

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

LITCHFIELD PLANNING BOARD

July 22, 2008

Minutes approved 9/16/08

Members present:

- Steve Perry, Chairman
- Jayson Brennen, Vice Chairman
- Alison Douglas, Clerk
- Leon Barry
- Marc Ducharme
- Frank Byron, Selectmen’s Representative
- Carlos Fuertes
- Edward Almeida

Members not present:

- Mary Anne Geist

Also present:

- Joan McKibben, Administrative Assistant
- Steve Wagner, Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Circuit Rider
- Note: Lou Caron, L.C. Engineering, was not present this evening.

Agenda:

- 1. Public Hearing for comment and adoption of the 2009-2014 Capital Improvements Program by the Planning Board per NH RSA 674:5-8 and NH RSA675:7**
- 2. Granite State Paintball Tax Map 2 Lot 2, 273 Derry Road. The Board will consider an amendment to a previously approved site plan. The applicant seeks approval for part-time public use.**
- 3. Rene Theroux Tax Map 15 Lot 6, 315 Charles Bancroft Highway. The Board will continue consideration of an application to subdivide one lot into three lots.**
- 4. Andrew Prolman - Discussion with the Board regarding the following:**
 - 1. Growth Management**
 - 2. Tax Map 2 Lot 88 remainder of the 88 acres owned by Cutler & Page, LLC**
 - 3. Open space/conservation overlay district**
- 5. Any Other Business**

Chairman Perry called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Fuertes was appointed as a

1
2 voting member.

3
4 **1. Hearing Capital Improvements Program**

5
6 Mr. Perry read aloud the public notice placed in the newspapers. Mr. Wagner explained
7 that over the past year the CIP has been updated with information collected from various
8 departments in Town. Members of the Planning Board went out and met with different
9 department heads and received lists of proposed capital expenditures they would like to
10 do such as projects, new buildings, etc. The information was then incorporated into the
11 CIP. If there are no changes, it is ready for final review and adoption.

12
13 Chairman Perry opened the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment.
14 Chairman Perry closed public comment.

15
16 Mr. Barry **MOTIONED** to accept the CIP for 2009-2014 as proposed. Mrs. Douglas
17 seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0. A copy will be provided to the Board of Selectmen,
18 Town Clerk and Budget Committee.

19
20 **2. Granite State Paintball**

21
22 Mr. Jason Farrow came forward to discuss the amendment to a previous site plan
23 approved April 2006 and he is looking for approval for part-time public use. He provided
24 a copy of the Lobster Boat Plaza site plan.

25
26 The typo error regarding the hours has been corrected. He has provided an email from the
27 Fire Department; they had no issues. The Building Inspector has reviewed the proposal
28 but Mr. Farrow has not received any official correspondence. The only issue that the
29 Building Inspector had was the portable potty. The portable potty will be handicap
30 accessible and secured to the ground. He has highlighted the location of the handicap
31 portable toilet on the plan.

32
33 Mr. Farrow said there would be no signage. The staging area has not changed since the
34 last approval in 2006. He is looking to open to the public meaning private parties and not
35 just to team players. There will be no additional hours or increased traffic. They had been
36 approved for one day during the week but he will not be doing this at this time. The
37 original approved hours: 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. weekends and one week day from 2:00
38 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

39
40 Talk ensued. The most players on the field at one time would be 16, but normally he
41 keeps it at 10 with three referees and sometimes there are more referees. Occasionally,
42 there are spectators. Regarding parking, there are four parking spaces below the field,
43 regular spaces out front and they have permission to park at Chappy's Garage. Mr.
44 Ducharme suggested that the portable potty be labeled on the plan submitted.

1
2 Mr. Perry opened the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment.
3 Chairman closed public comment.

4
5 Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to accept the application for the Granite State Paintball, Tax
6 Map 2, Lot 2, 273 Derry Road. Mr. Brennen seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

7
8 Mr. Perry said all the existing conditions will still stand with the correction of the hours
9 (typo) and the requirement of the handicap portable potty. This project has been referred
10 to as the Granite State Paintball expansion project but it is no longer that project name; it
11 is just amending the operations.

