

## MONT VERNON PLANNING BOARD

## Public Meeting

September 14, 2021

## AGENDA

Times are approximate and subject to change without notice.

7:00 pm Hearing on Subdivision Plan, 11 Trow Road, Lot 1-43

7:45 pm Discussion with Sally/Tom Wilkins, Withdrawal Lot 2-57

8:30 pm Other Business

Mail & Announcements

Review of Minutes 8/24/21

9:00 pm Adjournment

**Present:** Jim Bird, Steve Bennett, Chip Spalding, Tim Berry, Rebecca Schwarz, Bill McKinney

**Absent:** Dave Hall, Chuck Anderson, Charles Baker, Eric Will, Mike Lewis

**7:00 PM – Hearing on Subdivision Plan 11 Trow Road, Lot 1-43**

**Bird** called the meeting to order and had everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. **Bird** opened the public hearing on the application for a minor subdivision of Lot 1-43, 11 Trow Road. Present was the owner Tom Trow, represented by Mike Ploof of Fieldstone Land Consultants. Lot 1-43 currently consists of 26.986 acres in the rural residential district. This proposed subdivision of Tax Map Lot 1-43 into two residential lots will create a proposed lot 1-43-2 with 5.599 acres and a remainder lot 1-43-1 with 21.387 acres. There is a proposed ROW easement from 25' from the existing road into the lot to allow for drainage maintenance, etc. They seek a waiver on Section III-605.1(a)(ii)(1) on lot 1-43-1: "site survey map showing boundary of subdivision area, topography, streams, existing features and foliage lines, existing roads, structures, adjacent development and soil type by U.S.S.C. S.". The proposed subdivision plan is minor in nature by creating two lots; one lot of 5.845 acres (no waiver requested) and one lot in excess of 21 acres. There is no new development proposed on lot 1-43-1 with this application at this time. Therefore, they do not want to have to do a high intensity soil or topography survey on the lot with the existing house and request the Board grant the waiver. **Spalding** noted that the common boundary line between parcel 1-43-2 and 1-43-1 doesn't show bearings on the distances on the line that subdivides the parcels; is it in the notes somewhere or is it missing from the drawing. Ploof stated that there are a couple of Scribner's errors on this plan; it's there but on a frozen layer. It will certainly be there should the Board conditionally approve the plan. Spalding asked him to highlight any other frozen layers that we aren't seeing on this plan. Ploof stated that there is a 100' setback from the wetlands to the proposed building that is not shown on the plan. **Berry** asked if they are showing monumentation on all the lot corners. Ploof stated yes, in fact, there are drill holes already there from a prior survey. Do they pull out the drill hole to put a bound? As a surveyor, he doesn't like to pull out another surveyor's monument in order to put in a bound. The checklist asks for a certified soil survey stamp. They have a wetlands stamp; he will have them stamp it for soils. **Berry** noted

that the signature block is missing as well. Dave Cates, an abutter, asked where the proposed house will be located. The plan shows the box for the septic system; **Bird** guesses that given the slopes to the west, it would be just north of the septic system. Ploof said it also would depend on the type of house built. The Board reviewed the application. **Spalding** motioned to accept the application seconded by **Bennett**. All in favor. **Spalding** motioned to accept the waiver of Section III-605.1(a)(ii)(1) for tax Map 1-43-1 seconded by **Berry**. **Bird** commented that he feels it is especially less risky because the lot we are discussing is 4x the minimum lot size and is already developed. All in favor. The Board discussed waiver #2 regarding replacing set drill holes with granite bounds on what is to be a new bound. **Spalding** understands the requirement but wants to make certain that we have to do so; he agrees with the surveyor and questions what we are needing to waive. The Board reviewed Section III-605.1(c)(v) and determined that a waiver was not technically needed. **Bennett** motioned to accept drillholes as the end points for the new boundary line between the two lots seconded by **Berry**. All in favor. The Board went over the four items that need to be added to the plan:

- I. 1. Metes and bounds for all boundary lines.
- II. 2. 100' wetlands setback
- III. 3. Soil survey stamp
- IV. 4. Signature block

**Bird** noted that we will also need this in electronic format for the purpose of changing the tax maps. **Spalding** asked if the other town departments have given any comments or feedback on this proposed subdivision. It was noted that they are sent information on major subdivisions; not minor subdivisions. **Spalding** feels that there are enough changes needed that we cannot give conditional approval tonight. He feels they should come back to our next meeting with the necessary corrections to the application in order to check off as being completed. In the interim he'd like the other town department heads to have a chance to look over and give feedback. **Berry** is inclined to grant conditional approval with all deficiencies on the plan being fixed. We granted a conditional approval on the last application where there were changes needed on the plan; no feedback was requested from town department heads. He wants to move the process along. He does not see any major impediment; feels like it's all housekeeping of the plan itself. **Spalding** noted that every plan that we review, every application, stands alone. We should not be influenced by a previous application or previous plan. He understands what our Selectmen's Rep. is saying but he does not feel that means we have to follow the same path. **Bennett** feels it is unnecessary, but motioned to continue this to September 28, 2021 so that conditions can be met, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor.

#### **8:00 PM – Discussion with Sally Wilkins, Withdrawal of Lot 2-57**

Sally Wilkins came before the Board to discuss a draft of the planned withdrawal lot out of Lot 2-57. SPNHF requires a recorded plan even though they are not subdividing the lot. All but one of the corners of the "lot" are on stone walls. They are hoping to set a granite bound only on the new corner and mark the others with rebar, rather than putting in offset granite bounds. If in the future the house lot is subdivided off, the whole plan will have to be approved by the Planning Board. They are looking to get a consensus from the PB on this. The Board agrees that they do not have to put offset granite bounds where they are marked on stone walls. Sally Wilkins thanked the Board for their time.

#### **8:15 PM – Other Business**

Peter Stoddard of S&H Land Services called to inquire about Lot 1-24-6 on Purgatory Road. He needs help interpreting the setbacks. The plan shows a 100' setback line offset of the wetlands. Article 3 section II-302.1 of the zoning regs indicates a 75' setback to the wetlands. He's wondering which one governs here. The Board stated that the 100' setback line offset of the wetlands is what governs, as noted on the plan. The Conservation Commission had been involved in that part of the subdivision.

Rebecca Schwarz came before the Board on behalf of the Heritage Commission. They are in need of a Planning Board Rep. to that commission. The project currently at hand is the restoration and preservation of the Town Hall. Bill **McKinney** volunteered to join the Heritage Commission. **Bennett** motioned to nominate **McKinney** as Planning Board Rep. to the Heritage Commission seconded by **Berry**. All in favor.

The Board reviewed the minutes of 8/24/21. **Berry** motioned to approve the minutes as written seconded by **Bennett**. Three in favor, one recusal.

**8:30 PM**

As there was no further business before the Board, **Berry** motioned to adjourn seconded by **Bennett**. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Cleary

Administrative Assistant