

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR JULY 13, 2022

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on **July 13, 2022** beginning 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Building, 149 Websterville Road, Websterville, VT.

MEMBERS

In person: Mark Reaves Jon Valsangiacomo, Chris Neddo, Angela Valentinetti, Gerald Otis (alt), and Gina Galfetti (alt).

ABSENT:

Cedric Sanborn, Jim Fecteau, and Angela Labrador

STAFF PRESENT

Remote video: Chris Violette

In person: Cindy Spaulding

OTHERS PRESENT:

In person: Rob Townsend (consultant for Kevin & Cherie Frost), Brandon Morris and Jamie Deforge

A. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Reaves called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Mr. Reaves asked whether there were changes to the agenda and there were none.

C. APPROVE MINUTES –

June 8, 2022

On motion by Mr. Neddo seconded by Ms. Valentinetti, the Development Review Board approved the minutes of June 8, 2022 as written. Vote 4-0-2 (Reaves & Galfetti abstained).

D. NON-AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

There were no none-agenda items

E. SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY REVIEW

APPLICANT: Frost/Prelim 2-lot subdivision

Request by Kevin & Cherie Frost for preliminary review of a two-lot (2) subdivision of land on property located at 11 Sunbay Road: PID 012/006.05; zoned low density residential; P-22000007.

Consultant: American Consulting

Date: July 5, 2022

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a preliminary review, whereas the applicant is requesting review of a proposed 2-lot subdivision of land for a parcel they own that includes their own dwelling. The parcel subject to this request is located at 11 Sunbay Road with road frontage along both Sunbay and East Montpelier Road (VT Rt. 14). This parcel borders the Town of East Montpelier. The parcel is zoned low density residential which requires a

minimum lot size of 2-acres when using onsite potable water and an onsite septic system. This area of town is predominantly single-family residential dwellings on 2-acre sized lots or larger. The exception is that three abutting properties are all under 1.9 acres.

The subject parcel consists of 7.9 acres and as mentioned includes the applicants single-family dwelling that utilizes onsite potable water and onsite septic system. As it exist today, the parcel has approximately 192' of frontage along Sunbay Road and 640' along East Montpelier Road.

The applicant is proposing to create two lots, identified on the plans submitted by American Consulting as lot 2 which is proposed to be a 4.5-acre parcel and lot 1 which will be the remaining land reducing to 3.4 acres. Lot 1 retains the existing dwelling, lot 2 isn't proposed for development at this time but will have a septic system designed for it.

Lot 1 retains the Sunbay Road road frontage and will also retain 83' along East Montpelier Road. The 192' along Sunbay is just short of the required 200' for the low-density residential zone. By combining the two road frontage segments, the lot 1 remains conforming. Lot 2 will have 557' of road frontage along East Montpelier Road and is proposed to have a driveway from that frontage.

Because the access for lot 2 is coming from a State of Vermont road, the applicant will need approval from the state for a curb-cut. Discussion have been ongoing with the State and they were involved with the driveway location proposed on the plan. This location offers the best sight distance in both directions. I do not believe a letter of intent (LOI) has been issued by the state for a section 1111 permit but may be by the time the board meets. If not, a condition will need to be placed that such a permit is obtained.

COMMENTS:

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Townsend explained he had conducted a survey of the property, soil tested on lot 2 and the best location for a curb-cut would be on the south side of Lot 2 on to Route 14 for the state access permit application.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Valsangicom, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board approved moving the prelim to final review. Vote 6-0-0.

PARTICIPANTS: Mr. Townsend and Mr. Violette

F. WARNED FINAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

1) APPLICANT: Morris / Final – Variance

Request by Brandon Morris for a 42' variance of right-of-way setback (Farwell Street) for the purpose of constructing a garage located at 395 Farwell St; PID: 012/004.00; zoned low density residential; V-22000004.

