

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday April 6, 2016**

In attendance: A. Rosenblatt- Chair, M. Dell Orfano, C. Harris, S. Wilkins, G. Leedy, P. Lyon, R. Hart and S. Keach as administrative staff.

A. Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:30pm

**NEW BUSINESS**

**CASE #: PZ7190-030816 – Steven Wolfe, Trustee (Owner) – 369 Boston Post Road, PIN #s: 004-032-000, 004-032-001, 004-033-000 and 004-077-000 – Conceptual discussion of a lot line adjustment between four existing residential lots**

The applicant owns three contiguous existing lots of record located off Merrimack Road & Boston Post Road. Lot 4-32-1 fronts on Boston Post Road and Lot 4-32 has frontage on Boston Post Road and Merrimack Road. Lot 4-33 is a rear lot with no frontage. An additional rear lot, Lot 4-77, is under the same ownership but is not part of this proposed application.

There is an existing residence on Lot 4-32 that is served by an on-site well. The rear lot is located entirely within the floodplain and a significant portion of the frontage lots is encumbered by floodplain and wetlands. The applicant proposes a consolidation, subdivision and lot line adjustment to reduce the non-conformity of the three existing lots, resulting in three lots, each with frontage on Merrimack or Boston Post Road.

Staff recommends that the existing house lot retain the map and parcel number 004-032-000 for consistency with the Assessing Department's lot numbering standards.

Mike Hammer from Meridian represented the owner and presented the plan.

Mr. Wolfe owns several lots along Boston Post Rd and is trying to determine if they can become building lots. Originally the design was for four lots. Currently, lot 4-32 is the only conforming lot in terms of uplands. The result of the reconfiguration would give the dwelling lot adequate uplands and the other two lots minimum required frontage and more uplands- though not the required amount.

He asked the board members for their thoughts and concerns on the proposal before moving forward.

A. Rosenblatt stated that this is a conceptual discussion and nothing that is said by any party is binding in any way. Anything a board member says now may not be what they say if /when the project comes before the board for review.

R. Hart asked about the upland and if there is enough room for a septic system on lot 4-33. Yes, there is.

G. Leedy asked what the minimum requirement is for net tract area there per lot. It is two acres. He further stated that the consolidated tract has just over three acres of total buildable land and they're asking for three lots on it. Lot 4-33 is extremely difficult to build on especially if/when the homeowner wants to add or make changes later.

S. Wilkins stated that if there were three buildable lots and they were asking to realign them, that would be ok. But to have three lots with two of them unusable under the current zoning and try and create three viable building lots, that's a huge stretch.

48 C. Harris agreed with the opinions the board members had already stated.

49  
50 M. Dell Orfano asked for some clarification on the lot line description of lot 4-77. Mr. Hammer stated  
51 that the deeds for lots 4-33 and 4-77 date back to the mid-1800s and the descriptions are exceptionally  
52 poor. The description for lot 4-33 does include some drainage ditches. Lot 4-77 only includes distances  
53 by rods and adjoiners and the descriptions are poor. There is also a big gap between the description of  
54 that parcel and the next parcel over. He advised his client that it is not beneficial to work with that lot  
55 since it is not developable land anyway. He also stated that lot is within the floodplain. M. Dell Orfano  
56 stated he agrees with Gordon and he has a hard time with this plan for creating buildable lots.

57  
58 A. Rosenblatt stated based on the information presented he wouldn't be supportive of the plan. He  
59 wants to see two acres of upland per lot to be in favor of it.

60  
61 S. Wilkins suggested that the client may want to work on a plan for two lots rather than three.

62  
63 Mr. Hammer mentioned the tiny lot doesn't meet setbacks or land area but it is preexisting. If it was  
64 sold separately, a future owner could have a good case at the ZBA. He stipulated however that this  
65 person would be living essentially in a tower.

66  
67 G. Leedy said he would rather see two lots than three. This is a large area of land, but unfortunately  
68 there is a lot of floodplain and wetland. There is upland which will give the appearance of a normal lot.  
69 Lots that only have the minimum requirements lead to trouble later when there are owners that aren't  
70 familiar with the regulations that want to make changes or additions.

71  
72 OTHER BUSINESS

73 **Minutes: March 2, 2016**

74  
75 **G. Leedy moved and C. Harris seconded to approve the minutes of March 2<sup>nd</sup> as submitted.**

76 **Vote: 4 in favor with 3 abstaining (M. Dell Orfano, G. Leedy, Peter Lyon)**

77  
78 **C. Harris moved and S. Wilkins seconded to adjourn at 7:50pm. All in favor.**

79  
80 Respectfully submitted,  
81 Jessica Marchant