

# BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES FOR AUGUST 10, 2022

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on **August 10, 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 Labrador, Cedric Sanborn, Jim Fecteau and Gina Galfetti (alt).

## **ABSENT:**

Angela Valentinetti and Gerry Otis (alt)

## **STAFF PRESENT**

In person: Chris Violette

Remote (video): Cindy Spaulding

## **OTHERS PRESENT:**

In person: Brian & Wendy Holt, Pearl Hoyt, Susan Talmadge, Janis Carrier, Kristen Martin (Montessori School), Pat Smart (MSK Engineers), Robert Thompson (Velie Ave LLC), Hunter Thompson (Velie Ave LLC, Mark Browning and Ruben Stone (Browning & Stone), John Southgate

### **A. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Reaves called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

### **B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Mr. Reaves announced that items 2 Velie Ave, LLC and item 3 Southgate were being switched.

### **C. APPROVE MINUTES –**

July 13, 2022

*On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Mr. Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board approved the minutes of July 13, 2022 as written. Vote 4-0-2 (Fecteau & Sanborn abstained).*

### **D. NON-AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)**

There were no none-agenda items

## **SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

### **E. WARNED FINAL PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **1) APPLICANT: Montessori School of Central Vermont/Major Site Plan**

Request by Montessori School of Central Vermont for major site plan review (first of two public hearings) for the construction of a 6,500 s.f. addition to their existing school building, along with associate site improvements. The subject parcel is located at 84 Pine Hill Road; parcel ID: 009/020.00; zoned medium density residential; SP-22000003

Consultant: MSK Engineers

Date: July 25, 2022

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

This is a **warned public hearing** (first of two) for major site plan review. This request required site plan review in accordance with Article 5, section 5.6 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw whereas the applicant is proposing a 6,500 s.f. building expansion. This request is being considered as a site plan major because the proposal includes the construction of a new structure and expansion of an existing structure that exceeds 2,500 square feet (s.f.). This is the first of two required public hearing.

The applicant currently operates a private educational facility at 84 Pine Hill Road. The existing building encompasses approximately 5,595 s.f. (plus a basement) on a parcel that is 9.8 acres in size. The zoning for this area is medium density residential. The applicant received a conditional use permit (CUP-14000002) in May of 2014 to allow a private educational institution.

Detailed plans have been submitted that appear to meet the requirements of Article 5, section 5.6 for major site plan review. Plans submitted by MSK Engineers of Bennington, detail the existing conditions, proposed conditions, building elevations, building sections, exterior renderings, and a landscape plan. In addition, a narrative dated June 30, 2022 was also include with the timely submission.

In addition to the plan showing the proposed addition, the plans show a reconfigured parking area where now there is just a large parking lot. The main entrance remains the same but a more traditional loop with an island is created to provide better vehicular access to the school that will certainly enhance student drop off. The plan detail parking enough for 41 vehicles which includes two ADA spaces. The plans detail a much more robust landscape of the parcel than exists today which I think is beneficial to all. MSK includes a traffic generation detail with their submission as well.

This parcel is not served by municipal services such as sewer and potable water. Sewer is onsite and water is provided by a drilled well and an added (as a result of this project) 1,000-gallon precast concrete water storage tank. The proposed improvements will of course necessitate state permitting for an expansion of the use with regard to wastewater and water supply. Conditions that state permits be obtained will be added to the site plan permit.

Barre Town Zoning Bylaw requires that the DRB conduct site plan review with respect to the criteria below. The DRB may impose appropriate conditions, modifications, and protections where deemed necessary to eliminate or minimize potential problems and/or nuisances:

**1. The proposed land development as it complies with or compliments the policies, regulations, standards, and goals of the Town's Zoning Bylaw and its most recently adopted Town Plan;**

The proposed development conforms with the Zoning Bylaw by issuance of a conditional use permit (CUP) in 2014 allowing the private educational institution. The 2014 CUP did not place a limit on the size of the school or the student body or employees.

The proposed development conforms to the Town Plan in that the plan discussion education as an essential component of a community and educational opportunity and school quality are two significant basic services to make available to residents of a community. Strong educational facilities are key components to economic development and important to people that may be looking to move to our area. Strong educational facilities is noted as important throughout the Town Plan.

