

WEST WINDSOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Draft Minutes
November 29, 2016

Members Present: Shannon Harrington, Barbara Truex, Jane Hoisington, Dick Beatty, Genevieve Lemire

Others Present: John Saydek, Michael Spackman, James Lyall, Preston Bristow and 24 persons listed on attached attendance list

The meeting was called to order by chair Shannon Harrington at 6:30 pm.

The **public hearing on application #2638 by the Mt. Ascutney Outdoors and the Town of West Windsor** to install lights on the rope tow towers and use a warming hut at 400 Ski Tow Road on the Town Forest (parcel #3-2), which was recessed on November 9, 2016, was reconvened and recessed by unanimous vote until Wednesday, December 21, 2016, 6:30 pm at this location.

The **public hearing on application #2641 by MFW Associates, LLC** for Sketch Plan Review of a 13-lot subdivision to be known as Ascutney Fields off Coaching Lane (parcel #2-1) was opened with a reading of the hearing notice. No DRB member disclosed any ex parte communications or conflicts of interest. All 24 persons listed on the attached attendance list were accepted as interested persons and John Saydek, Michael Spackman, James Lyall and the 24 persons listed on the attached attendance list were sworn in.

Sketch Plan Review precedes Preliminary Plan Review and Final Plan Review under section 2.3 of the West Windsor Subdivision Regulations. The project will also be subject to Conditional Use Review under section 5.4 (Planned Unit Development) and section 5.4-1 (Additional Requirements for PUD in the Resort/Residential and Recreation/Conservation PUD Districts) of the West Windsor Zoning Regulations.

Provided with the Sketch Plan Review application were two maps entitled “Ascutney Fields, Existing Conditions Plan (C-1)” and “Ascutney Fields, Overall Site Plan (C-2)” both dated November 14, 2016.

John Saydek of Teruko Designs presented the application as follows:

- The entire property has been surveyed at 104.51 acres
- The proposed subdivision is 13 lots ranging from 5 to 18.74 acres; the regulations allow up to 20 lots.
- Building envelopes range from one third to one half acres.
- There will be 200-300 feet between houses.
- There are two accesses to the project, both from Coaching Lane.
- All driveway easements will be 50 feet wide.
- The travel surface on shared drives will be 16 feet wide with 2 foot shoulders for a total surface width of 20 feet.

- Shared drives will be built to town highway standards except for width (town highway standards call for a travel surface 24 feet wide with 2 foot shoulders for a total surface width of 28 feet).
- Maximum driveway grades will range from 6% to 10%.
- All wetlands have been mapped and a 50-foot wetland buffer will be maintained.
- There will be two stream/wetland crossings with culverts.
- Wellhead protection zones will be maintained for the three deeded spring rights as though they were in active use.
- A connector trail from Mile Long Field to the Town Forest will be preserved under a trail easement held by the town (currently held in escrow).
- A homeowner's organization will be established to manage shared drives and shared open space.
- There will be no "common land" but open space land will be maintained by conservation easements and deed covenants.
- Management of open space will include forest management of woodlands and mowing of agricultural lands, including managing for Bobolink habitat.
- Two-thirds of the property is wooded and there will be little change to wooded areas.
- All building envelopes and road rights-of-way equal 15% of the land area so the requirement to maintain at least 50% of the property as open space can be met.
- This will not be a "constructed development" in that the applicant will offer lots for sale but will not develop them.
- Shared driveways will be constructed as the lots sell.
- Green Mountain Power and Fairpoint have been contacted about utilities.
- Applications for state Act 250 and stormwater permits are in progress.
- Onsite wastewater system designs and applications are in progress. Existing springs assumed as "active" for isolation purposes.
- The Vermont Agriculture Agency has been contacted about agricultural soils.
- The Department of Fish and Wildlife has been contact about wildlife habitat.
- A growth and impact study by Doug Kennedy Advisors in Norwich is underway.

Shannon Harrington reviewed the checklist in the subdivision regulations identified as Appendix B – Application Requirements for Sketch Plan Review and noted that the following items were missing:

- Phasing and timing of work
- Written statement of compliance with Town Plan.
- Written waiver request, if any.
- Interior lot dimensions.
- Uses labeled of adjoining lands.
- Zoning district labeled on map.
- Written description of proposed covenants or deed restrictions and homeowners' association.

Article III (Design Standards) of the subdivision regulations further require that wetlands, streams, special flood hazard areas, critical wildlife habitat, threatened or endangered species,

agricultural soils, ridgelines, forest land and trees, historical and cultural resources, and existing recreational trails (as applicable) shall be identified and roughly outlined on the sketch plan.

Section 5.4-1 of the zoning regulations require a comprehensive conceptual development master plan be prepared in consultation and agreement with the Planning Commission and DRB. Timing and phasing of construction is an element of the master plan. A master plan must be prepared and presented in draft form before Sketch Plan approval can be granted.

