



Town of Hebron

PO Box 188

Hebron, NH 03241

Phone: 603-744-2631

hebronnh@metrocast.net

Hebron Planning Board

APPROVED Minutes of Hearing 3/7/07

Members Present: Chuck Beno (alternate), Dick Cowern (Selectmen's rep), Tom Gump (alternate), Roger Larochelle (chair), Ellie Lonske (vice chair), Curtis Mooney, Martha Twombly (alternate), David Wall and Sheila Oranch (secretary)

Others Present: Katherine Keon, Anne Hill, Patrick H. Wood (attorney), Richard Delaney, Barbara Delaney, Bill Nobles, Phil Twombly, Betsy Twombly, Jeff Hillier, Alan Barnard, Ken Lonske, Jerry Lauther, Ileana Saros, Gordon Karlberg, Carl R. Karlberg, John Schaefer, Camille Mucci, Sandra Settele, and Dave Settele.

Time Convened: 7:00 PM **Time Adjourned:** 10:30 PM

Next Meetings: 3/19/07 workshop on Site Plan Review updates, 4/4/07 monthly hearing

Agenda:

1. Administrative Matters
2. Approve minutes of 2/7/06
3. Continuance of Jaques ET AL subdivision and boundary adjustment applications
4. Continuance of Ridgewater Commons Cluster subdivision application
5. Any other matters that come before the Board

Administrative Matters

Roger Larochelle reviewed various materials that had been received. He introduced board members and asked speakers to state their name and interest when recognized for public comment.

Minutes of 2/7/07

Curtis Mooney noted on Pg 2 that his notes consisted of the matrix. The secretary believed there would be text and didn't capture what he said. He sent that by email and they will be kept on file as addenda to the minutes. Pg 3 change 'specified' to 'indicated' at end of next to last sentence. Change 'he' to Roger Larochelle. Pg 5 see paper. Pg 6 change 'form' to from. Pg 7 uniformly or uniformity? Delete 'after if' in prove it if...; Tom Gump noted on Pg7 last paragraph it should be 'detailed' inventory. Pg 8 4th paragraph from the end add 'in usable area.'

Dick Cowern moved/Curtis Mooney seconding approving the minutes as amended. PASSED

Jaques, ET. AL.

Alan Barnard reported that the Selectmen signed the new proposed George Road Right of Way agreements and they were sent to owners a day late. He called the attorney and learned that they are still in process. He requested continuance to 4/4/07 which was granted.

Ridgewater Commons

Chuck Beno stepped down as he is an abutter on the Ridgewater Commons case and Martha Twombly was appointed as a voting member.

Richard and Barbara Delaney, Pat Wood, Alan Barnard and Corey Johnston were representing.

Roger Larochelle reviewed new materials received: Curtis Mooney's summary of additional info needed was circulated to the board and copied to the applicant's team. It was not copied to Nobles et al. A paper copy was handed to Bill Nobles by Pat Wood. Roger said he had thought everyone had gotten copies. This was all discussed at the last hearing and the summary was just for backup.

A note from Mr. Delaney also reviewed what the Board was seeking.

A letter from Peter Cooperdock dated 2/23/07 to Luke Hurley of Gove Engineering was received in the Town office 3/1/07. Copies of this letter were handed to Board members this evening. Materials should be submitted ten days in advance, but this letter may be helpful in discussions unless there are objections from any Board members.

A letter from Anne Hill and Katherine Keon with abutters' concerns was handed in at the last hearing. These concerns will be reviewed this evening. Katherine expressed concern that their concerns might not be covered in a timely manner this evening.

Martha Twombly asked about new maps that may have been delivered to the office. Alan Barnard said he had delivered a stack of maps to the office and left them on the secretary's desk, as requested. Obviously they were moved by someone else using the room and were found on top of the file cabinets. Copies were handed around to the Board.

Roger read a February 23rd letter from Northpoint Engineering addressing the question of final lot plans (on file). Copies were sent to Paul Fluet, reviewing engineer for the Town, as well as developer's team. Roger asked Corey Johnston how different this is from the originals.

