

Approved

Mont Vernon Planning Board

MONT VERNON PLANNING BOARD
Mont Vernon, NH 03057
Meeting Minutes - April 11, 2017

AGENDA

Times are approximate and subject to change without notice.

7:00pm Dan O’Sullivan - Potential Subdivision Review 8 Horton Rd.

7:30pm Orchard Hill Subdivision

8:30pm Mail & Announcements
 Review Minutes from 3/28/17

8:45pm Other Business

9:00pm Adjournment

Seated: Chip **Spalding**, Acting Chairman, John **Quinlan**, Bill **Johnson**, Dave **Hall**

Absent: Bill **McKinney**, Annette **Immorlica**, Steve **Bennett**, Eric **Will**, Chris **Aiston**, Jim **Bird**

7:00 PM – Dan O’Sullivan, 8 Horton Rd., Potential Subdivision

Spalding called the meeting to order and asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken. Dan O’Sullivan, 8 Horton Road, came before the Board to discuss a concept for a minor subdivision. His property, Map 4-37-2, is currently a 12 acre parcel. He would like to divide into 2 lots, perhaps a 5 acre and a 7acre lot each. He understands that the current road frontage he has now is insufficient for that; he has 442’ frontage. This concept also has a driveway running down the west wall within the side setback. The intention is to build a house with a garage/studio on the back property. He was looking for feedback. **Spalding** stated that the zoning regulations explain the minimum parcel size along with setbacks and road frontage requirements. He asked if the parcel falls within the Purgatory Watershed. Mr. O’Sullivan wasn’t sure of the answer to that. They viewed the base map here and determined that this parcel in fact does fall within the Purgatory Watershed. This means it puts him into District 3 which is a 5 acre minimum requiring 300’ of frontage per lot. His existing frontage of 442’ is not enough. The Planning Board would not be able to move forward on this; it would require a variance granted by the ZBA. However, if he was able to demonstrate that these are 2 acre soils, he would then have enough frontage for two 2 acre parcels. They discussed section I-305 as another option to explore. This is in regard to open space developments. If he could qualify for that it would allow more flexibility with smaller frontage and smaller parcels. **Hall** asked if he has explored other options for access with his abutters. Mr. O’Sullivan stated that he hasn’t explored that as of yet; this is a preliminary discussion to see what his options might be. His next step is to do some more research. He thanked the Board for their time.

7:25 PM – Orchard Hill Subdivision

Brett Vaughn and Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, came before the Board. Branon continued discussion on the proposal to subdivide Mr. Vaughn’s property off Purgatory Rd. He spoke of the March 28th meeting where there was discussion relative to the off-site improvements to Purgatory Rd. He reiterated that those improvements were creating a problem for the feasibility of the development primarily because they feel that the standards being requested are not consistent with road upgrades but would be more in line with new subdivision roads. In this setting, where Purgatory Rd. is an existing Class V road, they are asking the Board to revisit those off-site design requirements. He and Mr. Vaughn put together a written proposal outlining what they are looking for and justifying it with engineering guidelines and professional recommendations. They used the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual to calculate their figures. There are 3 existing residences on Purgatory Rd. now. They have 4 approved lots on the south side and are proposing 8 more on the north side, totaling 15 residential properties. These 15 properties can be expected to generate approximately 132 to 151 vehicle trips per day. This type of traffic is considered to be very low and does not rise to the level of improvements that are currently being requested. This is supported by the NHDOT Suggested Minimum Design Standards for Rural Subdivision Streets and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads. The NH DOT’s suggested minimum standards are based on the anticipated daily traffic. For an average daily traffic of 50-200 vehicles NHDOT recommends that the roadway at a minimum consist of 12” of gravel, no crushed stone and be surfaced with an asphalt treatment (chipseal). These standards are significantly less than the current Mont Vernon Roadway Standards which seek 12” of

bank run gravel, 8" of crushed stone and 4.5" of asphalt. The AASHTO standards for very low-volume roads clearly represent that low-volume roads should not be held to the standards of local roads with higher traffic volumes. A very low-volume road is classified as any road subject to less than or equal to 400 vehicle trips per day. The recommendation for a road with 25-40 mph is 18'-20' in width including shoulders. These standards also outline that changes to existing roads should only be contemplated if there is evidence of a site-specific safety problem. Based on their research of the applicable design standards and their engineering experience they believe that a good design for Purgatory Road would consist of reconstructing the road through station 19+00 as shown on the current plan with a roadway cross-section of 20' in width with 12" of bank run gravel, 6" of crushed stone and 2.5" of pavement. The pavement shall be installed at 18' in width up to station 19+00 as depicted on the current plan. This would result in a substantial improvement to Purgatory Road, would exceed the recommended guidelines and standards outlined from NHDOT and AASHTO and would meet or exceed the Nat'l Fire Protection Association requirements (NFPA). They made note of the Boards concerns relative to the potential for future development along Upton Road with the current subdivision proposal. Mr. Vaughn is willing to place restrictions on the subject lots with frontage along Upton Road to ensure that no future development will occur from Upton Road.

Spalding discussed wanting to see a 300' minimum offset from the back boundary line because of the gun club; whether it is carved off and given to the gun club or as a restrictive easement. Branon does not think that is a good position for the Board to take. It is between two private property owners. Vaughn has had active discussions with the gun club relative to providing a buffer but there may be conditions and improvements that Vaughn would like to see happen internally amongst the gun club before he would be willing to give that 300' buffer. Branon went on to state that as a landowner Vaughn has the right to engage in those discussions with his abutter. Branon respectfully requests that the Board does not enter into this dialogue with the gun club. He feels there would be more accomplished by an active negotiation that has been ongoing between Vaughn and the gun club. Vaughn stated that he is meeting with the gun club again in three weeks to further negotiate. **Quinlan** stated that we do not have the authority to impose a solution between the two parties. We need to let them negotiate. **Spalding** went back to the checklist and questioned the underground utilities on Purgatory Road. Branon stated that as long as those wires are adequate to supply the next two houses they will keep them underground through that section. If Eversource has an issue with the underground line it will become overhead. **Spalding** requested that they submit a letter addressing the remaining few items on the checklist. Branon formally requested a continuance to the next scheduled meeting on April 25, 2017. **Spalding** suggested to Vaughn that if he could bring Jim Kempf, President of the gun club, to the next meeting to discuss the negotiations going on between both parties it would go a long way. Vaughn said that he would reach out to Jim Kempf.

8:45 PM –Mail and Announcements

Quinlan suggested that we table the minutes from the 3/28/17 meeting until we have more of the regular members present. All were in favor.

Other Business

Quinlan brought forward questions asked by Selectman Kim Roberge regarding the Old Mill Estates proposed development. We received an email from the DES wanting to know if the Town will be taking over the maintenance of the road as well as the BMP's which consist of 4 detention ponds, 2 infiltration basins, 2 treatment swales and vegetated buffers. She wants to know exactly how we should respond to the DES; specifically what are the estimated costs of this maintenance. **Spalding** went over the plan looking for easements for each of the drainage sites. He states that the bulk of the maintenance will be the catch basins. **Johnson** brought up the detention ponds needing to be periodically cleaned of sediment. These are things that are above and beyond what our DPW does. **Spalding** stated that the quick and unfortunate answer is – yes, it will be expensive to maintain with all the catch basins on the plan. The town is just not set up to manage catch basins that are off the road. He does not have a definitive cost associated with this. **Hall** gave an update from the TCD Subcommittee. Their first meeting went well; they meet again on 4/19 and will begin planning.

9:15 PM

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

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Cleary

Planning Board Administrative Assistant