

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES FOR JANUARY 10, 2024

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearing on **January 10, 2024** beginning 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Building, 149 Websterville Road, Websterville, VT.

MEMBERS

In person: Mark Reaves, Cedric Sanborn, Chris Neddo, Angela Labrador and Gerry Otis

Remote:

ABSENT:

Jon Valsangiacomo, Angela Valentinetti, Gina Galfetti (Alt) and Jim Fecteau (Alt)

STAFF PRESENT

In person: Brandon Garbacik

Remote: Cindy Spaulding

PUBLIC PRESENT

In person: Timothy Morris (Chase & Chase), Robert Bolus, Vincent Calcagni, Robert Granfield and Matt Henderson

Remote (observed): Brian & Cathy Deyo and Alec Bolus

A. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Reaves called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He conducted a roll call, there were no alternates available to replace absent members.

B. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - No changes to the agenda

C. APPROVE MINUTES – December 13, 2023

On motion by Mr. Otis, seconded by Ms. Labrador, the Development Review Board approved the minutes of December 13, 2023, as written. Vote 5-0-0.

D. NON-AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

E. SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

1. APPLICANT: BOLUS/3-LOT SUBDIVISION (preliminary)

**Continued from December 13, 2023*

*Plans submitted by American Survey Company. Dated June 1, 2023, revised January 3, 2024, entitled "A Subdivision Survey in Barre Town, Vermont for **Robert Bolus**".*

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER

UPDATE: After speaking with Mr. Bolus, I've learned that he is working with Rob Townsend to revise his plan to show two separate right-of-ways to serve the two lots. The two easements will be served by a shared curb-cut, minimum of 20' wide by 30' deep.

The applicant is hoping that the DRB will consider one of the right-of-ways to serve as an easement-in-common for both of the newly created lots to use, up until it is necessary to utilize the separate right-of-ways. In Section 3.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, it states that, "Shared driveways are

discouraged and will only be considered for up to two lots.” Though they are generally discouraged, the applicant believes that a common driveway for the two lots makes the most practical sense. These are long right-of-ways being proposed for these driveways. Having separate driveways for each lot would create a lot more impervious surface than if each lot shares one easement-in-common.

I’ve been told by Mr. Violette that the DRB has approved such a scenario numerous times in the past (though he couldn’t recall any specific examples). Plan A is that both lots use the common right-of-way. If that creates issues and a need arises, there’s a contingent Plan B there for two separate right-of-ways to be utilized.

There are potential concerns if the “easement-in-common” is approved. For instance, who will be responsible for paying the costs of the common driveway? And if there’s an issue and the second driveway needs to be built, who will pay the cost for that driveway? Is someone getting out scot-free while someone else is bearing these costs? With all of that said, Mr. Violette has said that he cannot recall any scenario where an “easement-in-common” was approved by the DRB which resulted with issues that prompted the contingent easement to be necessary.

Something else that was largely overlooked last month were potential concerns about sewer connections for these two lots. It is planned that the two newly created lots will connect to municipal sewer, with water sourced by drilled wells. The existing house at 340 School Road is connected to municipal sewer via a forced main coming from Richardson Road with an easement running through two neighboring properties.

Josh Martineau has stated that a shared pump station will not be permitted. But, if sewer easements can be obtained for underground forced main sewer lines to run from Richardson Road through those neighboring properties to access the two new lots, and they each have their own pump station, Mr. Martineau said that would be permitted. However, that would be asking a lot out of the applicants. There are two other options that the applicants can consider if they decide not to connect to municipal sewer. One would be to come back next month (or whenever ready) with septic design plans. The other option would be to defer site-specific information for development for those two lots, meaning that at the time of development the property owner would come back before the DRB.

DECEMBER 13, 2023 STAFF REPORT: This is a **preliminary subdivision review**, whereas the applicants are requesting approval of a proposed 3-lot subdivision of land owned by them. The parcel subject to this request is located off School Road and is located in a medium density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 2 acres and 200’ of road frontage.

