

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 12th, 2018

CASCO COMMUNITY CENTER

7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Stan Buchanan, Jim Macklin, Edward Phipps & Lynne Potter

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bob Barnes, Ted Beckner & Ray Grant

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

PUBLIC PRESENT: See attached

Lynne calls the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

Lynne states the first item on the Agenda is approval of the November 13, 2017 Minutes.

Stan moves to approve the Minutes as written.

Jim seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

Lynne states the next item on the Agenda is an application filed by Jones Associates, Inc. for an Amendment to an Approved Subdivision on behalf of Bruce J. Cort for property known as Map 9, Lot 52-8 located on Davis Brook Road in the Stonecrest Estates Subdivision. Amendment to the approved plan is to allow for a building envelope on Map 9, Lot 52-8.

Rick Jones reintroduces himself to the Board as the representative for Bruce Cort. Rick states that since the last meeting they have had a Site Walk with a few members of the Board present. He continues that he submitted a response to Jim Seymour's Memo along with additional information being submitted today.

Lynne asks Jim S. for his comments. Jim states that he received the Revised Culvert information from Silas Canavan and he did review it and it seems more in line with how it should perform.

Jim continues that Ted and Jim M. attended the Site Walk. It was observed at that time that one of the areas near one of the abutters is thin tree lined and that will now be a vegetated buffer.

Lynne asks if they should go through the Technical Review items on Jim Seymour's 2/6/18 Memo. She continues, obviously we didn't get to review the new information submitted.

The Board reviews the items in Jim's Memo as follows:

1. "The Plan shall depict the underlying zoning bulk and space standards to include necessary setbacks and buffers. These shall be added in notes along with any other restriction established as part of the Stone Crest Subdivision." The zoning standards for setbacks and bulk area requirements have been added to the final plan. The Board finds this acceptable.
2. "The applicant shall note on the Subdivision the restrictive covenants that will apply to the lot or need to partake in any associations for Road Maintenance etc." The restrictive covenants have been added to the plan. The Board finds this acceptable.
3. "Lot 52-8 is to access from Davis Brook Road. There is a Permit by rule application for a driveway box culvert but none is shown on the plan nor is there any engineered calculations or design plans showing its appropriate sizing." A stormwater management report and calculations have been submitted for review to look at the impacts of the culvert installation in the 2 yr, 10yr, 25yr, and 100 yr. rainfall events. Although, the report is submitted we feel that the computation need to appropriately model the brook as an open channel versus as a shallow concentrated flow. This may change the flow rate in larger storms with a higher flow rate, than as modelled. Based on the resubmitted information the stream base flow and model still seems too low of a flow." We received an updated report from Silas Canavan showing new calculations as requested and that the culvert is adequate size. The Board accepts this item.
4. "Lot 52-8 shall be provided with a passing soil test for septic design and a submitted HHE 200 design to support the lots potential septic system. A test pit is shown on the plan but no logs were submitted with the application." We did receive corresponding soil logs for the test pits shown on the plan meeting minimum requirements. The Board deems this acceptable.
5. "The lot shall show a well exclusion area from both the proposed and existing lots septic systems meeting state plumbing codes, and/or note of how well water or domestic water will be available for the proposed lot." The applicant has indicated that the proposed well will be added to the front of the lot just southwest of the proposed entrance to Davis Brook Road. The Board deems this acceptable.
6. "A note shall be added that the lot to be developed will require an amendment to the original approved Stone Crest Subdivision and as such this plan amends the approved plan for only the portion of Lot 52-8, and will supersede the findings as approved in May 2007." The requested notes have been added just above the title block as required. This is accepted by the Board.

