BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR AUGUST 8, 2018

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, August 8, 2018 beginning at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, 149 Websterville Road, Websterville, Vermont

Members Present:
Charles Thygesen, SR  Cedric Sanborn
Chris Neddo            Mark Nicholson
Jon Valsangiacomo      Jim Fecteau

Members Absent:
Angela Valentinetti    William Wolfe
Mark Reaves            

Staff Present:
Chris Violette – Planning & Zoning Director

Others Present:
Ken Carpenter          Loretta Wilson
Derek Wilson           Gray Ricker
John Deforge           Jeannette Deforge
Michael Lajeunesse     Joey Wilson
Elane Wang

A. 5:30 P.M. – SITE VISIT – NONE

B. 6:30 – 7:00 P.M. – PLANS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW

C. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER

D. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - NONE

E. APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Cedric Sanborn, second by Jim Fecteau, the board voted unanimously to approve the June 27, 2018 meeting minutes.

Motion by Cedric Sanborn, second by Jim Fecteau, the board voted unanimously to approve the July 11, 2018 meeting minutes.

F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)
G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW

1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW

APPLICANT: Wilson – 2 lot subdivision

Request by R. Derek & Loretta Wilson for preliminary review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property off Miller Road; Parcel ID: 005/088.00; Zone low density residential; P-18000012.

Consultant: Rick Bell

Date: August 2, 2018

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a preliminary subdivision request for the purpose of creating a two-lot subdivision of land. The subject property is located off Miller Road, across from Perry Road. The parcel is located in a low-density residential zone which has a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres and 200’ of road frontage. The parcel is located on a class 3 Town Road and access will be from Miller Road. No development is shown at this point; however, the intent is likely for the purpose of residential development.

The parent parcel, lot 1 is shown 98.7 acres on the plan submitted by Rick Bell. Assessing shows the parcel to be 100 acres. The new parcel, parcel 2 is shown to be 15.01 acres with 499’ of road frontage on Miller Road. The remaining land, lot 1, will reduce to 83.69 acres (survey) 84.99 (assessing) with over 2000’ of road frontage along Miller Road. Both lots are conforming as proposed.

If the entire parcel was surveyed then I feel comfortable using the surveyor’s information, if not the lot sizes need to be reconciled with the assessor’s records.

This request is on the same agenda for final consideration as well.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

No development is being shown so this subdivision is being done by deferral meaning that before the land is development, further approval is required showing the development potential. I recommend preliminary approval of this two-lot subdivision, moving it to final later this agenda.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above) noting that this is a relatively simple 2 lot subdivision by deferral. No development is planned at this time. Violette noted that the acreage discrepancy needs to be worked out.

No comments from the audience.

**MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Cedric Sanborn, seconded by Jon Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the preliminary request for the Wilson 2-lot subdivision.*

No board discussion

**NON-BOARD PARTICIPANTS:**

NONE

**APPLICANT:** Carpenter Living Trust – 3 lot subdivision

Request by Carpenter Living Trust for preliminary review of a three-lot subdivision of land on property located at 84 Websterville Road; Parcel ID: 006/037.00; Zoned high density residential; P-18000009.

Consultant: Rick Bell

Date: August 2, 2018

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER**

This is a preliminary subdivision request for the purpose of creating a three-lot subdivision of land on property adjacent to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School. The subject parcel is located in a high-density residential zone with a minimum lot size (with sewer and water) of 1/3 acre and a minimum road frontage of 110’. A final warned public hearing is also warned for this month given the simple nature of the request.

The 8.9-acre parcel is currently developed with a 2-unit multi-family dwelling. The proposed subdivision creates lot 4, a .97-acre parcel that will have enough road frontage on both Websterville Road and Carpenter Lane. Lot 4 will contain the dwelling. The second lot is a 625 s.f parcel that will be deeded to the Town of Barre as a turn-around. The remaining land, lot 1, will essentially be undeveloped. However, the remaining land is on this same agenda as part of a boundary line adjustment/merger. In the end, the remaining
land won’t be a stand-alone parcel.

No new development is planned with this subdivision.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend preliminary approval of this three-lot subdivision and moving it to final on later on this month’s agenda.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). Violette noted that the lot numbering sequence is because of the previous subdivision. This simply will place the apartment house on its own lot. He also noted that also coming out of this lot is the Town turn-around that will be deeded to the Town when the road is turned over. Violette recommends preliminary approval.

