Sutton Planning Board Minutes December 5, 2011

Approved _____

Present:	S. Paul, W. Whittier, R. Largess, T. Connors, D. Moroney, J. Anderson
Staff:	J. Hager, Planning Director

General Business:

Motion:	To approve the minutes of 11/21/11, W. Whittier
2^{nd} :	D. Moroney
Vote:	4-0-1, S. Paul abstained as he was not present

Form A Plans – None.

<u>Planning Meeting Schedule 2012</u>– The Planning Director asked the Board to review the proposed Calendar year 2012 schedule and let her know if there any conflicts. The Board will finalize the schedule at their next meeting.

(R. Largess arrives)

<u>Carrier Lane – Safe and Adequate Access?</u>– J. Hager explained that the proponent would like to divide a lot on Carrier Lane into two lots. The issue is whether the roadway that would serve as legal frontage to these lots is safe and adequate. D. Moroney expressed concerns with the portion of roadway after the driveway of Dave Teft. He stated this portion of the road is narrow and steep. J. Hager noted she has been told similar things by members of the fire department. Dave Teft of 16 Carrier Lane, also a Fire Captain in Auburn, confirmed that past his driveway the road is in bad condition and if often in accessible in the winter months. He stated he would be hesitant to take any equipment down this portion of roadway particularly in the winter. The Board will take a drive out to Carrier and report back their thoughts on the condition and what improvements they feel maybe necessary. They also asked for the input of the Police and Fire Chiefs.

<u>Correspondence/Other</u>- J. Hager noted the department has received the Expanded ENF for upgrade of lines for National Grid including the placement of a third line within existing power easements at various locations. The volume is available if anyone wants to comment.

Preliminary Subdivision (Cont.) – 191 Hartness Road

Owner Jeff Ruth and Engineer Norman Hill were back before the Board with a revised preliminary subdivision plan for 191 Hartness Road.

J. Hager noted that Preliminary Subdivision Plans are primarily filed for two reasons. First, to grandfather the land show on the plan to the zoning that is in place when the plan is filed IF the preliminary is followed by a definitive within seven months. Here it is unlikely the zoning will change in the near future. Second, is to see what issues may arise before substantial money is spent of full definitive design.

While the Board is not bound by their decision on the preliminary plan, they should be very clear on their major issues. Once the Board feels they have enough information, they must approve, approve with conditions/suggestions, or disapprove the plan stating their reasoning.

The Board asked if the Safety Committee commented on the last plan. J. Hager noted there is a summary in her memo to the Board which states the Police Chief deferred to the Highway Super and Fire Chief. The Fire Chief was not happy with the road length but noted perhaps if the fire cistern were oversized it would make a difference. The Highway Super felt that if the proponent wants a road longer than 500' he should try to change the Regulations. He noted obviously a longer road will take longer to plow and cost more to maintain. He noted he doesn't have a particular problem with a longer road, but that's what the Regulations say, so why have Regulations if you're just going to waive them.

J. Hager stated that changes to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations do not go to Town Meeting, they just go through a public hearing process with the Planning Board and therefore can be requested at any time. She confirmed the last time road length was considered, it did not make it through the public hearing process.

Norman Hill PE summarized they have shortened the road substantially to 870 feet, centered the road so no property line waiver is necessary, and reduced the number of potential lots from 9 to 7. He said the development will provide the benefit of a fire cistern in the area and a school bus turn around. His client is willing to install a cistern 5,000 gallons larger that whatever is normally required. He also stated as the Fire Chief seemed to like the idea of locating the cistern at the beginning of the road, they are happy to do that. He confirmed a home owner's association would fill and maintain the cistern. He stressed that the project is not financially feasible at 500'. They could only get 2 lots and that would barely pay for the roadway construction cost. They anticipate asking for only a few waivers, road length, one sidewalk and road width if the Board prefers a narrower road.

J. Anderson asked if Lot #1 meets the regularity factor. N. Hill said all the lots meet the regularity factor.

R. Largess stated that while he understands Mr. Hill's concerns with finances, the proponent's financial issues cannot enter into the Board's decision. He stated that if the safety department heads are fine with what is proposed, he is as well, although he would consider it a good idea to request a change in the Regulations. The Board sets precedent whenever they make a decision and prefers that all developers play on a level field, so this may be a better route to go.

D. Moroney stated the Regulations say 500' and if the developer wants to go longer, he should request the Regulations be changed. T. Connors agreed, noting consistency is very important.

S. Paul said he might consider a boulevard for the first several hundred feet and then a standard roadway, but otherwise he also felt the Regulations should be changed if the proponent wants a longer road.

W. Whittier felt the proponent should seek a change in the regulations.

December 5, 2011 Page 3

J. Anderson said the proponent should request a change. This would prompt a public hearing process and allow people to be heard and also allow help the Board to be consistent in their application of the Regulations.

Mr. Hill will speak with his client and return to the Board for their decision at a meeting in the near future.

On a question from W. Whittier, the proponent confirmed the road is proposed to be public.

Motion: To adjourn, W. Whittier 2nd: R. Largess Vote: 5-0-0

Adjourned 7:50 PM