12
13 Mr. Brennen **MOTIONED** to approve amending the operations of Granite State Paintball
14 per application by Jason Farrow with the following conditions: That the existing
15 conditions on the previous approved plan still stands. Also the condition that we change
16 the hours as stated (correcting typo) and there will be an addition of a handicap portable
17 potty as noted on the plan provided. Mrs. Douglas seconded. Mr. Byron suggested
18 amending the motion to state the hours of operation. Mr. Brennen **AMENDED THE**
19 **MOTION** to state that the hours of operation are from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on
20 Saturdays and Sundays, and 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. one day during the work week
21 Monday through Friday. Mr. Barry seconded the amendment. Motion carried 7-0-0.

22 Mr. Wagner mentioned to add another amendment stating rental of equipment to the
23 public. Mr. Brennen added another **AMENDMENT** to state that Granite State Paintball
24 will be opened to the public during those hours and equipment will be available for rent
25 to the public. Mr. Barry seconded the second amendment. Motion carried 7-0-0.
26 Main motion: Vote Motion carried 7-0-0.

27
28 **3. Theroux Subdivision**

29
30 Mr. Tobin Farwell (Farwell Engineering) came forward to speak for the owner, Rene
31 Theroux (present). Abutter Edward Stokes was also present. Mr. Farwell said the plans
32 were submitted July 18, 2008. Mrs. McKibben said she received the packet July 11,
33 2008.

34
35 Mr. Farwell: Per the discussion in the field from the site walk and I read the meeting
36 minutes, we have revised the plans to eliminate the detention basin and created a swale
37 that directs the water towards the east side of the property, the rear of the property, will
38 continue on into the wetlands. Those are the changes to the plans.

39
40 Mrs. McKibben provided a letter from the Planning Board's engineer Lou Caron.

41
42 Mr. Farwell said Mr. Wagner's recommendations have not been completed on the plan.
43 They are waiting State Subdivision Approval. They intend to incorporate the infiltration
44 system recommended by Lou Caron.
45

1
2 Mr. Perry: At our last meeting we had a discussion and the discussion was supposed to
3 stay within the Board as far as what we were going to do about hiring a hydrologist and
4 in that discussion the Board got a little off track and tried to move forward about saying
5 we weren't going to hire a hydrologist in which we couldn't do until this meeting because
6 this is when this case was continued to officially. It was supposed to be a discussion of
7 the Board; so, at this time anything we did at the last meeting would have to be redone to
8 be official because it would be nonbinding. With that said...the problem we had when we
9 sent out the RFP to hire a hydrologist is the few people that responded would not do the
10 study. They did not feel it was within their capability or desire to move forward to give us
11 a proposal. So, we were left high and dry. We have to withdraw having a hydrologist
12 study or continue to send out the RFP.

13
14 Chairman Perry asked members to reiterate the fact that the Board does not want the
15 study done.

16
17 Mr. Brennen: I, personally, do not think it was necessary due to the small area and a
18 hydrologic study covers a larger area revealing water moving under the ground and I do
19 not think that, per our town engineer he feels it is not necessary and therefore I do not
20 think it is necessary. I think it is more of a grading issue, more of water moving above the
21 ground than a hydrologic type of situation.

22
23 Mr. Perry said that Lou Caron was also here at the last meeting and he did not think it
24 was necessary to have it done. He felt that the water could be diverted out of the front of
25 the property where the main problem is over by the Stokes' property, try to regrade the
26 property towards the back and we were hoping the engineer (Farwell) would be able to
27 give us numbers that would state that unless we were in a flood situation, that water
28 would be percolated back into the ground prior to getting to the back of the property.
29 Were you able to do that? Mr. Farwell said he heard of no such request.

30
31 Mr. Ducharme: Lou did say that it would probably infiltrate going through the trench and
32 you could show it in a study that it would be diverted at a lower rate and volume to the
33 back of the property.

34
35 Mrs. Douglas: Okay, so we take all these probablies and tryings and things do not work
36 out, then what happens? Stokes is stuck with more water.

37
38 Mr. Farwell: It is a fact that there will not be additional water coming towards the Stokes'
39 property. The swale is guaranteed to divert water, surface water, away from his property
40 or at least a longer flow path, and I agreed. I think Lou has stated that this project will not
41 make it worse and it won't cure his problem. He has a wet basement today and he will
42 have a wet basement tomorrow.

43
44 Mr. Perry: As far as I was concerned, this new plan was supposed to solve two
45 problems.1. The ponding situation in front of the property by the Stokes' property.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Mr. Farwell: I think it was grading, wasn't it?

