

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

**Town of New Haven  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
REMOTE Public Meeting  
Monday, April 19, 2021  
Meeting Minutes**

**DRB Members Present via Remote:**

Charlie Roy, Kathy Barrett, Carol Charbonneau, Susan Smiley.

**ABSENT:**

Don Johnston, Paul Audy, Tom Fyles, Victor LaBerge

**Staff Present via Remote:**

Aaron Brown, Zoning Administrator & Town Administrator

Peggy Connor: Minutes

**Visitors Present via Remote:**

Tom Boise, Kim Rheaume

**Call to Order:**

DRB Chair Charlie Roy called the remote meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**I. Adjustments to Agenda:**

Aaron suggested that organization of the DRB be postponed until all members are in attendance. All those present agreed.

**II. Visitors' Business:**

None.

**III. Boundary Line Adjustment Application #2021-DRB-05-BLA Boise at 575 Town Hill Road**

Tom Boise explained that his objective in seeking a boundary line adjustment for the 13.1-acre property at 575 Town Hill Road will negate the need for an easement in allowing driveway access for the 2.1 acres that he plans to convey to his daughter. He also plans to sell the 10.1-acre lot as soon as possible.

Aaron pointed out that the new boundary lines on the 2-acre district measure 307.55' across the front, 591.03 to the south, and 117.10 at the westerly edge. Kathy Barrett noted that the 117.10 solid westerly boundary line on the sketch plan marked as "Option #2" indicates that a new lot will be created as a subdivision. She suggested that the solid line be eliminated for purposes of a boundary line adjustment, and the total acreage be noted on the map. Tom Boise pointed to the sketch plan legend indicating the total area before and after the boundary line adjustment to be 10.2 and 12.3 acres; however, Kathy explained that the total acreage should be marked on the map itself, and not just in the legend.

Kathy Barrett moved that for clarity on the Mylar map and future title searches, the hearing be continued so that an amended paper plan may be provided to the DRB for consideration at its next meeting on May 3rd.

**DISCUSSION:**

Tom Boise indicated that his map did not show a solid westerly boundary line but rather marked as "an adjoiner boundary line." Noting the letter submitted to the Town from Ron LaRose of LaRose Surveys, Aaron advised there had originally been two options considered: Option #1 connects the new boundary line to the southeasterly corner, while Option #2 shows an overlap of the southerly boundary. Following some discussion, it was concluded that the sketch plan

56 marked as "Option #2" may have been mislabeled. Tom agreed to provide the correct sketch  
57 plan to the DRB for review at its May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

58  
59 Susan Smiley seconded the motion.

60  
61 **Roll Call Vote: Yes - 4 (Smiley, Barrett, Charbonneau, Roy)**  
62 **No - 0**

63 **MOTION PASSED. Hearing continued to May 3, 2021.**  
64

65 **IV. Conditional Use Application #2021-DRB-06-CU Rheume d/b/a Lovin' Life Health**  
66 **and Wellness at 2304 Main Street for Commercial Outdoor Obstacle Course**

67 Kim Rheume explained that her family has been operating an obstacle course for 4-5 years,  
68 and now hope to create a commercial entity. The course is located behind the house in an area  
69 formerly used as pasture, and all trails fall in the land use plan that allows for sugaring or  
70 firewood removal. There will be no clearing or new trails created, and the course will be limited  
71 to the forestry land use plan, which is updated every 10 years.

72  
73 Charlie Roy asked about potential ramifications for running a business on property designated  
74 as forestry land use. Aaron indicated that although the issue is a matter for the state, it is one  
75 that the Rheumes may want to consider. Kim noted that the course should have no impact on  
76 the forest but would check with state officials. She added that some years ago, the property had  
77 been zoned in the land use as an archery range, which is likely very similar to that of an  
78 obstacle course.

79  
80 Aaron noted that the 32-acre property is currently zoned as a split lot between RA-2 and RA-10  
81 districts. Susan Smiley asked if there was anything in the description of permitted activities or  
82 uses in RA-2 and RA-10 related to what is being proposed. Aaron indicated that outdoor  
83 commercial recreation is considered a conditional use. He added that factors for determining  
84 conditional use include the potential impact on the neighborhood, parking constraints,  
85 performance standards related to decibel levels, emission of smoke, toxic gases, etc.; however,  
86 the operation as proposed does not seem to trigger any performance standards concerns. In  
87 terms of parking, Kim Rheume indicated that the driveway, a half-mile away from the road, is  
88 able to accommodate ample parking. She anticipates only 4-5 vehicles at any given time, with  
89 an average of 6-8 attendees; however, during weeks leading up to races, attendance for training  
90 may increase to 8-12. Regarding hours of operation, Kim suggested 1-2 nights per week from 5  
91 to 6 p.m., in addition to an early morning session from 6 to 7 a.m. Because the location is  
92 secluded, Kim noted there should be no impact on neighbors in terms of noise or lighting.

93  
94 Aaron suggested considering greater flexibility in summer evening hours from 4 to 8 p.m., May  
95 through September. Carol Charbonneau asked if there were any plans to install signs, perhaps  
96 one at the end of the driveway. Kim indicated that there were no plans for additional signage;  
97 possibly a small sign on the mailbox post. Aaron noted that a home occupation sign could be  
98 used, and conditional use may also carry a sign permit with it as well. He added that sandwich-  
99 board type signs probably do not require a permit. In terms of lighting, Kathy Barrett noted that if  
100 additional lights are installed, the fixtures be downshield-type to ensure neighbors are not  
101 impacted. Kim indicated that any additional lighting would be limited to around the house for  
102 parking purposes since the majority of activity would take place during daylight hours.

103  
104 Kathy Barrett moved to approve the application, subject to the following conditions: 1) hours of  
105 operation during the summer from 4 to 9 p.m. and morning hours from 6 to 8 a.m.; 2) winter  
106 hours of operation shortened from 4 to 6 p.m.; 3) any additional lighting to be down-shielded;  
107 and 4) with the assumption that there will be 8-12 additional vehicles at any one time parked on