Corey responded that to take over someone else's project, you can't just take the numbers, so he had to recalculate to be sure. Results were very similar. There are a few minor differences.

Roger said the Board has not had the opportunity to check with Mr. Fluet on any of this information within the available timeframe. But there are plenty of details to review and discuss this evening. Roger asked Corey to give a brief Subdivision improvement plans summary.

Corey said it is virtually the same thing Lesley Boulton had designed. In this set of plans the only difference is where she had a detention basin, they moved it and Lot 2 went from 1 acre to 1.6 acres. There was a lot line along a stone wall and they moved the detention basin to the other side of the wetland and avoided piping water to the other side of the lot. The only thing Northpoint has done is redesign the road, the grading and drainage. The lot plans have not been changed.

Ellie said that for her the most informative piece of information has been the lot plan showing exactly where everything will be ***table showing how many Usable acres are in each lot.*** Knowing how much Usable Area there is for each lot tells what the land is like.

Roger said he did not want to get into the details of substance yet, he just wants an overview of what is different.

Corey said in response to the 2/7/07 hearing minutes he produced color shadings to show where 25% grades will be.

Roger gave the floor to the development team to give new information. Richard Delaney went first and said he would hand off to Pat Wood and then Corey Johnston.

Ellie said what she feels the Board needs to see before a lot of discussion of details is the color map so we have a sense of the big picture of what this is all about. In the Cooperdock report he included a map of conservation areas. What he said about development was the process of defining the areas that cannot or will not be developed. Then you can see where lots could be put in a cluster development. If we look at too much detail before we can get a picture of the overall property. We know there are practical and economic concerns, but that's not where we are supposed to start. If you can show us where this plan is economically viable for you, not harmful for the environment, and not harmful for the abutters or the lake then I'm happy with it.

Roger gave Delaney the floor again. Please begin with the big picture.

Richard Delaney began with where they are.

1. Road design- have responded to most if not all of the issues brought up by the Board; going on the December review.
2. Provided a comprehensive EIS that shows no impact on Newfound Lake, responded again to the EIR.
3. For engineering plans we have gone pretty much as far as we can without some agreements from the Board.
4. Remaining piece is the covenants.

Corey Johnston was up next. He presented a color map scaled 1:120 so it all fits. He said it depicts tree clearing, dark areas uncut, lighter grass, brown house sites. Based on our design which is a little different than Lesley's because of newer zoning. Showing excavation cuts farther back—worst case scenario. Same basic layout. Provide each house with an area of cutting based on grade and septic and such. Tried to show reasonable disturbance areas. Approximately 19 acres out of 112 acres would be disturbed. Also shown is that 3.5% of the total lot area of impervious surfaces comprised of homes and driveways, or about 4 acres. Next dark gray areas are 25% or greater slopes. Wetland areas are a different shade. (Board does not have copies of this gray-scale map but Corey will provide copies to Alan.) The intention is to show everything on one sheet.

Ellie commented that this is getting close to what she wants to see. If you can take from the EIS where the stone walls, foundations, sensitive areas are, then that will show what we need to see. One question is about the impervious areas; when you say a percentage, of what are you referring? Of the Usable Area or of the gross area? What is the percentage when you exclude all the areas you couldn't use anyway? The question is, if you are going to build a cluster, before doing any plans, where should the cluster be?

Corey said he will address much of that. The woods road does not show on this plan because it won't be there after development. The next map in the set does show that and the snowmobile trail and existing features.

Alan Barnard said remember no matter what we show this road is the maximum length a road is allowed to be according to zoning.

Corey said to keep in mind that unlike many proposed developments, much of the preserved land is the better land.

Alan Barnard pointed out where there are big buffers and a wildlife corridor that are around sensitive areas.

Corey said next map shows the recreation area. Would agree with Ellie's take on how to design an ideal cluster. If you had a flat piece of land you could do that. If you have a rough terrain such as this one, you have to figure out where you can put in a road first. If you can't get up there it

won't matter where you want to put the houses. There is no other place where the road could get in. Corey said he is not familiar with the EIR details yet.

