

Auburn Conservation Commission, July 7, 2015 Auburn Town Hall

called @ 7:02 p.m.

Members Present: Jeff Porter (chair), Alan Villeneuve, Diana. Heaton

Others: Mike Garrepy (Tuck Realty), Jim Gove (Gove Environmental), Scott Frankiewicz (Brown Surveying & Engineering), Leonard and Elaine and Willet, Mickey Rolfe, Jeremy Logee, Joanne Dufresne

1. Proposed Subdivision on Dollard Road; Tax Map 9 lot 2 and Tax map 30 lot 8

Mike Garrepy of Tuck Realty spoke: This is a 36 acre parcel, we are planning on a small subdivision, 8 lots in total, we are here for feedback and recommendations for planning, have a conservation plan, also plan a trail easement at the end of the cul de sac that will get to trails, this will create a tie in for passive recreation for those living there, also have the rail trail on border to the west. There are some significant wetland systems, plus a level 1 wetland on the piece, there is also a large amount of upland on the piece.

D. Heaton: asked what is the acreage of the lots?

S. Frankiewicz: half an acre to about two acres

J. Porter: I question if this is this a viable cluster development, because with the huge wetland across the back, there isn't any way to develop otherwise

M. Grappery: disagreed, contending, we can get in many ways, however, we typically look to do conservation subdivisions

J. Porter: have you looked at how it would play out if you have a traditional grid, you might be pushed down that path, so it should be considered

M. Grappery: we wouldn't want to do that, it's not really on the table, and density allows us somewhere along the line of 13 lots, so we are under density with this plan

J. Porter: the cluster subdivision is getting a lot of pushback, my impression is this may not be the best use from a town's perspective, if there is a way to develop outside the buffers and stay out of the wetlands it bears exploring.

Discussion about ensued about the best use of the land, whether the houses will be seen from the road and how that may not fit in with the "feel" of Auburn. M. Garrepy said the houses would be far enough from the road, and that he doubted one could see them very well, adding that there are already houses along Dollard road

A. Villeneuve: asked if clusters are allowed in an R2 zone, what the frontage requirement for an R2 was, and noted that he didn't see the 100' buffer required from the exterior property line

M. Garrepy: said they didn't explore frontage requirements for an R2 zone because they were not interested in a doing a grid, he noted that the 100' buffer is shown on the plan and showed them where it is

A. Villeneuve: responded that the ordinance has a 100' min, 200' max.

M. Garrepy: said the buffer was based on width, it is an oddly shaped parcel, 50' in front then very wide in back, and they took measurements all around the parcel to come up with the 100'

A. Villeneuve: asked them to explain the funny triangle in the front corner

M. Garrepy: answered that they are acquiring a triangle from the Norris's that abut the property

A. Villeneuve: responded if that is the case, then your buffer line is not accurate

M. Garrepy: answered that the lot is part of the subdivision, so it does not require a buffer

A. Villeneuve: so you are creating a grid with a cluster, does that existing lot conform to today's standards, you are taking an existing lot and folding it into your cluster, you can't have it both ways

M. Garrepy: this happens a lot in the subdivisions we do, assemblage happens all the time where you acquire a number of lots to create the new subdivision

A. Villeneuve: I have a problem with you taking something that conforms to a regulation and folding it into a new parcel that has different regulations

M. Garrepy: we will need to discuss that with the planning board

A. Villeneuve: are you aware of keeping the lot lines out of the buffers

J. Porter: the zoning and planning boards are not wanting to grant waivers for work within a buffer, so they are looking for plans to have lines out of the buffers to ensure they conform to our regulations

M. Garrepy: the lot lines are not nailed down 100%, we can look at them to make sure we don't have any buffers within them

J. Porter: an abutting parcel has an active discussion about access to the school property,

He talked about houses stacked one on top of another seen in recent subdivisions with neighbors putting up chain link fences to separate their parcels because the houses are so close, this, doesn't hold with feel of Auburn, plus hinders wildlife mobility

M. Garrepy: wondered if there would be a question about connectivity to school property if it was sold and not used for a school

J. Gove: mentioned he was part of the folks hired by the town to look at this area for the school, provided a layout that showed utilization of an area for ball fields and what not, there is a large wetland that lays to the west and bisects the property, clearly a level 1 wetland that stretched from Dollard road to the rail trails we have no thoughts of trying to utilize the uplands because the impacts to the level 1 would be large and significant wetland crossings would be required. In regards to wetlands in the immediate vicinity of the cul de sac area, from the stand point of the smallest wetland, level 3, less than 5,000 sq. ft. with no vernal pool, created by a logging truck, there is a level 2 that goes off site, on site portion is less than 5,000 sq. ft. Have another level 2 narrow, poorly drained, no ground water recharge or discharge, not a vernal pool, no endangered or threatened species. Another wetland starts as a seepage out of the steep hillside, continues to a large flat area which extends to a large marsh on the Manchester Water Works land, there is a perennial stream that comes through flowing into the large marsh, a level 1 system

