

MONT VERNON PLANNING BOARD
Mont Vernon, NH 03057
MEETING MINUTES - Tuesday, February 14, 2017

AGENDA

Times are approximate and subject to change without notice.

7:00PM	Orchard Hill Subdivision
7:45PM	Old Mill Estates
8:30PM	Mail and Announcements Review of minutes from 1/24/2017
8:45PM	Other Business
9:00PM	Adjournment

Seated: Bill McKinney, Chairman, John Quinlan, Chip Spalding, Stephen Bennett,
Present: Eric Will, David Hall **Absent:** Annette Immorlica, Bill Johnson

7:05 PM – Orchard Hill Subdivision

McKinney called the meeting to order and asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Nathan Chamberlin, Fieldstone Land Consultants, was present for the continuation of appearance for Brett Vaughn, Orchard Hill Subdivision. He submitted a revised set of plans and addressed all comments sent by the Board on 2/2/17. The incorrectly numbered parcels have been revised accordingly. The plan has been revised to show that overhead utilities on Purgatory will remain. **Spalding** specified the section of underground utilities by the farmhouse and orchard. Chamberlin stated that more research needs to be done with Eversource. In regard to the proposed Right Of Way, Chamberlin stated that there is no reason to provide additional ROW along Upton Rd. as there are no plans to improve this road. Upton Road is a Class VI road and is not suitable for vehicular traffic. Purgatory Road is being upgraded to provide access to the proposed lots. The remaining portion of Lot 1-24 will be conservation land which will not require additional ROW. **Spalding** stated that we need either a 25' widened ROW or an easement on Purgatory Rd. at the end of Parcel 1-24-9 and also 25' on the south side of Upton Rd. It is a requirement necessary to allow for whatever road improvements or drainage improvements might become necessary. The plan has been revised to show Granite bounds at all lot corners, existing and proposed. The drainage easement on Parcel 1-21-4 has been revised to keep the proposed improvements within the existing drainage easement. The plan has been revised to specify driveway culverts at certain locations and to specify a 24" CCP at Station 3+50. Paved driveway aprons will be shown. Temporary erosion control in the form of silt fence and stone check dams as well as permanent erosion control in the form of riprap swales and aprons are specified within the plan. The plan maintains the existing grade of Purgatory Rd. Chamberlin noted that the section of the Subdivision Regulations that this checklist item references was repealed in 2008. They are not constructing a new road so this regulation is not applicable. They are shifting the widening of Purgatory Rd. to the north as they do not have control over the south side and they are trying to preserve the existing stone walls along the south side of the road per Section III.420.1 of the Subdivision Regulations. General Road Construction Notes have been revised to specify depth of ledge removal. The plan has been revised to specify a guardrail at Station 3+00 L to Station 4+00 L. The plan has been revised to specify roadside delineators. The plan has been revised to specify 8" of crushed gravel base. Legal documents pending conditional approval are culvert easement/drainage easements and conservation easements. The intent is to have the MVCC maintain ownership of the conservation easement. In regard to the paving of Purgatory Rd., Chamberlin stated that it was determined in previous discussion involving the Road Agent that 2.5" of pavement would be sufficient for the actual asphalt section. The Board did not agree; our minimum requirement is 1.5" wearing course and 3" base course. Chamberlin stated that this is not a new road; it is a road upgrade. The Board stated that 2.5" does not meet our standards. We need 1.5" minimum wearing course and 3" base course unless he can provide supporting documentation from the Road Agent stating otherwise and a waiver granted by the Planning Board. Chamberlin formally requested a continuance to the next meeting on March 14, 2017.

7:50 – Old Mill Estates

Kevin Anderson of Meridian Land Services came before the Board to give an update of the proposed subdivision. The subdivision had been approved in 2007 but has been stagnant since. They are in the process of applying for a new AOT permit with the DES as the prior one has expired. There are 19 proposed lots in this development; three conventional lots and the remainder to be open space cluster type

lots. In 2008 they obtained their wetlands permit and a road was roughed in to allow wetlands crossings to be put in with subdivision approval. Due to this, they are limited as to what they can do with the road going forward; basically the road is where it is. There are certain aspects of the state permit they will be requesting waivers to as they cannot meet the state requirements. **McKinney** addressed the issue of bonding the road. Typically bonding is required before any construction can begin. However, in 2007 the Planning Board granted bonding prior to first building permit being issued. Is the current developer willing to amend that and bond construction as the road is built? Matthew Arel, Better Built Homes, responded. He stated that he wants to keep it to bonding per issuance of building permits to keep his costs down. **McKinney** stated that bonding as the road is built would be a better safeguard to the community. If they were making substantial changes to the plan we could require this. However, he doesn't feel that the changes being made constitutes substantial. **Quinlan** asked if engineering bonding was required. Third party construction monitoring was discussed. Matthew Arel wants to use Meridian instead of a third party to do all road construction monitoring and inspections. He and Kevin Anderson suggested putting together a milestone inspection schedule for the Board to review. **Spalding** pointed out that there are no underground utilities shown on the plans and stressed that we need to have "as Built" plans on file so as to avoid problems that we have had in the past. They agreed. **Spalding** spoke of the proposed addition of infiltration basins in the cul-de-sacs. His main concern is if there is water retained and you have a freeze/thaw event it could break up the road. He would rather see a culvert to drain the middle instead of a basin. Anderson pointed out that the grade is extremely flat and does not allow for this. He is working with an existing ROW and existing culverts. He feels that the infiltration basin is the best way to provide treatment and mitigation to meet the state's higher elevated requirements. Anderson asked if they would entertain the installation of an underdrain. **Spalding** responded that the challenge with an underdrain is that once it's installed there is little or no means of preventative maintenance. **McKinney** noted that this is a preapproved subdivision. Our ordinances have not changed. Therefore, we do not get into 'substantial improvement' requirements. The only reason Meridian has come forward with any changes is due to the DES and changes to their AOT requirements. Anderson stated that he feels an underdrain installed on each of the cul-de-sacs would resolve the water runoff issue. **Spalding** asked if they would be able to tie the underdrains in to the closest catch basins and install cleanouts. Applicant agreed. It was agreed that this would be the best scenario given the preapproved site plan. **Hall** noted the fire code requires that the proposed cistern needs to be in place before any building permits can be issued. **Hall** asked if they still plan to have a common well. Anderson stated that there will not be a common well; they fall under the threshold of state requirements. This subdivision will have individual wells and septic systems. Anderson will work up an inspection schedule and a bond form for the Board's review. He hopes to have his AOT approval from the state within a week.

8:30 PM Mail & Announcements

McKinney read an email from an individual interested in purchasing a home in Mont Vernon. They want to be able to grow legal edible mushrooms in the basement and are wanting to know if they would need ZBA approval in order to do so. The response is that we would need to know what zoning district the property is in. If it is determined that the property is in the Rural Residential district then he could produce all he wanted for his own consumption and could even have a farm stand. If he was to turn this into a true commercial operation, he would need Zoning and Planning Boards approval.

The Board reviewed the minutes of 1/24/17. **Quinlan** motioned to accept the minutes as written. **Spalding** seconded. All were in favor, the motion passed.

8:40 PM

As there was no further business, **Quinlan** motioned to adjourn. **Bennett** seconded. All were in favor, the motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,
Joan Cleary
Planning Board Administrative Assistant