Mr. Perry: My hope of this new plan was to make sure we would help the situation of the ponding water by the Stokes' property which it should if it is done right it should be diverting the water back but we also need to make sure that we are not diverting water off the property.

Mr. Farwell: If I understand you correctly, there is a high point now from the old railroad tracks so all this water which flows off from Charles Bancroft in the property now heads in this direction towards Ed Stokes' property. We are proposing to raise the site and create a swale that will divert it in this direction towards the wetland which is lower. So, now the water will do this, be captured in the swale and will be diverted towards the larger wetlands out back. There still is a small amount of area, Mr. Stokes has built up a berm along his fence so that area will remain as it is today but the larger portion of the flow will now be diverted.

Talk ensued. Mr. Perry: Why didn't you put the berm further down? Mr. Farwell: I was trying to limit the amount of disturbance. I thought it would be best to try and not disturb more area, staying away from the property line and also it is a flat swale and the longer I make it, the flatter it gets.

Mr. Ducharme: And you can't put the berm on the Stokes' property.

Mr. Farwell said the berm will be located on Lot 2 and it is something that can be easily mowed having 6:1 side slopes.

Mr. Perry: I still can't understand why you wouldn't have incorporated more of the corner of that property. Mr. Farwell: I was sticking to the old plan, that is where the old plan had the leaching catch basin here so I just extended it because I thought that was the discussion in the field - eliminating it and then extending it. We have reduced the silt so much now that I truly doubt that water can pond. Before there was a significant area where the water could pond and now we have limited it down to 10% of the area that used to flow there. It is not a wetlands so water does not normally sit there. We have really cut off its supply of water that is going to be able to get there, not half but 90%.

Mr. Ducharme: Yes, I figure if you go in further into that corner, you are going to make it a ramp going towards the Stokes' property...

Mr. Perry: I do not see how that could be.

Mr. Ducharme: Well, the elevation you can't go down far enough and still get to the wetlands in the back they are out about 128 they would be flowing up hill slightly...

Mr. Farwell: So, it is a depression and it kind of acts like a detention basin. It is not going

1
2 to be able to fill and spill over; it is so flat.

3
4 Mrs. Douglas: This berm area, this lot maintains it, mows it, over time is there anything
5 in the deed that says they can't fill it in, or flatten it out? Mr. Farwell: No. I would say it
6 is a code enforcement issue if it wasn't done. If you go back to the file, that swale is
7 supposed to be there then the code enforcement officer would notify the landowner that it
8 must be corrected. This was discussed. Mr. Farwell said we could put it in the deed if
9 that is the Board's wishes. It was suggested to put a note on the plan that the swale is
10 there and must not be filled in. The swale is to be constructed before Certificate of
11 Occupancy (CO) is issued.

12
13 Talk ensued. Mr. Farwell said he did a drainage analysis that shows they were decreasing
14 the flow rate. So, there is water flowing towards the Stokes' property but at a slower flow
15 rate.

16
17 Chairman Perry opened the meeting to public comment. Mr. Levesque, Conservation
18 Commission: I see this is nothing but a bad project, period. The area is so wet it may not
19 be classified as a wetlands but all I know is that it has a lot more water standing on it,
20 many more weeks than the engineer says. The 40 years I have been going by that piece
21 of land, that area has been under water more than I can guess. The elevation is so flat if
22 you are going to approve this, I would make the foot elevation of the buildings at least
23 128 versus 127; bring it up at least another foot. I would require at least a \$10,000 bond
24 on each building for any potential water damage at least 3 years after the CO is issued
25 because I think you are going to end up with water in those basements no matter what
26 you do, for parts of the year...I think sliding this thing north a little bit 30 or 40 feet and
27 widening out that berm, that swale he is trying to create and making it wider to retain
28 more water.

29
30 Mrs. McKibben: Point of order. Mr. Levesque should be speaking as a private citizen
31 not as a conservation commission member.

32
33 Mr. Levesque said the Conservation Commission should have taken a much more pro-
34 active stance on this.

35
36 Chairman Perry closed public comment.

37
38 Mr. Farwell: Again, we did test pits in that area and not only did we go 6 inches above,
39 we went a foot and a half above the seasonal high water table, the regulation is 6 inches.

