

Amanda, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Board,

Given that entering the Public Hearing isn't doable for many of us, I've written down a few questions and thoughts – somewhat a composite of thoughts that could have been addressed in an actual Public Hearing, by my husband, myself, our three sons, all of whom have separate parcels of land impacted by this, as well as possibly other members of the community who are also limited by this not-really-Public Hearing. This puts us at a disadvantage, is probably longer than warranted, and because there's no allowance for questions, probably covers unnecessary territory. Also, I was unable to access the Packets so am having to go off from viewing the previous meeting from the best I could hear and remember.

1. What effect will this have on those who may already have 3 dwelling units on one parcel as was allowed, and one driveway named for 911? (I understand this was changed to 2 dwelling units off a driveway so hopefully this was considered back then – but...) Parents may age or pass away, the plan always being to divide the property among children or sell one if necessary to keep the rest. Is the answer, once again, "Tough luck." I would ask that rather than cutting down to one, you recommend going back to the original three.
2. Let's say old Mr. and Mrs. Smith owns land as above and, besides their house which is in a good distance, they want a small rental to help with taxes and other reasons. In a little further is one son who now has the responsibility for helping with his parents' as well as maintaining their rental – plowing, sanding etc.

**Three long narrow driveways vs. well-maintained, safely passable width, branching to each house with ample turnaround**

- a. Ingress and egress safety – one at a time, site distance
- b. 911 safety – choosing wrongly from 3 in a row and having to go back to main road – turnaround time vs. one driveway going to three dooryards with ample turnaround
- c. Cost – construction, maintenance, utilities - one to construct, one to plow, one to sand, one to access all - 3 houses

Comprehensive Plan

Affordable – older residents – allowing to stay in home

Affordable – keep young people here

Rural feel – unique scenic vistas

Interference with hayfields, possible wetland, wooded wildlife areas

3. Unintended consequences of forced private road vs. private driveway.

The Smiths (above) have owned their farmland for 40 some years; maybe they can't do the driveways as above (cost, safety, distance required between, site distance, topography etc. maintenance and easy access to all three units. There's no choice but to build a road.

It isn't just the cost of the road but the endless inspections and fees, not to mention that once there's any Town involvement, it's the end of privacy, "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness", unique lifestyle and future plans that they've worked for. But, "an overwhelming majority" who didn't work or pay, now want what the Smiths have anyway; so The Smiths are outvoted even though, in so many ways, it goes against the off-quoted Comprehensive Plan. Of course while their enjoyment goes down, their taxes go up because they have so much road frontage.

So, they get their road inspected, built, inspected again, approved, they have their 3-way maintenance agreement with themselves.

Now, what about no more Private Roads entering a Public Road? Not allowed, not allowed before but allowed now, allowed now but not for long – what's the rule there? They better hurry up and get the road in even allowed, sell off what they can and go somewhere else where they really do appreciate the uniqueness created by our :”work for what you get”, “live and let live” attitude.

If they do end up having to build a Public Road, is the rest of the Town going to be excited about maintaining this Public road that basically only goes to numerous Smith properties? (Not good for staying like they want, but at least a good investment for selling if they must.)

4. I believe this is presented as only having to do with backlots, but is this accurate? Ultimately, it will depend upon final wording, where, and how it ends up in the Ordinance. Will it come under “BACKLOTS” or will it come under “DRIVEWAYS”, “ROADS”, or “PRIVATE ROADS”? In other words, is this to be taken at face value (as for backlots only) or will it find its way into driveways period? It should be addressed that the wording honestly and clearly answer this.

I'm not asking that you read this, in its entirety, for the “Public”, but that you please address these issues, perhaps as paraphrasing the points. Again, I mention that these are a combination of some issues that would have been addressed by some 5 or more speakers.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bill and Lynda McDonald