A. Villeneuve: noted that he didn't see any detention ponds, or treatment swales, wondered how they would be dealing with that, there appears to be only a 6' height difference from Dollard road to the back of the cul de sac

S. Frankiewicz: we still need to talk w/ STANEC, M. Garrepy has talked with the abutters, we will have curbing, and about 300' back there will be a little pond to catch drainage and then discharge to back of property

A. Villeneuve: in lot 7 I would not want to see a reduction of the buffer, it is rather steep, and ultimately runoff goes into the lake, I have concerns about where you plan to go with all the run off because it is downhill to the big level 1 wetland, want you to stay outside 125' and also wonder how you plan to treat stuff, I am not going to be proponent of reducing buffers, we repeatedly see this, subdivisions go in with reductions granted to the wetland buffers, the new owners of the properties then want this and that and soon the buffer is gone, that is what we mean questioning the cluster, it is often not used the way it should be.

J. Porter: bear in mind you may have to change the orientation of a lot to make sure there is no breaching of the 125' buffer, consider changes to configuration of lots potentially

M. Garrepy: we don't intend to need any zoning waivers

J. Porter: there was a developer who put in a berm to delineate the end of the property and the start of the buffer

A. Villeneuve: yes, to keep people out of the buffer

D. Heaton: even mowing, or stumping people come back having done these things in the wetland and we want to keep people out of in the beginning.

J. Porter: access to railroad bed is a great plus, but how would people get out there

A. Villeneuve: where would people park to get to the trail?

M. Garrepy: we don't intend to promote parking on Dollard road, and figure the trail access would be for people that live there only

J. Porter: just out of curiosity, what are the sizes of houses you are planning to build?

M. Garrepy: the finished product will be in 2,000 to 3,000 sq. ft. range probably, but we haven't done a market analysis on that yet

A. Villeneuve: asked about size of the Dollard lot, voicing a concern about them wanting to put in a subdivision and get buffer reductions as well

M. Garrepy: I understand, although we want to buffer from the neighbors as well, 100' seems reasonable to use

D. Heaton: how much land will be open space?

M. Garrepy: 28 acres or so, we don't have a final count

D. Heaton: my biggest concern, is I don't love the idea of a cluster here but can see the rational for doing it because of the wetland, therefore I would absolutely want the buffers maintained, and the drainage issue addressed

M. Garrepy: we have about 600' to the end, one of the concerns from the planning board was the dead end length of Dollard road, so we committed to working with them in keeping the road no longer than Dollard, which would keep us from bringing longer road into the back and developing that area, no real viable connectivity in the back to anything else, we could create a paper street but it would go nowhere

J. Porter: I think in some ways you are unable to develop the parcel when you look at the wetlands and the waterworks property

M. Garrepy: I would argue that it is a developable parcel and we would have that discussion with the planning board, if we had to do this with a more conventional grid, it would fly in the face of preservation. I am a land planner, it's how you craft your decisions of approval, you put a note on the plan and at some point you (the boards) need to say no. The less flexibility you have in your regulations, the less creative designs you get

D. Heaton: we are trying to limit the inevitable conflict and wetland impact

M. Garrepy: understood, I will look at the buffers

A. Villeneuve: we prefer that none of your property lines extend beyond the buffers

D. Heaton: plan to keep detention ponds out of the buffer as well

Michael Rolfe: you might think about the access needed to get your ponds cleaned out

J. Porter: we will be meeting August 4, if you would like to come back the with more information on the pond

2. Paradis Cleanup –

Not followed up on/ next meeting

3. Article for Crier –

Not followed up on /next meeting

4. Carlucci –

J. Porter:

They are going before the Planning Board July 18, I think it would be appropriate if they have not shared plans with us to ask for them to get a continuance, they are supposed to have the plans done then

A. Villeneuve: I think we've been pretty clear about our concerns with the plan, can we not just review it with the planning board

J. Porter: one or two members before the planning board is okay, but it is not the same as us as a collective

A. Villeneuve: they brought the same plan back to us each time

J. Porter: yes and they had a detention pond in the middle of the sand pit

A. Villeneuve: there was no more engineering on the plan, we voted that we supported idea of what they want to do but not the plan as they presented it, they did not bother to deal with the various issues and concerns we had expressed to them

A. Villeneuve: Motion to go into close session -

D. Heaton: second

Entered closed session at 8:02 p.m.

A. Villeneuve: motion to adjourn

D. Heaton: second

Motion passes, meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.