

PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 18, 2007

MEMORIAL BUILDING

7:00 P.M.

The Following are to be considered draft minutes only until approved by the Board at their next meeting.

Present: Kevin Lee, Darrin Patten, Peter Keene, Ken Jacques, Neal Huntoon, Linda Welch, and Andy D'Amico.

Also Present: Bob Anderson, Tim Lee, Tom Lee, John Trachy, Cynthia Hayes, and Mark O'Halloran.

Kevin opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes: Correction as noted on page 3 changing a word "to" to "from". Ken moved to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Linda and unanimously approved.

Zoning Report: Andy reported the ZBA has reviewed (he stepped down as an abutter) Mr. Matarazzo's request for a Special Exception for road and driveway wetlands crossings. The Board has requested clarification from the Planning Board regarding the location of the entrance to the subdivision and proposed number of wetlands crossings.

Literature and Correspondence: Kevin announced the Spring Planning Conference scheduled for April 8th.

Merger: The Board reviewed a voluntary merger application from Maureen Seymour on Winding Wood Road in Eastman. The merger was approved.

Public Hearing RE: 2007 proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Present: Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Region Planning Representative, Courtney Daniell. The hearing was opened at 7:10 p.m. The Board reviewed the proposed amendments. Ken moved to propose the amendments for the 2007 Town Warrant, seconded by Darrin and unanimously approved.

The Board reviewed the sample ballot prepared by the UVLSRPC. The Board discussed adding the proposed definition changes to the ballot. Linda moved to add the list of the definitions, seconded by Andy. 2 members voted in favor, no one opposed, all other Board members abstained. The definitions will be added to the ballot.

Continuation Matarazzo Design Review Hearing:

Present: Engineer Ross Stevens, and abutter Donna Abair.
Andy D'Amico stepped down.

Mr. Matarazzo reported that the Zoning Board would like a definitive decision stating that there is no other reasonable access to the property in order for him to proceed with the Special Exception process.

He presented the Board with up to date mapping. Ross Stevens recently visited the site, and had requested the assistance of an independent wetlands scientist. They met at the site this week and have addressed Ross' concerns.

Ross stated he requested the review based on the information of the last set of plans that he had and his site inspection. Many of the issues he had have been dealt with and are shown on the plan presented today.

Mr. Matarazzo stated that conceptually he had addressed using other areas for access. His property is located greater than 3000 feet from the entrance off Hazzard Road. An access from Town Farm Road would present a similar situation. A road can only be 1500' in length before a cul-de-sac or other form of egress is required. The Board discussed their concerns for other potential entrance sites. Wetlands issues would be a problem in other areas as well. The narrowness at the entrance of Hazzard Road due to the location of the existing homes creates safety problems. The property would require another area of egress due to the length of proposed roads from either end of Hazzard Road.

The Board discussed the reasons why the Board feels there are no other feasible alternatives to access locations.

1. An entrance to the property (from Hazzard Road South) would be greater than 3,000 feet and another point of egress would be required.
2. Other points of entrance would have similar situations with road lengths and wetlands crossings.
3. An entrance from Hazzard Road creates safety issues due to the narrowness of the road and the location of the existing houses due to the increased traffic that the development will create.

George stated that he also needed the Board to address there were no other feasible alternatives for access to the property other than Hazzard Road. John Trachy questioned whether it might be feasible to access from the other end of Hazzard Road. The Board felt that the issues would be similar from that area. Route 4A is not feasible due to the size of wetlands needing to be crossed.

A motion was made by Peter Keene ,” after reviewing the plan presented; the Board finds that there are no other feasible alternatives, specifically both ends of Hazzard Road due to road length requirements, safety issues at each end, and wetlands crossings.” The motion was seconded by Linda and unanimously approved.

Cynthia Hayes asked how many wetlands crossings are there going to be? Ross stated the survey plans he has reviewed have identified the road and driveway encroachments.

Ross stated Mr. Matarazzo has done a good job at proposing driveway and road crossings in areas with a minimal amount of impact. The current plan he has presented appears to be the best use of the land. Ross stated he will send a letter to the Board that says that he feels comfortable with the wetlands issues as addressed.

Darrin asked Mr. Matarazzo to look at Lot 16. The lot as proposed creates a wetlands driveway crossing. Lot lines should be adjusted to avoid the need for a Special Exception for the driveway crossing.

Kevin addressed safety concerns regarding the grade of the hill on the road off Four Corners Road as well as the sharpness of the corner in the fill area. Ross stated the road design conforms to road requirements. Ross stated he would recommend guardrail in the area. If possible the grade of the road should be lessened. Ross stated he is also concerned with the driveway access in the area of the fill. Ross indicated he will be addressing those issues in his letter.

Mr. Matarazzo reviewed the change in location in the road off Town Farm Road. The lot is constrained by wetlands that have been found. Linda asked if there were to be any wetlands crossings for that road? Mr. Matarazzo stated that there were not. The road entrance off Town Farm Road has been moved away from logging road access toward the bridge, as this makes for better road alignment.

Neal asked how close this would be to the bridge? Mr. Matarazzo stated about 50 to 75 feet. The proposed entrance is at an old driveway location. Neal addressed his concern with the entrance being too close to the bridge. Ross indicated that he will be making some recommendations that there be a negative grade coming off Town Farm Road for some distance onto the access road to better provide for drainage coming off the road, and to provide for vehicle safety stopping at the intersection in winter.

Ken moved to continue the Design Review Hearing to February 15, 2007 at 7:10 p.m., seconded by Darrin and unanimously approved.

