Planning Board 1 August 30, 2021 2 Site Walk 3 4 6:30pm 5 6 Members present: Chip Current, Chris Smith, Roger Whitehouse, 7 8 Others present: James Seaver, John Jalbert, Tim Lavelle, Robert Loree, Rick Atkins, Holly Bright, Gail Turilli 9 10 11 **Stage Coach Estates Subdivision, Map and Lot 1-19-B:** 12 Chip stated this is a requested site walk by the Planning Board for a re-submitted subdivision 13 application. 14 15 16 The "finger" shown on the plan, down to Main Street ROW will have an easement at the top for 17 lots 19-3 and 19-4. Tim Lavelle stated that the drainage structure has been enlarged at the culde-sac shown on sheet 10. All lot lines will remain the same. There is currently fencing along 18 the abutting property line (1-20-B). The grade will pitch away from the road, 2% vertical curve 19 20 to 6% and back to original grade at station 150. Trees will be planted on both sides of the road. The site has been surveyed and Mr. Lavelle agreed with the survey stakes that are in place. 21 22 23 The abutter's present have a concern with water running off the corner of their property in the spring. West side drainage structure runs along the road. A culvert is proposed uphill on the 24 wetlands at station 375/380. The road will be hugging the tree line. Station 100 will have 4ft of 25 26 fill and a grass line swale with rip rap is proposed at the end of the road. 27 28 29 Notes from the site walk: 30 31 1. James Seaver would like to discuss street trees 32 33 2. Mr. Lavelle asked to be put on the agenda for Conservation's meeting on Thursday 34 35 Barry Hantman was unavailable but did do a site walk on his own on 8/28/21 and his notes are as follows: 36 37 1. Difficulty seeing boundary lines, lot lines, road center, etc. due to site not staked out 38 39 normally. 2. Consider an additional sign on Sandown Rd heading east alerting drivers to the 40 intersection with Emily Lane. Road Agent should look at this due to the ability to see up 41 42 over the rise where Emily Lane meets Sandown Rd. 3. A culvert will be needed under Emily Lane if one is not shown on the plan 43 4. The road being close to the abutting property line is not perceived as an issue. The 44 45 distance from the proposed road to the nearest house is more than adequate. The house

on the abutting lot is significantly higher in elevation than the proposed road so vehicle

46

47	lights, etc. should not be an issue. Any vegetative buffer or fence would be at a much
48	lower level that the abutting home and would therefore provide little value in terms of
49	visual or audio mitigation.
50	
51	
52	
53	Respectfully,
54	
55	Gail Turilli