

**CORNISH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 20, 2020**

The Cornish Planning Board met on Thursday, February 20, 2020, at 7pm in the Cornish Town Offices. Members present were Gail McKenzie, Acting Chair, Jon Glass and Mary Mancuso; Scott Baker, Selectman; Heidi Jaarsma, Secretary.

Chris Rollins, surveyor, and Colleen O'Neill also attended the meeting.

Gail McKenzie called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Approval of minutes: 1/16/2020

Mary Mancuso suggested an edit to the second to last paragraph. Mary Mancuso made a motion to approve the 1/16/2020 minutes as amended. Scott Baker seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

Mary Boyle, Bill Cable, Jim Schubert, and Jody Schubert – Completeness Review re: Major Subdivision, Saint Gaudens Road.

voting: Gail McKenzie, Chair, Scott Baker, Jon Glass, Heidi Jaarsma, and Mary Mancuso

Chris Rollins, Surveyor, represented the applicants, who propose to subdivide Map 8, Lot 15, 62+/- acres, into two lots of 31+/- acres, each. Currently, two primary residences occupy the single lot. The parcel will be divided in such a way that one residence will occupy each lot. A power easement runs through the property. Additionally, there is a large wetland in the southerly portion of the property. The entire property is delineated with 5-foot contours using a commercially available LIDAR database. Mr. Rollins described the history of the 1853 layout relocating Gap Road. Mr. Rollins pointed out two water rights on the property which are shown on the plan and described in the notes. Heidi Jaarsma asked Mr. Rollins to point out the existing structures in the utility easement: a privy, which is no longer in use; the corner of a shed owned by the Boyle-Cables; and a utility shed owned by the utility company. Ms. Jaarsma also asked if the names of the property owners given on the plan are as shown on the deed. Mr. Rollins responded in the affirmative.

Contours along the driveway were interpolations from LIDAR data. No improvements or changes were planned for either existing drive. The Board discussed whether or not to accept the LIDAR data for the driveway contours. Several members felt that the fact that the residences on each proposed lot were existing was unique and that a waiver of the requirement that contours be actual was warranted.

Heidi Jaarsma noted the color ink on the plan and asked if the Registry of Deeds would accept a map in color. Mr. Rollins responded that he would submit a mylar in black and white. He added that the mylar would not include the LIDAR contours shown on the plans presented to the Board. Ms. Jaarsma stated that it was important that the plan on file with the town be identical to the plan on file with the registry. She requested that paper copies submitted for signature be

identical to the mylar to be filed. Color copies for informational purposes could be included in the file. She added that the driveway contours should be shown on the copies to be signed.

The Board reviewed the preliminary waivers made on January 19, 2017, and September 20, 2018. The application checklist was reviewed.

3c. Location of all surface water on and within two hundred (200) feet of the subdivision including rivers, streams, intermittent streams, lakes, ponds, marshes, and wetlands, and location of all flood prone areas. The wetlands located in the southeast corner of the property were shown as requested at the September 20, 2018, preliminary discussion.

3d. Contours of existing grade at intervals of not more than five feet (5'). Intervals less than five feet (5') may be required depending on the character of the topography. Contour lines shall extend a minimum of one hundred feet (100') beyond the subdivision boundary. Contour lines are to be actual and not interpolations of USGS maps. Existing contours shall be shown as dashed lines and proposed contours shall be shown as solid lines. On January 19, 2017, the Board had requested that contours of the driveway or a profile of each driveway should be shown.

Ms. McKenzie asked for a sense of the Board regarding the interpolation of LIDAR contours. Board members found the LIDAR contours acceptable. Driveway contours are to be shown on the plan to be filed. The Board discussed the grade of the existing driveways.

3e. A drainage and hydrology report prepared by an engineer shall be submitted which includes the following: {i.-iv.}. The agent for the applicant requested a waiver of application requirement 3e.

4. Subdivision Road and Utility Plan. No new roads or utilities were proposed. The Board found that requirements (a), (b), (d), (f), and (g) did not apply. The existing utility poles were shown per application requirement 4(c), and the location of the existing on-site sewage disposal systems were shown per application requirement 4(d).

5. Subdivision As-Built Plans: The Board found that application requirement 5 did not apply.

6. Impact Assessment: The agent for the applicant requested a waiver of application requirement

7b2. Approval of Water Supply Systems and/or Subdivision Approval for On-Site Sewage Disposal from the N.H. Water Supply and Pollution Control Division. The agent for the applicants requested a waiver of application requirement 7b2 for Lot 15.

Heidi Jaarsma made a motion to find the application complete subject to the waivers and adjustments to the subdivision requirements listed, above. Additionally, the applicant shall submit at least (3) three paper copies for final approval which are identical to the mylar to be filed at the Sullivan County Registry of Deeds. Jon Glass seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative, 5-0.

Colleen O'Neill – Preliminary Discussion re: Site Plan Review, Lang Road.

Ms. O'Neill presented a certificate of zoning compliance allowing agritourism as part of the agricultural use of Langwood, her 400-acre tree farm. She described the types of events which fall under the definition of agritourism as defined in NH RSA 21:24-a.II(5).

The Board discussed the Site Plan Review application requirements with Ms. O'Neill. The Board made a preliminary review of the following waiver requests and adjustments.

A2. Preparation of map by a registered land surveyor, architect, landscape architect or registered professional engineer. The applicant requested a waiver of requirement A2.

A3. The boundary lines of the area included in the site, including angles or bearings of the lines, dimensions and the lot area. The applicant requested a waiver of application requirement A3. The Board suggested that the plan show the area of the property where the use occurs.

A4. The existing grades, drainage systems, structures and topographic contours at intervals not exceeding 2 feet with spot elevations where grade is less than 5 percent, otherwise not exceeding 5-foot contour intervals. The applicant requested a waiver of requirement A4.

A9. Vicinity sketch. The applicant requested a waiver of the application requirement A9. The Board requested that the zoning district be shown on the plan.

B1. The proposed grades, drainage systems, structures and topographic contours at intervals not exceeding 2 feet with spot elevations where grade is less than 5 percent, otherwise not exceeding a 5 foot contour interval. No proposed grading or drainage work is planned. The Board found that application requirement B1 did not apply.

B2. Proposed structures. The Board asked the applicant to show the proposed outhouse on the plan.

B3. Proposed roads, driveways, parking spaces, etc. The Board asked the applicant to show parking for events and for delivery vehicles related to events on the plan.

B4. Size and location of all proposed public and private utilities. The Board asked the applicant to show the potential location of an outdoor electrical outlet which is under consideration.

B6. Storm drainage plan. The applicant requested a waiver of application requirement B6, storm drainage plan.

B8. Construction drawing including but not limited to pavements, walks, steps, curbing and drainage structures. No such construction is planned. The Board found that application requirement B8 did not apply.

B9. Landscaping plan. No new landscaping is planned. The applicant requested that the plan be required to show only the existing garden.

Heidi Jaarsma made a motion to grant the waivers and adjustment to the site plan review requirements listed, above. Said motion is made on a preliminary basis and is non-binding. Mary Mancuso seconded the motion, and the vote of the Board was in the affirmative.

Respectfully submitted,
Heidi M. Jaarsma