Consultant: None

Date: July 6, 2022

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

This is a **warned public hearing** for the purpose of considering a request by the applicant for a 42' variance of right-of-way setback from Farwell Street, allowing him to construct a garage within 8' of the town road right-of-way. The applicant owns this parcel of land and is shown to be .4 acres in size and developed with the applicant's homestead, a single-family dwelling. The parcel is located in a low-density residential zone with a minimum lots size of 2.0 acres and 200' of road frontage. The minimum right-of-way setback is 50'.

As noted above, the applicant is hoping to construct a detached garage. When he first approached me about this, it was clear that as proposed the setback wasn't going to meet minimum (50' required, setback is proposed to be 8' which equals a 42' discrepancy) and I advised him that a variance would be necessary to enable me to issue a permit.

Upon further review however, regarding the actual setback and variance needed, as I took a closer look at this, I believe the actual setback of the proposed garage will be 15' not 8' which means the variance can be reduced to 35' instead of 42'. The map I've attached lays out that clearly the right-of-way lines are not accurate, and I've drawn lines that I believe are likely more realistic.

If anybody is wondering about whether a variance can move forward or not because the variance ultimately needed is less than what was warned, the answer is yes it can. You are within your right based on the warning to reduce the variance below what was warned, it just can't be increased.

The applicant has submitted responses to the five variance criteria as a narrative included with his application. Without specifically saying yes, his responses indicate affirmative to all the criteria. For the reasons noted, he feels that a variance is reasonable and necessary to provide relief.

The applicant would like to construct a 24'x24' detached garage adjacent to his home. The parcel in question is significantly undersized for the low-density residential zone it lies in at .4 acres when 2.0 acres is the minimum. The parcel was created long before zoning, so it is grandfathered from the minimum lot size standpoint. The parcel also host an onsite septic system and a drilled well. So, between the house, septic system, and well there isn't a lot of room. Compound that by the fact the parcel is irregularly shaped (GIS map enclosed) and the terrain along the rear property line drops way off, there is little room to accommodate the garage.

It should also be noted that the proposed garage will not sit any closer to the road than the existing house does.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

I think it is obvious that there are physical circumstances regarding this property, it irregular, small, and has physical that are particular to the property. Have a garage is a reasonable use of a property so the physical circumstances (septic system, well, terrain) all make it hard to enable the reasonable use. The applicants didn't create the hardship and the variance will not alter the essential character of the area. The garage will not be any closer to the road than the existing house. For that same reason, there should be no increased concern for the public welfare and in order for the applicant to have the 24'x24' basic garage, the request is the minimum deviation.

With consideration to the conditions below, I recommend approval of a 35' variance of road right-of-way setback (Farwell Street) allowing the applicant to construct a 24'x24' detached garage on his land.

- 1) The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required in addition to the access permit. The applicant shall visit the Department of Environmental Conservation permit navigator to determine what other State of Vermont permits are necessary for this development. The applicant shall obtain said permits prior to development of the lot and in accordance with any requirements of said permits, shall be complied with.
- 2) Issuance of this variance does not imply approval of any other town permits. The applicant shall contact the Planning & Zoning Office to determine what other permits are required.
- 3) Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Mr. Reaves asked members if anyone had a conflict or Ex-parte communications with the applicant. There were none. Mr. Reaves swore Mr. Morris and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report stated above and suggested to reduce the variance to 35' right-of-way set back.

Mr. Reaves asked Mr. Morris the criteria questions below: (Answer in bold).

1. Are there unique physical circumstances or conditions as to:
 - a. Irregularity, narrowness or shallowness of lot size or shape; **Yes**
 - b. Exceptional topography or physical conditions peculiar to a particular property; **Yes**
 - c. Unnecessary hardship due to the above? **Yes**
2. Are there physical circumstances or conditions that prevent conformity to zoning regulations; And, a variance is necessary to enable "reasonable use" of the property. **Yes**
3. Is it true that no unnecessary hardship was created by the applicant? **Yes**
4. Is it true that a variance will not:
 - a. Alter the essential character of the neighborhood? **Yes**
 - b. Substantially or permanently impair appropriate use or development of adjacent property? **Yes**
 - c. Reduce access to renewable energy sources? **Yes**
 - d. Be detrimental to the public welfare? **Yes**
5. Is it true the variance represents the minimum deviation from regulation and plan to provide relief? **Yes**