7. "A standard erosion control plan shall be submitted for a general practice of how the lot will be protected, during the construction of the driveway, Septic system or house itself." The silt fencing is shown for the culvert crossing and areas disturbed by that construction and the plan addresses erosion control measures for the rest of the proposed lot clearing and house/lot construction. The Board accepts this item.
8. "How much of the lot will be cleared, and prepared for sale or for applicants use, limits of tree clearing shall be shown." The limits of the site clearing has been shown. Given the proximity to an abutter's dwelling, the remaining ten feet of the lot remain in uncut tree buffer for a visual screening. This is acceptable to the Board.
9. "How will the lot be served for power? Underground service is preferred. A note for services shall be added to the plan." The requested note for underground power has been added. This is acceptable as well.
10. "There are no professional stamps on any of the drawings provided and will be required for approval." Plans have been adequately stamped and dated. The Board accepts this item.
11. "The design of the Driveway shall be stamped by a Maine Professional Engineer indicating dimensions of the proposed box culvert, grading, driveway dimensions, and sideslopes, along with necessary inspection requirements during construction." We note that the various components of the culvert were added but that the grades for inverts, wing walls, and top of road spot grades over the culvert were not added, nor were the requested inspection criteria. We have received the calculations and the appropriate stamps have been added. The Board finds this acceptable.

Stan asks about the note we received from the Road Commissioner. He is informed that that is regarding the other project before the Board this evening and not this project.

Lynne states she would like to review the Amended Plan Submission criteria. Jim S. states that on page 4 of his Memo, Conditions for Consideration. #1 has been met already and the question is do you want to include financial securities for installation of the culvert. Stan asks what the usual procedure is for this. Jim S. states for driveways it is just a building permit but the culvert affects the entire subdivision.

Rick states that there is a Permit by Rule and the applicant would prefer inspection by either you (Jim S.) or Alex. He continues that the applicant would rather not post bond

for the driveway and feels having an inspection would be adequate. Rick continues that the applicant may not be building the driveway, it may be someone else. Jim S. states the COA is written so that it is the responsibility of the lot owner. He continues that in lieu of a bond, they are willing to pay for the Town to inspect the culvert.

Jim M. asks if it the installation will be signed off on by Alex. Jim S. states it could be signed off by Alex or himself.

Lynne states she is concerned because of what is happening in Highland Lake with the large bloom; she wants to be sure it is addressed adequately to protect our streams and lakes.

Jim S. states that the Board could request a Third Party inspection if they desire. Lynne states she would rather it be someone from the Town that inspects it. Jim S. explains that if you require a Professional Engineer, the Board controls that PE, not the applicant.

Stan states that if the applicant sells the property and new owner proposes something different than what we are reviewing, we need to see it.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing on this matter.

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

Jim M. moves to accept items 8.1.1 through 8.1.14 as stated in Jim Seymour's Memo of 2/6/18. (see attached)

Stan seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

Lynne asks about the bond issue. Jim S. explains that the Board can either request a bond if it wishes or they may request payment for a Third Party Inspection for the culvert installation. If they desire a Third Party Inspection to be paid for by the party responsible for installing the culvert, the Board chooses the Professional Engineer to perform the inspection.

Lynne moves to accept a Third Party Inspection.

Jim M. seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

Jim M. moves to approve the Amendment to the Stonecrest Subdivision with the COA that the Subdivision Plan is to be amended to include a Note that the lot owner/builder of the lot or person(s) responsible for the installation of the culvert and driveway shall provide a payment to the Town of Casco to cover the costs of a Third Party Inspection of the driveway and culvert.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

Lynne states next item on the Agenda is an Application filed by D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers on behalf of RJR, LLC regarding a 4-lot Subdivision for property known as Map 8, Lot 8 located on Fountain Hill Road.

Jayson Haskell of Dustin Roma Consulting Engineers addresses the Board and states that the lots are all located uphill of the roadway providing a buffer along the downhill roadway. He continues that each lot will have its own well and septic system. Continuing, he states that runoff will go through side swales to level spreaders.

Jayson goes on to state that they are requesting two (2) waivers on the project. First is the requirement for HHE 200s for each lot prior to approval and second is for a waiver of the road standards. He explains that they have worked with Jim S. to address the issues in his review and they are looking for final approval tonight if possible.

Jim S. reiterates that they had originally come in to do this project as a 4-lot development through a backlot driveway. It was determined that it could be done that way, but it was not optimal. Jim S. continues that he and Alex suggested this be done with access from a Private Road; however, the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance don't agree on specifications for Private Road and therefore, we met in the middle to allow the Private Road to be 16' wide gravel way with 2' shoulders giving a full 20. He continues that the new Private Road won't be paved but rather be constructed from reclaimed asphalt and compacted. He continues that this will be a very sturdy road. Additionally, he states that we are in receipt of an email from David Morton, Road Commissioner, stating he is in favor of the waiver for the road standards. Jim states that it also will cut down on the runoff.

