

**TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
November 30, 2021**

Members Present: Malcolm Teale, Chair; Craig Fowler
Members Virtual: Elisa Clancy; Tom Wawrzeniak; Mary Walz
Members Absent: None
Guests Virtual: None
Guests Present: Ron Rodjenski, Town Zoning Administrator; Jim Harrison; Peter Garceau, Cross Consulting Engineers; Jeff Emerson; GMATV did not videotape this meeting.

Mac called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

1. **Welcome & Public Comment** – No public comment received and no changes to the agenda.

2. **Morrisville Sand & Gravel** – 10/12/2021 (first hearing) and 11/09/2021 (first continuance) – for Application #2021-64 submitted by Morrisville Sand and Gravel, LLC. Mac opened the hearing. Peter Garceau stated that there were four historical access ways to the pit, one on McFarland, two on Garfield and one via Ferland Pit Road into Morristown to Route 15. The existing weigh station access at 480 Garfield Road would be close and the Emerson Pit access onto Garfield Road would be the main access for the proposed merger of the active Harrison/Manosh pit and now closed Sundog/Emerson pit. The Board discussed the 200-foot buffer for excavation and 300-foot buffer for processing. Peter explained there are no plans to impact the Garfield Road berm and the new plans will comply with the 200-foot and 300-foot buffers. Jeff Emerson provided photos of the berm and its highest point but did not leave them for the DRB file. Elisa noted decibel readings now versus after the large berm is removed may change. Peter noted that he is not a sound engineer, and no sound modeling has been done, however the sound readings they have taken have all been below 65 decibels. Jim Harrison mentioned that when he was taking a reading during operations recently, he was on top of the existing large berm and decibels were 52 to 57. Jeff Emerson noted that when the berm is removed and no vegetation present on the Garfield Road buffer, noise will be higher. Peter stated that with noise now below 65 decibels near the equipment, it will dissipate more with length as it approaches Garfield Road (westerly, in the direction of Jeff's future home site). Jim Harrison noted that the former Emerson Pit access from the pit floor to Garfield Road is narrow and needs to be widened for two-way traffic, but no work is needed in Garfield Road right-of-way. Mary Walz asked about the bylaw language that says extension of non-conforming uses shall not be permitted as there is prior excavation within 200-feet of property lines at this site. Craig asked why the current operation is non-conforming. Mary responded that in addition to the excavation within the 200-foot buffer there is no reclamation plan. Peter stated that future work will comply with the 2020 Bylaw requirements. Mary noted that the current local permit is #95-02 and it allowed excavation within 200-feet of property lines, the 200-foot buffer was adopted in 2016. Jim Harrison stated no work has been done within 200-feet of the property line since he has owned the pit. Mary noted that the old permits from 1995 allowed up to 75,000 cubic yards withdrawn per year and asked what the average daily trips are for that amount. Peter stated the level of activity is based on the 75,000-max. annual to be withdrawn and varies. Mary stated 40 trips per day was in the prior permits, noting operation period was April 15 to November 15. Jim stated hours were 6:30 am to 5:00 p.m. with trucks arriving after 7:00 a.m. Monday – Friday with Saturday from 7:00 a.m. to noon. Mary noted year-round use would be new. Jim Harrison stated that the Ferland Pit Road access would not be used, except as an emergency access. Elisa noted that the maximum is 75,000 cubic yards but asked if the recent usage was less, so going back to the maximum would be an increased impact on the neighborhood. Peter noted the daily truck traffic is proposed to be capped at 40 trips per day. Mary stated that if the 75,000 cubic yards could be lowered it would reduce the impact on the neighborhood. Motion by Craig to close the hearing and move into deliberations. Seconded by Tom. Voting: 5 in favor, 0 against, motion passed.

3. **Business** – None.

4. **Adjourn:** Motion by Elisa to adjourn, seconded by Mary, meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Ron Rodjenski