There were no comments from the audience.

**MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Charlie Thygesen, Sr., seconded by Cedric Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the preliminary 3-lot subdivision request by Carpenter Living Trust.*

There was no board discussion

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICPANTS:**

None

2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**APPLICANT:** Bond Family First Limit Partnership

Request by Bond Family First Limited Partnership for final plat review of a boundary line adjustment between parcels owned by the partnership at 277 Morrison Road; Parcel ID’s 005/113.00 & 005/113.01; Zoned low density residential; P-18000007 & P-18000008.

Consultant: Chase and Chase

Date: August 2, 2018
STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing, continued from last month to this month, for the purpose of a boundary line adjustment (BLA) between two parcels owned by the applicant. The subject parcels are located in a low-density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 2 acres and 200’ of road frontage. Lot 2 is developed with a commercial warehouse. Lot 1 is only developed with recreation fields and associated buildings. Lot 2 has municipal water (Barre City) and onsite sewer. Both lots have road amble road frontage on both Morrison Road and Upper Prospect Street.

Lot 2 was originally created out of lot 1 in 2000 (P-00-04-19, plan 1909) as a 10.1-acre parcel. While I’m not sure of the reason, the applicant would like to reconfigure lot 2 and reduce its size to 6.1 acres. The only significant thing to note on the plan is that the existing waste water system serving the warehouse on lot 2 will now be on lot 1. An easement is shown being reserved in favor of lot 2. The other thing to note is that the rear property line, with the new configuration, is right on the minimum 25’ setback line (distance from the rear of the warehouse to the rear property line). However, both lots remain conforming to both the Subdivision Ordinance is the Zoning Bylaw.

This hearing was continued last month because of uncertainty regarding an old town right-of-way crossing the property as well as part of the land possibly being in a different chain of title. The Bonds have been to the Selectboard requesting that the town give up the right-of-way. The Selectboard is willing, I believe, but the process will take some time.

A new map has been submitted that shows the encumbered land as well as the land owned by William and Elizabeth Bond.

The applicant is hoping to move forward with the BLA this month. The W&E Bond land is going to be conveyed to the Bond Family First Limited Partnership and it is likely that the rights-of-way will be relinquished by the Town.

Percent of lot coverage is the main concern with making sure everything is understood about this parcel. Adding the W&E Bond land to the Partnership land seems to make the lot large enough. According to the calculations provided by Chase and Chase, there is 2.05 acres of building and other development on the property. The lot is shown to be 6.1 acres, if you exclude the rights-of-way and only use the W&E Bond land the size is 5.94 acres and 35% of that means total development can’t exceed 2.079 acres. If everything goes according to plan the lot as shown on the most recent plan appears to be big enough without using the rights-of-way.

The above scenario requires the W&E Bond land to be conveyed to the Partnership. Because to some degree the two parcels involve the same owners, it is likely this will happen. However, I will suggest a condition stating as such.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

You may wish to wait until the W&E Bond land has been conveyed but I think with a condition the project can move forward. I recommend approval, with consideration to the conditions below, of this boundary line adjustment, making lot 2 6.1 acres and lot 1, 62.4 acres.

1. All easements and/or rights-of-way, as shown on the final (stamped approved) plans by Chase & Chase, shall be created when the need arises in order to fulfill the development as proposed and approved.

2. In order to meet the minimum percent of lot coverage, the land currently owned by William and Elizabeth Bond must be conveyed and merged with the land owned by Bond Family Limited Partnership.

3. One (1) (18” x 24”) recording plat must be submitted to the Planning office for filing in the Town of Barre land records in accordance with Barre Town subdivision regulation and state statute within 180-days of approval.

4. Three (3) sets (24” x 36”) paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.

5. An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.

6. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that a proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to go back before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.

7. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). Violette reminded the board that this request was continued from last month because of a couple of issues. One being the old Town rights-of-way that incumber the property that have never been relinquished. Second, a small parcel, was a triangle from the old road configuration is owned by William and Elizabeth Bond and they will be conveying to the Bond Family Trust. This parcel is important because it is needed to help the parcel meet percent of lot coverage. The question is whether the board is okay with conditions being added and approved tonight or whether the land should be conveyed first.
Nobody was in the audience to represent. No other audience comments

Cedric Sanborn didn’t like the fact that the small parcel hadn’t been conveyed yet and that this is a final proceeding and everything should be in place before final approval.