Richard Delaney said he can add in the stone walls, foundations, etc. from the EIR.

Ellie said she would have thought that where the lots were placed was based on where they had available after eliminating sensitive areas. It sounds like this plan is not necessarily designed by those principles.

Corey said it's kind of in the middle. This is the only place the road can be in order to avoid the sensitive areas. If they were not trying to avoid the wetlands, it would be much easier to go straight in through the wetlands.

Pat Wood explained that it is a blending of approaches due to the terrain.

Ellie said she is in total sympathy with not only this development but any land development in Hebron, because this is the reality that a large part of the undeveloped land consists of steep slopes and wetlands.

Corey and Ellie discussed approaches and concerns for a while.

Ellie said she would make one more comment. She is not concerned about you disturbing the Usable Area; she wants you to avoid disturbing the un-usable area. The Usable Area is where you should be building.

Richard Delaney pointed out that for the most part the house locations avoid steep slopes. That was a guideline given to Lesley originally. There could still be some slight moving around of house lots as we progress.

Roger said what is not indicated on the green shaded map is specific sites for septic and well installations. Corey confirmed that this is correct and that there is enough area for each lot that they will have room.

Roger questioned the Board about whether they were ready to move on and asked Mr. Delaney if we could move on to EIS. Before that, reviewed the concerns expressed by abutters. Just keep in mind that we do not have all the information yet.

Ann Hill, West Shore Road, spoke about the letter she had sent and recapped her points.

A few of the concerns that have not been addressed yet include sewerage. Contamination is the main concern, not only of their own wells but of Newfound Lake. It has always been stated that this will be addressed later. Concerned about chemicals used on lawns and road salt because it is a cluster, not spread out over the whole property. Also concerned about runoff and floods. We have had two hundred-year floods in the past decade. The stream comes through our area and it does overflow. We do not have foundations. Our homes are on pylons. There will be fewer trees, so how can there not be more flooding? Looking at how the trees are going to be cut, how much is that controlled? When you write the deeds, do they show exactly where the homes must be built? Can the new owners decide to cut more trees to place their homes differently? As we said in the written concerns, what about plowing and snow mounds? Really we are concerned about protecting our homes and the lake. One concern I have on this whole thing is that I'm looking at a situation where I'm seeing Delaney's team coming in, blasting, building this road, selling the lots and going away. They're gone and my house is undermined, I've got a contaminated well, and who am I going to sue? I'm going to be sitting there holding the bag. I think the Town should require a bond so that if there is some damage in the future, I have some recourse. If there are going to be 19 lots I'll have to sit at 19 Planning Board meetings to know what is really going on in each of those lots.

Roger replied that it is the Planning Board's responsibility to protect the Town and the abutters. He assured Ms. Hill that her concerns are noted and will be taken into account.

Pat Wood wanted to clarify that with a cluster development they do not come before the Planning Board for each lot.

Roger Larochelle explained that for every construction there has to be Surety to assure that everything is completed appropriately. On the plans, the building envelopes are not yet specified but those details can be added.

Corey Johnston explained that within the green areas there is sufficient drainage area for each home.

Roger Larochelle asked the Board if they were ready to go on to the EIR.

Curtis said this is the first time we have seen Peter Cooperdock's response and we have not had a chance to look at it. The developers can go through it if they want.

Richard Delaney said he would go over the points in the actual environmental study. He clipped up a big display of his points.

He wants to focus on the recommendations. Extensive bedrock outcroppings—we agree that these are valuable. Peter Cooperdock said on page 33 that with reasonable setbacks from the steep slopes, there should be no problem with situating homes above them. There was one large wetlands area on the map and a contiguous corridor for wildlife down Ross Brook and through to Newfound Lake. It appears that Mr. Cooperdock is endorsing the proposal, and probably would even prefer smaller lots, like the original previous design, to preserve even more land. These were the recommendations and we have no problem with any of that.

Roger Larochelle said that he does not see setbacks from steep slopes.

