

FINAL

**CLASS VI ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES  
Remote via Microsoft Teams  
LebanonNH.gov/Live  
Thursday, November, 3rd, 2022  
6:30 PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Marc Coleman, Erling Heistad, Barbara Hirai, Colin Smith

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Stephen Wood

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Goodwin (Planner / GIS Coordinator)

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Don & Debra Goodwin

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Colin Smith called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

*Mr. Heistad MOVED to approve the October 21st, 2021 Minutes as presented in the November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 agenda packet.*

*Seconded by Ms. Hirai. **\*\*The vote on the motion was approved by those present (4-0-).***

*Mr. Heistad MOVED to approve the November 4th, 2021 Minutes as presented in the November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 agenda packet as amended.*

*Seconded by Ms. Hirai.*

Amendments:

Page 2, Line 27 Change “decided” to “proposed” and then add the following sentence, “But the decision was made to leave the scheduling to be determined by the Chair”. **\*\*The vote on the motion was approved by those present (4-0-).**

*Mr. Heistad MOVED to approve the August 4th, 2022 Minutes as presented in the November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022 agenda packet as amended.*

*Seconded by Ms. Hirai.*

Amendments:

Page 2, Line 11 Insert “Mark” prior between Mr. and Goodwin, as there were two Goodwins in attendance. **\*\*The vote on the motion was approved by those present (4-0-).**

### **3. STUDY ITEMS:**

#### **A. Continued Review and Discussion of Class 6 Rd #2 – Dorset Lane:**

Planner Goodwin provided a recap of previous discussions regarding Dorset Lane. He referred to the various historic maps that have been reviewed, the multiple discussions occurring during several public meetings, participation by the Wasson and Goodwin families, and general thoughts generated by the committee members.

Previous discussions included a focus on determining the actual treadway of the historic feature being reviewed, including the differences between some of the historic cartographic representations. Several individuals, including Ron Bailey and John Wasson shared vivid recollections of the treadway that they were familiar with, including some additional trails that were likely trail “spurs” off of the historic treadway referred to as Dorset Lane. One such trail meandered in an easterly direction towards the utility tower feature. Another trail connected up into the Blueberry Hill subdivision.

Discussion about the Road took place between the committee members. They referenced the three (3) historic homesteads that are consistently represented on several of the historic maps, and for which the location of the first two are the current Wasson residence, and the second one that is identified as the Scott homestead on the 1855 Eaton Map, and the Fresh homestead on the 1892 Hurd map. The second homestead location was a cellar hole that was relatively easy to locate for a number of years and is still visible on the current LIDAR imagery. The third homestead depicted as J. Scott on the 1855 map and D.G. Brigg on the 1892 map apparently did not leave a cellar hole or other on the ground evidence for which there was any supporting evidence referenced in the discussion, based upon individuals walking in this area. Donald Goodwin conveyed that to his knowledge the property in the general vicinity of where the third cellar hole is represented on the maps is known to have been in the Barden family dating back over two hundred years and so the map depicting the existence of a Scott and Brigg homestead would conflict with the known Barden ownership record. It was Mr. D. Goodwin’s belief that the Scott homestead is definitely depicted in the wrong place.

Committee members continued to discuss the geometric discrepancy of the treadway depicted on the historic maps in comparison with the treadway known to exist in the field, and as depicted on the LIDAR imagery. The angle of the depiction was noted to likely be more of a schematic or conceptual depiction. The existing Brook Road was discussed, as was the depictions on the historic USGS maps, as well as the depiction of a historic roadway feature on the 1892 Hurd map of Hanover.

Considerable review of the conditions on the ground, the topography, and the drainage features were examined as depicted on the LIDAR imagery. Mr. M. Goodwin highlighted the obvious challenge for a road to have existed traversing from location of the current D. Goodwin house site, north into Hanover, and then in a westerly direction back to connect to present day Laramie Road. Mr. D. Goodwin conveyed that logically a historic treadway, to be used by horse and buggy, would avoid wet and steep areas, further casting doubt that any such feature existed. Mr. D. Goodwin shared that although there are existing and remnant stone walls on the southern end of the Dorset Ln treadway, there is no evidence of walls in the location of the 3<sup>rd</sup> cellar hole, or which would be along a treadway heading west through the steep and wet ravine areas. He can attest having spent the majority of his life working in the woods, that walls simply do not disappear.

The Committee continued to express doubts as to the ability of Dorset Ln to have traversed along the three potential cellar holes, to within close proximity of the Hanover and Lebanon shared town boundary, and then back in a westerly direction to provide a loop. Mr. Coleman expressed that perhaps there might have been a saddle trail that somebody would take. But that it never really had enough use to justify as a public right-of-way. Further dialogue related to the necessity of a road connecting or looping to connect to another existing right-of-way ensued, with Mr. M. Goodwin sharing that there are no black and white rules that he is aware of but that typically a public right-of-way would connect to other public rights-of-ways, at least as far as the pattern observed in Lebanon.

The Committee transitioned to discussing options as to next steps, including emphasizing they are an advisory role, the pros and cons of making a motion to conclude the review of Dorset Lane, and having a scenario where no motion was made and the review simply terminated with the minutes serving as a “paper trail” to document sentiments expressed. Acting Chair Smith conveyed that he can not make a motion but he would certainly entertain anybody else making a motion, either positive or negative. Erling Heistad conveyed that he was at ease not taking any action on it as we poked at it from most every direction and haven’t come up with anything conclusive. Don and Debra Goodwin conveyed that their preference was to have the sentiment that there was not enough evidence to support the existence of a public right-of-way wrapped up in a motion format, as they would really like to know that after the months spent on this that the same questions would arise and the process would simply repeat itself at a future date. Barbara Hirai expressed concern for making a motion declaring that a right-of-way never existed in this location as that would close the door for additional information be presented in the future that may change the existing opinion. She further reiterated the value of public rights-of-way as a resource to members of the public and therefore prefers to simply adjourn the meeting in the absence of a motion speaking to the status of Dorset Lane.

A motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes was made by Barbara Hirai but failed for failure of a second. Acting Chair Smith stated that there are two options for the Committee, to include leaving this road at this point with no evidence or assertion that it’s a right of way, and this will be the last time we talk about it, or we can make a kind of closing motion to just tie a bow on it. Barbara Hirai moved that we end the discussion with no decision really. Seconded by Erling Heistad. Within the following discussion, Marc Coleman expressed that if we can’t comfortably assert that this is a public right-of-way, then we kind of answered our question that it is not a right-of-way. Ms. Hirai again conveyed being uncomfortable giving up what could potentially be a right-of-way. She stated there is a lot of public interest in this and she feels she represents the public. Mr. M. Goodwin reiterated the difference between members of the public desiring to walk in a certain area, and having the right to do such. Ms. Hirai asked whether a motion needed to include x,y coordinates and Mr. Goodwin replied that for a Council meeting that would be the case but it is not imperative for this group. Acting Chair Smith conveyed that he is of the opinion that the sort of language used in the current motion is kind of too vague to be helpful. That he is not convinced that it’s actually a voteable motion. He stated that unless anybody’s willing to make a motion that states the assertion that this is a right-of-way, or that we don’t think it it’s a right-of-way, then we leave the discussion and adjourn.

#### **4. OTHER BUSINESS: None**

#### **5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: None**

**6. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC: None**

**7. ADJOURNMENT:**

Erling Heistad moved to adjourn the meeting, with a second by Ms. Hirai.

***\*\*The vote on the motion was approved by those present (4-0-).***

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark Goodwin  
Emeritus Recording Secretary