**MOTION AND DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Cedric Sanborn, seconded by Jon Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to continue this BLA request for Bond Family First Limited Partnership, date certain, September 12, 2018.*

Discussion:

Mark Nicholson asked whether the Bonds had anything pending on this request. Violette noted that he was not aware of anything. Nicholson added that he didn’t think anybody has a problem with the request, they just want it clean.

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:**

None

**APPLICANT:** Wilson – 2 lot subdivision Final

Request by R. Derek & Loretta Wilson for final plat review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property off Miller Road; Parcel ID: 005/088.00; Zone low density residential; P-18000012.

Consultant: Rick Bell

Date: August 2, 2018

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER**

This is a warned public hearing for final plat approval for the purpose of creating a two-lot subdivision of land. The subject property is located off Miller Road, across from Perry Road. The parcel is located in a low-density residential zone which has a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres and 200’ of road frontage. The parcel is located on a class 3 Town Road and access will be from Miller Road. No development is shown at this point; however, the intent is likely for the purpose of residential development.

Final consideration assumes preliminary approval was granted earlier on this same agenda.
The parent parcel, lot 1 is shown 98.7 acres on the plan submitted by Rick Bell. Assessing shows the parcel to be 100 acres. The new parcel, parcel 2 is shown to be 15.01 acres with 499’ of road frontage on Miller Road. The remaining land, lot 1, will reduce to 83.69 acres (survey) 84.99 (assessing) with over 2000’ of road frontage along Miller Road. Both lots are conforming as proposed.

If the entire parcel was surveyed then I feel comfortable using the surveyor’s information, if not the lot sizes need to be reconciled with the assessor’s records.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

With consideration to the suggested conditions below, I recommend approval of this request for a two-lot subdivision of land by deferral creating lot 2, at 15.01-acre parcel and reducing the size of lot 1 (remaining land) to 83.69 acres (84.99 assessing).

1. The land size of the remaining land (lot 1) needs to be determined.

2. Approval is by deferral meaning that no development is shown at this time. Prior to permits being obtained to develop, updated plans must be approved by the DRB.

3. One (1) (18” x 24”) recording plat must be submitted to the Planning office for filing in the Town of Barre land records in accordance with Barre Town subdivision regulation and state statute within 180-days of approval.

4. Three (3) sets (24” x 36”) paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.

5. An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.

6. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that an proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to go back before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.

7. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). Violette noted that this is a warned hearing, preliminary was approved earlier. No changes from
preliminary.
Nobody in the audience had anything to add.

MOTION & DISCUSSION:

On a motion by Jim Fecteau, seconded by Cedric Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the request by Derek & Loretta Wilson for a two-lot subdivision of land by deferral with conditions 1-7 unaltered in the Planning Directors staff comments.

No Board discussion

NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICPANTS:

None

APPLICANT: Carpenter Living Trust – 3 lot subdivision – Final

Request by Carpenter Living Trust for final plat review of a three-lot subdivision of land on property located at 84 Websterville Road; Parcel ID: 006/037.00; Zoned high density residential; P-18000009.

Consultant: Rick Bell
Date: August 2, 2018

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing for a subdivision request that as proposed creates a three-lot subdivision of land on property adjacent to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School. The subject parcel is located in a high-density residential zone with a minimum lot size (with sewer and water) of 1/3 acre and a minimum road frontage of 110’.

This proceeding assumes preliminary approval was granted earlier on this month’s agenda.

The 8.9-acre parcel is currently developed with a 2-unit multi-family dwelling. The proposed subdivision creates lot 4, a .97-acre parcel that will have sufficient road frontage on both Websterville Road and Carpenter Lane. Lot 4 will contain the dwelling. The second lot is a 625 s.f parcel that will be deeded to the Town of Barre as a turn-around. The remaining land, lot 1, will essentially be undeveloped. However, the remaining land is on this same agenda as part of a boundary line adjustment/merger. In the end, the remaining land won’t be a stand-alone parcel.
No new development is planned with this subdivision.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend approval, with consideration of the conditions below, of this three-lot subdivision of land that creates a .97-acre parcel with a multi-family dwelling as well as a 625sf parcel of land that will be deeded to the Town of Barre and become part of Carpenter Lane.