During discussion it was noted that Mr. Morris's property meets the criteria in several ways and the request allows reasonable use of his property. In addition there was discussion regarding the proposed location of the garage and location of the existing onsite septic & well, and the purpose of the variance request.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Ms. Valentinetti, the Development Review Board approved closing the public hearing. Vote 6-0-0.

DELIBERATION

On motion by Mr. Otis, seconded by Ms. Galfetti, the Development Review Board approved a request by Brandon Morris for a 35' variance of right-of-way setback (Farwell Street) for the purpose of constructing a garage located at 395 Farwell St; PID: 012/004.00; zoned low density residential; V-

22000004, contingent upon conditions:

- 1) *The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required in addition to the access permit. The applicant shall visit the Department of Environmental Conservation permit navigator to determine what other State of Vermont permits are necessary for this development. The applicant shall obtain said permits prior to development of the lot and in accordance with any requirements of said permits, shall be complied with.*
- 2) *Issuance of this variance does not imply approval of any other town permits. The applicant shall contact the Planning & Zoning Office to determine what other permits are required.*
- 3) *Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this approval. Vote 6-0-0.*

CONDITIONS Yes X No

MOTION BY: OTIS
SECOND BY: GALFETTI

ROLL CALL:

Mark Reaves	<u>YES</u>	Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>YES</u>
Chris Neddo	<u>YES</u>	Angela Valentinetti	<u>YES</u>
Gina Galfetti	<u>YES</u>	Gerald Otis	YES

PARTICIPANTS: Chris Violette, Brandon Morris, Mark Reaves

2) APPLICANT: Frost / Final / 2-lot Subdivision

Request by Kevin & Cherrie Frost for final review and possible approval of a two-lot (2) subdivision of land on property located at 11 Sunbay Road; PID 012/006.05; zoned low density residential; P-22000007.

Consultant: American Consulting

Date: July 5, 2022

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

This is a **warned public hearing**, whereas the applicant is requesting approval of a 2-lot subdivision of land for a parcel they own that includes their own dwelling. The parcel subject to this request is located at 11 Sunbay Road with road frontage along both Sunbay and East Montpelier Road (VT Rt. 14). The parcel is zoned low density residential which requires a minimum lot size of 2-acres when using onsite potable water and an onsite septic system. This area of town is predominantly single-family residential dwellings on 2-acre sized lots or larger. The exception is that three abutting properties are all under 1.9 acres.

Consideration to final review and possible approval assumes preliminary approval was granted earlier on this month's agenda.

Below are my comments attached to the preliminary review. Nothing has changed between preliminary and final review.

The subject parcel consists of 7.9 acres and as mentioned includes the applicants single-family dwelling that utilizes onsite potable water and onsite septic system. As it exist today, the parcel has approximately 192' of frontage along Sunbay Road and 640' along East Montpelier Road.

The applicant is proposing to create two lots, identified on the plans submitted by American Consulting as lot 2 which is proposed to be a 4.5-acre parcel and lot 1 which will be the remaining land reducing to 3.4 acres. Lot 1 retains the existing dwelling, lot 2 isn't proposed for development at this time but will have a septic system designed for it.

Lot 1 retains the Sunbay Road road frontage and will also retain 83' along East Montpelier Road. The 192' along Sunbay is just short of the required 200' for the low-density residential zone. By combining the two road frontage segments, the lot 1 remains conforming. Lot 2 will have 557' of road frontage along East Montpelier Road and is proposed to have a driveway from that frontage.