Jim S. states that all lots will be on the upper side of the parcel and the lower side is in the Wetlands/RP area and provides that the homes will be high and dry. He continues that the RP will be put in conservation. Additionally, he states that per his Memo there were a lot of technical comments.

Lynne asks about the site walk. Jim S. states that as stated regarding previous matter and the site walk, Ted and Jim M. were present and the property is as we see it on the plans. He continues that where the new Private Road is proposed to come off of

Fountain Hill Road has an existing culvert that is very silted and we should ask the applicant to clean the culvert prior to any construction.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing on this matter.

Drew Sinclair of Fieldcrest Drive states he is concerned about runoff with a new culvert and who would be responsible for it if there is an issue of washouts. He continues that Fieldcrest Drive is a Private Association.

Jim S. states that Fountain Hill Road is a Town road and anything that falls onto Fountain Hill Road is the Town's responsibility; anything that is where their new private road comes in, would be their responsibility.

Drew asks if the Town will be upgrading Fountain Hill Road due to the increase in traffic. Jim S. states that would be for the Road Commissioner or Public Works to look at. Jim S. continues that he cannot speak for the Town, but feels that the Town should address it.

Peg Dilley of Edes Falls Road shows the Board on the Plan where there are wintering areas and wildlife areas. She states that developments are pushing our wildlife out; we rely on hunting and fishing in this Town. She continues there are 16 lots on Edes Falls Road and there has been nothing to keep the water from running and not just culvert; there are trickle streams that end up in our lakes. She goes on that if the Town is going to keep allowing Subdivisions, they need to maintain the Town roads before allowing more development. She further states we have issues in this area now and that Resolution up on that wall (she points) states that we are supposed to be protecting our water and water quality.

Frank Riordan of Fountain Hill Road states that he agrees with quite a few of Peg's concerns. He states we are a small community; we are not Windham. He continues that it costs us more for everything and he is concerned with the culverts; cleaning it out won't be enough. He further states that we need a State Engineer to come look and give the Town an opinion of what is necessary. Additionally, he states that four (4) houses will be adding more traffic on a heavily traveled area; this is the second Subdivision here; to tear down things and just keep building is not in the Town's best interests. He continues that where the location of that road is to be should be up further near the rock wall and if not up there, it should at least be farther up the hill. Frank goes on to state that there will be a lot more people coming down Fountain Hill Road and the people on the hill have concerns about this. Additionally, he states that four (4) homes is too many; we may consider three (3); we want to keep our Town a place that people want to come and visit.

There being no other comments, Lynne closes the Public Hearing.

Jayson states that in response to the concern of if the culvert will be adequate, it is able to process more than the existing culvert. He explains that the culvert under Fountain Hill Road is 12" and we are putting in two (2) 18" and one (1) 15" culverts to provide adequate drainage. He goes on stating the limit of disturbance is approximately 200'

from the brook so it does provide a vegetated area for the runoff prior to reaching any of the streams or brooks.

Jayson further states that they ran a hydrologic model that we are discussing the flow of runoff coming off our site.

Jim S. states that he would like to hear how two (2) 18" and one (1) 15" culverts reduce the flow. Jayson states that during the peak of the storm, the effect of the Subdivision is decreasing the amount of run off at peak as it is more widely spread , it goes into swales then level spreaders all before going into our lakes and therefore it is going at a slower rate. Jayson shows Lynne on the Plans where the culverts will be.

Jim S. states that each driveway will require a culvert coming onto Fountain Hill Road. He continues that the existing culvert is pretty much buried and it is not adequately functioning. He further states that we may be able to require them to clean out and make certain it is functioning property; although there is nothing in the proximity of this Private Road, during construction it should be taken care of and after that, it should be the Town's responsibility to maintain Fountain Hill Road.

Stan asks what the impact on the wetland will be. Jim S. states there wouldn't be any impact on the wetlands by making certain the level spreader is maintained by the Home Owners Association; they have to have a Home Owners Association.