1. One (1) (18” x 24”) recording plat must be submitted to the Planning office for filing in the Town of Barre land records in accordance with Barre Town subdivision regulation and state statute within 180-days of approval.

2. Three (3) sets (24” x 36”) paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.

3. An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.

4. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that an proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to go back before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.

5. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). Violette noted that this is a warned hearing, preliminary was approved earlier. No changes from preliminary.

Nobody in the audience had anything to add.

**MOTION & DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Charlie Thygesen Sr., seconded by Jim Fecteau, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the request by Carpenter Living Trust for a Three-lot subdivision with conditions 1-5 unaltered in the Planning Directors staff comments.*

No Board discussion

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:**
None

**APPLICANT:**  
**Carpenter Living Trust – BLA Final**

Request by Carpenter Living Trust for a boundary line adjustment (merger of two existing lots) for property located at 5 Carpenter Lane (off Websterville Road); Parcel ID’s 006/037.00 & 006/037.02; Zoned high density residential.

Consultant: Rick Bell  
Date: August 2, 2018

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER**

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of final plat approval of a proposed boundary line adjustment between two parcels that are owned by the applicant. The subject parcels are located in a high-density residential zone where the minimum lot size (with municipal sewer and water) is 1/3 acre and minimum road frontage is 110’.

The applicants own a .2-acre parcel that currently has a single-family dwelling located on it. The applicant would like to eliminate a common boundary line between this parcel and the adjacent .7.6-acre parcel. The 7.6-acre parcel was part of a subdivision that was on this month’s agenda as well.

Combined the parcel will be 7.8 acre and will contain a single-family dwelling. No other development is planned at this time. The BLA does not affect any other features or buildings.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I don’t see any reason not to approve this request, in the end not much is changing. With consideration to the conditions below, I recommend approval of this boundary line adjustment/lot merger creating one parcel of 7.8 acres with an existing single-family dwelling and road frontage along Carpenter Lane.

1. One (1) (18” x 24”) recording plat must be submitted to the Planning office for filing in the Town of Barre land records in accordance with Barre Town subdivision regulation and state statute within 180-days of approval.

2. Three (3) sets (24” x 36”) paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted
to the Planning Office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.

3. An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.

4. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that an proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to go back before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.

5. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

6. To complete this boundary line adjustment, a deed merging the two parcels must be executed within 90 days of approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above).

Chris Neddo inquired whether there is a house on the existing smaller lot? Violette stated that yes there is a house. Neddo asked whether there could be any other houses built on this lot? Violette advised no, not without further subdivision.

MOTION & DISCUSSION:

On a motion by Jim Fecteau, seconded by Chris Neddo, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the final request by Carpenter Living Trust for a boundary line adjustment subject to the unaltered conditions (1-6) in the Planning Directors staff comments

No board discussion

NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:

None

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

H. VARIANCES / SIGN SIZE EXCEPTION (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

APPLICANT: Martin Foods (Hannafords)

Request by Martin Food of South Burlington LLC (Hannafords) for approval of a larger free-standing sign than allowed for by zoning on property located at 456
STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing in accordance with Article 7, sec 7.5 (B) 2 of The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw whereas the applicant is seeking to install a free-standing sign that is larger than 48sf in size. The applicant is proposing to replace their existing 36sf free-standing sign with a sign that is 108sf. The subject parcel is in South Barre in a highway commercial zone with mixed zoning between commercial and residential.

Article 7, sec 7 regulates signs in Barre Town. In a commercial zone a free-standing sign is limited to 48sf. Specific sign limitations (B 2) has a provision for the Development Review Board (DRB) to hold a public hearing and determine, after reviewing the facts, whether the sign is creating a substantial change in the character of the area.

The applicant is proposing to erect a free-standing illuminated pylon sign with a steel foundation which they state will be like the existing sign, just much larger. A narrative and illustration is enclosed in your packets.

The proposed sign is well over twice the size of what our zoning allows, so it is large. I did see one of these signs in an area like the South Barre location and it didn't look as out of place as I thought it might. The area is mixed use but generally commercial, so the question will be does it have a negative effect of the area.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

While the size is much larger, I'm not sure given its location, it will have a substantial impact on the general character of the area.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). He stated for clarity that this is not a variance. The request is part of Article 7, section 7.5 (B) 2. Violette noted that the proposed sign is considerably larger than what they currently have at 108sf. Violette added that when he originally talked to a Hannaford’s representative his first reaction was that it was too large. However, once he saw one in Swanton, he thought maybe it wasn’t going to be out of character.

