dwelling that will be sold off will be a separate access, the new lot will have separate access by bearing off.

Jayson states it is seasonal access; the Causeway doesn't get plowed in the winter.

Jim M. states it is his understanding then that the intention is to connect the new road into the existing road and create a loop. Mark states that is correct and shows the Board on the Plan where it will run and states the existing gravel road will be the primary access to the other lots.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing. There being no one wishing to speak, Lynne closes the Public Hearing.

Jim S. states hearing this information he understands we will create Parcel "B" & Parcel "A"; "A" will have the existing structure on it and Parcel "C" will be a lot for sale. Mark states, no, Parcel "C" will have the new structure; Parcel "A" will be sold. Mark further states he has spoken with Mr. Manning regarding the limitation on clearing and was advised the regulation is 2500 s.f. for the structure. Jim S. states that is clearing in general.

Jim S. asks what their estimation is of the cleared width of a vehicle that can get down there. Jayson states 10' width; Mark states he is going to take some of the bigger trees, about 12" – 15" on the shoulder so, it has got to be 10'-12' wide.

Jim S. states that the options to improve the access to benefit lot added are either backlot driveway or private road. He continues that we recently did a Private Road and allowed a reduction to the shoulders. He states legal input is to work with the Board and the Applicant to make this a backlot driveway. He further asks what the shoulders are. Alex states 2' on a backlot driveway. Jim S. states he still feels the Board should

do a site walk. He continues that if we allow it as a backlot driveway, we can limit the amount of development if they want to do anything on the 4th lot they must come back before the Board; 3 is all that is allowed on the backlot driveway. He continues that we can't ignore what the Fire Chief says; what are the options to get over there if the access is blocked. He further states we can make sure there is an adequate turnaround once they are out there. Discussion continues between Jim S. and Jayson about the access roads.

Jim S. states if the Board does a Site Walk, they should invite the Fire Chief. Lynne states she would like Natalie's input in writing.

Jim S. explains the layout again to Ray.

Jayson states that there are only two (2) structures on the island that meet the residence structure requirements by having 1 bedroom, 1 bath and 1 kitchen. Ray asks what keeps them from adding a bathroom to the existing bunkhouse. Alex explains it would require a permit and you may or may not be able to do it to make it a dwelling unit. Jim S. states we need a proper assessment or inventory of the dwelling units and structures. Alex states he is not sure if he needs to go out there with someone or if it is part of the Site Walk. Jim S. states Alex should do it and provide written information. Alex agrees.

Ted asks how the bunkhouses are used; are they rented out or only family use. Mark explains they have a 12 week season. Cousins are there 8-12 weeks and have friends filing through for 3 day visits; children come up spending a few weeks; they are filled about half the time. Mark continues that regarding his structure, he lets friends and family use it. He continues that he has a few cabins attached to it; on average 65%-75% full occupancy during those 12 weeks. Jim S. states it is primarily family. Mark states yes, but all of whom pay rent. Alex asks if the septic or septic tanks are shown on this property. He continues that they can't just build a bunch of bunkhouses, they need to prove they have the capacity for septic for the number of bedrooms. Mark states there is one bathroom with two toilets and his place has 2-1/2 baths for at least 30 years. There is an above-ground engineered system there for at least 40 years. Additionally, Mark states the new structure will have its own septic system. Jim S. states we are going to need the septic locations; we need to have test pit as well.

Lynne asks if the Board wants to conduct a site walk; the consensus is yes.

Ray states he would think any lot being severed off would have to come to the Planning Board going forward. Jim S. states, yes that is why we are better going with the backlot driveway. He further states we need a Note added to the Plan stating that any further development must come back to the Planning Board. Ray asks if we have asked Natalie about if they can further subdivide off the Causeway. Jim S. states we need to know who has rights to the Causeway. Alex states that even without the Causeway, an

Island can be subdivided. Jim S. states they obviously have rights to Bear Island Road, but who owns the Causeway. Mark states as he understands it, legally the Causeway belongs to them. He further states they are going through this process to do things properly. He continues, he is trying to decide what to put in the Deed to be fair to all; he can do whatever he wants to at this point, but he is trying to find the right way to do this. The Board and Mark discuss how the access is given and to whom.

Jim S. states he wants to know if the Planning Board has a consensus if they want to allow moving forward as a backlot driveway. Ted states he would as we can control further development some that way. Alex states they can have two primary residences on the lot as long as you have the space standards unless you are going under the family exception. Jim M. states so we need to decide if the new "road" will be a driveway or a private road.

Alex inquires if the Board feels the proposed location is the best location or should it come up further. Jayson shows the Board on the Plan that it is going to be a "T". Ray inquires if he is understanding that the existing road will be moved up. Jim S. states it will be moved up about 300'. Ray states he feels it should be a backlot driveway. Jim M. agrees, Lynne and Ted also agree. Jim S. states the Board will require written waiver request.

