

TOWN OF WARREN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
WEDNESDAY MAY 3, 2006

Members Present: Peter Monte, David Markolf, Chris Behn, Virginia Roth and Lenord Robinson.

Others Present: Nicholas Nowlan, Jeffrey Resnick, Tom Williams, Miron Malboeuf and Ruth Robbins.

Agenda: Call meeting to order 7:00 pm

- 1) Review Notes of Site Visit to the Resnick/Williams Subdivisions
- 2) Application #2006-07-SD, Two Lot Subdivision Applicants Thomas & Mary Williams seek permission to subdivide a 2.79± Acre parcel, located at 761 Cider Hill Road (parcel Id No is 012003-200), into two lots, Lot A will be 1.13± Acres and Lot B will be 1.65± Acres. No development is proposed for these lots that are located in the Meadow Land Overlay District, Article 2, Table 2.2 Rural Residential District & 2.13 Meadowland Overlay District. This application will be heard in conjunction with an application for a four-lot subdivision, 2006-08-SD, located at 211 Cider Hill Road (Parcel Id 01200-300). As six lots are involved in the combined applications this property, it is warned for Sketch Plan Review, under Article 6, §6.2 Sketch Plan Review of the Warren
- 3) Application #2006-08-SD, Four Lot Subdivision Applicant Jeffery Resnick seek permission to subdivide a 51.47± Acre parcel, located at 211 Cider Hill Road (Parcel Id No.012000-300), into four lots: Lot 1 will be 33.4± Acres, containing the existing 7 bedroom house and two bedroom groundskeepers cottage and associated on-site individual water and sewer systems; Lot 2 will be 8.9± Acres; lot 3 will be 7.98± Acres; and lot 4 will be 1.19± Acres. Development envelopes are proposed for lots 2 and 3 portions of which are located in the Meadow Land Overlay District. Lot 4 will be conveyed to Tom & Mary Williams along with a counter convince of Lot A (1.13± Acres) as proposed to be created under application 2006-07-SD. As the combination of these applications involves six lots and proposes development in the Meadow Land Overlay District, it requires review under Article 2, Table 2.2 Rural Residential District & 2.13 Meadowland Overlay District, Article 6, §6.2(D) Sketch Plan Review, and Article 5, Development Review, of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations.
- 4) Other Business:
 - a. Review and approve Minutes from April 19, 2006
 - b. Review and approve Cohen and Hall Decisions
 - c. Review Administrative Amendment to Lloyd Decision
 - d. Sign Burns-Sidney Subdivision Mylar

Mr. Monte called the meeting to order at 7:17 pm.

- 1- Review Notes of Site Visit to the Resnick/Williams Subdivisions
- 2- Application #2006-07-SD, Two Lot Subdivision Applicants Thomas & Mary Williams seek permission to subdivide a 2.79± Acre parcel, located at 761 Cider Hill Road
- 3- Application #2006-08-SD, Four Lot Subdivision Applicant Jeffery Resnick seek permission to subdivide a 51.47± Acre parcel, located at 211 Cider Hill Road

Mr. Malboeuf gave a recap of the site visits – one in the morning with Mr. Robinson and one in the afternoon with Mr. Markolf. He also reminded the Board members that this application was very similar to the approved proposal back in 2002. Mr. Malboeuf mentioned the proposed road from the south side of the property that though it goes through meadowland, there is a significant section that is heavily treed as pointed out by Mr. Markolf. At the end of the proposed drive are two lots for future development of two homes and additionally a second access to the existing home that will remain on what will be referred to as Lot 1 (Resnick property). Mr. Williams spoke up and described his part in the plan that will allow for the road access to Mr. Resnick's proposed lots as well give them much desired contiguous lots. He went on to say that it was their intention to put approx. 20 acres into land conservation to prevent further development should this request be approved.

The topic of the proposed road cutting across the Meadowland Overlay District came up and discussion ensued as to what any other options might be. Mr. Resnick has a 50-foot strip of land that runs down to East Warren Road. Though he had been told a road could be put in most of the members familiar with the area felt it was much to steep an approach to the property. It was also mentioned that with a section of the meadowland heavily treed that the proposed road would be barely visible. When asked about the road, Mr. Resnick stated that he had no immediate plans to do any development on the two new parcels, that he was just putting things in place for the "next generation". He also added that the Williams had wanted to join their two parcels for some time and that this seemed as good a time as any. Mr. Resnick. Did say though, that he would like to at some time possibly put the road in along with underground power, not only to service the two new lots but to also service his home which had been subject to numerous power outages with his above ground lines.

Mr. Markolf brought up his concern about visual impact of any new development and the possible need for cutting restrictions. Mr. Monte asked Mr. Nowlan about steep areas and was told there were some thus the direction of the proposed road in order to avoid those steeper sections. Mr. Markolf asked if there was any mention of primary or secondary conservation areas in the prior decision. He continued to point out that it appeared as if the depicted building envelopes included some conservation areas. Mr. Nowlan stated that it would be difficult to avoid including 15% grade land but that avoiding the 20% and greater could probably be done. Mr. Markolf stressed that the ordinance calls for the applicant to show where the primary and/or secondary conservation areas are on the site plan.

The topic of deeryards was raised and based on the previous decision it appeared that there was not any areas of "critical habitat" on the subject property. Mr. Markolf asked about a road maintenance agreement for the proposed road, even if the tow lots are not sold or transferred right away, it should be done, along with an agreement for the partially shared wastewater system. Mr. Monte pointed out that even with Mr. Resnick not intending to sell anytime soon that not having these agreements in place causes more problems than having them.

Conversation then ensued about the current drive and the proposed new drive – would the Board want the old drive discontinued? (assuming the Select Board approves a new road cut) Mr. Resnick expressed his desire to possibly have the two accesses. Mr. Monte said that the issue will need some thought and the applicant would need to convince the Board as to why he would want to keep two roads. Mrs. Roth reminded the members that the proposed road goes through Meadowland and had to be looked at carefully. It was also mentioned that at least a road was less obtrusive than a structure would be and it may be the best place to allow access to the property.

Mr. Markolf then went over the list on items to be addressed at the next meeting:

- Show the Right-of-way to the two lots on site plan
- Indicate Primary & Secondary conservation areas on site plan (with no development in those areas)