Nobody in the audience had anything to add.
Jim Fecteau asked whether this was their standard corporate sign? Chris Violette stated that he had asked that question too and yes, he is told this is the corporate design.

Jon Valsangiacomo thought this is a huge change and it is too big. He wondered whether the Swanton sign had residential nearby? He also added that with the intersection nearby it’s not a good fit.

Mark Nicholson agreed with Valsangiacomo. Cedric Sanborn agreed, it’s a grocery store and how much do you really need? A larger sign might be needed but not what is being proposed.

Chris Violette asked whether the board would be willing to approve something smaller tonight? Nobody thought it would be a good idea.

Jim Fecteau asked whether there is a standard overage allowed? Violette stated no, it’s pretty much up to the DRB.

Nobody in the audience had anything to add.

**MOTION & DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion to approve the request by Martin Foods of South Burlington by Mark Nicholson, seconded by Cedric Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to deny the request. (note that the DRB makes all motions in the affirmative)*

Discussion:

Charlie pointed out that this area has two very dangerous intersections (Hannaford and Rt. 14/Rt. 63) and that there shouldn’t be a sign this size here.

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:**

None

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

**APPLICANT:** Bilodeau

Request by Mike Bilodeau for a conditional use permit to allow for a multi-family dwelling open land adjacent to 770 East Barre Road (Rt. 302); Parcel ID 006/068.01; Zone: highway commercial; CUP-18000003

Consultant:

Date: August 2, 2018
STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing, continued from last month to this month, for the purpose of conditional use review and possible approval for the applicants plan to create a residential development using two 24’ x 60’ buildings to create 8 units of residential housing (apartments).

This request was continued last month because the applicant had not submitted written comments related to the conditional use criteria. As of this writing, those responses still haven’t been received. A new plan was also to be submitted with changes discussed at last months meeting including inclusion of a manhole for both structures to feed into, parking showing enough parking for two cars per unit, and better representation of lighting.

The parcel subject to this request was approved in September of 2017 for a 4-unit mobile home park. The applicant has changed his plans and would like to move forward with a new CUP to create the 8 units of housing.

The parcel in question is zoned highway commercial which doesn’t allow a residential use unless, at a minimum, 8 units are being created. In addition, normally two dwellings on one lot wouldn’t be allowed except zoning allows for multiple dwellings if they are single entity owned rental housing (Article 4, sec 4.22 Barre Town Zoning Bylaw).

Municipal sewer (Barre Town) and municipal water (Barre City) will serve these buildings. Access will be via a 50’ easement across land of Dollar General and other lands of Bilodeau from East Barre Road (US Rt. 302)

Zoning requires 2 parking spaces for every dwelling unit. The plans are only showing 12 parking spaces. I believe the applicant plans to seek a reduction of the parking requirement. Recused parking is allowed for under Article 3, sec. 3.9G as long as the applicant can show one of the following:

1. The unique use of the property and it can be demonstrated that traffic volume will be substantially less than normally anticipated.
2. The requirement being excessive or insufficient for the use at the time.
3. The nature of the project for which vehicle usage is minimal such as elderly or disabled housing uses.

During the review of the 4-unit mobile home park I raised a question as to whether a new State of Vermont access permit would be necessary. The State said no for the mobile home park, I would suggest the applicant should make sure the increase to 8 units doesn’t change that.

The applicant has yet to submit answers to the CUP criteria and as a result I am not prepared to offer my comments on them. In addition, the Town Engineer has not looked at these plans yet and because of many factors, like the mobile home park project, I suggest he does.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:
Without the criteria responses and a new map, I am forced to recommend another continuance, date certain, September 12, 2018

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Chris Violette advised that the applicant has requested a continuance date certain September 12, 2018.

Nobody had any comments from the audience.

**MOTION & DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Mark Nicholson, seconded by Cedric Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to continue this request date certain to September 12, 2018.*

No board discussion.

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:**

None

J. SITE PLAN REVIEW

1) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**APPLICANT:** Lajeunesse Const. (L&D Safety)

Request by Lajeunesse Construction on behalf of Ricker Holdings LLC (L&D Safety Markings) for site plan review of a proposed 60'x225' building on property located at 304 East Montpelier Road; Parcel ID: 009/039.00; Zoned: office building retail.