Because the access for lot 2 is coming from a State of Vermont road, the applicant will need approval from the state for a curb-cut. Discussion have been ongoing with the state, and they were involved with the driveway location proposed on the plan. This location offers the best sight distance in both directions. I do not believe a letter of intent (LOI) has been issued by the state for a section 1111 permit but may be by the time the board meets. If not, a condition will need to be placed that such a permit is obtained.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

This subdivision as proposed conforms to both the Zoning Bylaw and Subdivision Ordinance. With consideration of the conditions below, I recommend final approval of this request for a two-lot subdivision of land, creating a new 4.5 acre parcel with access via East Montpelier Road and reducing the existing parcel to 3.4 acres which contains a single-family dwelling.

- 1) The applicants are hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required in addition to the access permit. The applicant shall visit the Department of Environmental Conservation permit navigator to determine what other State of Vermont permits are necessary for this development. The applicant shall obtain said permits prior to development of the lot and in accordance with any requirements of said permits, shall be complied with.
- 2) Issuance of the subdivision permit does not imply approval of any other town permits.
- 3) Plans submitted used for review of this permit shall become part of the approval and shall not be altered unless first reviewed by town staff for a determination of significance. Significant changes may require further review and approval of the DRB.
- 4) 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 Town of Barre Subdivision Ordinance and State Statute within 180-days of approval.
- 5) Three (3) sets (24" x 36") paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 45-days of approval unless extended by staff due to extenuating circumstances.
- 6) An electronic copy of the final approved plan must be provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.

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

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Mr. Reaves asked members if anyone had a conflict or Ex-parte communications with the applicant. There were none. Mr. Reaves swore Mr. Townsend and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Townsend mentioned the purpose of the proposed driveway location is because of a culvert in the area and that the State felt this was the best location.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Ms. Valentinetti, the Development Review Board closed the public hearing. Vote 6-0-0.

DELIBERATION

On motion by Mr. Valsangiacomo, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board approved a request by Kevin & Cherie Frost for final review and possible approval of a two-lot (2) subdivision of land on property located at 11 Sunbay Road; PID 012/006.05; zoned low density residential; P-22000007, contingent upon the following conditions:

- 1) *The applicants are hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required in addition to the access permit. The applicant shall visit the Department of Environmental Conservation permit navigator to determine what other State of Vermont permits are necessary for this development. The applicant shall obtain said permits prior to development of the lot and in accordance with any requirements of said permits, shall be complied with.*
- 2) *Issuance of the subdivision permit does not imply approval of any other town permits.*
- 3) *Plans submitted used for review of this permit shall become part of the approval and shall not be altered unless first reviewed by town staff for a determination of significance. Significant changes may require further review and approval of the DRB.*
- 4) *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 Town of Barre Subdivision Ordinance and State Statute within 180-days of approval.*
- 5) *Three (3) sets (24" x 36") paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 45-days of approval unless extended by staff due to extenuating circumstances.*
- 6) *An electronic copy of the final approved plan must be provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.*
- 7) *Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision. Vote 6-0-0.*

PARTICIPANTS: Mr. Violette and Mr. Townsend

CONDITIONS Yes No

MOTION BY: VALSANGIACOMO
SECOND BY: NEDDO

ROLL CALL:

Mark Reaves	<u>YES</u>	Chris Neddo	<u>YES</u>
Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>YES</u>	Angela Valentinetti	<u>YES</u>
Gina Galfetti	<u>YES</u>	Gerald Otis	<u>YES</u>

3) **APPLICANT: DeForge** (Warned Public Hearing – CUP)

Request by Jaime DeForge for Conditional Use approval to use two (2) RV's for seasonal residential purposes on property located at 867 Graniteville Road; parcel ID: 014/058.02; zoned very high density residential; CUP-22000002.

Consultant: None

Date: July 6, 2022

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

This is a **warned public hearing** for the purpose of conditional use review in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, article 5, sec. 5.4 whereas the applicant would like to conduct a use that is only allowed by a Development Review Board (DRB) issued Conditional Use Permit. The proposed use is to place two (2) RV's (campers) on the applicant's property located in a very-high-density residential zone. Article 4, Section 4.4 identifies placing a camper beyond 14-days as a temporary dwelling as being allowed, but only after Conditional Use review and a permit issued.

