



## **Planning Board Minutes**

Wednesday, April 12, 2006

7:00 pm.

### **Raymond Town Hall**

**Planning Board Attendance:** Patrick Clark, Chairman; Robert O'Neill, Vice Chairman; Ginger Wallace; Nelson Henry; Patrick Smith; and Samuel Gifford.

**Members absent:** Allen Tait.

**Staff Attendance:** Hugh Coxe, Town Planner; and Karen Strout, Recording Secretary.

**Call to order:** Chairman Clark called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm. Chairman Clark asked for a roll call, and stated that there was a quorum in attendance to conduct business.

### **Consideration of minutes:**

**MOTION:** moved by Bob O'Neill and seconded by Sam Gifford to approve the minutes dated March 8, 2006 with the addition of the word "impact" after minimal on page 4, line 17. Vote 6/0 to approve.

**MOTION:** moved by Bob O'Neill and seconded by Sam Gifford to approve the minutes of March 20, 2006 Public Hearing as presented. Vote 6/0 to approve.

**Correspondence:** There was no correspondence.

### **Public Hearing:**

Land Use Ordinance Amendment to Article XII In-Law Apartments

Chairman Clark opened the Public Hearing at 7:10 pm. He asked if anyone in the public needed to have a copy of the proposed amendment. (Copies had been left at the end of each aisle with the agendas.) Clark explained that there had been minor changes in the wording of the ordinance and that one change had been that the word "accessory" replaced the "word in-law" in the proposed ordinance. The changes in the ordinance would allow people who had built these additions, a less than 700 sf "in-law apartment" for family members, could now rent them out to anyone. This ordinance change would address several needs: one of which was to increase affordable housing in Raymond, one of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan; the change would allow people who had built these apartments for family members to rent them out to the general public.

There was no comment from the public.  
There were no comments from the Board members.  
Public Hearing was closed at 7:15 pm.

**MOTION:** moved by Robert O'Neill and seconded by Patrick Smith to send a positive recommendation to the Selectmen in support of this ordinance, and request that it be placed on the warrant for the upcoming Town Meeting. Vote was unanimous. 6/0.

**Applications:**

**Map 13, Lot 24 LRR1  
Plummer Road**

**Ralph & Linda McGrath**

**McGrath Road, a proposed private way/back lot driveway to serve 2 lots.**

Paul Lawrence of Paul Lawrence Consulting represented the applicant and reviewed the details of the project which had been before the Board on two previous occasions- September and November of 2005. Lawrence addressed the storm water report via the "punch page" in the report, and addressed the issues and concerns that had been brought up in the previous incomplete submissions.

Chairman Clark asked Hugh Coxe to review his memo:

**Project Description**

This is an application for a private road intended to serve an existing lot that currently has no road access. The road proposed on the plan would be a little over 1000 feet in length and would wind through a new right of way, 50 feet in width, which crosses three separate parcels (one of which is also owned by the applicants) between its origin on the Plummer Road and its terminus on the applicants' parcel.

The property is located in the LRR1 Zone, a shoreland zone, which requires a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 2 acres and minimum lot frontage of two hundred twenty five (225) feet.

This application was first filed in September at which time it consisted of a hand drawn sketch with little information that was deemed incomplete. The applicants re-filed for the November 2005 Planning Board meeting and met with the board at which time the board provided some feedback on the applicants' proposal. The applicants have since hired consultants and are now back before the board with this application for a private road.

**Decisions/ Issues**

The board will need to decide which sets of regulations apply to this application and then whether the submittal meet those regulations. Although the application states this is a Private Way/ Back Lot Driveway application, it probably is more accurately reviewed simply as a private way application under the ***Raymond Street Ordinance***. The primary difference being that review of the lot would be the responsibility of the CEO at the time a building permit application is made and the Planning Board would focus only on whether the proposed road meets

the street ordinance standards. The Planning Board would not review this application under the lot standards found in the Land Use Ordinance.

## Discussion

### Applicable Ordinance Provisions

The McGrath's are seeking to gain access to an existing 46-acre parcel and to create road frontage sufficient to meet the 225-foot zoning requirement for lots in the LRR1 district. In order to do that, they are proposing modifying an existing right-of-way and building a private road on that right-of-way.

