

MONT VERNON PLANNING BOARD**Public Meeting Via Zoom****November 10, 2020****AGENDA**

Times are approximate and subject to change without notice.

7:00 pm Continued Public Hearing Patricia Schmitz Revocable Trust
Subdivision of Map 3-28, Beech Hill Road & Upton Road

8:00 pm Public Hearing Robert Sheehan, 3-lot subdivision of 15-acres
Map 1-36, Trow Road & Old Milford Road

8:45 pm Other Business
Mail & Announcements
Review Minutes from 10/27/20

9:00 pm Adjournment

Present: Bill **McKinney**, Bill **Johnson**, Steve **Bennett**, Tim **Berry**, Chip **Spalding**, Rebecca **Schwarz**, Jim **Bird**, Charles **Baker**, Dave **Hall**

Absent: Eric **Will**

7:00 PM – Continued Public Hearing Patricia Schmitz Revocable Trust Map 3-28

McKinney continued the hearing on the Patricia Schmitz Revocable Trust Subdivision of Map 3-28 on Beech Hill Road and Upton Road. Mike Ploof of Fieldstone Land Consultants was there to represent the owner and also the applicant, Children’s Conservation Research Trust. Ploof went over the changes since the last time we met:

- They revised the lot numbers to 3-28-1 and 3-28-2.
- They added 50’ frontage along Upton Road per the request of the Board
- Added two driveway locations
- Added 25’ from center line of Beech Hill and Upton Road easement
- They revised the checklist to include items as not applicable or call it a waiver if needed.

Crosby is satisfied with the blanket 25’ easement for the Town.

The Board next had Ploof go over the waivers requested:

I. 1)Section III-605.1(a) “Maps should be at a scale appropriate to the amount of detail required, but not more than 100’ to the inch.”

The proposed Subdivision Plan is minor in nature by creating two lots in excess of 100 acres. There is no new development proposed with this application. They request a waiver to this requirement. **Bird** doesn’t feel this to be an unreasonable request. **Bennett** motioned to grant the waiver to Section III-605.1(a) as requested seconded by **Johnson**. All in favor, waiver granted.

I. 2)Section III-605.1(a)(ii)(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 in excess of 100 acres. There is no new development proposed with this application. Given the large size of this subdivision it would not be cost effective to map these features. However, they do show the existing roads for the most part as well as the U.S.S.C.S. soils. They request a waiver to this requirement. **Bennett** suggested we add the provision that should there be any future proposals for development of this lot, they amend maps to include the items they have left out per the waiver. Ploof asked if he means for any future subdivision of this parcel. **Bennett** restated that for any future development, whatever it may be, they would include amended maps to show items they have left out with this waiver. Ploof stated that the concern is if the owner

wants to build a house down the road, they would have to map 141-acres of wetlands and streams for one building. **Bird** feels that any waivers granted tonight should be exclusive to this application. **Berry** agrees and feels that this waiver applies to only this application which is not to develop this property in any way, shape or form other than to draw a boundary line down the middle of it. **Bennett** motioned to grant the waiver to Section III-605.1(a)(ii)(1) with the provision that the waiver applies solely to this application seconded by **Berry**. All in favor, waiver granted.

I. 3)Chapter III Article 3: Procedure III-412 “Has municipal expense account been created?”

The proposed Subdivision Plan is minor in nature by creating two lots in excess of 100-acres. There is no new development proposed with this application. This is non-applicable. They request a waiver to this requirement. **Spalding** asked if the owner is proposing to put all the proposed monumentation in place? There is no reason to bond anything here unless they are planning on delineating and putting improvements in. Ploof said they will not be doing anything; the monuments will be set after they get conditional approval. **Johnson** motioned to remove the request waiver as it is not necessary, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor, waiver withdrawn.

I. 4)Chapter III Article 4: General Requirements III-420.12 “Has the Board determined the need for special investigative studies?”

The proposed Subdivision Plan is minor in nature by creating two lots in excess of 100-acres. There is no new development proposed with this application. This is non-applicable. They request a waiver to this requirement. **Bennett** motioned to allow the applicant to withdraw the waiver as it is not required, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor, waiver withdrawn.

I. 5)Chapter III-605.1(b)(i) and (c) Plat Requirements “Location of septic systems and wells, Show water courses, Show large trees, Show foliage lines, Show storm drainage lines and analysis map, Show watershed areas and Show the area of lots denoting wetland acres and dry acres and total acres”.

The proposed Subdivision Plan is minor in nature by creating two lots in excess of 100-acres. There is no new development proposed with this application. They request a waiver to this requirement. **Spalding** questioned if there is an existing well in close proximity to the new boundary line that is creating this subdivision or are there no existing wells on this property. Ploof said they are not aware of any wells that are in proximity to the boundary line. Schmitz stated that the property has been in her family for 50 years and she is not aware of any wells on the property. **Bennett** motioned to grant the waiver to Chapter III-605.1(b)(i) and (c) with the provision that the waiver applies solely to this application, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor, waiver granted.

