

Town of Warren
Development Review Board
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, April 6, 2026

Members Present: Chris Behn, Maria Burfoot, Megan Moffroid, Jeff Schoellkopf
Staff Present: Ruth Robbins (ZA)
Others Present: Geoff Andrew, Susan Andrew, Jim Crafts, iPad (163), Gunner McCain, Peter Reynells, Mark Rickabaugh, Bruce Sargent

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Behn at 7:00 pm.

Application # 2026-01-SD submitted by McCain Consulting on behalf of Long Associates c/o Penny Reynells requests a Preliminary/Final Review for a 4-lot Subdivision. The 66 +/- acre parcel is proposed to be divided into Lot 1 (.77 acres), Lot 2 (.67 acres), Lot 3 (.61 acres) with the remaining Lot 4 (63.7 acre) as open space. Lots 1-3 will be suitable for future residences with associated infrastructure and Lot 4 has the possibility for a shared storage barn. The property is located at the end of Meadow Lane consisting of 66 +/- acres, parcel id# 005001-400 in the Rural Residential District.

Mr. McCain explained that, following comments received from the DRB, the Fire Department, and neighbors during the sketch plan reviews, changes had been incorporated into the subdivision plans. He summarized that one house site had been removed, and the road configuration, pull-offs and turnarounds had been revised; all these access changes being made to gain Fire Department approval. Mr. McCain then indicated that State permitting was getting underway, which will include further details regarding matters such as stormwater treatment, but that critical portions of related infrastructure had been included on the plans provided to the DRB. He explained that the building envelopes have been moved away from the top of the bank, in response to comments which had been provided during sketch plan review.

Mr. McCain also confirmed that the common land will be conserved and that no motorized recreation would be allowed, and provided drafts of all the legal documents which will be incorporated into the final subdivision, such as an HOA, Bylaws (rules for the homeowners' association), and Declarations (allowable and non-allowable activities). It was noted that these documents are essentially complete, with just some placeholder for items such as permit numbers which will need to be filled in.

The location and size of a planned retaining wall were outlined, and it was explained that engineers would design the wall, and that Mr. Reynells intends to provide the oversight of the infrastructure development, including the retaining wall, power supply, and the roadway to the sites.

Mr. Schoellkopf raised the matter of providing sufficient parking spaces at each residence, and there was some discussion of requirements for a single-family residence with or without an ADU, with it being noted that any proposal to build a duplex would need further DRB review. Mr. McCain indicated that it is difficult to depict parking on a site when the house design is not yet known, but that a condition to provide a minimum number of parking spaces would be acceptable.

Mr. Andrew asked if there should be any connection between the Long Associates HOA and the Farms HOA; Mr. McCain explained that legal advice had been provided that other agreements should not be tied to the Long Associates documents.

In response to questions from those present at the hearing, Mr. McCain provided some further information. The building envelopes were clarified. It was confirmed that there will be no naming of the subdivision or marketing connection to the Farms. Mr. McCain explained where the drivable portion of the access road ends, and clarified that there is not a roadway onto the common lot.

Mr. McCain also provided the following details for the Board:

- Jeff Campbell has not yet provided a letter of approval, but all the changes he proposed have been incorporated; a letter will be requested again.
- The plans indicate that any residence over 4000 square feet in size will be sprinkled.
- The common land area may have a structure such as a storage barn/community building; no residence, no septic, and no well will be located on that lot.
- There is no exterior lighting intended on the site other than what will be on individual lots.
- There are proposed limits of clearing noted on the plans submitted; generally, homeowners do not prefer clear cut sites, and it is likely that nicer tree specimens will be left in place.
- A biologist has defined the deer yard in more detail than what is found on the ANR atlas. (Mr. McCain noticed during the hearing that the deer yard layer had been removed before printing some of the plans; he will resubmit those with the deer yard indicated.)
- Utility lines will all be placed underground.

MOTION: *A motion to classify the proposal as a major subdivision passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that the plans submitted are in general conformance with the Warren Town Plan; and that the proposal is a reasonable PUD given that it clusters development, conserves open space as common land, minimizes roadways, and avoids primary conservation areas passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to condition approval upon receipt of a letter from the Fire Department outlining approval of the access road and driveway plans; that any construction on Lot 4 is limited to non-residential uses with the only utility connection for that lot to be electricity; and that prior to the issuance of a zoning permit for development of Lots 1, 2, and 3 it needs to be shown that there will be parking for three cars for a single-family residence, and for four cars if there is an ADU associated with the residence passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to condition approval upon a requirement that any substantial change in the site plan presented or drafts of legal documents submitted as part of the application undergo further review and approval by the DRB passed unanimously.*

Section 7.2 of the Regulations, covering the General Standards for Subdivisions, was reviewed.

MOTION: *A motion that Sections 7.2 (A), (B), and (C) have been satisfied by the application materials submitted passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.2 (D) has been satisfied, as the DRB has waived lot size and layout through the PUD review process, passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.2 (E) has been satisfied passed unanimously.*

A hedgerow planned to provide screening between house sites was noted on the plans, and Mr. McCain explained that the existing forested nature of the lots will provide screening. It was indicated that the required forest management plan will indicate where any cutting may take place on the common property.

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.2 (F) had been discussed and satisfied passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Sections 7.2 (G) and (H) have been satisfied passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Sections 7.3 (A), (B), and (C) will be satisfied upon the receipt of an updated site plan, indicating the extent of the deer yard on the property, passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Sections 7.4 (A), (B), (C), and (D) have been satisfied passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that, once all appropriate State Stormwater permits have been issued and copies of those provided to the Zoning Administrator, Sections 7.5 (A) through (G) will be satisfied.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Sections 7.5 (H) through (J) are not applicable to this application passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Sections 7.6 (A) and (C) have been satisfied passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that, once a letter of approval of the access and turnaround areas from the Fire Chief has been provided to the Zoning Administrator, and based upon the applicant's indication that dwellings of 4000 square feet and greater will be sprinkled, Section 7.6 (B) is satisfied.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.7 had been satisfied by the application materials presented passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.8 will be satisfied by receipt of a Wastewater and Potable Water Supply Permit passed unanimously.*

Mr. McCain confirmed that all utilities will be underground, installed along the road ROW.

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.9 had been satisfied passed unanimously.*

Signs included in the plans submitted include a standard road sign as well as 'No Parking/Turnaround' signs as requested by the Fire Department. No other signage is intended.

MOTION: *A motion to find that Section 7.10 had been satisfied passed unanimously.*

The Board then turned to review of the PUD Standards outlined in the Regulations.

MOTION: *A motion to find that the standards of Section 8.3 E had either been satisfied or were not applicable passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to approve the preliminary plan as submitted, subject to conditions as agreed upon during the hearing as well as the usual conditions, passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to close the preliminary hearing and open the final hearing for this subdivision application passed unanimously.*

MOTION: *A motion to provide final subdivision approval, incorporating all the conditions adopted during the hearing, and the usual conditions, passed unanimously.*

Other Business

The upcoming schedule was reviewed; the minutes of March 30, 2026 were amended.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Chamberlin, Recording Secretary

Development Review Board

Jeff Schoellkopf Date

Chris Behn Date

Maria Burfoot Date

Megan Moffroid Date