40
41 Mr. Ducharme: Isn't the current ground level to put the house on 128 so how deep is your
42 topsoil? It was said 14 inches. Test pit data was reviewed. Mr. Brennen: Thirty-two (32)
43 inches down is the shwt (seasonal high water table) which is what we discussed prior that
44 he put in some drainage structure that could potentially be partially full a good time of the
45 year and our original discussion was if all this water flows into that area, that thing is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

going to be full. That is why we went towards the swale scenario versus a drainage structure.

Mr. Perry: The bottom, the 129 line, that runs from the road to the back, is there any reason why it cannot be continued. Why can't we bring it back further?

Mr. Farwell: Right now it is ending at 128. The wetland is about that same elevation; they would just be flat level spreader and that is why it did not go on.

Mr. Farwell said the Town Engineer agrees with the engineering. The Board would like to speak more with Lou Caron to answer a few questions.

Mr. Farwell: According to Lou the plan has met the letter of intent that has been discussed in the field and at that meeting. It is very clear in Lou's letter that the swale is designed to capture the storm water from the site and route the runoff towards the existing wetlands and brook east of the property.

Talk continued. Mr. Farwell: If you are concerned that the homeowner will find water in the basement, let's add another foot to the finish floor elevation. I do not think that is unreasonable but I have already done that and now it is still not enough. First thing, there is going to be very little roof runoff. Anything that does flow is going to go in the swale and it will discharge at the end of the swale where we are showing it now but because it is so flat, there is quite a volume of water that that swale will hold but you are right whatever water flows into that is going to come out at the end of that swale.

Mr. Brennen: Do you have any estimates on where that water is going to go when it gets to the end of that swale?

Mr. Farwell: I do have an estimate. I believe it will head towards the wetlands in the rear. Exactly the route it will take, I cannot guarantee.

Mr. Brennen: Could it potentially take a U turn and go back? Mr. Farwell: No because it has gone beyond the high point. There is an existing high point for the railroad, the old railroad bed is right here where the easement is shown and that is the high point on our topo. That was the other idea and we've gotten beyond the high point of the railroad tracks. Mr. Ducharme: And the high point continues south? Mr. Farwell: We did not do a lot of survey beyond the property line. It is my belief that it continued on unless something has been done on the Stokes' property.

Mr. Perry: What was that railroad bed again, elevation? Mr. Farwell: We have two foot contours. It is 129.

Mr. Perry: So, you are saying that this swale is carrying us to the other side of that?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Mr. Farwell: That is correct. Mr. Perry: That makes me feel a little better. That actually starts to explain to me on why that berm is on the far side ends. Mr. Farwell: That does make it clear, doesn't it.

Mr. Brennen: I am not concerned about the basement elevation of the new homes. I think they are doing what we said in our regulations. Again, I do not think we need a hydrology study for this piece. I think it is more of an engineering thing, grading can take care of most of the situation. I am concerned about the swale and where that water goes outside the swale and if they can prove it does not go back towards the Stokes' property, I am satisfied. The problem is we know this land and if you go out there in some springs you can almost fish in there; it is close to knee deep; so, it is not a little amount of water. We have to know for sure where it is going and if we know if it gets over that lift and drains down somewhere, then I am satisfied and it is not impacting downstream from there.

Mr. Farwell: You have all seen it wet and you have also seen there is a dry area; it is not like it is wet continuously and that is the intent the swale goes beyond that upper dry area.

It was asked would it help if the swale was widen. Mr. Farwell: Widening the swale would not help the situation because we made it very flat so instead of having a flat bottom and then the side swales, we just have it very flat. The capacity of the swale is more than enough to handle any flow that will go to it. Mr. Perry asked how the swale compares to the detention basin they were originally going to put in as to volume. Mr. Farwell: It is a little larger than the detention basin by quite a bit, almost 50 to 75% more volume in the swale assuming because of the resistance that the flow will go up in the swale but if I assume there was three inches in the swale that would be a greater volume than that leaching catch basin.

Chairman Perry opened the meeting to public comment. Mrs. McKibben asked about putting a note on the plan that if the northern most lot is developed first, the swale would be built because the swale is on the southern most lot; will there be a note as to timing.

Mr. Farwell: The swale will be built at one time and the whole swale would have to be constructed before any CO would be issued for either Lot 1 or Lot 2.

