

Parsonsfield Planning board Meeting
Tuesday, January 22nd, 2019
Minutes

Planning Board Members in Attendance: Justin Espinosa, Nate Stacey, Rick Sullivan, Andy Yale, Marion Wright, Clifford Krolick, Attorney David Lourie

CEO Jessie Winters in attendance

Mr. Espinosa called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

Review list of agenda items

Mr. Espinosa updated the board that he has met with the select board last Tuesday regarding posting planning board minutes both as video and written record on the town website. A youtube channel is in the works by the town clerk. Mr. Espinosa is also currently working towards developing a hard copy of the video data to be accessible via the public library.

Mr. Krolick announces an upcoming meeting regarding a newly comprehensive plan and asks for participation from anyone interested in completing surveys or providing feedback. The meeting is set for January 30th, at 7pm.

Watson Woods Subdivision

The board members review a letter that was submitted on November 13th following up from the public hearing.

Ralph Austin does a brief introduction of who he is, and that he represents Nate Watson. Mr. Austin confirms with the board this letter was to summarize information provided that they have met the guideline criteria.

Mr. Espinosa inquired Mr. Lourie on the 50-foot buffer zone and violations that may pertain to the ordinance.

Mr. Lourie Reviews that the developers have followed the state rule, or permit by rule, in the conducted forestry methods. Although it's not illegal to proceed with the buffer zone as the developer has, the board is allowed to require, as part of their approval, to replant the area that has been cut. Mr. Lourie also asks Mr. Austin what other forestry practices they do have planned in reference to a section noted on page three.

Mr. Austin There will be no further cutting on the existing 8 lots during construction of the homes during the two months of June and July.

Mr. Lourie Asks about plans for reforestation for the remaining parcel of land?

Mr. Austin There will be no further cutting of that parcel, that will be left as is and the owner will retain it.

Mr. Lourie To confirm there is no further forestry plan for the remaining parcel.

Mr. Austin In talking with Nate, no, but will be left open to what may come along later.

Mr. Yale asks Mr. Lourie if he thinks the ordinance has been violated.

Mr. Lourie doesn't think the ordinance has been violated in that of the buffer zones but would suggest moving forward by imposing a condition for the applicant such as that of restoring the pre-cutting condition of the lot.

Mr. Krolick Asks if original cut permit of lot 14, was for sub division? And if they opened another application would they be able to circumvent the ordinance?

Mr. Lourie In lacking credibility on the developer he suggests again on imposing a condition.

Mr. Stacey Question in regard to another topic, in meeting the DOT requirement of a site distance of 450 feet per 45 MPH, there seems to be no record of actual measurements.

Mr. Sullivan believes three of the lots don't meet the requirements of the town but do meet the requirements of the state.

Mr. Austin Explains some possible reasons for some variations in the site distance and remarks there should still be stakes set out and offers further site walks.

Mrs. Wright States if there are any changes, then we need to go back to them. And asks why not have shared driveways?

Mr. Stacey From past conversation, it seems it would be harder to sell a lot with a joined driveway.

Mr. Austin Suggests and would be willing to work with the planning board on doing site walks

Mr. Yale brings up concerns of the storm water management report and asks clarification what the objection to that report was

Mr. Sullivan Suggests getting outside consultation in these areas for further review.

Mr. Espinosa Has spoken with the Select board in getting input from the public. Chair advocates opening to the public for comments and asks board members for further input

Mr. Sullivan Suggests providing a limited amount of time of 120 seconds

Mr. Stacey comments his concerns that their plan to continue with current drainage.

Mr. Espinosa Asks the board if there are any further questions before opening to the public.

Mrs. Wright Comments that the applicant must contact the school to ensure there will be no burden put on the school.

Mr. Austin The school has been contacted and we're told that there would be no burden on the school.

Mr. Espinosa opens for public comment with board approval.

Mr. Wright comments concerns that from the beginning the town did not know about the cut permit however there was a FON filed with the town and suggests that the process could have moved faster if handled more appropriately.

Mrs. Brendt, a member of the Select Board agrees with above statement, however stated the responsibility lies with the applicant to let the town know of their intention with the sub division lot in order for the town to move with proper proceedings.

Mr. Ryan requests clarification on the timeline for action on the application and custody of current application and asks about green space protection plans as well as imposing conditions based on applicants bad habits.

Mr. Anderson states the original plan was to widen Hussey road, however the developer chose to move some driveways to rt 160. He asks about a conservation easement for the remaining land to keep from the road from being overused.

Mrs. Lane The board votes to allow Mrs. Lane to speak as she is from another town. A majority of board members were in favor. Mrs. Lane states her concerns that she was informed no further

public comment would be allowed after the public hearing but that the applicant had submitted eight pages after the public hearing. Her concerns she lists are lot # 7 is a spaghetti lot with current measurement listed. Lot # 8 should have a driveway on Hussey road based on the ordinance. She notes the acreage on every document is listed differently. She also suggests not to let the applicant do their own measurements and for better accuracy to have the planning board acquire the measurements.

Gerard Comments that the developer violates multiple sections of the town ordinances, sections 7, 11 and 13. He also comments that it is mandatory the developer retain 10% of the parcel for recreation.

Mr. Espinosa Asks for any further public comment. None are submitted. He addresses the board how they would like to proceed with this application.

Mr. Sullivan Discusses concerns with the site distance with the existing house does not meet town ordinance criteria, as well as the high intensity soil test.

Mr. Lourie Answers board question in approval options. He states an option may be withholding a preliminary approval until they satisfy requested conditions.

Mr. Yale States his concerns with the conservation easement on the remaining 35 acres. Also concerned with the buffer being logged as it has and plans for new tree growth.

Mr. Krolick States concerns with storm water management and having multiple driveways added on the road.

Mrs. Wright states concerns with the number of houses being put in a low-density area.

Mr. Sullivan confirms the density values with the current comprehensive plan and suggests further review on the site distances.

Mr. Espinosa Addresses the board with options to vote on the plan as is or to require imposed conditions to be defined for the preliminary plan. The board continues discussion on main points of concerns and compiles a list of conditions set for a preliminary plan. The list of conditions is as follows:

1. Maintaining the buffer zone and working with an independent consultant in determining proper reforestation techniques.
2. Site distances of the driveways would need to meet the towns ordinance. Shared driveway option
3. Setting better storm water management, potentially utilizing consultation
4. Reserving 10% of the remaining parcel for recreation while postponing any future development for at least 10 years and having an impact study completed for the plantation.

Mr. Espinosa motions to vote on reviewing a preliminary plan with set guidelines as stated above at next meeting with intent to determine a final status of the application.

The board votes to continue final review at next meeting.

Mr. Espinosa motioned to adjourn the meeting. This was second by Mr. Stacey. The meeting is adjourned.

Next Planning Board Meeting will be held on
February 19th, 2019 at 7:00pm.