Lynne asks if they would have to have a Road Association. Jim S. states that they would need a Road Association. There is a note that David Morton, Road Commissioner, wants included on the Plan that it is a Private Road and will remain a Private Road and they are responsible for all maintenance.

Jim M. questions how this flow doesn't change with this development toward Fountain Hill Road. Jim S. explains that it has the deeper ditching which will keep it from changing the flow to Fountain Hill Road.

Lynne inquires as to what the road was going to be covered with since it is not being paved. Jayson states it will be reclaimed asphalt which will be compacted.

Jim S. and Frank Riordan discuss the existing culvert.

Peg states that there was no upgrades done to Fountain Hill Road when the Fieldcrest development was done. She continues that you will be cutting trees that will allow water to come down quicker; the trees hold it back.

Lynne reiterates, as she stated earlier, she is very concerned with the water and protecting it.

Lynne next shows the Habitat Map and states, as Peg pointed out, she is concerned about the wildlife and asks where this particular map originated. Jayson responds that the State prepared those maps from a database. Jim S. states the State generates these maps; you can see there is a wildlife wintering area, Brook Trout Habitat, Inland

Wading Bird and Waterfowl Habitat and Animal Habitat. He goes on to state that this project is not going into the wetlands area; that will be put into conservation.

Lynne asks how close the snowmobile/ATV trails are to the development. Peg shows the Board on the Plan where the trail runs. Jayson states there are no easements on the applicant's property. Jim S. states there are not any trails on the property in question and we have no obligation to provide such access.

Jim S. states there were a lot of comments in the 2/6/18 Memo and he received a lot of information in the last few days. He continues there are two (2) waiver requests out there which are the HHE 200s and Road Design standards. He goes on that we should start with the road design; if we make the road bigger, it will create more runoff.

Stan states that so in as far as a Private Road, this can meet our standards. Jim S. states that under the Subdivision Ordinance there is one standard, but under the Zoning Ordinance, if there is access for a certain number of lots, it can be smaller.

Jim S. goes on to state that if this were a Major Subdivision, you would be able to grant Preliminary Approval, however, since this is a Minor Subdivision it goes straight to Final Approval. He continues that the Board needs to decide if it wants more time to go through the information received or if they wish to proceed to go through the technical review now. The Board determines to review Jim's 2/6/18 Technical Review items as follows:

1. The Private Road is to access from Fountain Hill Road. We will request to see the posted speed limit and applicable sight distance on the drawings, along with a standard note that the Private Road will not be accepted as a Town Public Street. Sight Distance has been added with Notes #10 and #11 on the Plan. Accepted by the Board.
2. Each lot shall provide a passing soil test for septic design and a submitted HHE 200 design to support the lots potential septic system. Applicant has requested a Waiver for HHE-200 Forms. The Board acknowledges waiver request and will act upon same at a later date.
3. Each lot shall show a well exclusion area from both the proposed and existing lots septic systems meeting state plumbing codes, and/or note of how well water or domestic water will be available for the proposed lot. Well exclusion shown on Sheet SB-1. This is acceptable to the Board.
4. How much of the lot will be cleared, and an estimation for limits of tree clearing shall be shown. This is required or can be interpreted to be a requirement for the lot buffering under 9.4.3. A Landscaping and Buffering. Clearing is shown on the Stormwater Plan. This is acceptable to the Board.
5. Given the moderate slope of the lots topography and that the lots in general will be developed and graded to concentrate surface waters and foundation drains to the street, we feel there is a need for deeper ditching and or underdrains to convey the saturation

away from the road base and surfaces. Ditches were noted to be 3 inches below subbase gravel on Road Detail. This is acceptable to the Board.

