

TAMWORTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Tamworth, New Hampshire 03886

21 Sep 07

Tamworth Planning Board
Tamworth, NH

RE: SUP Application for CMI (Club Motor Sports)
Rte 25 Tamworth, NH (Amended Plans)

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board:

On 19 September 2007 the Tamworth Conservation Commission (TCC or Commission) held a special meeting to review the latest plan amendment submitted by CMI (applicant) to prepare for and respond at your public hearing on 26 September, 2007. The revised plans reviewed were dated Sept. 5, 2007, and the accompanying letter reviewed was dated Sept. 7, 2007.

The revised proposal was reviewed in light of our January 24th letter to you (reviewing the applicant's original E1A application), where this Commission raised three concerns.

Referring to our three concerns in the January 24th letter, we respond below:

This planning board made moot our first concern as to application "completeness". You did re-evaluate and did confirm your earlier decision that the application was, in fact, "complete."

Our second concern, being the minimization of impacts, the applicant has responded well. But the question remains: minimization to what ? In our Jan 24th letter, we gave examples as to how the original proposal could be minimized. Those examples were done hypothetically – while keeping in mind that the applicant wanted access to four different colored upland areas. They requested "guidance" as to how to minimize, and in a good faith effort to provide "guidance" we discussed methods of minimization which were then reported to you in the Jan 24th letter.

As part of the applicant's response to our second concern they re-engineered and eliminated the need for a SUP at impact area 13. This is a positive revision but does not negate the need for buffer waiver (see WCO Section F2 & J1). The revised application is not amended to request this waiver.

We do commend the applicant for demonstrating further minimization beyond our earlier recommendations within this revised proposal.

However, in the Commission's view, the applicant continues to fail to address our third concern – that being the proposed use, or the reason why the applicant needs an SUP. Statements have been made to “explore” commercial opportunities, but this is not a specific enough reason or a specific enough use to grant a SUP. Clearly, the applicant can move some testing equipment on and off site without requiring an SUP.

Statements have also been made that while exploring the other commercial opportunities, a motorsports country club remains their most favorable alternative. But the application gives no details as to the scope or size of a motorsports country club. Will that use or any other proposed use require additional SUP's or buffer waivers? If so, all should be reviewed and permitted as a single package.

Note that on page 2 of the SUP application, there includes a section where a description of “the proposed use(s) of the property and the existing and proposed improvements” is necessary. In this section the applicant refers to an “Attachment A”, however that attachment merely mentions the proposed use as “... exploring the development options of the property...”.

It is the experience of the TCC that granting a SUP application or a buffer waiver requires a specific use, reason, or purpose.

In addition, the entirety of a project - each and every required SUP or buffer waiver - should be reviewed as a single application. Not piece-meal as is apparently proposed. The same is true for applying with the NH DES for a dredge/fill permit. The general statement to “explore opportunities” is not a specific enough reason for a SUP, for a buffer waiver, for a NH DES application, or for the need to destroy wetlands and their buffers.

In summary, the TCC recommends denial of this application until the applicant proposes the specific use or upland improvement that the SUP will serve. And, that the applicant submit their development plans as a single package where each and every required SUP or buffer waiver is addressed.

We attach 1/ copies of our (draft) meeting minutes of September 19, and 2/ a copy of our January 24/th letter for your reference. We also request this letter become a part of the public record and request an opportunity speak at your September 26 public hearing. Thank you for this opportunity to respond to you regarding this application and for allowing us to fulfill our responsibilities of the WCO Section E-1.

Sincerely,
TAMWORTH CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Bryan D. Berlind, Chair

