

PEMBROKE CONSERVATION COMMISSION MEETING
Approved Minutes of MAY 21, 2007

1. Attendance

Present: Jeff Abbe (Alternate), Lea Anne Atwell, David Baril (Alternate), Kevin Gagne, Ammy Heiser, Stetson Heiser, Todd Terrien (Planning Board Representative), and Brian Tufts (BOS Representative) Ayn Whytemare

Not present: Carol Bertsimas

2. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Ammy Heiser at 7:04 pm. David will vote on Carol's behalf.

3. May 7, 2007 Minutes Review and Approval

There were several changes to the minute from the previous meeting. Roland Lemoine's address was incorrect. It should be noted in the minutes when Todd stepped back in to the meeting after recusing himself during the discussion of the North Pembroke Road proposal. Because there were two Lauras present at the meeting, the minutes should specify which Laura was speaking.

Stetson made a motion to adopt the minutes as amended. Todd seconded. All in favor.

4. Third Range Road Class VI to Class V Reclassification Request

There is a proposed subdivision of Lot 110, Map 563, which would require upgrading a portion of Third Range Road from a Class VI to a Class V road to provide access to the property. The applicant has submitted a proposal for upgrading the road, and the CC needs to comment on the proposed changes to the road. Todd recused himself.

Improvements would be made up to entrance of the propose subdivision, not along the entire length of the parcel. By law, the applicant would be required to upgrade the road along the entire portion of the parcel, and discussion took place as to whether they would need a variance for the upgrade as proposed. The proposed subdivision is a cluster subdivision with open space land on outside of and in middle of the cul-de-sac. The proposal is for 14, ½ acre lots with two open space lots. One of the proposed open space lots would be located in the middle of the cul-de-sac, which probably would not be very beneficial for conservation purposes.

Upgrading of the road would require curbs and sidewalks. The town currently has a conservation property, the Bragfield property, that is located across Third Range Road and adjacent to the proposed upgrade to the road. Discussion took place about the fact that the Town's Master Plan specifies that the corridors along the range roads would be valuable areas to protect for conservation. Upgrading of the road would eliminate the potential connectivity of parcels along Third Range Road, because a large paved area would be placed through this area. For example, upgrading the road would eliminate any connectivity for wildlife from the Bragfield property to any potential conservation property that would be gained as part of the open space subdivision. Discussion took place about opening up Third Range Road for

development, and this proposed development would open up a tremendous area of land for subdivisions and whether this was something the town wanted to do.

We discussed potential damage from the road upgrade, and the fact that the improvements would essentially stop right in front of the Bragfield property. The additional pavement from both the subdivision and the road upgrade would generate more runoff. The town's engineer would review the drainage plans to ensure that they would be adequate to handle the additional runoff. We discussed the fact that there would be a 6% slope from the upgrade portion of the road towards the non-upgrade portion, and the fact that there are additional wetlands further down Third Range Road past the location of the proposed upgrade. Discussion also took place about whether we had sufficient information regarding the upgrade to make any recommended changes or any comments.

The CC outlined its concerns regarding the proposal, which should be communicated to the BOS in writing:

- 1) The CC feels that it does not have sufficient information at this time to fully assess changes in the drainage from the upgrade, potential negative impacts to wetlands, and potential negative impacts to the Bragfield property. The CC has not been able to do a site walk to visually assess the area. The CC does not have information about where utilities would be located. In addition, the maps provided do not have sufficient information as to where wetlands are located and how the drainage would be impacted.
- 2) The CC has concerns that if the upgrades would extend along length of property, the Bragfield property would be negatively impacted. The CC is also concerned about the proposed parking spaces indicated on the plans, which look like they are in the middle of the road, and may negatively impact the Bragfield property.
- 3) The CC is concerned that the proposed upgrade may be unnecessarily impacting existing conservation land.
- 4) It is the CC's opinion that the proposed upgrade would severely limit the potential connectivity of conservation lands in the area and would actually limit the usefulness of current conservation land (Bragfield) in that it could not be linked to other parcels for creation of an open space corridor.
- 5) The CC is concerned about the precedent that this upgrade would set, in that land would be opened for development that the Master Plan indicates should be reserved for an open space corridor.