- 2. The convenience and safety of vehicular movement within the site, and in relation to adjacent areas of vehicular movement. This includes consideration of access management in regard to entrances and exits for the subject site;**

The proposed plans likely greatly improve on the safety of vehicular movement within the site. As mentioned in the introduction, the proposed layout of the entry to the building provides a much safer and more efficient means for vehicles to ingress and egress. Also eliminates the existing wide open paved parking area that doesn't provide any guidance for vehicular movement within the site. The parcel is served by one curb-cut from Pine Hill Road, there is no need for additional access management.

- 3. The convenience and safety of pedestrian movement within the site, and in relation to adjacent areas of pedestrian movement. Also included for consideration is the relationship to any pedestrian access deemed necessary for adjacent properties and along public roads;**

Like vehicular movement, the proposed plans with the new looped drop off area and a better defined parking area greatly improve the safety of pedestrians within the site. Because this site is located in a rural area of town and not close to a downtown or a center, it is unlikely students, employees, or visitors will access the property by foot. As such, there is no need for pedestrian access above and beyond the existing driveway and no need for access to adjacent property.

- 4. Storm water and drainage to ensure adequate consideration of storm water runoff and drainage issues in order to minimize the impacts of any development project on the adjacent property, the environment, and the Town. The applicant shall bear the responsibility for obtaining and meeting any and all permitting requirements of the appropriate state agency. The Town Engineer shall review the storm water runoff and drainage plan and shall approve the site plan and sign off on the design before the project may be approved;**

A grading and drainage plan is included with the submissions provided by MSK. MSK also notes in their narrative that the existing conditions do not fall under an Operational Stormwater Permit from the State of Vermont. Because of the existing large, paved parking lot, the addition isn't creating additional impervious conditions. MSK notes that a State of Vermont Operational Stormwater permit is still not required for the proposed project, less than 1-acre of impervious surface is being disturbed. The applicant has submitted an application for a Construction General Stormwater Permit from the state and will have to abide that permit and industry standards and best practices during construction.

- 5. The protection of historic or natural environmental features on the property under review, as well as on the adjacent areas;**

There are no known historic or natural environmental features on the property and the applicant hasn't noted any either.

- 6. The impact of new development on public utilities such as water and sewer infrastructure and on other users/consumers;**

This project does not propose utilizing public utilities such as water and sewer. Neither is readily available for this site. Onsite water and sewer will be used.

**7. Signage that meets or exceeds the criteria established in this Bylaw, Article 7, Sec. 7.5.**

Any signage will have to be permitted in accordance with Article 7, section 7.5

**8. The utilization of renewable energy resources;**

Nothing noted at this point.

**9. Landscaping and/or screening to assist in mitigating undue impact of the proposed land development upon neighboring landowners;**

The applicant has provided a fairly robust landscaping plan that adds numerous plantings throughout the site.

**10. The adequacy of parking as well as loading and unloading facilities including their impact on surrounding traffic patterns, in accordance with the provisions established in Article 3, Sec. 3.6 of this bylaw.**

According to MSK, there is currently parking for 85 vehicles. The proposed plans reduce parking to 41 parking spaces.

The parking requirement for a school is a bit complicated and the parking chart within the Zoning Bylaw doesn't offer a lot of help. There really isn't a clear requirement for a school and what is there may not fit well. Barre Town's Zoning Bylaw, for the most part, bases its parking requirement on the square footage of a building. In this case, the school will be approximately 12, 100 s.f. in size.

The professional/medical use category would require approximately 60 parking spaces. Places of Assembly would require 69 spaces. Both seem too excessive for this use based on the number of staff expected which according MSK is 20. The Montessori School serves children from 18 months to age 12 (grade 6) so unlike a high school, there is no need for student parking.

I think it is prudent to accept the proposed parking plan based on the number of staff which would leave 20 additional parking spaces. As noted by MSK, there is ample room for overflow parking in grassed areas (which may be hard to access during the winter months) but regardless, the focus is to make sure parking doesn't overflow to the town road and I do not believe that is a concern here.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I think the plans submitted are very detailed for our purpose and the proposed addition and site improvements will be beneficial in many ways and will greatly enhance the aesthetics of the property. Beyond the parking calculation complication, I believe all pertinent areas for site plan review have been met and along with state permits that will be required the proposal meets or exceeds Barre Town's requirements for site plan approval. With consideration to the conditions below, I recommend **approval of this first public hearing** for site plan review, which creates a 6,500 s.f. addition to the existing building along with site improvements.

