

Homestead Development Site Walk

Purpose: To inspect the property located at 459 US Route 1, Tax Map 60 Lot 24

Tuesday, April 3, 2018 – 11:00am

Attendees

Planning Board Members: Ann Grinnell, Karen Kalmar, Dutch Dunkelberger, Ron Ledgett, Russell White, Mark Alesse, Drew Fitch

Staff: Kathy Connor, Jessa Kellogg

Applicant/Agent: Michael Brigham, Ken Wood, Nathan Amsden

Other Participants: Elizabeth Comeau, Tim McEntee

Handouts

8 ½ x 11 Site Walk Sketch

Meeting

Ms. Grinnell called the meeting to order at 11:00am.

Nathan Amsden, Attar Engineering, described the colored flags were described as depicted on the Site Walk Sketch – yellow for the commercial area, orange for the centerline of the proposed road, red for the building envelope limits and blue for the stormwater treatment ponds. Mr. Amsden led the site walk and he and Ken Woods, Attar Engineering, answered questions raised, including:

Question: Will the existing overhead power lines remain? If so, is there an easement or right of way for them?

Answer: No, they will be changed to underground utilities.

Question: How is the existing natural pond filled with water?

Answer: The site is designed for surface flow to the pond which allows for infiltration, no piped infrastructure directly into the waterbody.

Question: Is there an opportunity to add berms?

Answer: The proposed stormwater treatment ponds meet or exceed existing stormwater standards and are designed to removed phosphorus and TSS (total suspended solids) from reaching the waterbody, so berms are not needed. The treatment ponds work really well, are designed to look like landscaped areas and are attractive looking.

Discussion: The 2008 approval for the property required the conservation area from the existing natural pond to be marked with conservation tags on trees demarcating the 100-foot buffer area. The residential lot 6 has such tags, but the parcel for this proposal does not have the tags placed. The developer will need to place those.

Question: The 2008 approval showed a turning lane southbound on Route 1, but was the northbound turning lane on the proposed second entrance part of that permit approval from MDOT?

Answer: Yes, the second entrance was approved by MDOT and designed with ingress and egress at both entrances and turning lanes. The stripping on Route 1 would need to be repainted and the MDOT permit is still valid.

The meeting adjourned at 11:37am.