

Shrewsbury Development Review Board
Hearings
11/30/22

6:30 Aleshire Subdivision.

Present were: For the DRB; Mark Youngstrom, Alan Shelvey, and Bruce Bullock.

7pm Valentin Subdivision.

Present were: For the DRB; Alan Shelvey, Mark Youngstrom, Bruce Bullock. Chris Corsones, representing the Valentin's. Emily Fredette and Michael Geary are participants in the mediation process that brought about the subdivision application. Adjoining neighbors Conrad Carruth and Jeff Majka.

Mark introduced all the participants.

Atty Corsones explained the application. Merge 2 lots, 2acres and 2.4acres with 4.4 acres total. Geary & Fredette will have the 1.2acre and 2.8acre parcels, totaling 4.0acres.

Mr. Youngstrom allowed questions.

- There was a question on which lots were actually "deemed" merged.
- Ms Raymond suggested that the 2 parcels totaling 4acres would be the ones that were deemed merged. As that was the minimum needed to conform, but possibly both the 1.2acre and 2.0 acre parcels would be deemed merged with the Fredette/Geary MH parcel as the Valentin was in separate ownership when the merger language was approved. She will report back to the DRB after researching the dates of transfers.
- There was a question from Ms Fredette to Atty Corsones about being able to have a right-of-first-refusal on the 2.4acre parcel included in the final agreement. Atty Corsones was unsure that was possible without renegotiating the entire agreement.
- Ms Raymond and Mr. Youngstrom replied that would require a subdivision at that time, but under current regulations it would not be allowed as it would leave a non-conforming parcel containing the Valentin house.
- Mr. Carruth questioned the ownership of the various parcels and how they are being divided and described his recollection of land ownership of the parcels being discussed.
- Atty Corsones explained the legal situation and how the application came to be- a prolonged mediation process between the Valentin's and the Fredette/Geary family.
- Mr. Majka questioned the choice of which parcels were joined to which.
- Mr. Youngstrom stated that the question of which went with which is not a question for the DRB. They have no authority to reconfigure an application.
- Mr. Shelvey questioned whether the previous subdivisions were required to be permitted.
- Ms Raymond stated that while Shrewsbury has had a Subdivision Regulations since 1972(?), that a process was required only for multi-lot divisions.
- Ms Raymond will research the timing of the subdivisions and whether they needed or had a subdivision process at the time. She will report back to the DRB.

- Atty Corsones stressed that this application is what was decided in a lengthy, expensive mediation process.
- Ms Fredette stated that all they agreed to was that this application could be brought to the board.
- Mr. Youngstrom explained the ability of the participants to appeal to the Environmental Court.
- Ms Fredette brought up a concern about a replacement site for a new leach field and where the well is.
- Mr. Youngstrom questioned Atty Corsones on whether a right-to-repair their water and wastewater systems would be included in the deed.
- Atty Corsones agreed that should be covered. It will complicate things a bit, but he said that will be protected.
- Mr. Geary said that there was electric service in the barn from the Geary's home.
- Mr. Corsones stated that will be covered, too.
- Mr. Carruth questioned why the subdivision lines are not moved by the DRB?
- Mark explained that the current application is what they can decide upon.

Submitted by Adrienne Raymond, DRB Clerk