- 1) The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits will be required. 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 a site plan permits does not imply approval of any other town required permits.
  - 3) Submitted plans used for review of this application 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) Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this site plan.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Mr. Reaves asked members if anyone had a conflict or Ex-parte communications with the applicant. Mr. Valsangiacomo recused himself and went into the audience. Mr. Reaves swore Ms. Martin, Mr. Smart and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Reaves asked if Ms. Martin or Mr. Smart had anything else to add. They stated they did not.

**Q&A**

Mr. Reaves asked if there are any school events?

Ms. Martin explained there is an end of year graduation that overflow parking is in the field.

Mr. Neddo asked how many fulltime educators does the school have?

Ms. Martin answered 16 full-time and a few part-time.

**MOTION:**

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

**DELIBERATION**

*On motion by Mr. Fecteau, seconded by Ms. Galfetti, the Development Review Board approved the first of two public hearings, allowing the application to move forward to the second hearing for the request by Montessori School of Central Vermont for major site plan review for the construction of a 6,500 s.f. addition to their existing school building, along with associate site improvements. The subject parcel is located at 84 Pine Hill Road; parcel ID: 009/020.00; zoned medium density residential; SP-22000003 with the following conditions:*

- 1) *The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits will be required. 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 a site plan permits does not imply approval of any other town required permits.*
- 3) *Submitted plans used for review of this application 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) *Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this site plan: to the second public hearing scheduled for September 14, 2022. Vote 6-0-0.*

CONDITIONS    Yes     No      
 MOTION BY:                      Fecteau  
 SECOND BY:                      Galfetti

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Reaves	<u>Yes</u>	Chris Neddo	<u>Yes</u>
Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>Recused</u>	Angela Labrador	<u>Yes</u>
Cedric Sanborn	<u>Yes</u>	Jim Fecteau	<u>Yes</u>
Gina Galfetti	<u>Yes</u>	Gerald Otis	<u>Yes</u>

**PARTICIPANTS:** Violette, Martin and Smart.

*Mr. Valsangiacomo returned to the meeting as a member of the Development Review Board. Ms. Galfetti was designated to stand in for Ms. Valentinetti.*

**2) APPLICANT:                      **Southgate / CUP****

**Request by John Southgate for Conditional Use Review to expand his existing single-family dwelling into a two-family dwelling on property located at 279 Websterville Road; PID 006/050.00; CUP-22000004.**

Consultant:                      None  
 Date:                                      July 25, 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 Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, article 5, section 5.5 whereas the applicant would like to conduct a use that is only allowed by a Development Review Board (DRB) issued Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

The applicant’s parcel is currently developed with his single-family dwelling and a large industrial building that formally (well it still does but only for a short time) housed his steeple business. The parcel is approximately 40 acres in size. The zoning of parcel is split between industrial (in the front) and high-density residential (rear portion). The conditional being reviewed here in is for his existing dwelling which is located in a high-density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 1/3 acre (with municipal sewer and water).

The applicant is proposing to construct an attached 20'x32' two-story addition to his existing two-story 1,500 s.f. home. The addition would be the second dwelling. As with the existing dwelling, the proposed second dwelling would use municipal sewer and potable water.

In reviewing a conditional use application, the DRB shall use the criteria below to guide them through the process and to create findings as well as help determine what if any conditions may be appropriate to mitigate any concerns. Ultimately a determination must be made that the proposed use, structure, or development conforms to the criteria and shall not result in an undue adverse effect on any of them.

The applicants' responses are provided in italics. My comments are in normal font following.

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

*"The addition of one dwelling unit will increase a-d by a factor of just one dwelling".*

**a. Emergency services:**

Barre Town emergency services have the ability to serve the one residential unit proposed.

**b. Educational facilities:**

Barre Town is part of the Barre Unified Union School District and children residing in Barre Town can attend Barre Town Middle and Elementary School (grades P-8) in Websterville.

Likewise, the district also operates a grade 9-12 high school in Barre City. Both are public schools. There is also numerous private middle, elementary, and high school options in the area.

