

**Parsonsfield Planning Board
Public Hearing for Watson Woods Development
Tuesday, October 30th, 2018
Minutes**

In Attendance: JP Espinosa, Nate Stacey, Rick Sullivan, Andy Yale, Clifford Krolick

Also in attendance: Ralph Austin, Amy Canali, Mark Hampton, Thomas Greer

Mr. Espinosa Calls the public hearing at 6:52 pm.

Public Hearing – Watson Woods

Mr. Espinosa Answers a question from a member in the audience, as to how this public hearing is legally required. Mr. Espinosa answers this is required for sub division site plan reviews that determines the application complete or not complete.

Mr. Espinosa After there are no further questions from the audience, the floor is given to Watson Woods

Mr. Austin Provides an introduction of his team and presents himself as Ralph Austin, a representative of Nate Wadsworth. He further presents Mrs. Amy Canali as an attorney, Thomas Greer with Walsh Engineering Associates and Mark Hampton, a certified soil scientist and licensed site developer. Mr. Austin states for the record the attendance of their committee as well as a timeline of their sketch plan being filed on April 19th, 2018, the preliminary sub division application on the 16th, a revised sub division plan with soil surveys on August 30th and based from information from the board a revised sub division plan and soil survey submitted on September 26th. He further reviews a brief overview of their plan in that this is a straight-line sub division along route 160 before turning over to Mr. Greer for a slide presentation of the developing lots.

Mr. Greer Presents several slides overviewing the project development. These slides indicate a detailed map location of the property along Route 160 and Hussey Rd, also, the location of the eight lots along Route 160 and the location of the wetlands/stream area roughly centered and running down the middle of the property. He further explains there is approximately 20 acres where the eight lots are to be developed and an additional 34 acres of the back lot in which the developer will retain. All the eight lots are 2-plus acres in size, in a ratio of 3:1 and have all had soil testing completed for suitable septic sites. Among other slides he indicates no-cut buffer areas on each lot for storm water management, additional 50-foot buffer zones on the lots frontage and shows seven driveways, one driveway being a shared driveway.

Mr. Hampton Briefly introduces himself and his credentials. Explains this area on their map is primarily made up of a glacial till soil type. He presents a soil survey map and points out the slope indicators on the map which places the wetlands lower area running down the center of the map. Then he explains regulations pertaining to septic site locations and remarks this site has

shown roughly 15-24 inches of naturally occurring soil (not fill), being among average across the state for septic placements. He indicates on the map the sloping areas currently runoff water into the valley/wetlands area. He explains how he has done several soil tests along the property, most being in the zone to be developed and others scattered throughout the property and by using depth measurements this determines where the hardpan is which then defines drainage classes throughout the map.

Mr. Greer Points out he believes there would be little impact on Hussey Rd as the home owners would more likely use the paved road rather than using Hussey Rd to the gravel road based off the proposed driveway locations.

Public Member A gentleman in the audience asks if the soil maps are based off solely just the soil samples or if also include water tests due to Spring weather developing higher water levels, redefining wetland location.

Mr. Hampton Answers that he does wetland delineations and tests for hydride soils, vegetation growth, ground cover, tree's and hydrology (surface formation).

Mr. Ryan Introduces himself as a member from the public audience and asks Mr. Hampton for dates that he completed the evaluation for wetland delineation. Also, when doing these tests if it was considered the impact of the current forestry methods. Thirdly, if he would consider sharing his field notes by request and what the requirements are for professional standards versus ordinance.

Mr. Hampton Explains when there are cut backs in wetland areas, this does not necessarily mean this will result in a rise in water levels and vice versa. Mr. Hampton also states he would not be willing to provide his field notes as he has already provided the required documentation for the application. He also answers he doesn't feel there has been a discrepancy in standards as he has provided a class A soil survey in ordinance that he is supposed to provide them.