McKinney asked the Board’s position on this Subdivision application. **Spalding** asked Crosby if there are any road features or road frontage features that he feels are not adequately captured by the proposed easement being 25’ from the center line going into the new subdivision. Crosby said the only area that might be a project would be near Chip Day’s property where there is a large culvert. **McKinney** noted his one concern is that it is difficult through Zoom to work through our checklist and compare to the actual plans. However, if there is no further discussion, he would recommend possible conditional approval of this and give the time for the Secretary to verify that all checklist items are correct and compare it to our plans before signing. **Spalding** asked the surveyor if all the town cross culverts on Beech Hill Rd are shown on this plat? Ploof said no, they are not because this is a compass and tape survey. Typically, you would not put a 25’ ROW easement along a minor subdivision such as this. What usually happens is once the 140-acres goes for the next development, that is when you come up with a precise survey. If this lot is ever to be subdivided again, at that time there would be a very precise survey done. **Spalding** would like to see cross culverts as drainage may be an issue. He asked Crosby if there are any drainage issues; Crosby said only the large culvert near Chip Day’s property. He doesn’t feel there has been anything else significant; he would have to go out and look to see what has been upgraded from concrete/metal to plastic pipe. **Berry** stated that we just granted the waiver to Chapter III-605.1(b)(i) and (c). This is redundant. **Bennett** motioned to conditionally approve the Subdivision subject to the Secretary having the opportunity to make sure the plan complies with it, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor, motion passed. **Johnson** motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by **Berry**. All in favor.

7:50 PM – Public Hearing, Robert Sheehan 3-Lot Subdivision of 15-acres, Map 1-36

McKinney called the hearing to order. Mike Ploof, Fieldstone Land Consultants was present to represent the applicant. He presented a subdivision plan as well as a topographic and soils plan. The owner of record of Map 1-36 is Thomas Trow. The applicant is Robert Sheehan. The purpose of this plan is to subdivide existing tax map parcel 1-36 into three residential lots. The total area of the parcel 13.54-acres. It has 1,431 feet of frontage on Trow Road and 325 feet of frontage on Old Milford Road. They are proposing a conventional subdivision with District 1 and District 2 soils conditions. Minimum lot size for District 2 soils is 5-acres; minimum lot size for District 1 soils is 2-acres. Two proposed lots are 5-acres, District 2 soils and one proposed lot is 3.54-acres, District 1 soils. There is a proposed 25’ ROW on Trow Road and Old Milford Road. There are no waivers being requested on this application. **Spalding** questioned the side setbacks listed at 20’; not the 30’ required. Ploof said that was an error on their end which will be corrected. There is plenty of room at 30’. **Spalding** questioned Crosby regarding drainage issues. Crosby said there is no ditch line on Trow Road at all; the water has nowhere to go but on the travel surface; it follows Trow down and runs onto the lowest proposed lot and out on to Old Milford Road. Crosby said there are issues with the proposed driveways. There are slopes and stone walls that will create a potential sight distance issue for those driveways. **McKinney** questioned the slopes greater than 25%. Ploof said the majority of the site is not greater than 25%; he can have their soil scientist show the calculations of slopes and soils for each of these lots if the Board has questions. **Johnson** asked if they would be showing the proposed building location on these lots. Ploof said they could, but when the lot gets sold, the new buyer will have their own ideas and plans on where they want it to go. Ploof will add to the plan. **Johnson** asked if all the foliage lines can be shown on the plan. Ploof will put in the notes as these lots are all wooded. **McKinney** asked if the public had any questions. David Brooks of 36 Old Milford Road addressed his drainage concerns. Trow Road washes out in heavy rains and ends up in his driveway. He is concerned that if they put in a driveway on the lowest lot it will make changes in the topography which will send even more run off onto his driveway. Shelley

Brooks said that this summer they had 2” of water that went over their threshold and into their basement. They don’t want the issue getting worse. Crosby suggested that putting in a culvert may be the solution. **Spalding** shared the NRPC contour map showing the ridge lines. Ploof will speak with Robert Sheehan to see if he would be willing to work with the town to find a solution to the drainage issue. **Spalding** suggested that Ploof ask the current owner for permission for the Planning Board to walk this property to become more familiar with it. The Board would also like to see the Brooks property. Crosby requested this walk be done during the work week so he can attend. The Board set a tentative date of Friday, November 13, 2020 at 1:30pm. Ploof will check with the owner and let us know if the owner will give permission. **Berry** motioned to adjourn this public hearing on the subdivision request until Friday, November 13, 2020 at 1:30pm seconded by **Bennett**. All in favor, hearing adjourned.

8:50 PM – Other Business

McKinney updated the Board on his discussion with Town Counsel regarding Old Wilton Road. He has also requested legal input from the NHMA and hopes to be able to provide the Board with information soon. The Board reviewed the minutes of 10/27/20. **Berry** motioned to accept the minutes as written seconded by **Bennett**. All in favor.

9:20 PM

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

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Cleary

Administrative Assistant