Adding one residential unit will not create a burden to the educational facilities in the area.

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

Regarding municipal sewer and water, Barre Town has capacity to serve this proposed development with both sewer and potable water. There is an existing connection now, the same service will serve the proposed second living unit.

**d. Recreational facilities:**

There are numerous recreational facilities and opportunities in the greater Barre area. Barre Town owns and operates a recreational facility adjacent to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School in Websterville. In addition, the town also owns and operates a 300 plus acre forest with numerous walking, biking, disc golf, and other recreational opportunities. In addition, multiple neighborhood playgrounds are scattered around town.

It is not anticipated that the proposed development will have a negative impact on existing recreational facilities.

**e. Conservation or other designated natural areas:**

*"It will have no impact; this is a grout pile".*

There are no known conservation or other designated natural areas.

**f. Solid waste disposal facilities:**

**“I have a private dumpster/recycling....load will increase by one dwelling”**

It is not anticipated that this proposed development will overburden the existing solid waste system.

**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;**

*“Addition will match house in style”*

The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw states that the very high-density zone is “designed to encourage continued predominantly residential development at relatively high densities in established neighborhoods close to village centers which have both public water and sewer services”.

Other than the applicant’s own dwelling, the character of the immediate area is industrial waste land. The location of the applicant’s house is on a grout pile created decades ago when the former Well Lamson Quarry was active. His house was permitted in 2010 and constructed shortly thereafter.

The rest of the area of Upper Websterville is a mix between single and multi-family dwellings. Character of the area should not be negatively impacted.

**3) Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;**

*“Same driveway to be shared, road use will increase by one dwelling”.*

The access to the applicant’s parcel is off Websterville Road, a town paved heavily travelled road.

The addition of one living unit will not have an impact on the traffic on the roads in the vicinity.

**4) Zoning Bylaws and bylaws then in effect;**

*“High density residential zoning in keeping with this project I think”*

Article 2, table 2.1 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw provides guidance on uses that are either “permitted” (reviewed and permitted by the Zoning Administrator) or “conditional” (reviewed by the Development Review Board as a conditional use). The table (on page 7) allows two-family dwellings in a high-density residential zone. This section refers to Article 3, section 3.3 (e) for density considerations.

Article 3, section 3.3 is the equal treatment of housing section with the Zoning Bylaw. Subsection, (E) specifically relates to multi-family dwellings and density based on whether an



existing structure or a new structure. Under new structure for high density residential, a new structure can have up to two units. Of course, this is what the applicant is proposing.

Based on the above, the project conforms to the Zoning Bylaw with regard to use and density.

5) **Utilization of renewable energy resources:**

*“Other than firewood I do not have renewable energy here.....hope to but not yet”.*

The applicant is not proposing the use of renewable energy resources.

6) **Minimum lot size:**

The minimum lot size for high density residential is 1/3 acre. The subject parcel exceeds the minimum lot size at 40 acres.

7) **Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;**

*“Neighbors so far away from here there should be no impact”*

The closest existing use that isn't the applicant own house, is his business which is nearly 700' was. Beyond that, there is residential use along Kelley Road at around 900' away.

There should be little to no impact on nearby uses.

8) **Site Plan Review:**

N/a as a two-family dwelling.

9) **Any other standards and factors (as needed) that the bylaw may require.**

None anticipated for just a two-family dwelling.

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

Article 3, section 3.9 (Off-Street Parking...,) (G) (minimum parking chart) requires that all residential dwellings have two (2) parking spaces for each dwelling unit.

There is plenty of parking in the immediate area of the applicant's dwelling. Parking for four vehicles will not be an issue.

11. **Loading/unloading facilities.**

N/a

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

This applicant is proposing to build an addition to his existing single-family dwelling for the purpose of creating a two-family dwelling. As pointed out above, the project conforms to the Zoning Bylaw. With

consideration to the conditions below I recommend approval of this request for a conditional use permit for purpose of allowing an existing single-family to expand to a two-family dwelling.

- 1) The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required. 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 a site plan permits does not imply approval of any other town required permits.
- 3) 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. Southgate and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Reaves asked Mr. Southgate if he had anything to add. Mr. Southgate stated he did not have anything else to add.