ACTION ITEM: Lea Anne will email this list to Ammy, who will send letter conveying the CC's opinions to the BOS.

Todd rejoined the meeting.

5. Conservation Land

a. Review and Revise Public Use Policy for Town-Managed Conservation Lands

Discussions took place about the revisions based on the last public hearing. The language on page 2, prohibited uses – section # 3 should be changed. Ammy made note of the changes and

will give them to Laura Scott for inclusion in the revised draft. We thought that uses should be broken out into three categories with headings: generally allowed uses and activities, possible uses, and prohibited uses. We should also add sentence that the CC reserves right to make changes to allowed, possible, and prohibited uses on any parcel after a public hearing on that parcel. We will reconsider this at the June 11th meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Send to Town Counsel for review.

b. Ames Brook Easement – review changes per CC and PB input

The changes from the previous draft are good, but the applicant may want to make sure they are consistent with our new proposed changes to the draft policy (see above). Horseback riding went from allowed to possible uses. Hunting was not moved up to allowed uses; was this an oversight or did the applicant not want to make that change? We can pass our most current suggestions to him, but the policy may go through another revision. The public hearing for the revised draft use policy is scheduled for June 11th meeting.

c. White Sands Site Visit Follow-Up Discussion

We have draft copy of minutes. Where are we now? At the walk, we recommended gating the road and talked about where to put gate and boulders. At this point in time, the CC needs to make a decision and make a recommendation to the BOS. Discussion took place about the fact that putting up the gate will have implications that we will not be able to predict. The best course of action would be to put up the gate, then revisit the mater in another year and assess what changes need to be made. Ayn suggested putting something in the paper to communicate the fact that a gate will be going up to restrict vehicle access, and that the parcel is not being closed.

The following recommendations should be communicated to the BOS, both in writing and at the BOS meeting on May 30th at 6:30 pm. The CC is in favor of the gate, as proposed on the site walk. We are in favor of adding boulders to block off potential ATV trails and post signs for no parking. We would like initial implementation of these activities and would like to revisit this issue in another year to evaluate the effectiveness of blocking off the parcel to vehicle traffic. Initially, we would like the police to make more visits once the gate is in place.

Discussion took place about posting signs “Parking for Pembroke Residents Only – All others will be towed;” “Non-motorized Vehicles;” “Carry-In/Carry-Out;” etc. The CC can pay for the signs from our budget. It would probably be worth looking into the price for an anti-graffiti coating for the signs.

ACTION ITEM: Talk to Jocelyn to see if she would write a blurb in the paper regarding the road closures. Kevin will check on sign prices. Ammy will write a letter to the BOS and will attend the meeting.

d. Potential Conservation Easement Site Visit Follow-Up Discussion

A potential conservation easement on a parcel of land on Buck Street, which is owned by Ammy and Stetson Heiser was discussed. Ammy and Stetson recused themselves as CC members. They are thinking to propose 3 lots close to the roads, then put rest in conservation.

Ayn asked about a long-term agricultural management plan. They should clarify if it includes sludge application. The license for agricultural uses could be held by the Town, then lease out haying rights. The CC felt that this issues warranted more discussion.

ACTION ITEM: Add this item to our agenda for our working meeting.

Ayn left at 9:05 pm. Ammy and Stetson rejoined the meeting as CC members.

e. Monitoring Visit Schedule

- i. White Sands** – Ammy and Stetson are doing the monitoring and also follow up on Brenda Lafratta’s infractions. They will do the monitoring on June 3rd at the same time as the clean-up.
- ii. Whittemore** – We should do this together as a commission – schedule this at the June 11th meeting.
- iii. AGNE Easement** – Tentatively plan for June 25th before the meeting. Stetson will contact the for access.

We discussed the need to actively identify parcels for conservation! **ACTION ITEM – Work Session at second June meeting – existing or potential conservation properties only – no other items should be on the agenda except the AGNE monitoring.**

6. Adjournment

Ammy made a motion adjourn, which was seconded by Stetson. All in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Lea Anne Atwell, CC Secretary