A "lot" is defined in **Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance** as a parcel of land that has frontage on an approved street or has a private right-of-way. A "back lot" is defined in **Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance** as a lot for single-family residential use that does not have frontage on a public or private road but is provided direct access to a public road by a back lot driveway. A "back lot driveway" is defined in **Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance** as a driveway that provides access to a back lot and that originates at a public road and serves no more than two back lots.

For the McGrath's parcel, approval of a private way to this parcel will create a lot. But the lot will not be a back lot as it will not have "direct access to a public road by a back lot driveway" and can not be served by a back lot driveway because the proposed way will serve more than two lots. Therefore this application probably should not be reviewed under the back lot provisions (**Article IX, Section T of the Land Use Ordinance**). Review of the lot, pursuant to **Article IX, Section U of the Land Use Ordinance**, would be the responsibility of the Code Enforcement Officer at the time a building permit application is made.

The Planning Board however is required by **Section 3 of the Street Ordinance** to review this application to determine whether the proposed road meets the **Street Ordinance** standards.

### Submissions

The submission requirements of the **Street Ordinance** include the following:

- Construction drawings showing a plan view, profile and typical cross-section of the proposed streets and existing streets within 300 feet of any proposed intersection.
- Roadway and right-of-way limits including edge of pavement, edge of shoulder, sidewalks and curbs.
- Kind, size, location, material, profile and cross-section of all existing and proposed drainage structures designed in accordance with a storm water management plan prepared by a registered professional engineer that meets the minimum storm water design and construction standards of **Article IX of the Subdivision Regulations**.
- Locations of all existing and proposed overhead and underground utilities.
- A soil erosion and sedimentation control plan.

- A phosphorous impact plan (for streets to be located within the watershed of a great pond).
- For a street that is to remain private, a plan setting forth how the street and associated drainage structures are to be maintained.

The submissions are largely complete with the exceptions that 1) the plans are missing the locations of all existing and proposed utilities and 2) the applicants have not provided a plan setting forth how the street and associated drainage structures are to be maintained<sup>1</sup>. The board typically requests the town attorney review and sign off on road maintenance agreements. Both these items could be handled as conditions of approval.

## Street Design Standards

The relevant street design standards are in **Section 5.5 and 5.10 of the Street Ordinance**. For a private road serving fewer than four residences, the road must have a minimum travel way of 12 feet with two-foot shoulders and a maximum grade of 12%. It does not need to be paved but should be constructed with a 12 inch aggregate sub-base and a 3 inch crushed aggregate base. The road design appears to meet the street design standards.

## Other Standards

The **Street Ordinance** requires a storm water management plan, soil erosion and sedimentation control plan, and a phosphorous impact plan and requires that those plans meet the relevant standards of the **Subdivision Regulations**. For the storm water management plan the relevant standards are found in **Article V, Section 2.12** of the **Subdivision Regulations**. For the soil erosion and sedimentation control plan the relevant standards are found in **Article V, Section 2.12**. The applicants' submissions appear to meet those standards.

For the phosphorous impact plan the relevant standards are found in **Article VIII, Section 15** of the **Subdivision Regulations** which incorporates the most recent edition of "Phosphorous Allocation Factors for Lake Watersheds in the Town of Raymond" as adopted by the Raymond Planning Board. This calls for the applicant to calculate maximum permissible phosphorous export, calculate the phosphorous export that can be expected from the post-development conditions and then, if the post-development export exceeds the permissible export amount, propose treatment options to reduce phosphorous export. (A version of this standard can be found in **Article IX, Section U.6 of the Land Use Ordinance**.)

Based on the calculations found in appendix D of the applicants' Stormwater Management Report, the allowable phosphorous export is .235 lbs/yr while the predicted post-development phosphorous export is .497 lbs/yr indicating a need for additional phosphorous controls. However, the applicants' submissions do not propose

---

<sup>1</sup> Although notes 9 & 14 on the applicants' plan refer to future maintenance the notes appear to be in conflict with each other and nevertheless do not meet the ordinance requirement. **Section 4.2.J of the Street Ordinance** requires "For a street that is to remain private, the application shall include a plan setting forth how the street and associated drainage structures are to be maintained. Responsibility for street maintenance may be assigned to a lot owners association or to lot owners in common through provisions included in the deeds for all lots that utilize the private street for access. The applicant shall submit appropriate legal documentation such as proposed homeowners association documents or proposed deed covenants for Board review. This documentation must address specific maintenance activities such as summer and winter maintenance, long-term improvements and emergency repairs and include a mechanism to generate funds to pay for such work."

any additional controls. Presumably this is because under the new DEP Stormwater Rules, projects with less than 20,000 sq. ft. of impervious area, such as this project, are not required to propose additional phosphorous controls. However the change in the DEP rules neither requires nor permits the Planning Board to exempt projects based on impervious area unless or until the town's ordinance is changed to reflect this new regulatory direction.