Tim Lee – Consultation: Tim stated in the past he had met with the Planning Board, the Selectmen and the Zoning Board about subdividing his property. When he subdivided his property a couple of years ago he questioned whether he would be able to subdivide the remaining property with the frontage available. He was told at that time that as long as he could provide a 50' right of way he would be able to do so. He and his brother both own homes on the property and he wants to be able to subdivide off 5 acres for his brother. He has no problem with a 50' right of way as a shared driveway access for both lots. He has been unable to refinance his home with his brother's house on the property. He does not have the money to update the Class VI road. He has been to the Selectmen and they have indicated that they do not have a problem giving him a waiver for a shared driveway, with a deed restriction that the property not be further subdivided.

Andy stated that the ZBA had suggested that he come in with a proposal for a shared driveway.

The Board reviewed the frontage available, and discussed lot configuration. The Board considered that if in the future Old Croydon Road were to be upgraded, then adequate frontage could be provided for further subdivision. Without Old Croydon Road being upgraded, no further subdivision would be allowed with the 50' ROW. The deed should be worded as such.

Tom stated it was always their intention to have his lot created before all the changes in the subdivision regulations were noted. They are not asking to create anything new, but to grant separate lots to the two existing home. Neal stated the Selectmen have voted to grant a waiver to allow access to a lot that does not have frontage.

Linda commented if a waiver is required to bring a lot into existence, then no further subdivision should happen on that property.

Tom asked for clarification regarding upgrading of the Class VI road. The Board discussed the only way further subdivision could happen would be if Old Croydon Road were brought up to Class V or better. Required frontage would have to be provided for all lots created.

The Board indicated the access needs to be a deeded access, but does not have to be built. The Board indicated to Tim that the access to the back lot needs to be shown, but can be part of the front lot, and does not have to be part of the back lot. The back lot would have deeded access from the front lot. The plan needs to show that there is land enough to meet setback requirements. Wetlands need to be delineated. State septic approval is not required for lots greater than 5 acres.

The Board agreed they would give the plan consideration since the process of planning this subdivision was back before the Board began planning for changes to the regulations. They indicated that they would take that into consideration and encouraged Tim to proceed.

Cynthia Hayes, as a representative from Ausborn Sargent Land Preservation Trust (ASLPT) attended the meeting to present a questionnaire to the Board. ASLPT is gathering information to help them create a land summit meeting. They have compiled a series of questions regarding issues related to land conservation, growth and development. She has met with the Selectmen and the Conservation Commission. The following is a list of the questions asked and a summation of the Board's responses:

1. *What are Springfield's challenges regarding growth and development?*
Regulations to control and direct growth. Management of growth and development and maintaining the rural character of the town.
2. *What land conservation challenges does Springfield face?*
Premature subdivisions, issues with the Gile Forest, development of large tracts of land that now enhance the rural character of the town.
3. *What growth, development and land conservation issues would you like to discuss with other towns or learn more about?*
How towns deal with zoning ordinances for conservation zoning, feature based zoning, how other towns handle obnoxious uses. Examination of regional coordination for open space and wildlife corridors.
4. *What land conservation, growth, and development successes has Springfield experienced?*
Creation of the Forest District and Wetlands Overlay District.
Wetlands setbacks. Protection of the land around McDaniel's Marsh.
5. *What are the key factors that made these possible?*
Public willingness to support the issues that maintain the rural character of the community.
6. *Has Springfield identified its land conservation goals and priorities?*
The goals have been identified in the Master Plan and they are now implementing how to get there.
7. *What barriers does Springfield face in accomplishing its land conservation goals and priorities?*
Development pressures. Not having money available to maintain open land.
Current use helps with tax liabilities to relieve tax burdens.
8. *What regional land conservation issues concern Springfield?*
Water quality issues, infrastructure and development. Watershed for Eastman wells and tapping of that aquifer. Development of open land.
9. *What consideration does Springfield give to the connection between land conservation and historic preservation?*
Springfield gives due consideration. Development pressures on open space and farm lands.

10. What land conservation topics would help Springfield use land conservation more effectively in directing growth and development?

Feature based zoning. Lot size averaging.

ASLPT is planning a summit for the fall around October 20 or 27.

Bob Costello: Kevin reviewed a letter from Bob Costello requesting information relating to subdivision of property that abuts his. The subdivision took place in 1995. The Board agreed that if there is a dispute regarding the property line or right of way then Mr. Costello should have the property surveyed. This dispute is a survey dispute between property owners and is not a town issue. Kevin stated he would contact Mr. Costello advising him of the Board's recommendations.

Lauderdale: The Board agreed that Mr. Lauderdale should be contacted and asked to come to a Planning Board meeting to review his wetlands crossing and a possible boundary line adjustment or shared driveway to avoid a wetlands crossing.

Miscellaneous Business:

Kevin discussed with the Board the need for a site specific permit to clear land for pastureland.

Linda commented that following the work on the proposed amendments the Board should consider a workshop with a municipal planner to carry forward the ideas the Board began working on to achieve their goals while working on the Master Plan.

John Trachy suggested the Board, in revising regulations, might want to consider regulations that deal with total area qualifications versus square footage. As an example Mr. Matarazzo's plan deals with many isolated wetlands that don't meet the 10,000 square foot requirement that get ignored for house and well locations. Wetlands intensive areas need to be considered.

Cynthia Hayes asked if the Board had an opportunity to view the matrix study from the Lake Sunapee Watershed Coalition? Darrin stated that he had looked at it very briefly. Kevin has the report if others wish to review it.

With no further business, the Board voted to adjourn at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janet Roberts,
Recording Secretary