**MOTION:**

*On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board closed the public hearing. Vote 7-0-0.*

**DELIBERATION**

*On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Fecteau, the Development Review Board approved request by John Southgate for Conditional Use Review to expand his existing single-family dwelling into a two-family dwelling on property located at 279 Websterville Road; PID 006/050.00; CUP-22000004., contingent upon the following conditions:*

- 1) *The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont Permits may be required. 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 a conditional use permit does not imply approval of any other town required permits.*
- 3) *Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this permit. Vote: 7-0-0.*

CONDITIONS	Yes	X	No	_____
MOTION BY:			Sanborn	_____
SECOND BY:			Fecteau	_____

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Reaves	<u>Yes</u>	Chris Neddo	<u>Yes</u>
Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>Yes</u>	Angela Labrador	<u>Yes</u>
Cedric Sanborn	<u>Yes</u>	Jim Fecteau	<u>Yes</u>
Gina Galfetti	<u>Yes</u>	Gerald Otis	<u>Yes</u>

**PARTICIPANTS:** Mr. Violette and Mr. Southworth

**3) APPLICANT:     **Velie Ave, LLC./Conditional Use Review****

**Request by Velie Ave, LLC for Conditional Use Review (possible approval) to allow up to eight (8) apartments in a new structure (to be constructed) on property located off Barclay Quarry Road; PID 014/007.00; CUP-22000003.**

Consultant:     None

Date:             July 29, 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 Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, article 5, section 5.5 whereas the applicant would like to conduct a use that is only allowed by a Development Review Board (DRB) issued Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

The parcel in question is currently vacant (once had a dwelling on it) located on Barclay Quarry Road in the Upper Graniteville section of Barre Town. The zoning of this parcel is very high density residential which is consistent with the rest of the village. The minimum lot size for a very high density residential is 8,500 square feet (s.f.) (with off-site water and sewer) and 85’ of road frontage is required. Barclay Quarry Road is a dead-end town, class III pave road with a bit of a grade to it.

The applicant is proposing to construct a new building that will have eight (8) residential apartments. Along with the application filing, the applicant submitted a brief narrative trying to address the conditional use criteria. A narrative providing more detail of the project was not included and the responses to the criteria are minimal. What I know about the project is really based on speaking to the applicant’s father which essentially includes what I’ve already stated above except for the fact that they plan to provide parking for at least 16 vehicles to comply with the Zoning Bylaw.

To the best of my knowledge, the property is served by municipal sewer and water. The property was previously owned by Rock of Ages and there was a house on the property. The house was very dilapidated and torn down several years ago. The applicant will need confirm from the Graniteville Fire Districts on their ability to serve this parcel for the intended purpose and the applicant should also consult with Barre Town Engineer regarding the sewer. He should also discuss the access with the engineer for what would be a significant expansion of the driveway from a single-family use to a multi-family use.

In reviewing a conditional use application, the DRB shall use the criteria below to guide them through the process and to create findings as well as help determine what if any conditions may be appropriate to mitigate any concerns. Ultimately a determination must be made that the proposed use, structure, or development conforms to the criteria and shall not result in an undue adverse effect on any of them.

The applicants' responses are provided in italics. My comments are in normal font following.

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

*"No foreseeable strains on local municipalities or emergency services for they are well equipped for this project".*

**a. Emergency services:**

I agree with the applicant here, Barre Town emergency services have the ability to serve a proposed eight-unit residential dwelling.

**b. Educational facilities:**

Barre Town is part of the Barre Unified Union School District and children residing in Barre Town can attend Barre Town Middle and Elementary School (grades P-8) in Websterville. Likewise, the district also operates a grade 9-12 high school in Barre City. Both are public schools. There is also numerous private middle, elementary, and high school options in the area.

It is not anticipated that this proposed development will create a burden to the educational facilities in the area.

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

Regarding municipal sewer and water, Barre Town has capacity to serve this proposed development. While this parcel was previously served by municipal sewer, I strongly suggest that the applicant discuss the sewer situation with Josh Martineau, the Town Engineer.

The potable water is provided by the Graniteville Fire District. While I believe the previous house was served by water from the fire district, confirmation that off-site water is available and that the Graniteville Fire District has the ability to serve needs to be completed before final approval is granted.

