

WEST WINDSOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Draft Minutes

May 21, 2012

Present: Glenn Seward, Shannon Harrington, Hal Pyke, Genevieve Lemire, Barbara Truex, Scott Hammond, Martha Harrison

1. Site visit – At 6:30 PM, the DRB conducted a site visit to 1184 Hammond Hill Road, the Hammond property, in connection with application #2480. The applicant was not present.
2. Call to Order – DRB Chair Glenn Seward called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.
3. Public Hearing - Glenn opened the public hearing on application #2480 by Scott Hammond for sketch plan review of a 2-lot subdivision of parcel #6-102.1 at 1184 Hammond Hill Road. The application is subject to review under the West Windsor Subdivision Regulations. Glenn noted that there are no interested parties present other than the applicant. Glenn swore in Scott Hammond and asked Scott for an overview of his plans. Scott said he is hoping to put a single-family house on the new lot and the septic design is for a 3-bedroom house. The DRB reviewed the application checklist in Appendix B. Glenn noted that Martha has the application form and Scott confirmed that the application fee has been paid. The DRB confirmed that the name and address of the landowners, applicant and adjoining property owners are included on the application. Glenn asked if there is a written description of the development plans, including the number and size of lots and timing of work. Martha said the site plan shows the number and size of the lots but we don't have information on timing. Scott said he has a year to complete the access work. Martha said after the final subdivision review, Scott will have six months to record a Mylar. Shannon confirmed that the applicant submitted a written statement of compliance with the town plan from Planning Commission Chair Hal Pyke. Glenn asked Scott if he is asking the DRB to waive any design standards or anything. Scott said he is doing everything to state specifications. Martha noted that Scott asked the DRB to waive preliminary review at the bottom of the application form. The DRB commented on the thoroughness of Scott's "sketch," which includes date, north arrow, legend, property boundaries, existing and proposed property lines, lot dimensions and acreage, and adjoining roads and drainage. The DRB noted that the adjoining land uses are residential and that the proposed subdivision is in a residential zoning district, as indicated in the "General Notes" on the site plan. Regarding the general location of significant natural features, the DRB noted that wetlands are designated on the site plan, as is a vernal pool. The site is not in a special flood hazard area. Regarding critical wildlife habitat, Scott said there is no deeryard on the property. The DRB members agreed that additional information on critical wildlife habitat and endangered species is not required for this application. Regarding agricultural soils, the DRB checked the map in the Town Plan and determined that there are no prime agricultural soils on the property. The DRB members also agreed that there are no ridgelines on the property. Regarding Forest Land and Trees, Scott pointed out where he has already cleared and where he plans to clear, in the area toward the leach field. Scott said he also plans to cut firewood. If the septic system on Lot #1 were to fail, Scott said, the designated replacement sewage disposal area for Lot #1 would have to be cleared as well. Scott said he will maintain the buffers around the wetland and the vernal pool, as required. Regarding historic and cultural resources, Scott said no one will remove the stonewalls, and there are no cellar holes on the property. Scott said there is a snowmobile trail on the adjacent Despart property, but there are no recreation trails on his property. The DRB members noted that contour lines are shown on the site plan, as are existing roads, paths, driveways, parking areas, and structures. Existing rights-of-way and easements for CVPS and for a replacement septic system are noted on the plan. Existing utilities, water supply and wastewater systems are also noted on the plan. Scott said there are no existing covenants or deed restrictions on the property. Shannon advised Scott to review Appendix D before coming back for Final Review and noted, for example, the engineering reports. Hal said Scott should be sure that the deeded easement for wastewater for Lot #1 is

documented. Glenn suggested that Scott review all the design requirements in Section 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 of the Subdivision Regulations. Martha asked if they are all applicable. The DRB agreed that Section 3.2 is not relevant for a 2-lot subdivision, and that the proposed subdivision complies with Section 3.3. The DRB agreed that Section 3.3-1 is not applicable. Regarding 3.3-2, Glenn said he feels that it applies to a larger subdivision and that related driveway issues are addressed in the highway access permit. Shannon asked if a 12' driveway is wide enough. Martha said the B-71 standards require a minimum width of 12' for driveways. Scott said he has his highway access permit. The DRB members agreed that Section 3.3-3 applies to larger subdivisions. Regarding Section 3.3-4, Glenn said disturbing one or more acres may require a construction and/or stormwater permit from the state. Shannon estimated the proposed disturbance at $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. Shannon added that if Scott clear cuts and stumps the property that could require a permit. Glenn asked Scott if he is going to disturb more than one acre. Scott said he is going to open up the property down toward the stone wall, where the leach field will be. Shannon told Scott that, if he's going to stump it and turn it into lawn, he should do it in stages, less than an acre at a time, and stabilize it before proceeding. The DRB members agreed that the proposed subdivision is not going to generate traffic that exceeds the capacity of adjacent roads so 3.3-5 is not applicable. The DRB members also agreed that Section 3.3-6 is not applicable. Regarding Section 3.4-1, Glenn asked Scott if the power is going to be underground or overhead. Scott said he is within 150' of an existing telephone pole so he's not going to bury the line. Regarding Section 3.4-2, Scott said he is not going to put up street lights. The DRB agreed that Section 3.4-3 and 3.4-4 are not applicable. Regarding Section 3.4-5, Glenn said Scott should limit the hours of major construction and trucking and notify neighbors before any blasting. Barbara said there should be hay bales around the wetland. Shannon said he'll need a general permit, which will state the requirements for protecting the buffer. Scott said the buffer is noted on the site plan. Barbara agreed that the state permit will tell Scott what they want him to do. Scott said what is shown on the site plan is what the state wants. Shannon asked Scott if he needs a permit. Scott said yes. Glenn said Section 3.5 is not applicable. The DRB members agreed. Regarding Section 3.6, the DRB noted that Scott has already complied with that section. **Glenn moved to go into a deliberative session. Barbara seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

4. Minutes: January 10, 2012; March 13, 2012; May 8, 2012 – **Glenn moved to table consideration of the minutes until June 4th. Genevieve seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**
5. Adjourn – **The DRB adjourned by consensus at 7:45 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Harrison