Alex states we should set up the site walk and he will have the applicant set up an inspection with him.

Ray states he would like input from Natalie regarding further subdivision.

The Board sets Saturday, September 29th at 9:00 A.M. for the Site Walk. Sandy confirms she will get the Notice out and contact the Fire Chief regarding same.

The Board takes a 5 minute break.

Lynne calls the meeting back to order at 9:50.

Lynne states the next item is Daniel Bannon of Baker Design Consultants has filed an Application on behalf of Pablo Savid-Buteler to permit construction of a single-family dwelling on property known as Map 4, Lot 24, Meadow Road. The property is located in the Village, Limited Residential Recreational and Stream and Wetland Protection Districts.

Dan Bannon introduces himself to the Board and begins by giving an overview of the property. He states the property is known as Map 4, Lot 24 and is part of a previously approved Subdivision known as Rolfe Brook Estates. The application is for a single-family residence which is pretty unique; it is 165' from coming off Meadow Road up to the house site and will have views over Panther Pond. He continues, the driveway is about 3,250 l.f. The initial portion along the low section of the site is an existing driveway for logging; we tried to stay within the existing driveway but along the stream it moves to keep in compliance with the Zoning

Ordinance. Further, he states, the beavers have dammed up Rolfe Brooke and caused fresh water wetlands. The driveway comes out into the woods to keep within the 130' setback requirement for 50'. At the bottom of the hill it starts to get interesting and we used multiple switchbacks to keep the grade down otherwise we would have been 25% and we are trying to keep it all under the 9% grade per the ordinance. Dan continues there is one spot where it is over 9% which is allowed as long as it is under 200'. This section is 14.4% for a short distance.

Dan further states the building site itself is located in the Residential Zone although quite a lot of the site is Shoreland Zone because of the wetlands on the site. We are keeping it out of the 250' shoreland setback. All construction, except part of the driveway is outside of the Shoreland Zone. We have observed some vernal pools and have to have them evaluated in the correct season. There will be no public utilities. The driveway is 12' wide along its length and is just a driveway to one residence.

Dan goes on to state as far as other permits, they did need to apply for a Permit by Rule from DEP however, no ACOE permit was required and we have provided both of these documents to the Town.

Dan wishes to go over Jim Seymour's Review Memo and his responses. Starting with the Shoreland Zoning Standards, there are 9 items that must be addressed as follows:

1. Will maintain safe and healthful conditions – JS Memo states "The project in whole appears that it can be constructed to uphold these values for the lot created, but can the access support emergency response. The driveway has some steep sections and a stream crossing. The applicant has provided additional turnarounds along the driveway route. Prior to approval the Fire Department shall comment on the access and ability to turn around as this site is very long, narrow and steep, but is just a private driveway. Other concerns are how it will be maintained for winter access." The applicant's response is "The applicant concurs that the driveway is long, narrow, and steep. The proposed design was considered to be the most practical alternative for construction of a driveway to the proposed building site after reviewing multiple other alternatives for site access. The length of the driveway is necessitated by the need to achieve reasonable driveway gradients while traversing approximately 165' in elevation. The gradients, while steep, are in compliance with the requirements of Town's Ordinance (§215-9.21E) in that driveway grades are no greater than 9%, except for short segments of less than 200-ft. The width of 12' satisfies the Town's Ordinance (§215-5.3E) for a private driveway serving one dwelling."
2. Will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters – JS Memo states "The applicant has not provided computations for the runoff or treatment for the runoff created by the proposed driveway. The site may deduct any existing driveway development from the overall computation as it is grandfathered. Given the overall area buffers can be utilized easily but should be shown or provided via plan restriction. We will also need to verify no increase in runoff quantity will be observed to Rolfe Brook or its tributaries." The applicant's response is "The Town's

Site Plan Application Checklist requires the submission of "Engineering Calculations used to determine drainage requirements based on a 25-year storm frequency, if the project will significantly alter the existing drainage pattern due to such factors as the amount of new impervious surface (such as paving and building area) being proposed." The application did not include computations for drainage requirements as the alterations to existing site drainage are not considered significant in the context of the existing driveway footprint and the very large site area in relation to the proposed improvements."

3. Will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater – JS Memo states "A subsurface wastewater design for the proposed home was included with an HHE-200 form. The design meets the criteria for approval." The applicant did not respond.

