

**PLANNING BOARD  
OCTOBER 21, 2014 at 7:30 PM  
TOWN HALL, 41 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

In attendance:

**Members:** Kate Connolly, Judith Esmay (Chair), Joan Garipay, Michael Mayor, Iain Sim;

**Alternates:** Jon Criswell, Brian Edwards

**Staff:** Vicki Smith

Others: See Attendance Sheet

1. **MINUTES:** The minutes of September 30<sup>th</sup>, October 6<sup>th</sup> and October 7<sup>th</sup> were approved.

2. **P2014-39 CONTINUATION OF CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AT THE CORNER OF ROUTE 10 AND GOODFELLOW ROAD, 2 GOODFELLOW ROAD, MAP 12, LOT 51-1, OWNED BY KIMBERLY TAYLOR IN THE “RR” ZONING DISTRICT.** [Previously heard 10/07/2014]

Dan Nash, of Advanced Geomatics & Design, said he designed a driveway culvert for each of the three proposed driveways. Goodfellow Road is steep; doing a single driveway in the center of the three proposed lots will result in two steep driveways accessing the outer lots. He suggested that the International Building Code and other local municipalities require no more than a 10% grade on a driveway. Nash said a single driveway located in the center of the three lots will go right into a 20% grade. This would also require significant disturbance right at the wetland buffer. Steep driveways create a greater potential for erosion. Nash said his concept is to use headwalls on each side of the culvert to minimize the fill. He said his concern for bridges or half arches is scouring, which can cause a culvert to fail.

Board & Staff Comments/Questions:

Concern was expressed for:

- the steepness of the hill, depth of the ravine and width that has to be bridged
- debris coming down the hill in a bad storm
- emergency vehicle access
- ecological damage
- preservation of existing features
- the placement of a shared driveway along a proposed common lot line
- the massive amount of work required to bring a vehicle across Pete’s Brook
- changing the character of the road by adding two massive passages across Pete’s Brook

The following was questioned:

- the size of culvert(s) needed
- the ability to safely access these properties from Goodfellow Road
- whether the site has 7.5 acres that are less than 25% slope
- whether there are any level spots to locate a house
- construction sequence of the culvert(s)

- the history of the existing driveway
- how the applicant is going to convince the ZBA that he is minimizing wetland impacts by installing two driveways when there is an opportunity to have a shared driveway access from the existing driveway that would eliminate the wetland impacts altogether

Suggestions were made to:

- have a site visit accompanied by an engineer to explain the plan
- consult with Peter Kulbacki, DPW Director
- put an access drive up the northern boundary line of the present property and use the single drive that exists already
- find places where there are more spaces for bridge abutments

Breck Taylor, husband of the property owner, said we are aware of all of this. The design team has been at this for nine months. This has been well thought out. They've looked at the slope requirements. There are buildable areas on the lots. Nash said recent road washout (Slayton Hill Road) occurred during what equated to over a 500-yr storm. You can't use that or similar washout occurrences as a basis for design. Nash said we need to look hard at our data to be sure we can create two additional lots before we go much further.

Public Comments/Questions: None

### 3. OTHER BUSINESS

Technical Review Committee: The Committee provided the Board with an example of a conflict within the Ordinance that the Committee is working to address. The example dealt with Sections 210.1B(3) and 210.2. After a lengthy discussion, the Board reached consensus that a conflict does not exist. The material should be arranged so that it is sensible and presented in one piece. ESMAY said there are other bold conflicts of purposes that will have to be resolved beyond the Committee's review.

Hanover Consumer Co-Op: There was a lengthy discussion about the Co-op having to modify their streetscape plan at the request of the Public Works Department for ease of snow removal. Smith said this is a major design change that comes with consequences for the Co-Op. ESMAY asked under whose authority the change was made. Smith said DPW staff announced the change during a pre-construction meeting. She said this type of change is unusual. SIM said the Board approved the site plan and spent some time on it. DPW staff has a seat at the table during Staff Review at the beginning of the application review process. They should get all of their assessments and remarks in at that time. Smith said the Co-Op has other changes they would like to implement. The application to modify could have been heard in November, but the Co-Op has asked to be heard in December. ESMAY said there should be a system of notification to the Board when staff proposes significant changes to an approved site plan and inquiry whether the Board objects.

### 4. ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted, Beth Rivard