6. A statement with how Fire Protection will be addressed will need to be given on the plans with a confirmation that it is acceptable from the Fire Department. Fire Chief is reviewing and the Board is awaiting input.
7. A note shall be added to the plan discussing how wetlands were delineated and mapped along with a summary table of the amount of wetlands that are to be impacted with the development activities. Wetland Note #8 has been improved. This is acceptable to the Board.
8. Will the Planning Board require a new pole light at the intersection with Fountain Hill Road? The Board briefly discussed this, but will address at a later date.
9. We will need to see the applicant's financial capacity to build the road and develop the subdivision as planned potentially upgraded. The Board wishes to see an update Financial Capacity letter.
10. Street monuments shall be designated with granite monuments at the front and at the end (4-total) of the proposed street per the Subdivision Street standards section 9.4.5 Lots/Monuments. This item has been corrected and is acceptable to the Board.
11. The stormwater level lipped spreaders shall be included in a drainage easement for the benefit of the road association. This has also been corrected and is found acceptable to the Board.
12. The approved road cross section detail shall be placed on the final subdivision. With note that it is not to be submitted for nor approved as a Town Street and will remain private and maintained by the proposed road association. This item has been added to Sheet SB-1. The Board finds this is acceptable.
13. The stormwater plan discusses that the roofs will be constructed with formal drip edges. If that is the case then a note shall be added to the plan if part of the proposed surface runoff treatment plan. Note #9 has been added to the Plan and is acceptable to the Board.

Jim S. states that even if the Board does not waive the HHE-200 forms requirement, oftentimes even if we have the HHE-200 the septic gets relocated prior to construction due to the location of the house.

Jim S. asks Jayson if they've gotten the information on the well on Lot A. Jayson states that Ron has requested it, but has not yet received it.

Stan inquires if a new pole light is requested under the new Subdivision, who pays for that new light. Jim M. states that with the Town trying to reduce lighting, it doesn't seem reasonable to add a new one. Lynne states she agrees with Jim M.

Jim S. states that the roof runoff is being infiltrated back into the ground via drip edge roofing.

Stan asks how the utilities are being supplied. Jim S. advises they are underground.

Jim M. states that it seems like from the public input the major concern is Fountain Hill Road which doesn't necessarily apply to the Subdivision, but should be reviewed by someone. Jim S. states he agrees with this.

Jayson states they will coordinate with Fire Department.

Lynne states we took out 31 lights and evidently Fountain Hill Road gets quite a bit of traffic, but not being a through road, it doesn't require a light.

Lynne asks the Board if this matter should be tabled to next month and we can mull over the public comments. Jim M. states we still seem to be missing some information anyway.

Jim S. states so the Board wishes more information on the existing conditions of Fountain Hill Road, correct. Jim M. and Stan state yes.

Jim S. states they have met the standards on the runoff. He continues asking if the Board would like them to expand on the Habitat Map. The Board's consensus is they would like that expanded. Continuing he states that we are awaiting input from the Fire Department at this time.

Jim S. ask if the Board would like to give some indication whether it supports the waiver requests or not. Lynne asks the Board how they feel about the HHE-200 forms and Road waivers requested. Jim M. asks what they requests were for again.

Jim S. explains that one waiver is the Road Standards in the Subdivision Ordinance. They are requesting the road be allowed at 16' width with 2' shoulders on each side rather than 20' wide with 2' shoulders. He continues that the Subdivision Ordinance also requires paved roads and they are proposing reclaimed asphalt. Lynne states that she would support the road waiver unless the Board wishes to address that next month. She continues that perhaps both waivers should be addressed at the same time. The Board consensus is they believe the road waiver is acceptable and also believe the HHE-200 waiver is likely acceptable. Both waivers need a vote next month.

Jayson asks if the additional information on Fountain Hill Road is something the Board should be addressing. Jim S. states that the impetus should be on them to check with either David Morton or perhaps Ron. Jim S. further states the Board also needs Ron's updated Financial Statement.

Lynne moves to table this matter to next month.

Stan seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

Lynne asks if there is any other business.

Alex states last month he wanted to talk with the Board about the Aquifer Protection Zone. He continues that this is the Aquifer Protection Zone that Point Sebago came in to discuss the discrepancy between our overlay and the State's over and was presented by Dustin Roma. He further states the State maps were redone in 1997 or 1998 and it looks as if the Town never updated their maps. He goes on to state the question is what does the Board think we should do to take this to Town Meeting to update it to match the State overlay. Alex states we could hire someone to review it or we can just go ahead and address it. Alex further states that there are some properties in the AP Zone that shouldn't be there while others which should be in AP are not. He continues that we need to hold a Public Hearing as it is a Zoning Change; and ideally we should have the Public Hearing in April at the latest so we should wrap this up next month.