The DRB determined that this hearing would have to be recessed and reconvened at a later time when this additional information could be provided.

The hearing was then opened to public comment and the following comments were received:

- Owner Dan Purjes should be invited to the next meeting.
- Realtor Seth Warren should be invited to the next meeting.
- This subdivision doesn't make sense with so many properties in town already for sale.
- What will happen if the lots don't sell?
- Will clearing of building envelopes occur before the lots sell?
- Pond construction should be prohibited because this is an important aquifer and it may affect the ponds of adjoining properties.
- Springs and ponds on adjacent properties should be depicted on the plan.
- This property was once considered for a snowmaking pond and the information from monitoring wells on the property should be found and considered.
- Hayfields managed for Bobolink should not be grazed by horses.
- Meadow Larks and Sparrows are widely observed in mowed areas as well as foxes and turkeys.
- Although not a mapped deer yard this property is prime deer habitat.
- Roz Renfrew and Chris Rimmer of the Vermont Center for Ecostudies in Norwich were offered as resources.
- Concern regarding integrity of aquifer to existing springs if project in built.
- The brooks on the plan are not accurate and need to be more accurately depicted.
- All recreation trails on the property (not just the connector trail reserved on the easement held in escrow) are a community legacy and should be shown and protected.
- Will house sites be visible from Bible Hill?
- How many new school students are anticipated?
- What will be the increase in traffic on Coaching Lane?
- How will speeding on Coaching Lane be controlled?
- Will Coaching Lane need to be widened or improved?
- Who will repair damage to Coaching Road from cement and other trucks?
- Noise and light pollution should be considered.
- Pesticide/herbicide/fungicide use by lot owners should be limited.
- Is there ledge and will blasting be needed to develop these lots?
- What are the current assessment and taxes paid on this property?
- What have been the outcomes of development of similar properties elsewhere?
- Will power and telecom be buried or above ground?

John Plaustainer provided written comments (attached) regarding the access drive construction standards, maintenance, ownership, turnarounds, and stream crossings; the location of utilities; the access points off Coaching Lane; and better depiction of brooks.

Michael Spackman (Fire Chief and Highway Foreman) stated that it is typical to require a 60,000-gallon pond with a dry hydrant no further than 1400 feet from all homes. If this is not possible each single-family home may be required to have its own fire suppression (sprinkler) system. All turnarounds must meet state A-76 standards and more turnarounds may be needed. In his opinion, a 16-foot road width with 2 foot shoulders will meet fire and safety requirements and an additional access other than from Coaching Lane is not necessary.

Jim Lyall of Ascutney Outdoors (AO) and Sports Trails of the Ascutney Basin (STAB) answered questions on area trails and the trail easement conveyed to the town (but currently held in escrow) for a connector trail across the property. Shannon Harrington confirmed that the DRB determined on December 7, 2015 that this perpetual trail easement, once recorded, would satisfy the “demonstrable contribution to the recreational development of the area” requirement of section 2.3-5 of the zoning regulations.

At 8:50 pm the DRB voted unanimously to recess the hearing and to reconvene the hearing on Wednesday, December 21, 2016, at 6:30 pm at this location.

Respectfully submitted,
Preston Bristow
Administrative Officer and DRB Clerk

Attendance List
“Ascutney Fields” Sketch Plan Review Hearing November 29, 2016
West Windsor DRB

Bruce Boedtker
Catherine Boedtker
Erik Boedtker
Kelsey Boedtker
William Brehm
Hannah Bright
Frank Brock
Judy Brock
Paul Deluca
John DeMasi
David Deschamp, Jr.
David Deschamp, Sr.
Kathleen Deschamp
Robert Edgerton
Alan Ewald
Marcea Ewald
Kathy Fitch
Rudolph Gross
Win Johnson
Wayne Lamire
Sarah MacNeil
Stephen Marcus
Finley Perry
John Plaustainer

COMMENTS TO WEST WINDSOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

RE: Application No 2641 by MFW Associates, LLC.

By: John Plaustein, at Public Hearing 11/29/2016

1. Please note under notes #3 Total Length one mile

(A) This does not meet Vermont standards for Town and Development Roads

(B) Who will be the owner of this Access?

© Who will be responsible for maintenance and Plowing?

(D) Hammer Head turn arounds do not conform to specifications as per Vermont Standards for Town and Development Roads COL-DE-SAC

(E) Sketch Map does not show a Dead End turn around for Parcel 1 & 2 and 12 & 13

(f) Stream Crossings have to be bridges not culverts, Act 250

(2) Sketch Plan does not show utilities location, nor type

(3) Coaching Lane from Coaching Lane Extension to Ascutney Fields entrance has to be improved to handle the additional traffic.

(4) Brook on Map is incorrect (there are more than one)