4. Will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat – JS Memo states "We will need to acquire a letter from the State on the wildlife habitat given the proximity of the stream and potential vernal pool locations and any potential for essential wildlife habitat. We would recommend that, while these requests have been submitted, the applicant must provide the State and Federal approvals as part of the local Town approval." The applicant's response is "As part of the application process, we have reviewed State mapping for protected wildlife habitats. Refer to Figure 1 below for a section of Beginning with Habitat's High Value Plant and Animal Habitat database accessed 9/7/18. Note that the only habitat identified on the project site is Wild Brook Trout Habitat which is mapped along the length of Rolfe Brook. The proposed project results in no impact to Rolfe Brook or the adjacent wetlands. Also, as part of the permit application process, an Official Species List has been generated through the US Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC system. A copy of this report was provided in the permit application package as part of Attachment L. The Official Species List identifies No Critical Habitats within the project area. Maine DEP has approved the permit-by-rule application for the project on August 27, 2018. ACOE has provided a letter confirming that due to no impact to freshwater wetlands, a permit is not required for the project. Both of these permits have been provided to the Town on 9/4/18."

5. Will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual points of access to inland waters – JS Memo states "The applicant does appear to impact some wetland setbacks and minor visual quality by creating a new driveway to the top of the hill where there is a scenic vista. The existing private driveway alignment will be shifted and a new access location for the driveway to reduce road slopes with a cutback type design. Given the topography and choice to build at the hill top not many design options are available." Applicant's response is "Note that the location at the

top of the hill and driveway construction within the existing scenic vista are not located within the Shoreland Zone. For the section of driveway within the shoreland zone there is some clearing necessary in order to facilitate the new driveway construction. This clearing is necessary in order for the location of the driveway to satisfy setbacks from the freshwater wetland that are required by the Town Ordinance. The proposed clearing is located further from the wetland than the existing driveway clearing. After construction of the new driveway, the existing driveway clearing will be loamed and seeded with an erosion control mix, and native plantings will be allowed to migrate into the previously cleared area. As a result, in the long-term shore cover in be improved from the conditions that exist today.”

6. Will protect archaeological and historic resources as designated in the comprehensive plan – JS Memo states “We will likely need some letter from the State Historic Preservation Offices.” Applicant’s response “The proposed project occurs on an existing undeveloped property that is part of an approved subdivision with no known history of development. There are no known archaeological or historic resources in the vicinity of the site. Review by the Maine Historic Preservation Commission is not listed as a criteria for either the Site Plan of Shoreland Zoning applications and has not been completed. If the Board determines that such a review is warranted, this can be requested from MHPC.”
7. Will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or marine activities in a Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District – JS Memo states “We concur that the existing use for access to motor vehicles is established and will likely have no further significant impacts on fisheries, but will need to see evidence that the State’s Inland Fisheries and Wildlife is in agreement with the applicant’s driveway impact.” The applicant’s response is “The project does not occur within a Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District.”
8. Will avoid problems associated with flood plain development and use – JS Memo states “We feel there is no evidence that this is indeed the case but will need to see limits of the brooks flood elevation called out on the plan and want to assure they implement Erosion Control Plan provisions in association with vegetated buffers to protect the resource.” Applicant’s response is “The project includes no proposed development or use within a mapped floodplain.”
9. Is in conformance with the provisions of Section 15, Land Use Standards – JS Memo states “The residential single family use is an allowed use under the Shoreland Zoning and within the Residential District but must be done so with minimal impact. The applicant must adhere to the performance standards of the Site Plan Ordinance for driveway and roads. A site walk may alleviate any questions raised as to the overall driveway location and design if not adequately answered by the application.” The applicant’s response is “The single-family residence is not located within the shoreland zone. The proposed driveway occurs partially within the Shoreland Zone. The

proposed driveway design has been developed to result in minimal site impact in consideration of Site Plan Ordinance Standards for driveways. If the Planning Board deems it necessary, we are amenable to scheduling a site walk.”

Dan continues that there are two 60” metal culverts and they appear to be in good condition. CMP has an easement on the property.

Jim S. states he want to be sure the culverts are large enough.

Jim S. states he would like to go over the Site Plan Review articles as follows:

- A. Preservation of Landscaping – The application includes a grading and planting plan for the home location and given the remote location deep into the parcel we see no need for any other landscaping.
- B. Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment - The Single Family Building planned for the site is located atop the steep ridgeline to gain the views from atop. Being it is a single family structure, the Board has little say with the chosen location other than if safety is compromised.
- C. Vehicular Access- The site plan indicates that the access to the site will utilize the same access across Rolfe Stream and will then veer off the existing access to create reasonable access up the hillside slopes using a cut back road design to achieve more length and help reduce slope. Applicant also needs to address the integrity of the existing driveway stream crossing to handle the added weight from the construction equipment. A construction management plan and sequencing of activity will also be beneficial. The biggest concern is with driveway grades being steep and how emergency access will be conducted. More turnarounds might be advised but we will request the applicant obtain some letter of review from the Fire Department. Applicant replied “The integrity of the existing driveway stream crossing has not been formally assessed. Given the prior use of the access route to support logging and access by CMP to the transmission corridor, it is believed that the culverts are adequate to support construction vehicle use during the project and use as a private driveway after project completion. A brief inspection of the culverts has been completed and the culverts are believed to be in adequate, functional condition. If it is found necessary to upgrade the culvert this would require separate permits and would be part of a separate application. We understand that the Fire Department has been provided a copy of the application for comment. We are prepared to accommodate recommendations of the Fire Department, if necessary”.
- D. Parking and Circulation – No parking lot is proposed with the lot development so thereby the criteria would not apply for this application if parking is not required.

