

Planning Board Minutes
Wednesday, 19, September 2012
Mallett Hall
7:00 PM

Members present: Ron Hodsdon, Joan Mueller, Liza Nichols, John Bowdren, alternate Matt Chipman, planner Tony Dater

Members absent: Matt St. Cyr, alternate Jeremy Gould

Guests: Karen Grindle, Tim Grindle, Leo Arris, Russ Schmidt

1. Call to Order: at 7:00 by the Chair

2. Secretary's Report: August 15th meeting minutes - on the first page, third line from the bottom, "situation" was corrected to *situated*. On a motion by Hutch, seconded by Joan, the minutes were so moved and accepted as corrected.
Sept. 11th workshop meeting minutes – on a motion by Hutch, seconded by John, the workshop minutes were so moved and accepted.

3. Old Business: Grindle Family Partnership subdivision

The Grindles brought a more complete plan showing the location of the proposed lot on the property and gave the Board an authorization letter signed by the other partners. A question arose about note #9 on the plan - "no wetlands per owner." A wetlands delineation hadn't been done, the Board couldn't take the word of the owners as they are not authorities on wetlands, and it would seem the surveyor wasn't going to take on the wetland issue either. The Board decided to wait until it conducted the onsite (Saturday, 22, Sept.) to determine if it felt any further wetland delineation was necessary, but clearly the note as is would not do.

We noted that a portion of the lot is in the Floodplain; there is a note to that effect and the building envelope is set 75' from the stream.

Going over the checklist, in addition to the wetlands, there needs to be a note on the plan about best management practices (Liza gave the Grindles some sample language) and we will check the need for an hydrology study at the site walk. It was felt that with these updates, and since the parties know about the need for a driveway permit, that the plan would probably not have to be stamped "unbuildable until all ordinance requirements" as was originally thought.

Tony questioned the section in the application about covenants and easements that pointed to 60,000 sq.' for each dwelling on the property. That was from 1978 and our ordinance now requires 90,000 sq.'. Ought there to be a note or disclaimer of some sort on the application? We went round and round and there was much discussion and confusion as to what is actually in the partnership agreement with the town, what is in old Planning Board minutes and what was officially decided by the Board. It was

decided that as it doesn't directly affect this application we would leave the issue to another time.

Liza requested that the Grindles have their surveyor put the final plan on disk for the electronic updating of the tax maps.

6. Other: Russ Schmidt asked if he could quickly ask a few questions about his and his father's property on the Poland Range Rd. His father had divided off lots for Russ and his brother Bill about ten years ago. Since then the property has been further portioned by their father's will. Should Russ decide to spin off a lot or two what are the ramifications regarding subdivision? What about the three lots within five years rule? Tony explained that since the division ten years ago was recorded as a subdivision in the Registry of Deeds any further division is considered an amendment to the subdivision and therefore subject to Planning Board review. When Russ is ready he will come back with the original plans and we can take it from there. In the meantime he can contact Tony for more input.

In a related note Joan said that a lot had been approved across from her home and she knows that the property had been subdivided before. The Board has tried to make the CEO aware of the need to check into previous subdivisions or to at least let us know when lots come up to no avail. It's believed the Selectmen have requested he do so too. Craig seems to feel the 3 in 5 year rule applies regardless and that is just not the case.

5. Discussion: Hutch said he reviewed the Zoning draft for references to "private ways" and found only the one we already located in Section 17. We will have to keep our eyes out as we move on to other portions of the draft.

Hutch also noticed in Tony's handout of the Land Use Tables that non-residential use requires 100,000' for a front yard! Tony will correct it to 100'.

7. Next month's agenda: Grindle subdivision and review of the Ordinance Draft.

8. Adjournment: 8:55 PM – motioned by Liza, seconded by Hutch, so moved and accepted by all.

Respectively submitted,



Liza Nichols, Secretary.