Jim S. states that from a standpoint of liability, where we don't match up with the State, it leaves us vulnerable.

Stan states so he understands this could have an impact on Point Sebago. Alex states it could affect several lots. Jim S. states the biggest thing is notification to those being affected. Jim M. states it has been this way for quite some time, why do we have to do this in a month. Jim S. states because we had a request to address the matter. Stan asks what about other people who are in the AP zone and could be affected, what happens to them. Jim S. states there are two ways to do this. One is to request the adjustment to the Map and everyone who is affected is notified or we can address it on the requested property and anyone who wishes to have their property removed from the AP could file a request for it. Jim M. states he would like to know more about it before he makes a decision. Alex states it may require we hire someone to look into this then. Jim S. asks Alex how many properties are in the Overlay that would be affected. Alex states he can put a database together. The Board states they would like that to review.

Alex states he would like to bring the Shoreland Zoning before the Board also next month. He continues he has gone through a lot of it and has updated some sections showing language either added or deleted. Stan asks what the affect would be to changes to the 30% expansion. Jim S. states that it would not be looking at volume expansion. Alex state there is also added language to dock section, revegetation; ideally he would like to see this done this year. Alex states there are also changes to timber harvesting in shoreland zones which could be done by the State. Stan asks if the changes to expansion include existing structures that want to expand. Alex and Jim S. state yes. Lynne states we should probably be in line with the State.

Mark Kingston states the changes also give all of the Towns the push to replace the reasonable return requirement. Alex states he needs to do some research on this and get in touch with the Town's attorney as well.

Lynne moves to adjourn.

Stan seconds.

Any discussion? None.

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

8.1.1 Is in conformance with goals policies, and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan of the Town; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.2 Will not result in undue water or air pollution, and in making this determination, the Planning Board shall at least consider: *Due to the proximity of the Brook the Board should be clear this has been adequately addressed by plan changes or conditions of approval.*

- A. The elevation of the land and its relation to floodplains:**
- B. The nature of soils and subsoils and their ability to adequately support waste disposal:**
- C. The slope of the land and its effect on effluents: and**
- D. The applicable State and Local health and water resources regulations**

8.1.3 Has sufficient water available for the reasonably unforeseeable needs of the subdivision; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.4 Will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply: *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.5 Will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the land to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition may result: *Due to the proximity of the Brook the Board should be clear this has been adequately addressed by plan changes or conditions of approval.*

8.1.6 Will not cause or unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of highways or public roads existing or proposed; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.7 Will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.8 Will not cause unreasonable burden on the ability of the Town to dispose of solid waste and sewage if municipal services/facilities are to be utilized; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.9 Will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historical sites, rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights to physical or visual areas; *Due to the proximity of the Brook the Board should be clear this has been adequately addressed by plan changes or conditions of approval.*

8.1.10 Is in conformance with the Casco Zoning Ordinance including Shoreland Zoning Standards and with other pertinent state and local codes and ordinances; *With the DEP approval and appropriate setbacks we feel the requirements can be met.*

8.1.11 The subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the above standards; *Given that this is only for a single family lot the Board shall request that the applicant may have to provide evidence to cover for the driveway construction costs*

8.1.12 Whenever situated, in whole or in part, within 250 feet of any pond, lake or river, will not adversely affect the quality of such body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of such body of water; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.13 Will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater; *We feel this requirement has been met.*

8.1.14 In all instances the burden of proof shall rest upon the applicant (A) To make all required submittals and (B) To Demonstrate compliance with all applicable approval standards.

PB 2/12/18

SIGN IN SHEET

PRINTED NAME

AGENDA ITEM OF INTEREST

Jayson Haskell	Fountain Hill Rd Subdivision
Reck Jones	Court Down way
FRANK Riordan	Fountain Hill Rd
Mark Ludman	New Zealand Zoning SATELITES
Olena Pettit	Fountain Hill/Feldcrest Dr.
Andrew Sicker	Fountain Hill Rd
James Doucette	Fountain Hill Road
PE. R. DILLEY	Fountain Hill Rd