**d. Recreational facilities:**

There are numerous recreational facilities and opportunities in the greater Barre area. Barre Town owns and operates a recreational facility adjacent to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School in Websterville. In addition, the town also owns and operates a 300 plus acre forest with numerous walking, biking, disc golf, and other recreational opportunities. In addition multiple neighborhood playgrounds are scattered around town.

It is not anticipated that the proposed development will have a negative impact on existing recreational facilities.

**e. Conservation or other designated natural areas:**

While the subject parcel is directly adjacent to the Barre Town Forest, there are no known conservation or other designated natural areas that impact this project.

**f. Solid waste disposal facilities:**

Solid waste is not addressed within the application provided by the applicant. Solid waste is managed via local haulers and is disposed of at approved landfills. The applicant will have to provide receptacles or dumpsters to each unit for trash and recycling.

It is not anticipated that this proposed development will overburden the existing solid waste system.

**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;**

*“Lower Graniteville already has many multi-unit properties within hundreds of yards”*

The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw states that the very high-density zone is “designated for land centrally located where town water and sewer facilities are available and where, due to reasons of utilities, location and existing intensive development, higher density is appropriate. The purpose of this district is to permit a continuation of residential and related uses where consistent with the objectives on the Barre Town Municipal Plan”.

The applicant attempts to point out (I believe) that Graniteville already has dense development and multi-family dwellings. That statement is true, and the overall area of the proposed development is predominately dense residential uses (with the exception the industrial uses nearby). However, that is not the case in the immediate area along Barclay Quarry Road and adjacent Clermont Street. In total, there are seven (7) single-family dwellings, with the furthest away is only 300’.

Expanding upon our existing dense development areas is supported by both zoning (it allows what is being proposed) and the Town Plan where it encourages “in-fill” development, taking advantage of existing municipal utilities etc. And, while there is no doubt that both Upper and Lower Graniteville have dense development and multi-family dwellings, this will most definitely be a character change for the residents that live along Barclay Quarry Road and Clermont Street.

**3) Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;**

*“The road is well built and able to withstand the minimal expansion of new vehicles”.*

Barclay Quarry Road is a Town paved, class III road that is approximately 600’ long and appears to be a two-rod (33’ wide) right-of-way as opposed to three-rods (49.5’ wide). While the width of the right-of-way likely doesn’t come in to play, the paved portion of the road may be slightly less wide than more heavily travelled roads. The road does have the appearance of being narrow. The center of the subject parcel is approximately 350’ from its the intersection of

Graniteville Road, which is the only road that will feed this development. Clermont Street, a town road that only serves a few dwellings in close proximity.

Adding eight additional living units essentially doubles the amount of potential vehicular traffic on Barclay Quarry Road which will also be an impact to the neighborhood. However, from purely a road standpoint it is likely that the road can support the traffic and I believe site distances are acceptable in both direction along Graniteville Road. Having said that, I believe it is important to get the Town Engineer to review the project and provide guidance on whether there are any concerns related to the road and traffic.

**4) Zoning Bylaws and bylaws then in effect;**

*“This is already permitted for high density residential”*

Article 2, table 2.1 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw provides guidance on uses that are either “permitted” (reviewed and permitted by the Zoning Administrator) or “conditional” (reviewed by the Development Review Board as a conditional use). The table (on page 7) allows multi-family dwellings in a very-high density residential zone. This section refers to Article 3, section 3.3 (e) for density considerations.

Article 3, section 3.3 is the equal treatment of housing section with the Zoning Bylaw. Subsection, (E) specifically relates to multi-family dwellings and density based on whether an existing structure or a new structure. Under new structure for very-high density residential, a new structure can have up to eight units. Of course, this is what the applicant is proposing.

Based on the above, the project conforms to the Zoning Bylaw with regard to use and density.

In accordance with Article 2, table 2.2 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, percent of lot coverage of impervious surfaces shall not exceed 35%. Without a site plan, that is impossible to determine for compliance.

**5) Utilization of renewable energy resources:**

*“This is a brand new build in which we will be utilizing energy efficient products”.*

Always good to use energy efficient products. It does not appear that any renewable energy resources are being proposed.

**6) Minimum lot size:**

The minimum lot size for very-high density residential is 8,500 s.f. The subject parcel exceeds the minimum lot size at .5 acres.

**7) Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;**

Adjacent nearby uses are residential and are within less than 100’ away.