Richard Delaney said he was referencing bedrock outcrops, not all steep slopes.

Roger said we have not seen a map of the outcroppings yet. Corey said that is correct.

Richard Delaney continued to quote the EIR summary that with proper construction procedures there should be no impact on Newfound Lake. There is more impact from homes closer around that lake. His final recommendations are that improvements to the plan could be made by having smaller lots, narrower road to reduce impact on the land. Mr. Cooperdock said that an 18' wide paved road is suitable for a development like this.

Roger Larochelle called on Curtis Mooney to speak to the points in Luke Hurley's review of Peter Cooperdock's environmental review. Pat Wood and Richard Delaney discussed which points of whose reviews were covered. They think that Mr. Cooperdock's response to Luke Hurley's reply is sufficient. Roger Larochelle said that in fairness to all, the Board will have to take time to read and digest Mr. Cooperdock's letter of 2/23/07. Where does the Board want to go next?

Curtis Mooney said he wanted to hear from abutters.

David Settele said the recommendations are fine. What guarantee do we have that these will be put into action?

Roger said these are recommendations for design. They may be incorporated into the final design and the Board has to judge that.

Pat Wood said there are substantial guarantees. The law that empowers the Board to do this work states that the Board can withdraw approval if work is not being done according to the approved plan. This is a powerful guarantee. Also the covenants will direct the owners as to how they can build.

David Settele asked for assurance that the work can be stopped at any time if things are not going right.

Roger Larochelle said there will be inspections and monitoring. If anything is not being done appropriately, they will be shut down.

Katherine Keon asked what happens after the lots are sold and Delaney is gone.

Alan Barnard said a SWPPP (storm water pollution prevention plan) must be done for each individual lot.

Corey Johnston explained that they cannot do the exact plans until they have decided on the exact building plan. For each lot there is a State requirement for an erosion control plan that is site-specific for drainage, culverts, flow and detention. The plan exhibited shows areas of erosion control mats that help grass grow and controls runoff meanwhile. Then there are areas of stone and gravel that retard the velocity of runoff until rip rap is put down. Then there are silt fences that direct the water and catch the silt before it can funnel down. These all have to be maintained and there are inspections by the Town throughout the process.

Richard Delaney interjected that all this runoff goes into an area where it collects and goes into a treatment swale that slows it down and lets the silt fall out before the water goes into the wetlands. As it goes farther down the hill the water goes into a collection area and it is either infiltrated into the ground or detained so it can drain out gradually. The detention area has a level spreader so the water goes down before it flows further. All these treatment areas are acceptable to the State for protection of wetland and the lake. Where this all approaches West Shore Road, there is an existing culvert that the water misses. So we are going to reconstruct that according to the State's instructions to improve the storm drainage. Now the EPA has said that if you are going to disturb more than one acre of land, you have to submit another, more detailed plan. At Northpoint Engineering, we wait until there is a contractor engaged to do a SWIPP, so you can go back and forth about methods. There are many decisions, such as where they will stage things. What Alan was talking about is that the contractor has to also submit a SWIPP and there will be weekly inspections. It is possible for there to be a 100-year storm during construction and there could be a temporary failure, but that would be amended before the permanent construction.

Chuck Beno asked to what extent Mr. Johnston took into his calculations the input from 19 house sites and their respective driveways. If memory serves from Ms. Boulton, there were some calculations that could not be done prior to the house plans.

Roger asked Corey to respond.

Corey Johnston said that different engineering firms have different approaches. In terms of mundane engineering, they look at a percentage of the lot as to what is going to be impervious. They do not track the exact flow of each lot at this stage. They take into account the overall volume of drainage. The State takes a look at that and comments if they don't think it is adequate. I don't have the exact numbers off the top of my head but can bring that next time if desired.

Bill Nobles asked if we're going to come back to the EIR next month.

Roger Larochelle said yes.

David Settele asked who would be this competent person to do these inspections.

Roger Larochelle said that the Board picks experts according to the need. It would be someone competent and available to oversee the project.

Phil Twombly said in any case, the costs of inspections are paid by the developer. Can the road bond incorporate all this inspecting and solutions?

Roger Larochelle explained that yes, there is Surety and it may be done in phases. Now it is important to move along to lot sizes.

Curtis Mooney asked Corey Johnston to show the road cross sections for cut and fill. Corey showed the grid and explained the notations. There was some discussion and Curtis asked what the fill would be in that first cut area. Corey said there is a retaining wall of about 10 feet that is not shown yet. He will add that. This is the worst spot, about 27 feet high right by the wetland. That wall is about 250 feet long. He can't cut it down without going closer to the wetland. There is a possibility for part of it to be a stepped wall. There is considerable vegetation creating a buffer so you won't see it from West Shore Road.

Roger asked about the culvert. DES wants a larger 36" pipe so animals can go through from the wetlands.

Chuck Beno asked for more explanation of the retaining wall and the engineer's disclaimer on the plan. What is the intent of that?

Corey Johnston read the disclaimer that it is the contractor's responsibility to engage an appropriate engineer to design the actual head wall and retaining wall. The details shown on the engineering plan are for a standard stone wall. Typically companies that provide these interlocked stone wall products also provide the construction plan appropriate for them. Until you get the approval there is no point in spending the money to design the details of the wall. It will look pretty much the same.

Curtis Mooney asked about the other retaining wall higher up the road. Corey measured and it will be about 17-20 feet high for 90 feet. Its purpose is to limit the impact on the wetlands. It would be easier to slope it back down, but that would increase the impact.

Roger Larochelle returned to the topic of lot sizing. In the interests of fulfilling a cluster lot subdivision, the element of lot size is important to address.

Ellie Lonske led the discussion. She said there seems to be a misunderstanding to clear up. The Planning Board never said they wanted the big lots to take up all the Usable Area. Sounding like Goldie Locks, some of the lots being proposed are too small, some are too big and some are just right. She went over the sizes of the very small lots (in usable acres) that apparently are on the very steep slopes. Having said that, and looking at the bigger lots up the slope, why are those lots bigger? We can guess that it is because that land is easier to develop, as it is more level. We don't necessarily want lots that big. As for the smallest lots in usable area that are on very steep slopes, I for one would not countenance those lot sizes.

David Wall said his concerns are similar to Ellie's because he took that site walk. It is hard to envision homes being placed on lots 1-4 and not slide down onto West Shore Rd. It appears that this area will be an eye sore and there can't help but be increased runoff in times of heavy rain.

Roger Larochelle clarified that the lots in question are on Page 3.

Martha Twombly said she has the same concerns about those lots and buildable area. Our ordinances allow up to 10,000 square feet to be disturbed. In this area it appears that considerable blasting will be needed and that could affect sensitive areas and change the hydraulics of the area. It seems that you will have to blast those first four lots entirely.

Ellie Lonske said all four of the first four lots collectively the total is only 1.3 acres. In a conventional development you wouldn't even be able to put one house on a lot that size.

Roger Larochelle summarized that this is the primary concern of the Board.

Pat Wood explained that most of the cost of the development is building the road. So there are some real economic reasons to try to get some lots close to the beginning of the road to recoup some of the initial costs so they can continue developing.

Richard Delaney said another factor is that doing it this way helps keep the road frontage down to about 1500 feet so if something is going to go wrong it will surface early in this first phase. Also for lots 1-4 there is little or no infringement on wetlands. There is little information now as to what impact blasting may have in this area. He went over some of the details of what they will need to do for the first few lots. Also if cutting trees is a concern, where you have a home sitting on a relatively level platform surrounded by fairly steep slopes, you get a great view without hardly any cutting. It is really an ideal circumstance.

Alan Barnard added that for each cluster subdivision you also have to go through a further approval process with the State for each of the septic and well areas. The goal is to have each lot stand alone for its septic and well.

Pat Wood asked what about the rest of the lots.

Roger Larochelle said he wanted to get public comment first.

