

Project Review Committee Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2016
CONFIDENTIAL – DO NOT COPY

Committee Members Present: Kevin Newby, Paul Rantalo, Leo Keeler

Board Members Present: Charlene Murphy, Charlotte Mizzi

Landowners Present: Jerry Ladewig, Debbie Blais, Timothy Murphy, Claudette Dirkers, Joe Tosclair, Kathleen Rakela.

Meeting Called to Order: 7:05

First Topic: Project Review Application Instructions:

It was requested that before the revised Project Review Instructions are sent to the Board for review and that they be reformatted into a “web ready” style so they are easier to read and understand. The Board will review the revised instructions at the May 16 Board meeting. After Board approval the instructions are sent to landowners for the 30 day review.

A Landowner raised a question on the requirement that Landowners stake out the foot print of the project before applying for a review. Landowners sometimes rely upon the contractor for staking the project and identifying boundaries and meeting set back requirements.

The Committee identified the need to have the project and nearest boundaries identified on the drawings submitted and staked on the ground before site inspection can be done.

Either the Landowner or Contractor can do the actual staking for Project Inspection.

A Landowner requested that the statement “try to make a good drawing” be changed to “provide a good drawing,” which was accepted and noted to be changed in the instructions.

The need to have DEQ approvals before beginning the GLA review process was brought to the Committee’s attention by Charlotte. **Charlotte also recommended that the landowner have the septic permit and all necessary permits, but not the electrical permit or the indoor plumbing permit, prior to the application being considered by the board.**

The Committee and Landowners discussed past complications from not having DEQ approved plats and the Committee approved having the DEQ approvals, when necessary, as part of the application package landowners submit.

The need for adjoining or potentially impacted neighbors being informed of a project was voiced by Kevin.

Most Landowners and Committee members agreed that Project Application data, without personal information, should be posted on the web.

It was agreed that adjoining landowners should receive a phone call to notify them the application is on the web, inform them of the date the Project Review Committee meeting to discuss the application and invite them to the meeting.

The ability to find phone numbers and who makes the calls identified that the Fire Dept. has phone numbers of all Landowners, and the Project Review Committee was the best group to make the calls.

Paul Rantalo offered to research a list of Landowner phone numbers from the Fire Department that the Committee could use.

It was recommended that there be a check off box on the Project Application to indicate neighbors had been informed.

Problems from simply accepting the check off box were discussed and no resolution agreed upon.

Second Topic: Application by Kathleen Rakela for Driveway Accessing SG 51

NOTE: Questions and concerns about the number and size of the lots in the minor subdivision of Lot 51 as advertised for sale were raised. The Committee agreed the questions of the subdivision of Lot 51 and related assessments for subdivided lots were a Board issue not a Project Review issue.

The 2006 preliminary approval given by GLA, County Commissioner signature on the Subdivision drawing in 2012, Land Surveyor signature in 2008 being before County approval, Landowner and County conflicts preventing timely processing and Master Plan implementation in 2007 caused questions from Landowners that were beyond the scope of location of a driveway in an legal easement across Lot 49.

Kathleen informed the Committee that the DEQ approved the Water and Sanitation for the Parcel 51 minor subdivision on 5- 21- 07 She is waiting for copies of these records from the county and will forward them to the Board when she receives them.

Landowners and the Committee discussed the general approvals given by DEQ under the lawsuit settlement agreement and process for additional approvals as lots are subdivided.

All Committee members had met on site with Landowners Ms. Rakela, owner of Lot 51 and Mr. Trosclair, owner of Lot 49, and were familiar with the issues of the driveway.

Concerns included grade being near, but under, the GLA maximum permitted by the GLA Road Driveway Standards, and water flow management.

Kevin presented information from a meeting with both Landowners and engineer William Smith about the driveway location and design.

The recommended location for the driveway is along the south and east side of the easement crossing Lot 49, with three culverts, 12 inches in diameter, 20 feet long placed at strategic points.

Due to steepness of the driveway, the engineer recommended inward sloping with drainage ditches, 3 culverts and rocks used to disperse the flowing water energy and prevention of impacts to Lot 49.

Ms. Rakela asked to discuss possibility of only constructing the driveway entrance/junction with Leo Drive to inform possible purchasers of the existence of the easement and GLA's approval of the driveway.

Concern was expressed that the driveway may not be completed in the 18 months required by the Board.

The potential problems from erosion caused by only partial construction added to present concerns.

Options of increasing visibility of the staking of the driveway were discussed with no decisions being made.

Ms. Rakela asked what would be required for GLA to approve her application.

Agreement was reached between the Committee and Ms. Rakela and Mr. Trosclair that Ms. Rakela would work with an engineer to develop specific driveway construction instructions/directions and drawings, along with increased staking of the driveway, and present that information for further review.

Action item for Kevin; Get the Project Reviews on the web site. He is to visit with Dan and Mark about it.

Meeting Adjourned 8:45 PM