The applicant has placed two (2) RV's as temporary living quarters for family members. Upon becoming aware of the extended use of the RV's, I reached out to the applicant and informed him of the process to go beyond 14 days. The property is located in the village of Upper Graniteville, at 867 Graniteville Road.

The subject parcel is .6 acres in size with 126' of road frontage along Graniteville Road. There is currently a single-family dwelling on the property served by municipal water (Graniteville Fire District) and municipal sewer (Barre Town).

The requirement for a conditional use permit was added to the Zoning Bylaw in 2008 as a way to allow temporary or seasonal use of RV's for living accommodations. The main focus on this when it was added to zoning was how waste is being handled on a regular basis. Prior to inclusion into the Zoning bylaw there were instances of waste being improperly disposed of and creating a health hazard.

In this case, the applicant is going to provide a narrative as to why the need for the two RV's but as of this writing I haven't received it yet. From what I understand, the need is based on several factors but mainly that the campgrounds at least one of the RV's were located at could no longer host it. I'm not sure of the other situation requiring the second one but I'm told both are temporary situation, likely to be resolved by the end of the summer or early fall.

The conditional use process is required because “No permit shall be issued by the Zoning Administrator for any use, structure, or development which requires a Conditional Use Permit in this bylaw until the DRB grants that approval. In considering its action, the DRB shall make findings on the general and specific standards contained herein, hold hearings, and attach conditions as provided for in 24 V.S.A. 117 §4414(3), §4460(4), and §4464.

The DRB shall determine that the proposed use, structure, or development conforms to the following general and specific standards and shall not result in an undue adverse effect on any of the following”.

(my comments are bold)

1. The impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities, to include but not limited to:

- a. Emergency services:

I believe there is little impact to emergency services, no different than any other single-family dwelling and the Town’s emergency services can serve.

- b. Educational facilities:

Use is temporary, should not have an impact on educational facilities.

- c. Water, sewer, or other municipal utility systems:

There will be no impact on municipal services with this request regarding sewer or other utilities. The water is provided by the Graniteville Fire District and normally we’d want them to sign off on a conditional use application, but given the circumstances, the use should be minimal and may not necessarily be required. I have asked the applicant to address that however.

While there is no impact on municipal services, the question remain how is the disposal of waste being handled. I do not specially remember what the applicant said beyond using his house some. More clarity on that will be needed especially given that waste disposal is the main focus of this use.

- d. Recreational facilities: N/A

- e. Conservation or other designated natural areas: N/A

- f. Solid waste disposal facilities: N/A

2. The character of the area affected as defined by the purpose(s) of the zone within which the project is located, and specifically stated policies and standards of the municipal plan;

The area affected by the proposed use is heavily residential on mostly small lots but there are some medium sized lots as well. The section of zoning that this use fall under was added to allow what is proposed. However, at the same time giving the Town more control, ensuring proper health measures were being adhered to. Camper use as a seasonal or temporary dwelling is not unprecedented but if not done with certain measures

in place can be a health hazard and nuisance. As such with the applicant following the rules, this proposed use should be in character with the area it affects.

3. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.

The proposed location is off Graniteville Road which is a Class III paved Town road at the intersection of Donahue Road. The proposed use will not generate any more traffic than an ordinary single-family residential use. The addition of these two dwellings should not negatively impact Graniteville Road, surrounding roads, or cause any traffic issues. The existing driveway will be used, no new curb-cuts are being proposed.

4. Bylaws and ordinances then in effect.

Article 4, section 4.4 allows the use if a Conditional Use Permit is issued by the DRB.

5. Utilization of renewable energy resources. N/A

6. Minimum lot size:

The minimum lot size for very-high density residential zone is 8,500 square feet (SF) when both municipal water and sewer is used. The subject parcel is .6 acres which is well above the minimum lot size.

7. Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;

The closest adjacent uses are residential and are about 100' away.

8. Criteria (as needed) adopted relating to site plan review pursuant to Article 5, Sec. 5.6 of this bylaw; N/A

9. Any other standards and factors (as needed) that the bylaw may require; N/A

10. Off-street parking requirements in accordance with standards outlined in Article 3, Sec. 3.9 of this bylaw;

Each dwelling unit is required to have sufficient parking for two vehicles. In this case, with the existing dwelling and two RV's, a total of 6 parking spaces are required. It appears based on my observations and the enclosed map, the parking requirement can be met.

11. Loading/unloading facilities. N/A

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

The Zoning Bylaw was amended during the 2008 rewrite to include allowing campers to be used for temporary purposes or seasonal dwellings. It sounds like there are extenuating circumstances here that have a couple of people in a bind for housing. Given how hard it is to find housing and the fact this situation is temporary, and assuming that a satisfactory method of waste disposal is proposed, then I recommend approval of this request with consideration to the proposed conditions below.

- 1) This permit is granted to Jamie J. DeForge and is nontransferable.
- 2) This approval shall expire by the end of October 2022 and any RV's being used for habitation shall cease. If the RV use is needed again in 2023, a new conditional use permit shall be obtained.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Mr. Reaves asked members if anyone had a conflict or Ex-parte communications with the applicant. There were none. Mr. Reaves swore Mr. DeForge and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. DeForge explained family members are living in the two RVs temporarily. One is his sister visiting until October and the other is his wife's daughter and family as they do not have a place to live. The potable water will be from his residence. The septage from the RVs will be pumped every ten to fourteen days by Wind River Environmental.

Mr. Valsangiacomo asked if Mr. DeForge would be coming back next year for the same request. Mr. Violette answered it would be a new request at that time.

Discussion ensued regarding procedural process for temporary requests such as disposal of sewage and expiration date. Ms. Valentinetti asked what would happen if Mr. DeForge's family can't locate housing by the expiration date of the permit. Mr. DeForge stated, he probably would put in for a building permit because the family members would be moving into his residents until they could get their own place.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Mr. Otis, the Development Review Board closed the public hearing. Vote 6-0-0.

DELIBERATION

On motion by Ms. Valentinetti, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board approved a request by Jaime DeForge for Conditional Use approval to use two (2) RV's for seasonal residential purposes on property located at 867 Graniteville Road; parcel ID: 014/058.02; zoned very high density residential; CUP-22000002, contingent upon the following conditions:

1. *This permit is granted to Jamie J. DeForge and is nontransferable.*
2. *Sewage disposed by a certified waste disposal company*
3. *This approval shall expire by October 31, 2022 and any RV's being used for habitation shall cease. If the RV use is needed again in 2023, a new conditional use permit shall be obtained.*
Vote: 6-0-0.

CONDITIONS Yes No

MOTION BY: VALENTINETTI
SECOND BY: NEDDO

ROLL CALL:

Mark Reaves	<u>YES</u>	Chris Neddo	<u>YES</u>
Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>YES</u>	Angela Valentinetti	<u>YES</u>

Gina Galfetti

YES

Gerald Otis

YES

PARTICIPANTS: Mr. Violette, Mr. DeForge.

G. OTHER - None

H. FOLLOW-UPS

Mr. Valsangiacomo asked what future projects are there. Mr. Violette mentioned that the town is working with a company in the Wilson Industrial Park, there is a small housing development and potentially Millstone Woods may be starting up. He also gave a status report of Rock Pile Properties in East Barre

I. ROUNDTABLE - None

J. ADJOURN!

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Ms. Valentinetti, the Development Review Board adjourned at 7:56 p.m. Vote: 6-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Spaulding, Clerk for DRB

Mark Reaves, Chair

Jon Valsangiacomo

Angela Valentinetti

Chris Neddo

Cedric Sanborn

Angela Labrador

Jim Fecteau

Gerald Otis (alternate)

Gina Galfetti (alternate)