It also appears that the turnarounds may also be used for parking associated with the home as the parking is well below the finish grade of the home.

- E. Surface Water Drainage - The drainage plan has been provided. The proximity to Rolfe brook and large wetland places a greater requirement and threat to water quality and protection and measures shall be placed at the greatest extent possible to reduce phosphorus and sediment transport as well as impacts from runoff velocities. We did not see any stormwater computations or summary of how that facet will be controlled. Applicant responded "As noted previously, runoff calculations were not provided as the alteration to site drainage are not considered significant. This is allowed by the Town based on the Site Plan Checklist. The contractor will be required to follow the Erosion Control Plan and employ Erosion and Sedimentation Control BMP's during construction. We concur that adequate buffers will be present to alleviate wetland impacts due to driveway runoff.

Jim S. states he is just concerned about the culverts going up a pretty substantial slope. Lynne states we need to see what has held up in the past.

The Board also discusses the Fire Chief's Memo stating those steep sections are very concerning to the Board. They (FD) need adequate turnaround, a cistern, a residential sprinkler system or a monitored fire alarm system for early notification of a potential problem.

The Board returns to discussions of the driveway regarding Fire Department needs. Dan states the driveway was designed for passenger vehicles and box trucks; they didn't design it for large trucks, however, they do understand they need to make accommodations for emergency vehicles. The Board would like specifications of emergency vehicles from Chief Cole.

Alex states that regarding residential sprinkler systems, there is nothing in the 1995 Subdivision Plan that requires them for single family dwelling. He continues that the SFMO wouldn't require it either. He further states that with the location of this dwelling you may want to install it.

Jim S. inquires if there will be some sort of alarm. Dan states yes. Dan continues stating the homeowner is not in favor of a cistern and is not opposed to the sprinklers. Jim S. states he is not sure a cistern is practical for a single-family dwelling. He continues that the concerns are environmental due to the steep slopes of the driveway; we need to make sure we don't have washouts as there is only one way in. Ray states he sees no reason to require sprinklers or a cistern; a monitored alarm is fine. Jim M. states there is an insurance benefit to having a sprinkler.

Jim S. states that maybe on the switch ups you can widen the shoulders.

Lynne states she is concerned about environment with washouts, etc. Jim S. states that can be addressed from the stormwater perspective. Dan states they have trees to keep it as natural as possible and slow the water starting from the house down as well as at the switchbacks there is ditching on one side of the driveway and rip rap on the other; the ditching is on the uphill side, runoff is always on the left side of the driveway. Dan states they did not provide the runoff calculations. Jim S. states we will need to see those; we need to have the turnout appropriately sized, ditch sizing and culvert sizing because it is a long, windy road.

Dan asks if the Fire Department need to get directly to the house or can they be 200' or 300' away. The Board states they need access.

The Board discusses possible Conditions of Approval (1) Alex or Jim to review Stormwater calculations on culverts and ditching; (2) Require a Letter from the Fire Chief regarding acceptability of access and (3) Owner must install a monitored fire alarm system to provide early notification of a potential problem.

Jim M. moves to accept the application with the conditions discussed (1) – (3) and to allow setback reduction from 130' to 50' along the driveway as shown on the Plan and not to be less than 50' at any point.

Ray seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain.

Lynne states the Board has one item to discuss under "Other" this evening. She continues that this is regarding Kennels and will be on the October 1st Agenda for discussion. Alex explains about there was a Complaint in the Village District and the Selectboard worked out a Consent Agreement with the persons who owned multiple dogs. He continues that our definition of a Kennel is three (3) or more dogs is a kennel. Further, a kennel is only an allowed use in the Commercial Zone. The Selectboard wants the Planning Board to look into possible amendment of the Ordinance or the definition. Alex further suggests the number of dogs be changed from three (3) to five (5) because five (5) is the State Statute for a kennel. Jim S. states that being a rural area, it is something you may wish to allow as a conditional use in other areas beside Commercial.

Lynne moves to adjourn.

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain