

APPROVED

**Town of Pownal
Planning Board Minutes
Wednesday, May 31, 2023
Meeting Minutes**

Members Present: Matt Altieri, Secretary Marcia Bowen, Brian Stornelli, Mercedes Pour- Previti, Orion Breen showed up later, Samantha Peikes with NorthStar Planning, Ginifir Giddinge, Code Enforcement Officer and Recording Secretary, Alison Purinton

Members Absent: Christine Watson, Todd Mellin

Guests: Kim Drew, Pat and Nancy Malone, Heidi Curry Selectboard, Tom Estabrook, Pat and Ron Hodgdon, Alan Bradstreet

Call to Order at: 6:02 pm by Matt Altieri

Old Business

Matt- We are going to do things a little different tonight and will call Tom Estabrook, with Estabrooks greenhouse. Invites Tom Estabrook with Estabrooks up to speak.

Tom Estabrook- We received permits from the State later than expected. Typically, with the work at the DEP it usually takes about 3 months. They asked us to go on hold and kept us on hold for 7 months. We are here tonight to ask for an extension.

Matt- Any questions for Tom?

Tom- We have not had any changes to our site plan ordinances and there is no reason from my end not to grant the extension.

Marcia- What do you need from us?

Tom- I assume you would need to amend your timeline with the proposal.

Ginifir- If you amend that it was granted, they know where they're at. The process will move along quickly, especially with the State and their timeline. They will have to start that system coming from Chandler Brook, at the lowest point in the season so the State Permits are on a set time frame. I think just do the amendment, so they have that year extension, so they have on their records, and we have on our books.

Matt- So all you need is a decision tonight granting the extension.

Tom- Starting the clock over again. We have from July to October to do the intake work on Chandler brook. We have a long bid process; the greenhouse needs to be manufactured. We will start with clearing and fencing. The project will be phased in throughout the years.

Matt- I have downloaded and reviewed everything that was sent.

Tom- Nothing has changed from the site plan.

Matt- What is the date you are looking for?

Tom- I would like the clock to start as of now. We could not get the information to the town because we were held up at State level.

Matt- Is everyone okay with May 31, 2024?

Marcia- I move that we extend the timeline for the Estabrook project until May 31, 2024. Matt to second. All in favor (4-0).

New Business-

Matt- Next up we have the North Pownal Community Outreach Center (NPCOC).

Kim Drew- Introduces herself and presents a business plan. Our thought process is to continue a use of valuable property under a different nonprofit. The Church is unsustainable at this point with the United

APPROVED

Methodist Church (UMC) and we have had permission to separate from the UMC in writing. They are excited about our mission and continuation of the food ministries and food pantry. Expansion of those services and turning the property over to a new nonprofit group of people while maintaining a community church. In addition to the food ministries, they will have things like meeting places and expansion of the food pantries and continuation of our public suppers are a few things we have in mind.

Matt- A couple of questions. You have put in a ton of work and it has been a long process and effectively the church building is the same. You are providing the same services that you were under the UMC.

What is the reason for the change of use?

Kim- The change in use is the church is no longer sustainable under the UMC banner. They have mission shares, and it is what it has turned out to be. We have had to rethink the property to make sure the building can still function and give the community a space.

Matt- Church isn't viable under the UMC but the building is still going to be used.

Kim- Right now it is the UMC non-profit with a food pantry and food ministry. We have turned it into a new non-profit, with a change of use where the non-profit is deciding to continue the small church and a food ministry plus everything you see in the business plan. The sky is the limit with that property. We have spoken to people from Emergency Management to turn it into an Emergency Shelter is needed.

There is a ton of different things that can be done there. It is a way of gifting something to the community of Pownal.

Matt- I have some thoughts but before I do, does anyone else have comments or questions.

Marcia- A church and community center are lumped together as permitted uses only in the Village District Zone. Since you are not in the Village district, how did it come to pass that it is an approved use.

Matt- The church building was built in 1840.

Ginifir - In your bylaws does it state anything about being a church in your nonprofit organization.

Pat Hodgdon- No it does not. The intent is the nonprofit isn't going to conduct church activities.

Ginifir- Is the nonprofit owning the building?

Pat Hodgdon- Introduces herself and explains the plan is the nonprofit will rent the sanctuary back to the congregation so they can continue worship there. They will expand the activities into whatever with the business plan laid out. The bylaws for a nonprofit do not mention church as it is a stipulation with the UMC they don't disaffiliate and go to another church.

Ginifir- To give the board a little background about the UMC in all the deeds that the UMC owns in a church is a trust clause that states it will always be United Methodist Church, so the building goes back to the UMC ownership. Pownal is different because it doesn't say that in their deed. If I am wrong, please correct me. The deed was transferred to the trustees at the time and never was incorporated and the building never belonged to the conference at all. To disaffiliate from the UMC and still be able to keep the building without owning it is a tremendous thing. The definition is a nonprofit organization in a group of people that will worship there. They are not a church. Then you get into the tax stuff.

Matt- I think we can look at this effectively as not a change of use. We have to make a finding on whether it is a church or not. I look at this as it is the same church building and being used for many of the same purposes and there is not an added problem to the community that we are aware of. As a result of this and being around for almost two hundred years, I see it as continuing just under different ownership. I don't know how you can approve a change of use of this category in rural district, so I don't know how to do that otherwise. I see this as the same use just under different ownership.

Pat- It is funny that you should say that. At our last board meeting we batted around the idea of what is it if you just continued doing what you're doing and possibly disaffiliated the UMC and form a community church or whatever. Or stay with the UMC and continue. Basically, the people on the board feel it is what they want to do. A question I have is if we are to continue down the road and you don't feel it is a change of use, what types of activities would require us to come before you again? For example, The North Pownal Store was going to have a dinner show there. That is clearly a change of use.

Mercedes- I have the same sentiment. Is there anything in this business plan that you feel is a departure. Are there things that you are envisioning that would be a departure.

APPROVED

Kim- Yes, home schooling, after school care.

Pat- We need to find ways to bring in revenue. It could be for a home-schooling network, a commercial kitchen a little along the line of the Freeport Community Services line. I was talking with the Fire Chief as I was worried about the change of use. There is no change of use from the Fire code standard it is all assembly. Don't know if that helps you.

Kim- Things like cooking classes. Pet food pantry perhaps expanding the pet part. Veterans group, Emergency groups.

Mercedes- I have never seen churches do all of these things.

Kim- Community gathering place. I have heard throughout the community they want some type of gathering place. It is a huge asset with a commercial kitchen.

Matt- Your question is a fair one. Just off the top of my head significant commercial enterprise is there would be a very significant change. I think there may be some way to test the waters and come back before the board in 3 or 5 years. Have a sense of how much it has expanded and then maybe before the board of appeals would be to decide. The way the board works is to say to these exceptions you can do these 8 things. But we can't do much beyond that. That would be the board of appeals. We can make a finding tonight that it continues to be a church use. Alan, you have a question?

Alan Bradstreet – Introduces himself and wants to make a comment. I am on the board of the new organization, and I also live across the street. I think what you need to see here is this is not a new church. It is a new nonprofit. I picture is a nonprofit organization intended to supply or meet the needs of the community. The things Kim suggested were us brainstorming. They are all in line with meeting the needs of the community. On some level fund raising will be needed to help pave the way. That is what the church was doing until people dwindled away and the church could no longer provide that.

Matt- Thoughts from the board.

Brian- I don't think church use is even relevant. In the village district its community buildings are for public use. It's nonprofit, it's continuation, it's community buildings. I don't see an issue.

Marcia- I don't see a downside personally.

Matt- I don't either, I don't even think we have to do anything because it is continuing to do the same.

Pat- I think what threw us off was the ordinance Rural A doesn't even allow for a church. We were concerned that when we had a change in title it would reflect a change in use. Initially it is not going to be used that much differently.

Matt- Going forward it will be on you and the CEO to keep an eye on the scope of uses.

Ginifir- If they stay as a church some has to be funded. They can't get grants as a church that they can as a nonprofit.

Matt- We are not asking them to stay as a church in some category other than our land use the way we think of it. They can advertise as a nonprofit or something different.

Brian- It is a nonprofit to a nonprofit is how we look at it.

Pat- That is why we are here.

Alan- The church entity that exists today is not taxed by the town. You can argue the mission is unchanged. It is a new organization. Would that remain untaxed?

Matt- That is a question between your attorney and tax assessor, and potentially the Selectboard.

Pat- As long as the money we take goes to the purposes of the organization we don't have an issue with any income taxes and the same rule applies to property taxes.

Matt- Thank you all. It is an exciting transition.

Secretary report: Approval of meeting minutes of April, 12 2023

Matt- I have seen Marcia's changes.

Marcia- I move that we accept the minutes as amended, Matt to second, All in favor 4-0 motion carries.

Other Business- Draft Conservation ordinance Review and Town meeting Presentation

APPROVED

Matt- I intend to present at that town meeting with what we have so far.

Marcia- I drafted for discussion a concept of a one-page handout. Passed them out so the board could review. It is a one-page handout. Maybe a poster board with a slide presentation is my thought. Basic concepts are something to start out with. At the next meeting we will need to have everything solidified.

Matt- I totally agree.

Brian- Optically (refers to handouts) this needs to be one quarter here and the rest over here with the trees.

Marcia- We need to drive home to the point.

Matt- I think these are all key points.

Mercedes- Its simple.

Matt- The one item we need to discuss tonight is the increase the number of lots per parcel. Are there other thoughts about the handout?

Marcia- Were you thinking about a poster?

Matt- I was envisioning a deck of slides. Typically, we have a projector. I will check with Becky. A poster could do the same thing. You just can't swap through them, and it is only so big.

Mercedes- Elevator talk with one or two sentences. It will help with the context.

Brian - Maybe statistics on towns that have adopted this. It is not groundbreaking.

Marcia- All of the surrounding towns have done this.

Brian- Visual buffers would be a thing too.

Matt- Maybe after the meeting tonight we can create a little more definition.

Mercedes- I have a work trip.

Matt- The only other committee that will meet before November are the conservation committee and the economic development. Anyone who wants to come to those meetings on August 3rd and June 27th are easy ones to make I am having to go to the June 27. Then we can figure out who goes to August 3rd. We should make sure all the committees are invited and know what we are doing. Let me fill you all in on a conversation with Natalie Burns, the town's attorney. I wanted to ask her the question at the last meeting as always, we were talking about density and how to manage it. We have wrestled with two possibilities. One possibility was drafting language the says you cannot build more lots on a parcel using the conservation subdivision than you could using the space and dimension standards applicable to minor subdivision. We decided not to go forward with that. The alternative is to say we are going to build on a sliding scale. The concern was we don't want to have a 12- or 15-acre lot that today would have 5 lots, because of the road standards. Because the conservation standards would allow 8 lots. Because less frontage would be required. Ben and Sam from NorthStar called me about a week or so ago. The concern was if a sliding scale would be applying a new zoning standard which could be problematic. We should run this by counsel quickly before this becomes a problem. Natalie said that she has never seen a sliding scale piece and she would have the same concern. A better way is to apply the minor subdivision standard including frontage so that every applicant that comes before us must present a plan that shows that and then give them the density bonus features. That is the way most towns would do this. I think we need to be more cognizant of that. It is making sure we are not adding more or fewer lots. I spoke with her at 4:30 this afternoon and she will send some conservation language along.

Brian- Draws on paper what it would look like. 300 feet equals 4 lots.

Matt- You can't build any more on a conservation subdivision than in a minor subdivision.

Brian- What is the incentive to go with the conservation subdivision and go with the longer road.

Matt- The only way to build more than 5 lots is through a conservation subdivision under the current draft. There is no incentive.

Mercedes- Can you put in another road?

Matt- Yes if you have enough frontage. You could have two roads in what would be a major subdivision.

Brian- 900 feet would give you 12 lots.

Matt- Under the minor standards we don't remove the unbuildable area by doing that calculation.

Brian- Then you are saying you could do a density bonus. If someone can do 4 but they have 25-30 acres, they can do x more. Then you are getting away from being neutral.

APPROVED

Matt- Maybe the term “density bonus” is an incorrect phrase. Maybe change the phrase. It is not about density as much as per parcel. Rather its density in terms of proximately to each lot smaller and closer together. A definition for density could accomplish the same thing.

Marcia- The density bonus seems confusing.

Brian- We have said all along that we want to be neutral but allow for affordable housing.

Matt- So that is the density bonus.

Marcia- Other towns have density bonuses if they connect to trails and show where they are on the plan.

Matt- Do we want to incentivize that? I don’t see why not. We should contemplate and show on the plan where the public trails are.

Sam- It says it on the draft as part of the density bonus.

Mercedes- Is this going to allow others to presume that they will have access to those trails. We have talked about this before.

Marcia- It should not be assuming.

Ginifer- But they are taxed on that open space.

Brian- If they do an easement you can save up to 75% and it is all rural.

Matt- Tree growth at 25%, open space at 25% and wildlife at 25%. That is an issue we need to touch on. He said something at the public meeting. Let’s bookmark that.

Marcia- Not all homeowners will want someone walking in the back yard.

Matt- Under our draft now we have the option.

Brian- I thought like 10 feet. Connectivity for future parcels.

Matt- As I read this draft, I see it as has to be open but only as long as passive recreation is permitted.

Brian- G3 That is the minimum.

Matt- Its fine to leave it in for now and see how people perceive it. I like the idea. It could be a nonstarter for folks.

Brian- It is narrow you could just have a trail.

Matt- Is everyone on board with the area of density so the drafting process can begin.

Mercedes- That is 300 foot of road frontage is the road longer in the conservation area?

Matt- That is a good question. It is a tricky thing. We say you are allowed a 1000-foot road.

Brian- That’s secondary. You have flexibility to push those eight lots.

Sam- It is encouraging growth. The lots are pushed up further.

Matt- Natalie also mentioned that developers would not even build if they could not build on the new road. Conservation subdivisions are built on existing roads and the land behind it is saved for conservation. Typically, it is not how it’s done. She suggests either allowing construction on existing roads or allowing a waiver.

Brian- Don’t we have a blanket right to waiver? I think we are trying to eliminate curb cuts.

Matt- There is an option between standard major subdivisions and conservation subdivisions. Then there is what we are proposing that all major subdivisions do this. It’s not like we have to incentivize that much. I agree I just wanted to pass that along.

Brian- We still have the minor that has the option of this also?

Matt- Minor can still be built on existing roads. There is a spot we may want to consider a waiver. Explain your thoughts.

Brian- By default they could just opt in. We calculate 4 lots but put the houses back maybe esthetically or there is a 5 home there. Then they create 60 percent open space.

Marcia- I am confused because you still need all that road frontage. Isn’t it just a series of lots.

Matt- Imagine that if someone wants to build 4 lots on an existing road, right now if they want that to be a conservation subdivision where they are allowed a half an acre, they will have to build a road. Building that road could be cost prohibitive or there could be some other reason to use the existing road. We might say we can waive the requirement that you can build on a new road that you have built. Instead say you can build on the existing road because that benefits the town and still preserves the open space. What Natalie has suggested is encouraging us to do is say you know what that could be cost prohibitive. A developer has a 4 lots subdivision, and 100,000 dollars is the cost to build that road for a conservation

APPROVED

subdivision. I just want to do 4 acre lots. The developer can't afford a new road, we want to have the discretion to waive that new road. Does that make sense to everybody.

Orion- Would it still be 200 feet back?

Matt- I see what you are saying now.

Brian - One road you end up with 4 little lots, so you have 4 curb cuts for one road.

Matt- Or you say it is 4 curb cuts instead of 4 curb cuts that are spread out.

Brian- So with 599 feet or less you can only do one road with four driveways.

Orion- Who is going to want a 200 foot driveway, The buffering requirement is the entire point of the conversation. If doing a subdivision, they should have to do a road that must be 200 feet back.

Matt- I do see this category but it is only where it is 1200 feet of frontage on the existing road. The number of minor subdivisions with that much space is almost $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile.

Mercedes- In some cases could it be better if the homes were closer together.

Matt- We may need to address in the future, until then we have the ability to waive. A couple of other things. There are some other concerns out there.

Brian- The affordability piece regardless of the percentage is how do we enforce it. It is generic right now. Some developers may just sell lots. Language should define a lot of value. Affordability to that income bracket for a lot and even so if we add just those bonus lots that need to be affordable.

Orion- What does LD2003 say about the bonus stuff? Doesn't it have a density bonus with affordability in that?

Matt- I think that is where the 4 lots where one would normally be permitted. We need to look at that more closely. There are two separate issues. 1. How we enforce that the lot owner, who builds an approved subdivision sells at an affordable rate?

Brian- So they don't flip it to market rate. You want to keep those bonus lots affordable for the lots and dwelling units. Would that be a deed restriction. I don't know who would do that?

Matt- That is a good question for Natalie. My guess is we could approve the subdivision with that condition. How frequently does that get enforced. The amount you pay for a property doesn't show up on the deed. We shall ask Natalie and have her give us the language.

Sam- How should the density bonus be calculated based on that.

Matt- The advice from Natalie was it is very typical to say the conservation standard should not result in more lots being built than permitted under the existing minor subdivision standards. I will ask Natalie to provide some language and will forward it.

The question that Brian is proposing is how we apply the density bonus to this. Either 20 or 25 percent we could add back in.

Marcia- What happens if we don't add anything back in? Maybe allow them to increase the number of lots.

Orion- How do we determine how many lots?

Matt- Explains what we discussed earlier about the submitting of plans as it is typical in other towns.

Orion- That simplifies things.

Marcia- The buffers around the wetlands. I think we need a wetland ordinance to begin with. Instead of adding them here I would rather do it globally. Buffers around state protected areas and to put in an ordinance and not have in anywhere else. There has been support for additional support for natural resource protection.

Matt- Have you looked at others? What do they look like?

Marcia- They are standard.

Ginifir- Doesn't the state already have something in place. If you have a stream going through your property you will have to go to the state to get the permit.

Marcia- The loophole is that if you don't have to go before the state you can build right up to the wetland.

Sam- The set back is 75 feet.

Ginifir- That may be done in the soil folks that some have done to their property, and it states in the report what they can do. The option is to apply to the state for a waiver to build within some many feet of it.

APPROVED

Brian- A stream is less based on our definition. 250 feet from freshwater wetland or 75 feet of the high-level water line of the stream. It almost seems flipped.

Ginifir- Certain wetlands can be filled in so they are buildable.

Matt- Sam- Correct me if I am wrong, but for almost any subdivision it has to go through the site location development with the DEP.

Sam- It has to qualify and be greater than 20 acres.

Matt- We should also think about a wetland's ordinance after this. Sam, can you frame up the question? So currently a 20-foot buffer what other resources should require a buffer. Is 20 feet a good number? Do you want to make it larger?

Orion- 20 Feet from what?

Sam- Natural resources.

Marcia- We already have 40 front and 25 sides this will go down another 20 feet. Am I thinking about that correctly.

Ginifir-Some of that is dependent on if the stream is all year round. Or just a seasonal thing. The State is pretty adamant about it.

Brian- How do we define stream? Free flowing body of water depicted on the US geologist survey.

Ginifir- The state has their regulations on top of that.

Orion- If this is the generic for the state or town I don't know if we want to change it.

Sam- You will need to take it one step further. Some towns include and some don't. The question is to keep it or take it out.

Ginifir- As long as we have the knowledge of the state. If I come up on something I think is too close to the streams. I'm going to flag it. If we have that knowledge, you can tell folks before they come to the planning board. As part of the requirement so they are aware of it.

Mercedes- Will this apply to any road?

Ginifir- You would probably need a culvert.

Mercedes- Why do we need it here if the state already has so much?

Ginifir- All that information should be on the plans. When I go out and do an inspection, I can check out the rest of it. I prefer it not to be in there I believe it is too restrictive. There are several pieces of property in Pownal that have streams, wetlands, and wildlife.

Matt-The draft as of now shall provide a 20-foot buffer around all wetlands, vernal pools and significant wildlife habitat. Would you have trouble enforcing that?

Ginifir- No

Sam- In addition to

Matt- So this moves it to 100 feet.

Orion- Do we want to say 20 feet? What is the state requirement.

Ginifir- They would have to get the permit from the state to reduce that.

Sam- It is not 75 feet for all wetlands It is for significant wetlands.

Matt- It is my understanding that the Shoreland ordinance is the same in every town.

Sam- That's right.

Marcia- I think there is a map for the shoreland zone and the requirements are based on a map and maybe not accurate.

Matt- Is this pretty common in other towns.

Sam- It's not super common. I think it would be hard to enforce with the way the language is now. It may constrain your developable area.

Brian- Don't we already make people show wetlands on their site plans.

Ginifir- We do

Brian- I think the only thing new is significant wildlife habitat.

Matt- Where do we stand on the 20-foot buffer.

Mercedes- I am confused as to why we have it. There is some gray that I am not comfortable with. I need to understand state law.

APPROVED

Orion- I am fine with taking it out. The CEO feels they have it under control and we have some discretion.

Brian- I think wetland and streams are covered so generically a buffer shall be created around vernal pools and wildlife habitat. Just to flag it

Matt- It just kind of flags it for the board.

Marcia- Are we saying significant wildlife habitat.

Ginifir- If I don't have a clear definition for myself, I would pass it on to the planning board.

Sam- I took the piece about cul-de-sac out it is a separate issue that could be discussed next year.

Matt- Why is this so hard.

Sam- It is not that it is hard, it needs other standards like frontage and radius. Currently the ordinance allows for hammerhead turn arounds. If you wanted to do cul-de-sacs, you would have to add in some new standards for that table.

Matt- So your proposal is to push the cul-de-sacs standard until next year. How do folks feel about that?

Brian- So we would not be able to allow a cul-de-sac.

Matt- For the time being.

Orion- Can we do one later?

Matt- I would rather have a cul-de-sac than a hammerhead.

Marcia- Is it because of the fire truck access?

Brian- In the picture helps with that cluster.

Sam- There are more than additional and dimensional standards.

Brian- It seems it was tied to road length.

Matt- Can we just permit cul-de-sacs in conservation subdivisions and then ask the road commissioner to review?

Sam- Usually it is standard first.

Marcia- Which brings up the point the road commission and fire chief should look at this too.

Matt- I agree the right way to go is to have a standard first. It seems to be really complicated and one of those technical things I don't understand. It creates issues we can tackle.

Ginifir- Is there a standard size?

Sam- I think there is I just don't know what it is right now.

Brian- The only place it would be relevant is in the conservation subdivision so is this an opportunity to copy and paste until we can figure it out.

Matt- Is there a problem with that?

Sam- There should not be a problem as you are taking dimensional standards.

Matt- I would like to do that. Sam- what else Sam

Sam- We already have something that says fire chief, but I don't think we have anything that says road commissioner.

Matt- We do always. It is in the checklist.

Brian- Maybe put sections G-L in the back as they are a little more boiler plate.

Sam- Move it to the bottom you said.

Brian- To clean up section 7 take out trails and leave roads. It would just be cleaner.

Sam- So separate trails and roads.

Matt- Section N Performance and Design Standards. I think it should say "Conservation Subdivisions shall adhere to the standards below." And 2A to add the language from Natalie.

Marcia- The letter that Sam sent about lot size. Setbacks are you saying for Conservation subdivision. Did we talk about that?

Matt- We are allowing 1/2 acre lots. Is there a reason to shorten that to 40 feet and a 1/2 acre. It is pretty close to a lot boundary.

Marcia- I was thinking of keeping them the same as existing ordinance.

Ginifir- If you take the place on Verrill road that has .9 acres they still have to meet the setbacks on that.

Matt- Yes, I don't want to change that.

APPROVED

Marcia- You have a question on the road frontage. Should the road frontage be no less than 75 feet or should the existing road frontage be 350 feet?

Matt- I think no less than 75 feet. 225 feet of frontage required on a ½ acre lot. I don't know - that seems like it would require it to be very rectangular.

Marcia- That is what is written there now.

Matt- We talked about buffers.

Brain- What about the 750. I think we agreed 750 feet was second.

Matt- For an additional road. Where is that in the draft. N5B page 8

Marcia- Then on 9 it says new roads shall be spaced 750.

Matt- So we do both.

Brian- What are we trying to solve here?

Matt- I think we got there because of a concern on a cap per number of lots per road people will get around that. I think there should only be one road. That is where we landed. We didn't want to encourage more roads. In certain circumstances we can do a waiver.

Ginifir- I am going to throw a wrench. If we are thinking of the roads. What is the possibility in the future they become a town responsibility. Then we have all these roads that need to be maintained.

Matt- That is another reason to say no more than one road. Unless a waiver is granted.

Brain- Do we want to go so far to say all roads will be private roads and maintained by an HOA. Some say public road, new road, private road. Maybe just add private in front of anything.

Matt- My view is a small category of issues. I think it is better to put it in and then have the option for a waiver. This gives the board discretion.

Brian- Do we say one road.

Matt- Yes maximum of one road.

Orion- Is there a limit now.

Matt- Yes, however we are allowed to waive that.

Marcia- Back to the cul-de-sac question I am reading down to the last part, talks about new roads.

Matt- Appendix 16 of the existing ordinance.

Brian- I think to approve one new conservation subdivision rather than changes to Appendix 16 as well.

Matt- Is the cul-de-sac standard bulky?

Sam- No the problem it is a separate ordinance issue. It's tricky to just do it here. Right now, you want to follow 16 which is currently for hammerhead roads. It is a different ordinance issue to address.

Brian- It's in addition to the following standards. We are making changes to Appendix 16 in this ordinance.

Matt- No the idea is when this goes before the town, we would need to amend the subdivision ordinance.

Orion- What if you added language under Section 7 that maximum road length shall be 1000 feet the board shall have the ability to grant waiver request on a case-by-case basis. As well as waivers for cul-de-sac.

Matt- The board shall have discretion to grant waiver request for the maximum road length or to prevent the construction of a cul-de-sac.

Sam- Leave it up to the engineer.

Matt- If anyone throws a fit, we can say it is on our work plan.

Ginifir- Until we put it in the standards it can't be required.

Matt- I think it will be required.

Ginifir- What is the benefit of having a cul-de-sac?

Matt- For me it is esthetic. It looks a lot better.

Orion- If the idea is a fire truck thing it makes sense to me. A fire truck can go around the circle. This is why we would want to consult the fire chief and road commission about what is acceptable. The idea is the cul-de-sac will be so far set back no one will see it.

Matt- It may also push the project back further like Marcia was talking about. Is there anything new coming up for the month?

Marcia- I haven't received anything yet. It looks like prep for town meeting.

APPROVED

Matt- I motion to adjourn the meeting. Marcia to second, all in favor.
Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm.

Respectively submitted,
Alison Purinton
Planning Board Recording Secretary