**8) Site Plan Review:**

Site plan review is not specifically required for residential uses, even commercial residential uses. They are not exempt either, especially beyond 2-units. Combined with (A) under section 5.6 of Article 5 of the Zoning Bylaw, which states “any proposed land development that has a significant impact on either traffic patterns or traffic generation in the areas around the development, and/or would create an added negative impact in an existing heavy traffic area” requires site plan review.

While I did not think to tell the applicant about the site plan requirement prior to the very last-minute submission for conditional use review (things were hurried and it came to me as I write this), site plan review is required. The applicant filed the conditional use application at the filing deadline and would not have had time to prepare documents for site plan approval anyway.

**9) Any other standards and factors (as needed) that the bylaw may require.**

There may be other factors to consider but reviewing this project as both a conditional use and site plan should cover most everything.

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

Article 3, section 3.9 (Off-Street Parking...) (G) (minimum parking chart) requires that all residential dwellings have two (2) parking spaces for each dwelling unit. In this case, eight (8) dwellings are being proposed which means 16 parking spaces will be required.

While the applicants does not address parking in his application, when discussing this with his father, he indicated he understand the parking requirement and could easily comply. I told them we'd want to see a site plan showing parking etc. A plan has not been submitted as of this writing.

**11. Loading/unloading facilities.**

Likely not applicable.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

While the proposed use is clearly allowed by the Zoning Bylaw, there is much to talk about with this proposal. How might character of the area concerns be mitigated? Are there concerns with water or sewer access? Is the road suitable for potentially doubling the traffic? There isn't a site plan available at this time to review what the layout of the land will look like including parking compliance. Likely a continuance is in order while more information is gathered.

So at this point, I reserve further comments as the process moves along.

**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. R. Thompson, Mr. H. Thompson, and Mr. Violette in for testimony.

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Violette also mentioned that this would have to go for a Site Plan Review as well.

Mr. R. Thompson mentioned that the site plan was not available at this time. They are proposing to build up to eight units and there is municipal water and sewer already on site.

Ms. Labrador asked for clarification of the "Future Use" map in the Town Plan. Mr. Violette explained the map was created during the 2007 Zoning Bylaw rewrite and that the future use map is only a guide.

Highlights of discussion:

- Concerns of debris buried on site
- Character of the neighborhood
- Impact of traffic increasing
- Safety of pedestrian traffic
- Type of housing
- Safety of the neighborhood

**MOTION:**

*On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Fecteau, the Development Review Board moved to continue the request by Velie Ave, LLC for Conditional Use Review to allow up to eight (8) apartments in a new structure (to be constructed) on property located off Barclay Quarry Road; PID 014/007.00; CUP-22000003, date certain to September 14, 2022. Vote 7-0-0*

CONDITIONS Yes X No       
MOTION BY: Sanborn  
SECOND BY: Fecteau

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Reaves	<u>Yes</u>	Chris Neddo	<u>Yes</u>
Jon Valsangiacomo	<u>Yes</u>	Angela Labrador	<u>Yes</u>
Cedric Sanborn	<u>Yes</u>	Jim Fecteau	<u>Yes</u>
Gina Galfetti	<u>Yes</u>	Gerald Otis	<u>Yes</u>

**PARTICIPANTS:** Holts, Hoyt, Carrier, R. Thompson, and Violette

**F. OTHER**

- 1) Conceptual discussion with Stone and Browning Property Management regarding a potential application for conditional use and site plan review for the purpose of adding additional residential living units to the existing mixed use (residential/retail/office) building located at 379 South Barre Road.

Mr. Browning and Mr. Stone of Stone & Browning Property Management proposed to repurpose the former Howards Market on Route 14 to mix use, up to eight residential apartments, keeping the front retail and South Barre Post Office. Discussion ensued regarding the local and state permitting process and the traffic issues at the intersection of Bridge Street, Sterling Hill, and Route 14 (South Barre Road).



**G. FOLLOW-UPS**

Mr. Violette mentioned that 130 Mill Street did get its occupancy permit from the State of Vermont Division of Fire Safety.

**H. ROUNDTABLE**

**I. ADJOURN!**

*On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Mr. Sanborn, the Development Review Board adjourned at 8:30 p.m. Vote: 7-0-0.*

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)	_____