

MINUTES

Cambridge Development Review Board

12/8/14

Board Members present: Kathy Quimby Johnson, Eli Moore, Jeff Coslett, and Jon Wood, Andy Hoak, Dave Fay

Public: Mark Roberts (Admin Officer), Laird and Nancy MacDowell (applicants)

Kathy opened the meeting by swearing in all interested persons.

The Admin officer read the warning and distributed a Sketch Plan map of the project prepared by Outback Design, the application and the warning.

Kathy asked if there had been any ex parte communications – there were no ex parte communications.

Jonathan Wood described some past contractual relationships with neighboring landowners and the applicants at one point. The applicants and the Board stated this posed no conflict of interest.

Laird MacDowell then described the project: The intent is to convey a 49 acre woodlot to a neighboring landowner. They intend to keep 20 acres with a house and mobile home on the property and will have to be taken out of the current use program. The 49 acres will remain in current use if the new owners apply for a land use transfer of ownership.

Laird presented a small copy of a recent survey of the project that included a depiction of a road from lot 1 to lot 2 that was not on the sketch plan drawn by Outback Design.

Woody presented an Agency of Natural Resources map showing wetlands in the general area of the project. The wetland appears to cover the area that is also part of the frontage for lot 2. Woody explained that in his opinion the regulations require frontage to be capable of being developed as an access should the need ever arise. The ANR wetland map indicates that may not be possible.

Discussion followed on whether or not access had to be a part of frontage. It was agreed that a lot does not have to be access at the point of frontage but that the frontage requirement is to assure access to lots regardless of ROW's granted by adjoining landowners.

Andy asked if the applicants would consider moving a lot line to the west to encompass the logging road access on Lot 1. Laird stated that would then require him to establish a replacement area for the septic on lot 1.

Applicants were asked if Agricultural soil maps had been consulted. Laird presented an ANR map showing most of lot 2 designated as prime ag.

Laird stated that he felt the discussion had brought him to 3 choices: 1, Grant a ROW to the logging road so that Lot 2 will have access. 2 Ask for a conservation easement by declaring the land for

conservation purposes only or give up some more land to lot 2 to encompass the access and improve the frontage for Lot 2.

Discussion ended and the applicants were dismissed.

Deliberative Session:

Discussion concerning the wetlands in the frontage 'corridor'. Other discussion noted that if lot 2 had been set aside for conservation purposes the regulations may allow for variances on the access and frontage rules.

A motion was made by Eli and seconded by Jeff to deny sketch plan approval based on the evidence presented at the hearing which indicated that Lot 2 has no access as drawn on both the survey and the sketch plan , the frontage for Lot 2 may not be suitable for development as an access and the plat does not reflect a 'conservation purpose only'. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Roberts

Cambridge Administrative Officer