Mr. Clifford States his name and asks a question regarding the soil survey. He points out on the slides there has been a lot 13 built on the backside of the property and as was cited there were limited soil tests done in this area of the map asking why there hasn't been a class A high intensity soil survey completed for this lot with an existing home on it. He also makes comment that the wetlands shown on the map are defined as "of special significance" and has been deforested by the developer with the building envelopes of four lots encroaching the wetland area.

Mr. Austin States the sub division is of the eight lots along route 160 while the remainder of the property is being retained by the developer. There were prior plans submitted, this is the plan being submitted to the board now.

Mr. Hampton Answers to the term "Of special significance" meaning of any location adjacent to a river, stream or brook and of any location with greater than ½ an acre of open water or aquatic vegetation. He further explains that these occur all over the state and is a way for the DEP to protect lands being developed nearby natural resources, using this terminology as a threshold for permitting standards.

Public Member A gentleman asks the size of each lot and the required frontage of Rt 160 with concerns of having seven driveways on Rt 160. He also inquires of the elevation difference between those lots from end to the other.

Mr. Greer States the lots on Rt 160 have 200 feet or more of frontage and points out there is about a ninety-foot drop in elevation from one end of the strip to the other.

Mrs. Lane Introduces herself and comments that lots #1, #2, #6 and #8 have building envelopes that encroach over into the wetlands area. She offers to show these areas on the site map.

Mr. Greer States the envelopes are laid out on the plans as 200 feet by 200 feet for all lots.

Mr. Austin Reiterates these meet the envelope of 200 feet by 200 feet.

Mrs. Brendt Introduces herself and asks Mr. Hampton if he knows if any part of the wetlands is in the national wetlands inventory. She further asks when the initial site plan review was presented to the town? For reason being it was written in the Conway Daily Sun's letter to the editor by a representative of Mr. Wadsworth this was initially presented in June 2017. However, by the towns records this was on the agenda for March 2017 and that also other information has mislead some to believe this began in October of 2016. She reiterates by towns records; this development was presented in March 2017

Mr. Hampton Answers that he doesn't know the answer to her question as he hadn't looked through any national maps, but that there are a series of maps provided to towns and agencies to use as a planning tool for proposed developments.

Mr. Austin Reiterates again, these are the current plans and application now.

Mr. Clifford Asks what their plan is for storm water management, is this a storm water analysis based off current rain fall or is there an actual plan for storm water runoff?

Mr. Greer Explains there has been an analysis on the existing conditions as well as the developed conditions. They are using buffers and putting a level spreader on lot #5, the driveway culverts are a requirement of the DOT permits. The culverts will not be going across Rt 160.

Mr. Yale Asks why the state would require a waiver with special conditions in order to permit the driveways.

Mr. Greer States they have filed the normal application for entryway permits.

Public Member A gentleman asks if the multiple driveways will cause increase in water runoff into the wetlands.

Mr. Greer States most the water will run back into the stream area but by using the buffers this won't change the water levels that much.

Mr. Anderson Introduces himself and comments his concerns the storm water runoff may flow back towards his property. He explains Hussey Rd is 4 feet narrower than state requirements given its history which is the reason for the developer to reduce the number of the original lots and have them all located along Rt 160. His concerns are with the increased traffic on Hussey Rd would cause a burden to taxpayers having an increase in road maintenance. He asks if the developer will be putting a conservation easement on the property.

Mr. Ryan Asks if the different plans will be compiled into one or if the currently presented plans are the final version and if there have been other plans submitted that are not being seen today.

Mr. Greer States that the planning board has everything that has been submitted and it is available to the public.

Public Member A gentleman asks what the waivers are for the driveways.

Mr. Krolick States the special conditions attached to the waiver was to have very specific driveway locations, all of which would have a culvert with no existing culverts by the state being used so the storm water could be managed separately.

Mrs. Lane Comments she spoke with DOT about the driveway permits and found three driveways do not meet the towns requirements of 450 feet. Lots with permit number ending in 74, 95 and 97.