Mr. Wagner said to carry that notation that no alteration of the swale without Town approval. There is a note on the plan regarding the lot to be grassed that states, "All finished grading shall be loamed and seeded." Talk went on as to bonding for three years. Mr. Farwell did not have that as a note to be added. He went over the recommendations from the last meeting: Proof they did not need alteration terrain permit, this was resolved with Lou Caron. No CO until drainage is in place and functional. Grassed front yard and style of house to be consult with Planning Board prior to permit.

Talk ensued as to seeding and loaming. Review of Mr. Wagner's comments: He has not incorporated Lou Caron's comments yet. The groundwater infiltration to catch the roof runoff to be added to the plan. Waiting for State Subdivision Approval. Mr. Farwell said

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

they were not intending to provide easements because they feel it would be a code enforcement issue after construction. Impact fee note to be added. Error in note numbering on sheet 1. Existing pool (Theroux) outside the wetland setback.

Mr. Farwell: Steve noticed that that 50 foot line nicks the pool. I think if you have 100 soil scientists out there, the line would vary 100 times. I am sure it is a properly permitted pool. Mr. Theroux said he has a permit for the pool.

Mr. Barry pointed out on the Reference Plan #5, a typo, where it says, “plan of land owned by” that it should be James. Mr. Farwell will have to verify the information. Talk went on about a \$10,000 bond in place for three years. This would have to be reviewed by Town Counsel. Mr. Wagner suggested instead of the bond to raise the foundations up.

Mr. Farwell: I still think it would be reasonable if you are that concerned to raise it another foot. Mr. Barry agreed. Mr. Brennen: We are already above shwt. What are we going to do, raise these things out of the ground so it looks completely out of character with the neighborhood. You already mounded enough up and the foundation footing is more than 6 inches about the shwt; 18 inches above. It could to a point where it would look strange.

Mr. Perry: It is exceeding. It is a great question that I would like to ask Lou if Lou was here.

Items to be completed:

1. Note added to plan that swale to be constructed prior to CO; no alteration of swale without Town approval
2. A 3 year bond for grass and lawn to be established
3. Question on Reference Plan #5
4. Note #3 error note numbering on Sheet 1
5. State Subdivision approval
6. Impact fee note
7. Driveway Permit to be renewed

Mr. Wagner asked when would the lot cease to be cultivated fields. Mr. Farwell: Once they start building, there will be an interim time when they are doing construction, stripping the loam and bringing in the fill then putting the top soil and once they start shaping the swale...is it your concern that they would go back to row crops? Mr. Wagner: I guess what I was thinking once we get through this harvest season as part of the approval that it ceases or at the point when the building permit is drawn?

Mr. Perry: I would say once the building permit is drawn.

Mr. Brennen Motioned that Litchfield Planning not mandate the completion of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

hydrology study on the Theroux Subdivision Tax Map 15 Lot 6. Mr. Barry seconded. Mr. Ducharme said it is a groundwater hydrology study. Mr. Brennen withdrew his motion. Mr. Barry withdrew his second.

Mr. Brennen **MOTIONED** that the Litchfield Planning Board not mandate the completion of a groundwater hydrology study on the Theroux Subdivision Tax Map 15 Lot 6. Mr. Ducharme seconded. Motion carried 7-0-0.

Mr. Perry **MOTIONED** to continue the Theroux Subdivision, Tax Map 15 Lot 6, 315 Charles Bancroft Highway, to August 19, 2008. Mrs. Douglas seconded. Mr. Farwell asked to go over the conditions: 1. Add note no alteration of swale without town Planning Board approval. No CO prior to swale being constructed. 2. Check spelling on Reference Plan #5. 3. Change note to 4 inches of loam and seed. 4. Bond for loam and grass for a 3 year period (bond amount determined by Lou Caron). 5. Lou Caron's note roof infiltrators. 6. Error in note numbering on sheet 1. 7. State Subdivision approval. 8. Impact fee note. 9. Driveway permit renewed. Motion carried 7-0-0.

Recess - The Board took a recess. Chairman Perry called meeting back to order at 9:12 p.m.

4. Andrew Prolman

a. Growth Management: Mr. Prolman said he is here in part on behalf of Cutler & Page Limited Liability, owner of property off of Page Road, 88 acres and to talk as a citizen about zoning.

The Growth ordinance was extended last year until 2010, and he feels 2010 creates a problem with the ordinance especially with the economy. This was discussed. He said the Board had said it would look at the sunset clause again for Town Meeting in 2009. He suggested the Board take a good hard look at the ordinance. He feels if it stands, it will be challenged. So, he suggested the Board modify it to allow more building permits and a better approach to require a negotiated phasing plan on projects. He went on to say that growth ordinances are not supposed to be long term. He said it is flawed by using Manchester and Nashua and further explained how it is hard to get a project built out with such an ordinance.

