

**TOWN OF WARREN  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
WEDNESDAY APRIL 18, 2007**

---

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

Others Present: Jason Lisai, Peter Lazorchak, John Crump, Margo Wade, Miron Malboeuf and Ruth Robbins.

Agenda: Call meeting to order 7:00 pm.

- 1) **Applications, 2007-08-SD**: Two-Lot Subdivision off West Hill Road. The applicant **Summit Ventures NE, LLC** (dba Sugarbush Golf Club) seeks approval to subdivide a 2.5± acre parcel off the existing 175± acre golf course parcel. (Parcel id # 053001-200). The 2.5± acre parcel to be subdivided will be joined to an existing abutting parcel, 49.2± acres, located at 1203 West Hill Road [Weinstein]. No development is contemplated for the parcel and any development would require a subdivision amendment. Based on the fore stated facts the applicant request a waiver of meeting requirements. Specifically that Sketch Plan, Preliminary and Final Plan Approval to be combined into a single meeting. This application requires review under Article 6, Subdivision Review and Article 7, Subdivision Standards, of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations.
- 2) **Applications, 2007-09-SD**: Subdivision - Boundary Line Adjustments of Approved Lots, 1927 West Hill Road. The applicants, John & Caryn **Crump** seek approval to reconfigure three lots, Lots 1 & 3 of the Colpitts subdivision (2004-09-SD), currently 6.6± & 5.24± acres, respectively and an adjoining parcel, currently 5.18± acres, acquired from June Sardi. The parcels, ID # 016004-400, are located in the Rural Residential District. The applicant is requesting a waiver of the Minimum Lot Frontage, 200 feet. The proposed realignment of the parcels is as follows: Lot 1 – 5.0± acres, Lot 3 – 6.07± acres & the Sardi Lot – 5.95± acres. This application requires review under Article 2 (Table 2.2) Rural Residential District, Article 5, Development Review and also under Article 6, Subdivision Review, §6.2 (E), Sketch Plan Review, Boundary Adjustments, & §6.4, Final Plan Approval, and Article 7, Subdivision Standards of the Warren Land Use and Development Regulations.
- 3) **Applications, 2007-07-SD & 2007-07-CU**: Two Lot Subdivision Partially Located in Meadowland Overlay District for (Continued from April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007, To be continues to May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007) Preliminary Plan Review/ Final Plan Approval. The applicant, Bruce **Fowler**, seeks approval to subdivide a 4.9± acre parcel located at 258 Senor Road. The parcel, ID # 023009-000, is located in the Rural Residential District and partially located in the Meadowland Overlay District. **(To be continued to May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007)**
- 4) **2007-02-SD**, Revisions to an approved plat. Applicants, John & Elizabeth H **Graves**, seek permission to modify and existing subdivision off Gold Hill Road, Parcel Id # 005001-420. **(to be continued to May 9<sup>th</sup>)**
- 5) Other Business:
  - a) Review and approve Minutes from April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007.
  - b) Review & sign decisions

Mr. Monte called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

- 1- **Applications, 2007-08-SD**: Two-Lot Subdivision off West Hill Road. The applicant **Summit Ventures NE, LLC** (dba Sugarbush Golf Club) seeks approval to subdivide a 2.5± acre parcel off the existing 175± acre golf course parcel.

Mr. Malboeuf began the hearing giving the Board a description of what the applicant was requesting. Sugarbush is looking to divide off an approx. 2.5 acre piece of their golf course parcel with the intention of selling it to an abutter (Weinstein). This particular piece is already “naturally” divided by West Hill Road and it is believed that the Weinstains are looking to acquire it for privacy purposes only and have no plans for development at this time. Mr. Lisai added that the dirt, stones and such that were piled there would be removed and they also intended to place a couple of boulders at the road cut entrance.

Mr. Markolf asked if they were creating an undevelopable lot? It has 410 feet in frontage, is 2.5 acres in size, but does have a utility easement running through it. Mr. Lisai said that they were only concerned with dividing off this parcel and selling it – to which Mr. Monte pointed out that the Board needed to be satisfied that it was a developable lot on its own or else might then require it be merged with the buyers existing lot. Mr. Monte also stated, that maybe this usual concern is not applicable to the lot under consideration because due to the existing boundaries and the road as a boundary that they weren’t actually creating a lot in practical terms but the question was who was to own it going forward.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board finds the application complete, that it be deemed a minor subdivision, and that they grant a consolidation of the proceedings into a single hearing.

**SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board finds the standards of Article 7 Subdivision Standards Sections 7.2 General Standards, 7.3 Protection of Primary & Secondary Conservation Areas, 7.4 Open Space & Common Land, and 7.5 Stormwater Management & Erosion Control are all satisfied. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

Mr. Monte asked if the Board wanted to consider combining the access for this parcel with the existing drive. Mr. Lisai commented that it would be difficult to access the new parcel off of the existing driveway due to a ditch and vegetation. Mr. Lisai asked for clarification as to whether or not they should place boulders at the entrance as previously discussed. Mr. Markolf said that if this was a true minor subdivision, and the parcel was not going to be merged with the existing lot of the intended new owner (the Weinstains), then they really needed to provide information on a building envelope and the primary and secondary conservation areas as with any other subdivision. Mr. Lisai asked what if there are no intended development plans. Ms. Wade added that they were selling the lot “as is” and that the buyers would be responsible for complying with any subdivision requirements should they decide to develop the lot. Mr. Monte said that the Board was allowed to provide waivers for many of the provisions so that in turn they should be able to approve the application subject to conditions that the requirements be met in the future.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that any approval contain the condition that no development shall take place on this parcel except for the removal of stockpiles of dirt/brush/gravel without further review and approval of the DRB and the submission of a plot plan that includes all the requirements of Table 6.2 and with consideration of access being connected to the existing access of the adjacent parcel to the west (current Weinstein parcel). **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board finds the requirements of Sections 7.6 Community Services & Facilities, 7.7 Roads & Pedestrian Access, 7.8 Water Supply & Wastewater Disposal, 7.9 Utilities and 7.10 Signs are either satisfied or not applicable at this time. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Markolf that the Board approves the applicant’s request for subdivision based on the preceding findings and conditions. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

- 2- **Applications, 2007-09-SD:** Subdivision - Boundary Line Adjustments of Approved Lots, 1927 West Hill Road. The applicants, John & Caryn **Crump** seek approval to reconfigure three lots, Lots 1 & 3 of the Colpitts subdivision (2004-09-SD)

Mr. Lazorchak of McCain Consulting explained to the Board that the applicant was seeking a boundary line adjustment to a previously approved subdivision (Colpitts). Of the original three-lot subdivision, Mr. Crump currently owns Lot 1 (approx. 6.6 acres) and Lot 3 (approx. 5.24 acres). Mrs. Crump has obtained a new job out of state and her new employer has employed a relocation company that will only take over the selling of their property if the house sits on five acres or less. Thus the reason behind the boundary line adjustment request. The house sits on Lot 1 and lot 3 is currently undeveloped.

Mr. Lazorchak explained to the Board that he had brought two options for them to consider: option 1 that seems to make the most sense but does not meet the min 200-foot frontage requirement and option two which does. In addition to the two lots from the Colpitts subdivision, Mr. Crump also owns an adjacent parcel of approx. 5.18 acres which he bought from Mrs. Sardi for the purpose of solving the encroachment issue of the wastewater system. Currently, there appears to be no formal access to the Sardi parcel. Discussion continued about access to the Sardi lot, the fact that an existing lot was being altered and the need for additional information such as conservation areas, steep slopes (if any) and a designation of a building envelope.

Mr. Crump asked if the Sardi lot issues could be addressed in a future meeting and just take care of the changes for creating a maximum five-acre lot for Lot 1. It was Mr. Crump's hope that any buyer of Lot 1 might also want the Sardi lot at some point as they did for additional privacy.

The Board suggested that with option one being the preferable one, that the frontage issue could be addressed by extending the right-of-way and using that to satisfy the frontage requirement. Mr. Crump wanted to make sure that the extended right-of-way would still be owned by Lot 1, which it would. It was also discussed that to accomplish what the applicant wanted and to keep it simple, that any adjustment of the boundary between lot 3 and the Sardi parcel should be eliminated from this application and saved for another time.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board deem the application complete and classify it as a boundary line adjustment. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board agrees to move from initial application process to final plat approval. **SECOND** by Mr. Markolf. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the Board consider Option 1 to be amended to [a] extend the 50 foot right-of-way (ROW) onto Lot 1 a sufficient distance to provide for 200 feet of frontage and [b] that Lot 3 be reconfigured to exclude any additional land from the former Sardi lot. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Monte that the requirements of Article 7 Subdivision Standards are found to be satisfied due to the fact that none of the changes requested by the applicant affect any of the subdivision standards. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

**MOTION** by Mr. Markolf hat the Board approve the application subject to the afore voted on amendment. **SECOND** by Mr. Robinson. **VOTE:** all in favor, the motion passed.

- 2- Other Business

The Board reviewed and signed the previous month's minutes and the Jones and Robinson mylars.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth V. Robbins  
DRB/PC Assistant

**Development Review Board**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lenord Robinson                      date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter Monte                              date

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Markolf                              date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Virginia Roth                              date