Mr. Greer States the DOT issued the permits and they believe they have met the requirements.

Public Member A gentleman towards the front row states they would like to see specific measurements followed as he has in the past been required to meet required standards for smaller projects on his property.

Mrs. Sawyer introduces herself and asks the planning board for clarity on their position in this matter and the general protocol.

Mr. Yale Explains this public hearing is set for the planning board to be able to listen to the public of any questions or concerns to consider, along with the ordinances, when deciding on determining the plan complete or not complete.

Mrs. Brendt States her concerns with the buffer zones and per ordinance the planning board can request the developer regrow these areas.

Mr. Ryan Asks the planning board what the statutes of limitations are.

Mr. Espinosa States he is not aware of any, however the planning board has gone through the plan line by line in comparing it to the sub division ordinance and sub division regulations.

Mr. Clifford Comments the cut permit provided was dated 10/26/16 and was changed to “Sub Division” and the developer has not complied with the 50-foot buffer as well as the storm water management plan is not a plan but only an analysis.

Public Member A gentleman asks the applicant what the required grade is for septic installments, what the grade is for drainage and how water will flow/drain throughout the lot

Mr. Hampton Answers he has marked the area to be developed as a class A soil survey while the remainder of the lot, not to be developed, is a class C soil survey. All areas on the map are considered moderately-well drained, except for the wetlands area which is considered poorly drained and due to the steepness of the slope, water will typically drain back into the wetlands area.

Mr. Sullivan Asks about the soil tests initially showing as class C in the beginning.

Mr. Hampton States as a consultant he provided what was asked of him by the applicant and at this time he has provided a class A soil test

Mrs. Lane Suggests to the board they seek their own peer review.

Mr. Ryan Comments on an earlier rebuttal from Mr. Hampton that there would be no impact on the wetlands by the forestry methods that were used. He states there has been forestation completed on some lots that overlap into the wetlands area that may impact the area greatly given the amount of cutting that has already been done.

Mrs. Brendt States that by accounts Mr. Wadsworth already new he would be developing this land and should have known about the buffer ordinances.

Mrs. Griffan Introduces herself then comments that she feels the applicant has been making efforts to correct the plans in accordance to the ordinances.

Public Member A gentleman states that the buffer zones should be regrown to something similar of its original state.

Mr. Clifford States to the board the ordinance requires an impact study be completed prior to any construction activity on the property.

Mrs. Winters Comments that having houses put in is better than having mobile homes put in
Mr. Ryan States he was a member of the board during a site walk of this property and recalls the applicant making a statement that the intent was to build small, slab homes with propane heat on the lots.

Public Member A woman in the front row asks the board if there have been any geological hydrology assessments done.

Mr. Espinosa Answers this was considered but by current regulations the property did not meet the requirements to have one done.

Mrs. Lane Comments that this subdivision should be considered a 9 or 10 lot plan given the house that was previously built on the back lot and the division of land that was gifted.

Mr. Espinosa Closes the public hearing to any further public comment and turns over to the board for further questions.

Mr. Yale Asks Mr. Austin to clarify to the board that the remaining parcel of land will not be further developed as previously stated by the applicant and to clarify what type of housing the applicant intends to build.

Mr. Austin States he will ask Mr. Wadsworth these questions to get clarification.

Mr. Espinosa Asks if there is an intent to change the development plans

Mr. Austin states that the applicant intends to develop a subdivision

Mr. Krolick Asks what the storm water management plan is

Mr. Austin States if the planning board would like to impose conditions on the plan, they would be fine with working with them

Mr. Espinosa Schedules a site walk for Saturday November 17th at 10am. The board agrees with this date and time.

Mr. Clifford Asks the board if they will be walking all the lots.

Mr. Espinosa The applicant will be required to mark out the property as well as the proposed driveways.

The public hearing is adjourned at 9:05pm

**A site-walk for the Wadsworth development
has been scheduled for
Saturday November 17th at 10:00 am.**