Mr. Prolman: The Town under the current growth management ordinance the Town sets the number of building permits you are going to allocate over a year in relation to a growth rate, a regional fair share growth rate where we compare all the neighboring towns and we look at that growth rate say it is 1%, 5% (range between 1% -5%) and we say we want to fit in that number and compare it to existing housing stock and come up with 20 permits a year. You can adjust that growth rate and say we are going to set a growth rate of 3% and no more and adjust that growth rate figure which would translate more building permits

1 allocated over the year. Another approach is to have all subdivisions over so many lots
2
3 maybe 5 or 6 or 7 lots have a phasing plan to be approved by the Planning Board within
4 these parameters...projects over 6 lots phasing over two years, 10 lots would take over 3
5 years and the applicant to proposed the phasing plan. The developer has a surety how
6 many permits he will have. Currently, I do not know if I am getting a permit. It is
7 difficult to plan.

8
9 Mr. Byron stated that phasing never worked even when Mr. Prolman was chairman. Talk
10 went on as to phasing.

11
12 **2. Tax Map 88**

13
14 Attorney Prolman, acting as attorney for his client, Cuter & Page LLC, talked about the
15 88 acres parcel he is trying to get rezoned to residential. Att. Prolman: In my opinion, it
16 was terrible zoning. This site is never going to get developed before other commercial
17 sites, for a host of reasons. It does go hand and hand with the open space discussion.
18 Talk ensued.

19
20 **3. Open Space/Conservation District**

21
22 Mr. Prolman went on to talk about an open space ordinance.

23
24 Mr. Prolman: I do have a project that has Phases III and IV approved and if there is this
25 discussion that goes down the road with respect to an open space overlay, we would pull
26 Phases III and IV off the table so we can do a much better design for the whole site. If the
27 Board is considering this, this is not something to just focus on this one lot it would be an
28 overlay district. A good way to think about it is what happens if some of the farms start
29 going, or some of these woodlands start going, and we should have some way to set aside
30 land other than acquisition and buying up property.

31
32 Mr. Barry asked why open space has never been a concept in Litchfield. Mr. Byron, a
33 former Planning Board Chairman, went on to explain the past feeling of some
34 townspeople regarding cluster/open space. There seemed to be in the past certain people
35 against open space or cluster, and the board couldn't come to an agreement on it and this
36 went on for several years. Mostly the reason was having houses closer together and other
37 issues.

38
39 Mr. Prolman: I think people tend to see the negative when they think of open space.
40 There are some real bad examples of open space, plenty in Hudson but there a plenty of
41 good examples if you do it right.

42
43 Talk ensued. Att. Prolman: If the Board is going to march down this road, I would focus
44 on a simple zoning, standard open space zoning to start.

Litchfield Planning Board

July 22, 2008

1 Mr. Barry asked about work force housing.

2

3 Mr. Prolman: I think affordable housing is key...It would be very difficult to do
4 something like that in Litchfield, because of housing density issues without sewerage.
5 The State law just went into effect with respect to workforce housing. The town may be
6 okay with that State law because it has requirements, the town was to provide for
7 workforce housing and we may be okay with a couple of manufactured homes, apartment
8 buildings...but it is really tricky to do without sewerage to me to make it work for a
9 developer, there has to be some density bonus...the key to providing work force housing
10 is high density.

11

12 **Any Other Business**

13

14 Mr. Wagner mentioned a grant program and if the Board is interested he would need a
15 letter of support.

16

17 On another matter, Mr. Barry mentioned Litchfield hosting a drug disposal day like they
18 did in Nashua. Mr. Byron pointed out that the drugs from Nashua were not brought to
19 Litchfield for disposal as was previously reported by Mr. Barry at the last meeting. Talk
20 went on as to hazardous waste disposal.

21

22 On another matter, Mrs. McKibben said she is trying to get the Economic Development
23 advertisement back on the Cable TV.

24

25

26 There being no further business, Mr. Barry **MOTIONED** to adjourn the meeting. Mrs.
27 Douglas seconded. All in favor 7-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

28

29

30 Lorraine Dogopoulos

31 Recording Secretary

32

33