Tom Greer of Pinkham and Greer gave an overview of the road construction and reviewed the road data.

### **Comments from the Board:**

Chairman Clark stated that he was glad to see that the phosphorous had been addressed.

Nelson Henry inquired about the difference between crowning and pitching as it related to road construction. He was told that pitching encouraged the runoff to go towards one side of the road.

Clark asked if they intended to keep the road private. The applicant responded in the affirmative.

O'Neill inquired about the longevity of use and the maintenance of the dry swales. He was told that maintenance was minimal; the surface would need occasional rototilling.

Ginger Wallace asked what would happen when the unpaved road surface wore down. Paul Lawrence stated that the maintenance agreement would deal with the road and the other maintenance issues.

Clark added that expectations are that the road will withstand normal use. He further stated that the maintenance of the dry swales should be added to the maintenance agreement. Tom Greer agreed to add an attachment being added to the maintenance agreement for the dry swales.

Clark stated that he felt the applicant had met the standards for phosphorous and that using a combination of the two standards was appropriate given that the Town of Raymond was in a position of being between standards with new ones being adopted by the DEP.

Clark pointed out other issues:

- Plan note 9 & 14 appeared to be conflicting
- Potential of an additional access
- Set back violations for existing structures resulting in nonconformance
- frontage on road
- no further lot access from McGrath RD w/o PB approval
- Sheet c-3 should show the continuation of the private way
- road grade waiver
- turn around location
- access to remaining land
- the need for a phosphorous waiver

**MOTION:** moved by O'Neill and seconded by Smith to grant a waiver for the phosphorous export allowance from .23 to .28. Vote was unanimous to approve. 6/0.

Based on its findings that most of the phosphorous from this site will be generated from a pre-existing road, that due to the location of the road, treatment options are quite limited, that further phosphorous treatment would be technically challenging if not unfeasible, that the small amount of predicted phosphorous export above that allowed (approximately .05 lbs per year) is insignificant given the small size of the site and the variability in the modeling techniques and methodology, and that a waiver will not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of the ordinance, the board grants a waiver of the **phosphorous allocation** requirement of Article VIII, section 15 of the Subdivision Regulations from the allowance of .235 lbs per year to the .28 lbs per year predicted by the applicants' calculations.

**MOTION:** moved by O'Neill and seconded by Smith to grant approval to Ralph and Linda McGrath for the proposed way referenced by Tax map 13, lot 24 in the LRR1 district with conditions of approval:

1. The development shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the plans, specifications, testimony, submissions, and supporting documents presented to the Planning Board in conjunction with the developer's application for private way approval.
2. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall provide a road maintenance agreement, which includes a maintenance plan for the proposed phosphorous control mechanisms, to the Town Attorney (with a copy to the Town) for his review and approval.
3. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall provide revised plans pursuant to the testimony and proceedings of the April 12, 2006 Planning Board meeting. Those revisions shall:

Show the locations of all existing and proposed utilities.

Add a note stating that any change or modification to any aspect of the approved plan, including the development of additional lots or additional access drives off McGrath Drive shall be considered an amendment to the plan and shall require approval of the Planning Board.

Strike note #9.

Add a reference in note #14 to the road maintenance agreement

4. Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall have the Code Enforcement Officer and/ or the Board of Appeals review the conformance of the setbacks of the existing buildings to the proposed right-of-way and road. If the setbacks are not in compliance with the applicable provisions of the town's zoning ordinance, the applicants shall either bring them into conformance or obtain a variance from the Board of Appeals prior to issuance of a building permit.

Vote was unanimous. 6/0.

**Map 5, Lot 1-VR1**

## **Raymond House Condominiums**

### **Webbs Mills Road**

#### **Peter Busque**

#### **Sketch plan for a 129 unit condominium development on 60 acres.**

Member Patrick Smith asked to be excused from participating on this project due to the fact that Sebago Technics is the engineering firm that Peter Busque has hired for this project. Smith revealed that he was employed by that firm. The Board honored his request and Smith removed himself from the Board.

