

TOWN OF WESTFORD
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Minutes for Wednesday, July 13, 2016
Approved on July 27, 2016

Board Members Present: Wayne Brown, William Cleary, Lisa Fargo, Tony Kitsos, Matt Wamsganz (Chair)

Board Members Absent: Jason Hoover, Sara DeVico

Also Present: Sue Adams, Esther McLaughlin, Loreen Teer, Cindy Berg, Betty Allen, Pat Garcia

The meeting began at 7:15 p.m.

Sketch Plan Review for a 2-Lot Subdivision – Bernice Weston & Esther McLaughlin property

After Matt opened the meeting, Loreen gave a brief overview of the project. She pointed out a couple of mistakes in the staff report, namely, that the replacement septic system on the Quimby lot serves the proposed 2 acre lot only; the backup system for the larger lot is behind the 2 family dwelling on that larger lot. Also, the number of outbuildings have changed since the 2005 site plan in hand. (Later in the meeting, Esther reiterated that there were not as many outbuildings as before).

The DRB then went through the staff report.

Matt & Tony explained the ‘subdivision by right’ which allows the applicants to create a lot size of only 2 acres in the R5 district. The remaining 3 acres (the sum of which meets the 5 acre required lot size) must be shown on Lot 1 on the site plans and survey, along with the proper notations stating they will never be developed.

Tony explained that the amended site plan should show the 2 lots in the proposed subdivision as well as the Quimby’s lot. Also, the larger lot should be labeled Lot 1 and the smaller, proposed lot should be labeled Lot 2.

Tony also explained that the site plans and survey must show the septic easements (Quimbys to Lot 2 and Lot 1 to Lot 2) and that draft easement deeds for these are required at the time of the final hearing.

Loreen asked if Sue checked with the State whether the 2004 Wastewater Permit is still current and applicable. Sue did not. Tony explained that that is the applicant’s job. Furthermore, applicants must determine if any other State of Vermont permits are required.

The review of the staff report went fairly quickly as much of the subdivision criteria falls under the R5 point system which doesn’t need to be strictly addressed at the sketch plan level. Furthermore, the driveway/private road standards were not specifically addressed given the applicants are willing to wait until the Planning Commission rewrites the road and driveway sections in the new town regulations. Sue shared that once amendments are finalized (hopefully by late fall), the DRB will have the authority to decide whether existing driveways need to meet road standards.

Loreen mentioned they do not yet have an engineer or surveyor but that her brother is working

on hiring one. She also explained that the family filed paperwork to opt out of Current Use but that the State has not processed anything yet. Therefore, she is comfortable pushing the subdivision final hearing out several months for all of these reasons.

Tony reminded the applicants that they will need a letter from the road foreman stating whether the public rights of way, road and infrastructure adequately serve the subdivision proposal.

Matt pointed out that the driveways for the 2 lots do not meet the 1000 ft access spacing under the R5/Rt.15 standards. All board members present felt this standard should be waived given the driveways are existing.

A few items in the staff report resulted in lengthy discussion, namely: 1.) Snow storage on site plans. Questions arose as to why residential projects (as opposed to commercial projects) need to show this. In the end, Matt reiterated that because snow storage is a criteria to be met, the applicants will need to show it on the site plans. 2.) Building envelopes for each lot. Tony explained what they are and why they are needed on site plans and surveys. 3.) Statewide versus prime agricultural soils and 4.) Agricultural/silvicultural versus non-agricultural/non-silvicultural disturbance and clearing outside of building envelopes.

The Board review of the staff report ended at 9pm. The applicants left at this time.

Bill acknowledged there was not a quorum of necessary Board members present to approve the June 22nd minutes.

Other Business, Citizens to be Heard & Announcements

Discussion of the new regulations continued for some time. It was agreed it would be constructive to have a PC member present during a sketch review or final hearing to see how the new regulations are perceived by applicants. Thus far, certain sections feel onerous (i.e., lighting standards, snow storage). Sue said she would bring all discussed issues to the PC's attention at their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Submitted by,
Sue Adams
Interim Planning Coordinator