

TOWN OF RAYMOND
Planning Board Minutes

Wednesday, December 6, 2006

7:00 pm.

Town Hall

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

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

1.Call to order: The workshop was called to order at 7:08 pm. Roll was called and it was determined that there was a quorum present.

2. Ordinance Review:

The Board began its work with discussions which were a continuation of previous workshop addressing various proposed ordinance changes.

- ◆ **subdivision matrix**
Changes are outlined in spread sheet which had been previously distributed.
- ◆ **land use map**
Discussion:
 - ◆ Reason addressing map changes is we are still using 1989 map with a colored cut out. Goal to make it gis based. They are proposing stream protection areas instead of LRR1. Typically the stream protection is an overlay zone with performance standards. DEP has guidelines and the towns can impose additional ones. Recommendation by CPIC is 100 ft protection districts. DEP has standards, and towns need to be at least as strict as DEP. There will be changes in resource protection based on DEP data. So it is proposed that resource protection areas will be created by definition, and there will be a map to define where it will be. Chairman Clark suggested that there be two separate warrants for the map- one for existing and one for proposed. Hugh commented that the old one could be a problem because it does not match up to resource protection areas.
- ◆ **subdivision approval- length of approval- sunset clause-performance guarantees**
Discussion:

What triggers the starting point of a subdivision? Road construction? Hugh will look into this. Clark stated he felt that all subdivisions should have a performance guarantee and a maximum of two years of subdivision approval before expiration, with the ability to get an extension for a third year. The value of bond would be determined by estimated construction cost. Expiration of subdivision needs to be written into ordinance. There was some discussion as to how this would work with phased project.
- ◆ **Two tiers for subdivision;**
Discussion:

Most towns have two tiers-major and minor. Clark stated that he felt that 5 lots was the key number in determining whether subdivisions were major or minor. Clark further commented that it would allow the developer have the opportunity to focus on a more limited area and to

have different standards for items such as landscaping and mapping. These requirements would still give the Board discretion and should be a little bit open ended. There was mixed reaction regarding whether some standards would still need to be met. O'Neill stated the contours (mapping) are what we want. A requirement we will waive if we want, but still a requirement. Hugh stated that we may need someone else draft the work major and minor subdivisions. Anyone who writes ordinances should be able to write from this information. They could get examples from almost any town, as most towns do have this.

- ◆ **Waiver provisions-** embellish the language

- ◆ **Discussion:**

- ◆ Applicant needs to clearly state in writing with 3-4 bullet points why they want the waiver. There should be no debating in front of Planning Board. We need the applicant to clearly explain in writing what they want for waivers. Wallace commented that they need to explain what they have done and why they cannot meet them. O'Neill added that they need to supply "sufficient detail". Applicants should come to the meeting and not have interchange with the Board. They should meet the fundamental standards, not just get a convenience waiver.

- ◆ **Checklist and signature**

- ◆ **Discussion:**

It was suggested that a checklist be added to the application and that Hugh sign off on the completeness of the application and that the application was acceptable for processing. No waivers would mean that it would not be on agenda.

- ◆ **Road length-**

- ◆ **Discussion:**

Suggested to change length of road requirement to 2000 feet. It was commented that the length usually depends on shape of parcel. If the Board decides 2000 feet is reasonable length, it would reduce number of waiver requests. The standard could be different for road to be built to town standards vs to remain a private way. In general it would reduce the request for waivers.

- ◆ **Road Connectivity**

Discussion: There were mixed feelings regarding requiring developers to propose future access points with ROW. It was concluded that this was a policy decision and it may never be made, but creates the opportunities. Clark commented that roads in excess of 1000' should trigger need to provide a connecting future row. Potential for second connection- this is dead end road length. Right now there are large tracts of land in the growth district that cannot be accessed. If you are doing a subdivision, would it be worthwhile to propose a row. Coxe stated that the Board has been moving in that direction. There is a need to have connectivity. If each development is separate, more difficult for snow plows, school buses, public safety, and trash collectors. This road would be designed to make connections, but to discourage through traffic. Gifford asked if there were any examples to see. Response was that the closest would be Tarkiln Hill. Tait asked what are we requesting of them? Clark stated that at 1000' we are asking them to look at a point of connection or show why it does not make sense to make one. For example there might be a stream or lot configuration or topography that would prevent it. Smith asked who would own this? Who uses it?? Clark responded the home association owns it. If public, then the next person in line. More than likely it will never happen. Unless someone has the money. Will the lot that contains the ROW be required to use it? O'Neill stated that it would be a big sell. Smith said he did not see the benefit since plowing and road maintenance were the responsibility of homeowners' association. Some members did not see that there would be the benefit of the connectivity component; Board clearly divided on the issue. Hugh plans to draft the language.

- ◆ **Outside Information**

Discussion:

Chairman Clark commented that he would like to see the final information from especially from significance projects after the applicant had the final DEP report and made the changes required by them. Hugh commented that very seldom would the changes they make not be good for the town. Smith agreed with Coxe. Clark repeated that he would like to see the outside information and would like to see them get the DEP order before the Board gives final approval and have the applicant come to Board having seen those changes. Not the reverse. Coxe commented that it would certainly be workable. Coxe cautioned that after having gone to DEP and made changes, and if the applicant has worked with DEP, they will scream if they are asked to do changes. Clark would like to see the difference between what is presented to Town and what comes back from DEP. Gifford asked if we would have the final say?? Yes, was the response. Clark added that the Board could make this compliance a condition of board. The could give conditional approval, but must come back to the board. Consensus was to have a fourth meeting when DEP report comes in. Coxe suggested that this might become an administrative action with no discussion, unless the Board chose to open it up.

Hugh was given direction to clarify the ordinance language in several other areas.

The time line leading up to Town Meeting was reviewed.

Hugh requested that the Board consider out sourcing some of the writing of the ordinance language have as much ready as possible for Town Meeting. Hugh will check with Town Manager regarding the funds.

Motion by O'Neill to authorize expenditures of funds to out source as much the writing of ordinance language as possible to prepare for the May 19th Town Meeting. Seconded by Gifford.

Vote was unanimous.

3. Announcements:

Next regular Board meeting will be January 10th. Chairman Clark scheduled a Jan 17th workshop with where the goal will be to have as much of the language as possible ready. The Board will invite a technical consultant to workshop as well.

- ◆ **Timber Harvesting**

Hugh reported that he had met with Greg Foster who had supplied a handout for the Board to review in regard to the Timber Harvesting Ordinance. He stated that underlying impetus of his comments were that they were do a good job and have kept the land open. He feels that the local ordinances should not be any more onerous than state ones. This relates to Comprehensive Plan issues.

4. Adjournment:

Motion by O'Neill and seconded by Gifford to adjourn at 9:25 pm.

Vote was unanimous.

Karen G. Strout
Recording Secretary