Charles Brown of Sebago Technics gave a "sketch plan" presentation on behalf of Peter Busque and explained that the applicant was proposing a 129 unit age restricted (55+) development on 60 acres. He outlined the changes that had been made since their last appearance before the PB in December of 2004 two of which were an increase in the number of units- from 109 to 129 and a different septic plan design. Brown also said that the applicant was looking at eliminating the sidewalks from the project and to replace them with a wider road that could be lined with a pedestrian strip. Their decision to go this route was that it was difficult to keep side walks clear in the winter.

Chairman Clark asked Hugh Coxe to review his memo:

### **Project Description**

This is pre-application sketch plan review for a 129-unit condominium on about 60 acres on Webbs Mill Road. The project is located in the Village Residential district. The project was before the board in December 2004 for a pre-application sketch plan review. At that time the project was proposed for 109 units utilizing common septic systems. Due to concerns expressed about common septic systems, the applicant is now proposing individual septic systems for each unit.

Other board comments at the December 2004 meeting concerned the amount of traffic that such a large project would generate; the need for sidewalks; impacts on wildlife and wetlands; that the open space should "make sense;" and the effect that the project would have on the public's use of trails currently on the property. The applicant was asked to develop a plan to relocate snowmobile trails.

### **Decisions/ Issues**

The pre-application sketch plan review is an informal discussion in which no votes are taken. It provides an opportunity for the board to see the general concept of the proposal without requiring the applicant to do the detailed engineering and site work that will be required for the preliminary application. It also allows the board to provide some feedback to the applicant and for the applicant to get some direction from the board.

Issues the board may want to discuss include the net residential density calculations and the number of units allowable, which ordinance provisions will apply to this project, and the applicant's waiver request.

### **Discussion**

## **Net Residential Density**

The definition for “Net Residential Density” in **Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance** sets out the method for determining the permissible number of dwelling units allowed for a parcel. In calculating the permissible number of dwelling units for this project the applicant has used the minimum lot area per dwelling unit for multifamily buildings and calculated that 136 dwelling units could be permitted. However multifamily are defined in the ordinance as a building with three or more dwelling units (**Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance**) and that is not what has been proposed in the sketch plan. The units proposed for this development are all either single-family homes or duplexes and the ordinance has different minimum lot area per dwelling unit figures to use for those types of buildings. For single-family buildings there needs to be 40,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of buildable area per dwelling unit and for duplexes there needs to be 20,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of buildable area per dwelling unit (see **Article IV, Section A.4.b of the Land Use Ordinance**).

Assuming the applicant’s calculation of 48.96 acres of net residential area (buildable area) is correct, then the maximum net residential density calculation for single family dwelling units would be 53 while the maximum net residential density calculation for duplex dwelling units would be 106 (which would translate to 53 separate duplex buildings). If the applicant were to propose multifamily buildings, the net residential density would be about 140 dwelling units but those would have to be in buildings of three units or more.

The board may also want to discuss the net residential area calculations. The applicant indicates that the total area of the parcel is 59.73 acres, which differs from the town’s tax records that indicate the parcel is about 51 acres. It is unclear from the submission if the calculation may include some land in the Burnham property over which one of the access roads is proposed. Also, in calculating the net residential area the applicants have deducted acreage for the right-of-way within the subdivision and for the slopes greater than 35% but there is no deduction for land that his “unsuitable for development to drainage were soil conditions” which typically are wetlands. They will be required to delineate wetlands on-site and if there are some they should be deducted from the total acreage.

## **Applicable Ordinances**

It is unclear from the submissions exactly what type of project the applicant is proposing (multi-family or a combination of single-family and duplex) and therefore whether the Site Plan Review provisions in **Article X of the Land Use Ordinance** should apply to this project. Site Plan Review applies to multifamily projects but it exempts single-family and duplex projects. The applicant should provide some clarity as to what type of project this is to be. Also the applicant seems to be proposing a clubhouse (the plans set aside some land for a possible future clubhouse), which would also require site plan review - though it appears that the zoning ordinance may not permit clubhouses in the village residential zone in which this is located.

