Present: Patricia Beaton, Sheila Bourque, Greg Foster, Chairman Robert O’Neill, Kyle Bancroft

Absent: William Priest, Vice-Chair Bruce Sanford

Staff: Code Enforcement Officer Chris Hanson, Contract Planner James Seymour, Recording Secretary Mary Quirk

Applicant: Ron Willey, Dick Sweet of Sweet Associates

Call to order
Chair Robert O’Neill called the meeting to order at 7:03pm. Quorum was declared.

Consideration of Approval of Meeting Minutes
November 9, 2016
Mr. O’Neill asked for a motion

MOTION: Sheila Bourque moved to accept minutes as presented; Greg Foster seconded
DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, the board agreed to change “planning board” to “preliminary review”
VOTE: 4/0/1 (Beaton)

New Business
DM Roma: Pre-application sketch plan for minor subdivision: Willey Property Pipeline RD. and Patricia AVE.

Jim Seymour presented the matters before the board for consideration in light of the submission being at sketch plan pre-application: type of subdivision desired, site walk, and to provide direction and set the tone for the future. He also presented the reasoning for the recommendation of “minor subdivision”.

Dick Sweet reviewed the features of a map of the entire property under discussion, including wetlands, existing lots, and gravel pits. The wetlands are all significant wetlands requiring 75-foot setback which is one of the reasons why they are applying for a conventional subdivision with the understanding that any future development with an interior road would require an application for cluster development.

Mr. Seymour advised the board that an application for future development would be an amended subdivision. Discussion followed clarifying requirements for consideration of a cluster versus a conventional subdivision. He recommended that a note be made in the plans that if there is an
application for further development it would require consideration as a cluster subdivision.

Mr. Seymour noted that a portion of the designated Lot 3 lies in Windham. The Windham portion is shown on the map attached to the Raymond portion, avoiding the appearance of a non-conforming lot in Windham.

Chris Hanson explained that this is in Village Residential thus having a smaller lot minimum and less road frontage requirements resulting in less infrastructure impact.

Board members expressed unanimous agreement to deem the application a minor conventional subdivision and that a site walk was unnecessary. They further agreed that a notation be made in the plans that an application for further development would require consideration as a cluster subdivision.

Board members posed a number of questions regarding the wetlands mapping, drainage, and water levels.

Mr. Seymour asked the applicant for clarification of main pit access, adequate sight distance and separation for driveways.

Mr. O’Neill stated that the Board would be interested in a containment buffer around the wetlands. Discussion followed concerning the desirability of requesting that these be put into a conservation easement.

Mr. Seymour and Mr. O’Neill discussed the phosphorous run-off point system plan for the project and composition thereof. Mr. Hanson commented on the quality of the work done by applicant on designated Lot A as an example of what could be expected for the additional lots. The board agreed the point system was appropriate. Mr. Seymour requested that a formal, written waiver be provided by applicant since this is not standard for this type of project.

Workshop

a) Site Plan check list

Mr. Seymour made a presentation on the new Site Plan Check List for major, minor and staff review site plans. He noted that the application would be revised to correspond.

Discussion followed on the intended uses and users of the check list. Mr. O’Neill asked that it be reviewed by the town attorney. It was agreed that, after corrections and edits by staff and the attorney review, the checklist and revised application would be brought to the board for review. In response to a question from Mr. Foster, a terminology change on page three under Design Guidelines Commerical Zone Properties was agreed.

b) Possible sunset clause

Mr. Hanson referenced a memo prepared by the town attorney concerning the number of other towns with sunset clauses and possible forms for a sunset clause. Staff and Board discussed the pros and cons of a such a clause. Mr. O’Neill asked staff to develop recommendations regarding a number of points raised in discussion.
c) Stormwater standards
   Mr. Seymour identified conflicting stormwater standards and references in the various ordinances and suggested ways to resolve those. Staff offered the opinion that these changes must be submitted as a warrant. The Board and Staff concurred that, due to the magnitude of the changes necessary, they should be taken in sections into warrant.

d) Additional items
   1) Subdivisions are required to install cisterns. However, there is no provision for maintenance responsibility.
   2) Staff received a request to consider larger signs for farm stands. Mr. Hanson will ask the town attorney for options short of an ordinance change.

5. Planner Communications
   Signing mylars for RSU 14 and finding of facts

6. Adjournment
   MOTION: Robert O’Neill moved to adjourn; Sheila Bouque seconded
   DISCUSSION: None
   VOTE: Passed (5/0/0)

   Mr. O’Neill adjourned the meeting at 8:25PM

Mary Quirk
Recording Secretary