

MEETING SUMMARY
MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE TO
UPDATE DENNING'S LAND USE CODES
October 20, 2008 from 7:00 to 9:15 p.m. Town Hall

Attendees: David Brooks; David Gilmour, Town Comprehensive Planner; Jennifer Grimes; Jerry Huncosky; Carl Landon; Lester Milk, Katherine Parr & Kevin Smith.

The September 22, 2008 meeting summary was accepted by full group consent with one change.

The group went over the driveways discussion document distributed to the group in August. They provided detailed comments line by line.

1. Mr. Huncosky - Para 1 "providing flexibility could also mean allowing steeper driveways for short sections..." while on the next page, #8 refers to "max grade on vertical curves should be 10%". He asked if these were contradictory. It was discussed they referred to different aspect/ elements.
2. Mr. Huncosky - #13 turnarounds: just under 500 feet doesn't require a turnaround. Is this too long a run? Group felt 300 feet is more appropriate -- easier to back down.
3. Same item, Mr. Landon: do we need that large size for turnaround? Group is split on the area required. Some feel snow and terrain dictate a larger space; yet, fire trucks pull into bays, so they should be able to turn around in a space smaller than 120 feet in diameter. T or L shape turn around would be preferable. Gilmour will research acceptability of 15x50 feet with a fire chief.
4. #18: driveway length markers. Ms. Grimes -- what are these; are they used by other towns? David felt they definitely are used in other towns. He will check with fire chief for an opinion.
5. Mr. Smith #17 -- weight requirement (30 ton) seems high for culverts. Group suggests remove culvert and just leave bridges on this item. Gilmour will research weight standards for the driveway as well as culverts. Mr. Brooks didn't think rating that the capacity requirement was necessary for culverts.
6. Same item, Mr. Landon, the Town has standards for culverts where driveway meet road, so this should pertain to points beyond that. Ms. Grimes asked should the Highway Department's requirements be integrated into the zoning.
7. #16 Remove 4" of uniform granular base. Also, the Highway Superintendent should not be required to approve design & specs. Rather, refer to a designated official. Keep III which provides for alternative driveway types.
8. #6 Mr. Brooks wondered if the Planning Board needs to get involved. Why do we cap the length of driveways? There was a consensus to remove the first sentence.

9. #7 Mr. Brooks, why get fire chief involved? Remove first sentence, and say “For all driveways...”
10. #9 Bring down cleared width to 14 feet and provide for a cart path width of ten feet plus two feet more cleared on each side.
11. #15 Do we need guard rails? Should Planning Board be involved? Ms. Grimes and Misters Brooks and Smith felt it should be left up to owners. Consensus to take this item out.
12. #20 A large majority of group wants the shoulder maintenance requirements out.
13. B. At the discretion of the ‘Highway Super.’ Should be removed.

The group continued into the common driveways section:

1. B2. Discussion that some of the public expressed feelings against common driveways, including at the last public outreach meeting. One problem cited was the fallout that can occur between neighbors and challenges of financial liability for shared driveway’s upkeep. Terms of upkeep must be included in the deed. “Recorded maintenance agreements” are common now too.
2. There was discussion of differences between rights of way and common drives. It could be the nature of property rights or the characteristics of built access.
3. A2. Mr. Brooks – prefers that three lots can qualify for common driveway versus four. Makes sense in road and driveway hierarchy? The group agreed.
4. Mr. Brooks and Landon: can we cut down text under common driveways that’s just repeating driveways information?
5. The consensus is to call these “Shared” Driveways.

Mr. Gilmour requested individual to forward their thoughts on this topic before the next meeting. Next time we will try to complete review of driveway document.

Other Business:

- Mr. Landon suggested an idea of using the online forum to continue review of documents. Mr. Gilmour was concerned that private communication would be perceived as a “meeting”. Mr. Landon said it could be made viewable (but without the ability for the public to comment). Some of this group does not have computer access, others were against it.
- Comment was made that people are asking what we’ve done. It doesn’t sound like they’ve accessed the meetings summaries online. Mr. Gilmour will draft an update for posting on the web page; hopefully that can be commented and posted before the next meeting. The group discussed project schedule.
- The next two committee meetings were set, with an interim meeting scheduled in just over two weeks, on November 10 (there was already a meeting set for November 24), and a meeting tentatively set for Monday, December 15, 2008.

End of summary.