Phil Twombly said several comments have already been made this evening over the road plan and all. This is a very difficult property to develop. When you see the lot layout, they are even more problematic when you see shared driveways to service two homes. It is reasonable to me that the Planning Board takes great care to make sure the development is made responsibly and that this not be built as an eye sore. It should be built in the best way possible for everyone's interests. The Board should certainly insist that those lots be redesigned.

Jeff Hillier said he will also put his comments in writing, but briefly, he attended the Society for the Protection of NH Forests conference. There was discussion of climate change and all kinds of issues.

Chuck Beno said that some time ago some consideration was given to steep slopes by the developer in so far as he had submitted plans for some multi-family homes that would have perhaps been more appropriate for avoiding steep slopes areas. They could possibly be used to concentrate building on more level land higher up. Also multi-family dwellings can use shared well and septic systems.

Roger Larochelle brought things back to cluster developments and read the zoning ordinance definition of cluster subdivision regulations. Also read the section that states that cluster subdivisions are permitted and what the standards should be. The reality is that the Planning Board does no actual planning but guides the development process. This subject of lot size is very tricky because it is not just a question of the developer presenting a plan and we judge it. We have to assert our concerns about these lot sizes. We can't really address the aesthetics but the environment is our primary concern. Roger asked the Board members to state how they are feeling about the lot size discussion.

Ellie Lonske said she had already stated her concerns.

Curtis Mooney talked about Wetlands and that if lots 18 and 19 were adjusted you could do a lot to protect that wetland area. If you adjusted lots 16 and 17 you could have a lot more open area. If you adjust lots 13-15 you could protect Wetland G1. Going to lot 7, you could reduce or shift that and protect the possible vernal pool. Going to 32-9, you could reduce the boundary and protect that whole wetland going over to Ross Brook. Then at 32-11, if you reduce that lot, you will create more of a buffer and protect the wetlands better.

Ellie Lonske said in terms of how small a lot can be you want to have some surrounding area, after you have your setbacks and drainage areas, so you don't have to make such big lots. I don't see all that much clustering with all those lots spun out up hill from there.

Richard Delaney asked how far down they can go on road frontage. Is 75' enough?

Ellie spoke about taking 25' and 25' of setback plus the width of the house and that might be enough.

Richard Delaney said so we could get by with 75-100' of road frontage, tighten up the lots and have a few more lots up nearer the end of the road. And do we still have to adhere to the length-width ratio? Can we get down to a basic guideline for lot size?

Ellie Lonske said it's really a function of the grade of the land.

Alan Barnard asked if the Board is going to hold them to a specific number for usable area.

Roger Larochelle said the idea is to cluster in order to protect the most area possible. The Board is asking you to address those concerns about those very steep slopes around the first few lots.

David Wall asked if they did not build on lots 1, 3 and 4, could he still achieve the same economics they talked about to recoup road costs.

Richard Delaney said they do not want to leave the hearing tonight with the goal of reducing the lot sizes to cluster better, and not have a definitive guideline for a minimum acceptable lot size.

Ellie Lonske said if you want a guideline, think about it. You want to put four homes on an area that would not qualify for even one home in a conventional plan.

Pat Wood said to remember that this application came in under the prior zoning ordinance, so that argument does not apply.

Ellie said of course, but the reason is the same. You can't build on it because of very steep slopes.

Richard Delaney pointed out that the one lot is an ideal situation. He and Alan Barnard discussed that they may be able to change the plan around but they don't want to do that without some assurance that they are doing what the Board will find acceptable.

Dick Cowern asked if there was a guideline for how big a lot or home can be.

Alan Barnard responded that they should stick with a minimum and not maximum. Curtis Mooney's suggestions are very helpful.

Roger Larochelle said if Mr. Wood could define what he thinks is reasonable, the Board could respond. We are asking you to work with us on minimizing cutting by reducing lot sizes and moving some of the lots.

Pat Wood said his house is on a one-third acre lot and his house takes up maybe one-sixth acre of that. It gives him a fairly small yard, which suits him just fine. But he is on town water and sewer and this situation is different.