This project will require subdivision review as the subdivision law applies to projects that create three or more new dwelling units as well as ones that create three or more new lots. As proposed, the project does not appear to create any new lots - all of the land will be in one commonly owned condominium project – but it does create new dwelling units. However it is not clear if the applicant intends this to be reviewed under Raymond’s open space subdivision ordinance (**Article XII of the Land Use Ordinance**). Reference is made that the condominiums have been planned with an “open space” concept but the net residential calculations do not follow the methodology of that ordinance nor has the applicant provided any kind of narrative explaining how the proposal addresses the purposes of that ordinance provision – a requirement at the pre-application stage should the applicant propose an open space subdivision.

The applicant will have the burden of showing that the proposal meets the ordinance requirements and in order to do so should set out a narrative explaining what ordinance provisions apply and how they have complied with them.

### **Sidewalk Waiver Request**

The applicant has indicated that he will be requesting a waiver for sidewalks to be constructed adjacent public roads. He bases this on the target age of the residence and anticipated site grading. **Article IX, Section 5 of the Subdivision Ordinance** requires that sidewalks shall be installed where a subdivision abuts or fronts on to a major street. The planning board is permitted to grant waivers under the subdivision provisions where there is a finding of undue hardship and the waiver will not nullify the intent of the ordinance. The applicant’s submissions offer no basis for a finding of undue hardship and as presented, it would be difficult to see how such a waiver would not nullify the intent of the ordinance requiring sidewalks given the proximity of this project to the village and to Webb Mill Road.

### **Other Issues**

The board should consider potential current road connections to the project and potential future connections to this project. Eagles View Drive to the South may have a right-of-way up to the border of the subject parcel. Under **Article 9, Section 2.8 of the Subdivision Ordinance** the board may require right-of-way widths for future connections to undeveloped land.

The applicant will also need to demonstrate that he has right, title and interest to cross the Burnham property for a second means of egress from the parcel to Webb’s Mill Road.

The board will need to determine how to classify the street for purposes of deciding which street standards are applicable. A collector street is defined in the street ordinance as “a principal roadway that conveys traffic between arterial streets.” A minor street is defined as “a street that primarily serves for access to abutting properties.” Webbs Mill road is considered an arterial street and though the proposed roadway will be running from Webbs Mill Road through the project and back out to Webbs Mill Road, it probably is more accurately described as a

minor street under the Raymond street ordinance. As such it would require a 50-foot right-of-way and a travel width of 20 feet paved with a maximum grade of 8%. Should the board determine that the proposed road is a collector road, it would require 60-foot right-of-way with travel width of 22 ft. and a maximum grade of 6%. The maximum grade may be important as the roadway that enters the site at the southern side of Webbs Mill road has to go across some fairly steep land once it gets about 400 ft. into the parcel.

When this project comes before the board for a preliminary application, the board should look closely at the groundwater impacts of the septic systems given the large number of units and density of development proposed. The board might consider requesting a groundwater impact study and have that peer-reviewed.

Likewise the board may want to consider having the engineering for the septic, the road, the drainage, etc. peer reviewed given the size and intensity of this proposed development.

**Comments from the applicant:**

Brown stated that the applicant would be submitting an application for an Open Space Subdivision. He further commented that there was no plan to relocate the snowmobile trails. Brown added that the property had been examined and there were no wetlands. Dick Sweet was working with the applicant and there would be a formal report submitted.

**Comments from the Board:**

Clark discussed difference between multifamily and single family dwelling units, as outlined in the ordinances, and its impact on net residential density calculations. The proposed units are not considered multifamily because they are not at least three unit. Density calculations for the proposed development need to be figured on single family and duplex requirements because the proposed units do not follow the Town's definition of multi family.

Gifford inquired about the sidewalks. Brown responded that they intended to make the roads wider, rather than building sidewalks. They were considering designating the walking area by striping it off.

O'Neill commented that there did not appear to be any clear delineation of open space. What they proposed was not what he visualized open space to be- an area that would maintain wildlife habitat and could join other open spaces in the future. He further stated that he would like to see sidewalks and would have a tendency not to waiver the sidewalk requirement.

Wallace also wanted to see sidewalks. Her other concerns were the traffic and the impact on wildlife (turkeys). She further stated that the "open space" should make more sense.

Clark commented on the septics and was concerned about the number of systems planned. He stated he would like to see some shared systems for every 2 units.