Consultant: Lajeunesse/Wilson Consulting

Date: August 2, 2018

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER**

This is a warned public hearing in accordance with Article 5, section 5.6 site plan review for the purpose of considering site plan approval for the proposed construction of a 60'x225' building. The applicant operates L&D Safety Markings from this location which is located in an office building retail zone. The character of the area is mixed use between commercial and residential. Zoning is office building retail with a minimum lot size of .5 acre. The subject parcel is served by municipal sewer, water is onsite.
Currently the property has a 12,000sf office/warehouse along with another large storage building and large paved and gravel parking areas.

The proposed building will be mostly vehicle storage. Submitted plans show that the building will be served by municipal sewer. Water is onsite, but the plans show the existing water supply will be disrupted by the new building, actually being eliminated. A new water service is proposed using an existing well on an adjacent property that is also owned by the applicant. That property also has a single-family dwelling located on it. The plans do not show the new building being connected to that water supply, but I assume that is in correct given that the building does show having sewer.

The application did not have a narrative with it so it is hard to know exactly what the overall plan is. No responses to the site plan criteria were submitted either. There was some confusion with this application as it was submitted due to being on vacation so the applicant wasn’t told at that time to submit comments. However, most any site plan application is customarily accompanied by a little bit of detail as to what is occurring.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

Overall the plan is not complicated, but I don’t know much about it other than what is shown on the plan. Very little information is included about stormwater management etc. The applicant may be able to provide that information to make the board comfortable at the meeting. However, at this point it is hard to me to recommend approval.

Conditions as discussed during public comment:

1. All state permits shall be obtained including but not necessarily limited to; Division of Fire Safety, waste water, water supply, stormwater run-off.

2. Standard erosion and sediment control must be followed as noted on the plans which shall be incorporated as part of the approval.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Chris Violette summarized his staff comments (which are in their entirety above). Violette stated that he had placed a narrative on the members desks prior to the hearing starting. He also noted that he knows the applicant and his consultants are prepared to offer much more information.

Mike Lajeunesse asked the board members if they had any questions about the narrative? He also stated that Joey Wilson was here to answer any questions related to stormwater management.

Mark Nicholson asked whether they were staying on the well and whether they need to have the building sprinklered.
Gray Ricker stated that no, no sprinkler will be used. There isn’t water there other than a well they will be using which is new but on the adjacent parcel also owned by Ricker Holdings LLC. The existing well will be abandoned.

Joey Wilson went through some of the state permits that they’ll will be getting. They will be using the existing septic system, they don’t see a design flow increasing. So, the waste water permit shouldn’t be a factor, they will work with ANR for water supply. As far as stormwater, impervious surface isn’t being increased by more than 5,000sf so they believe the existing stormwater system will be adequate and won’t need to do anything further. However, that all still remains to be seen.

There were no further comments from the audience.

Violette suggested a few conditions be added. State permitting, waste water, portable water, stormwater, etc. need to be obtained. Normal standards for erosion and control need to be followed. Wilson noted that at this point it should be a low risk project.

See conditions discussed during discussion under the Planning Directors comments.

**MOTION & DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Jim Fecteau, seconded by Chris Neddo, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the request for site plan approval for the construction of a 60’x225’ building with conditions as added by the board under the comments of the Planning Director.*

No board discussion

**NON-BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPANTS:**

Gray Ricker – Mike Lajeunesse – Joey Wilson

2) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

K. FLOOD HAZARD REVIEW

L. APPEALS OF ZONING ADMINISTRATORS DECISIONS

M. OTHER

N. FOLLOW-UPS

O. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE
TOWN
MISCELLANEOUS

P. ROUNDTABLE
Q. ADJOURN!

_On a motion by Jon Valsangiaco, seconded by Cedric Sanborn, the DRB voted unanimously to adjourn the August 8, 2018 meeting at 7:50 p.m._

Respectfully Submitted,

Chris Violette

__________________________
Mark Nicholson, Chair

__________________________
Cedric Sanborn

__________________________
Mark Reaves

__________________________
Jon Valsangiaco

__________________________
Jim Fecteau

__________________________
Charlie Thygesen Sr.

__________________________
Angela Valentinetti

__________________________
Chris Neddo

__________________________
William Wolf