Alan Barnard asked for permission to talk with the Fire Chief to get input before they redesign the plan. He said he just wants to discuss it before they do any design.

Roger asserted that any official request for review should go through the Board but to have an informal discussion to discover what the Fire Chief would like to see, that should be fine.

Richard Delaney said for starters, there has been a lot of time, a lot of effort and money put into that design. Some of it we can do fairly easily, but to redesign those first four lots could be expensive. Maybe we can remove a couple of those first four lots and add some up above but you are asking us to do this without any guidelines.

Chuck Beno said he wanted to remind everyone of his prior comments about how The Ledges had designed their back land development by laying out 100x100 foot envelopes and no further cutting is allowed. It may be helpful for them to do such a layout.

Corey Johnston said in his mind it seems really a compromise with what Mr. Mooney had been saying to protect the wetlands as much as possible and give some leeway down closer to the road. We are looking for a compromise.

Roger said there will still be a concern about steep slopes.

Richard Delaney asked if they come back with a plan with half acre lots, will that be acceptable.

Dick Cowern said it seems reasonable to give them a kind of guideline.

David Wall said that is a reasonable question and it seems like a reasonable guideline. They might come back with 18 perfect lots and one that the Board doesn't like. But at least there would be progress.

Roger said there was one more item submitted by Betsy Twombly which is a request for a scale model of the property in the context of the area. It would be nice to have but we won't make it a requirement.

Pat Wood responded that the cost is very high and it's not that easy to make a 3-D model like that.

Ellie said that a half acre of Usable Area is reasonable but not if it is comprised of itsy bitsy pieces of land. It should be contiguous.

Pat Wood requested a continuance to April 4 and it was granted.

10:05 Break

Bolln Boundary line adjustment

Alan Barnard representing.

Roger Larochelle reviewed the completeness of the application, check is signed, abutters were notified, Alan Barnard authorized as agent, maps and details provided.

Alan described the lay of the land, sensitive areas and showed overlapping setbacks on a separate map. Ross Brook as a Designated Brook has 50' setbacks, which overlap with Shoreland setbacks and property line setbacks. This is the first time all the setbacks have been shown on a map for the Planning Board. The map that gets filed with the Registry should not show the setbacks. No new lots or new homes are being created; this just makes an existing lot more compliant.

Richard Cowern pointed out that there are two buildings on the land.

Alan said one has no services to it—no water or septic, so even though it is an old camp, it cannot be considered a dwelling by current standards. Both buildings are to be taken down and one house will be built. They have planned it within the current setbacks and could not do otherwise without getting a variance.

Roger asked for comments from the public.

Ileana Saros said this is the first she has heard of this. Even though they have no intention to subdivide, would it be possible in the future?

Roger Larochelle said with a four-acre lot, once you take out the area for the stream, there is no longer an option for two compliant lots under current zoning.

David Wall added that there are also some steep slopes.

Dick Cowern said it should be a condition of approval that the second building must be removed. There can only be one dwelling per lot. He also asked for confirmation that there are not rights-of-way through it.

Alan Barnard explained that there is an easement for a power line but that is noted on the map and deed.

John Schaeffer asked where the lines are being moved to and whether the lines are all still on the same land.

Alan showed him on the map and there was some discussion about zoning and Usable Area.

Dick Cowern moved/Ellie Lonske seconded approving the boundary line adjustment as presented subject to the camp building indicated on the plan not be used as a dwelling. PASSED

Other Business

David Wall reported that the CIP Committee report will be presented to the Board of Selectmen for review tomorrow.

10:30 PM Dick Cowern moved/Ellie Lonske seconded a motion to adjourn. PASSED

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS:

Dick Cowern moved/Curtis Mooney seconding approving the minutes as amended. PASSED

Dick Cowern moved/Ellie Lonske seconded approving the boundary line adjustment as presented subject to the camp building indicated on the plan not be used as a dwelling. PASSED

10:30 PM Dick Cowern moved/Ellie Lonske seconded a motion to adjourn. PASSED