

June 28. 1990

Dwayne Morin, Town Planner
TOWN OF WATERBORO
P. O. Box 130
Waterboro, Maine 04087

Re: Phase I Beaver Pond Estates

Dear Mr. Morin:

I am an abutter to the proposed subdivision known as Phase I, Beaver Pond Estates in Waterboro, Maine. In reviewing the plans, I wish to point out that the proposed layout, leaves a 50' strip next to my property line. If a road is proposed in the future within this 50' strip, it would not meet the regulations in Section 9.3.1.5 of the Waterboro Land Use Regulations.

According to the Minutes of the 6/13/90 meeting, Mr. Stanton has stated that this right of way is being established in case a second access is required by the Planning Board for future development of the remaining 80 acres. I am asking the Planning Board to consider the following:

1. In reference to the 50' strip of land, that a note be added to the plan that states that a street cannot be built in this strip for Town acceptance because the centerline of said road would not be at a 90 degree angle to the centerline of the existing Route 5.
2. The proposed plan shows a total of 10.6 acres being developed. The adjacent Beaubien parcel is 10.44 acres in size, so that the total acreage of the proposed plan and Beaubien lot is over 20 acres. Therefore, DEP review is required, unless the proposed subdivision is reduced in size.
3. There seems to be a very clear common scheme of development by Mr. Stanton, which exceeds 20 acres in size, and therefore, would require DEP review at this time. In addition to the acreage of the Beaubien lot and the proposed subdivision, one would also have to add the acreage for the 50' strip

located next to my property, since Mr. Stanton has stated that said strip is for a second access for development of the remaining 80 acres. In addition, the total area of exposed mineral soil from the gravel extraction operation is also part of the common scheme of development. The total of all of this acreage greatly exceeds 20 acres.

The existing gravel extraction operation probably requires a DEP permit under Site Location Law. Gravel has been hauled off this property throughout the 1970's and 1980's. If one took the total area of the exposed mineral area since 1971, it probably exceeds five acres. If it does total more than five acres, then Mr. Stanton should be required to get a permit from DEP under the Site Location Law. If Mr. Stanton has to go to DEP for a permit, I am sure that my concerns about dust from the access road will be resolved.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

William H. Hanson

WHH

cc: Robert Fay