John Rand of the Conservation Commission asked that the applicant map out the trail system of the area. He stated that there was a fairly extensive system to the east of the

waterline. He encouraged the developer to consider public access and connectivity to the trails already there and to preserve them. Rand referenced Valley View as being a good model to follow. Rand specifically asked that they map the trails and think about scaling the project back towards the east side of the utility lines.

Raymond resident, Bruce Chapman stated that he had the area mapped and would email a copy to John Rand.

Sam Gifford also expressed his concerns about the lack of sidewalks.

A site walk was discussed, but because most of the Board had already been on a previous site walk to the area, it was decided that any Board members wishing to visit the site make arrangements with the property owner on their own.

It was the consensus of the Board that peer review would probably be warranted on a project of this size.

No formal action was taken on this project.

### **Map 16, Lot 47 RR**

#### **Valley Heights**

#### **Spiller Hill Road**

#### **Lee F. Adams Jr**

#### **Subdivision pre-application for 3 lot subdivision on 40 acres.**

Board member Robert O'Neill disclosed that his homeowners' association was an abutter to the Valley Heights parcel. O'Neill stated to the Board that he felt that he could participate with out bias in review of the proposal. Both the Board and the applicant felt that it was fine for him to sit on the Board and act on the application.

Bob Berry of Main-Land Development Consultants represented the applicant with a subdivision pre-application sketch plan for 3 lots on 46 acres. Berry gave a brief overview of the project. All of the proposed lots will have frontage on either Valley Road or Spiller Hill Road.

Chairman Clark asked Hugh to review his memo:

### **Project Description**

This is a pre-application sketch plan review for a 3-lot subdivision on about 46 acres on Spiller Hill Road and Valley Road. The project is located in the Rural Residential district.

### **Decisions/ Issues**

The pre-application sketch plan review is an informal discussion in which no votes are taken. It provides an opportunity for the board to see the general concept of the proposal without requiring the applicant to do the detailed engineering and site work that will be required for the preliminary application. It also allows the board to provide some feedback to the applicant and for the applicant to get some direction from the board.

## **Discussion**

The lots presented on the applicant's survey plan all appear to meet the basic dimensional zoning requirements of the rural residential district. They have sufficient frontage and lot sizes are adequate.

## **Land Subject to Subdivision Review**

This three-lot subdivision consists of one lot of 3.94 acres that was previously split off and sold but which has not been developed, and two other lots to be sold. There have been some other lot splits and sales of adjacent land by the applicant making the subdivision status of these parcels confusing. The board may want to get a more detailed explanation than what has been provided with the submissions in order to more fully understand which land is subject to subdivision review.

## **Subdivision Submissions and Review Criteria**

When this project is brought to the board for preliminary subdivision review it will need to comply with submission requirements of **Article V of the Subdivision Ordinance**, the General Requirements of **Article VIII** and the Design Standards of **Article IX. Article V, Section 2 of the Subdivision Ordinance** sets out the required submissions for subdivision applications. These include things such as the proposed locations of buildings (building envelopes), mapping of natural features such as wetlands, contour maps showing the topography of the land proposed for development, information about road design, information about the proposed water supply and proposed sewage disposal and plans for phosphorous control, stormwater management and erosion control.

## **Road Access**

As presented the plans do not show any access to the proposed lots either from existing or proposed roads. **Article IX, Section 3.2.9 of the Subdivision Ordinance** requires that "all subdivisions shall be designed to provide access to individual lots only by interior subdivision roads." It further prohibits direct access from any public road to any lot unless the Planning board determines "that physical conditions unique to the parcel justify the granting of a waiver."

## **Comments from the Board:**

Nelson Henry asked the applicant to point out the location of the lots on the plan. Ginger Wallace commented on the irregular configuration of some of the proposed lots. Chairman Clark polled the Board and consensus was that there would probably not be a problem with the road waiver, if the applicant made a reasonable case to support the request.

The applicant inquired about getting both preliminary and final approval at one meeting. He was told that a procedural waiver would need to be requested in order to get both approvals at the same meeting, and that the application would need to be complete.

No formal action was taken by the Board for this application.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

CPIC Update-

The CPIC did not have a quorum at their last meeting. It was reported that work was being continued on the Zoning map. The CPIC committee is also looking at the possibility of applying for a Regional Grant.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:** moved by O'Neill and seconded by Gifford to adjourn at 9:42 pm. Vote 6/0.

Karen Strout

Recording Secretary