The subject parcel as it exists today was created as part of a boundary line adjustment proposed by the Alfred R. Monty Revocable Trust which was approved in August 2000 (Plan 1913) and recorded in the Land Records (Slide #239). The parcel is approximately 15.5 acres in size and is developed with a single-family dwelling. The existing dwelling at 340 School Road is served by on-site water and municipal sewer. Currently, the parcel has approximately 400’ of road frontage along School Road. The parcel is mostly wooded where the two new lots are proposed.

The applicant is proposing to create two new lots, identified as Lots 5B & 5C on the plan submitted by American Surveyors, and will contain 4.2(±) acres and 3.0(±) acres respectively. Lot 5A is shown to be the remaining land and will reduce to 8.3(±) acres in size. Access to Lots 5B & 5C would be served by a 50’ wide easement which begins on the corner of the property (just

before the driveway of 354 School Rd) where an existing partially stone path is located. Lot 5A would retain the single-family dwelling and other existing structures on the property, as well as all 400' of road frontage.

No septic plans were submitted with this application. The applicants are planning to have the proposed lots connected to the municipal sewer lines (as the existing house at 340 School Rd is), with water provided by drilled wells (proposed locations not included in plan). I have reached out to Town Engineer Josh Martineau to confirm that sewer connections are available at the proposed lots.

As proposed, each lot conforms to the Subdivision Ordinance and Zoning Bylaw. A final warned hearing is warned for this agenda and assumes preliminary approval being granted.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

As proposed, each lot is conforming. A revised plan has been submitted. There are still some questions to work out involving access to lots and wastewater disposal. However, I believe there is enough information to recommend preliminary approval and move this to a final public hearing which is warned on this same agenda.

COMMENTS:

Mr. Garbacik provided an overview of his staff report as stated above, with highlights on connection to municipal sewer or alternatives of onsite septic plans or deferral septic design until lot is ready for development.

Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone from the public to speak about the proposal, No one spoke up on the matter.

Mr. Sanborn mentioned that shared driveways are discouraged, the proposed looks like two 25' right of ways with a shared access point. It was suggested to put language in the deed on responsibility of each property owner for the shared curb cut.

Mr. Sanborn is concern about municipal sewer connections requiring easements across abutting properties. It was suggested to submit septic designs or deferral to a later time.

Mr. Neddo questioned if one of the driveways may be encroaching on an existing sewer easement to an abutting property, this needs to be protected.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board voted to continue prelim review to date certain February 14, 2024: Request by Robert & Margaret Bolus for preliminary review of a three-lot (3) subdivision of land located at 340 School Road; PID: 011/001.05; zoned medium density residential; P-23000007. Vote 5-0-0.

2) APPLICANT: Calcagni / 2-lot Subdivision (Preliminary)

**Continued from December 13, 2023*

Request by Vincent Calcagni for a preliminary review of a **two-lot (2) subdivision** of land located at 375 Beckley Hill Road; Parcel ID: 008/020.00; Zoned Low Density Residential; **P-23000009**.

Consultant: Chase & Chase Surveyors & Septic Designers, Inc

Plans submitted by Chase & Chase Surveyors & Septic Designers, Inc. Dated October 11, 2023, revised January 5, 2024, entitled "Subdivision Survey: Vincent Calcagni, Nichols Road & Beckley Hill Road, Town of Barre, Vermont".

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK,
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER**

UPDATE: Chase & Chase are working on updating the plan to show a common easement of about 50' wide x 150' deep to place a shared curb-cut (minimum 20' wide and 30' deep) at the beginning of the applicant's existing common driveway between him (397 Beckley Hill Rd) and his neighbors (401 Beckley Hill Rd). The plan is to place the driveway for the newly proposed lot directly off of the identified shared curb-cut. Section 3.2(C) of the Zoning Bylaw states that shared curb-cuts limited to no more than three driveways are allowed. This section states that the reason for this is to encourage a reduction in the number of curb-cuts in close proximity. Mr. Calcagni and Chase & Chase decided that it made the most sense to place the proposed driveway off the shared curb-cut since this location is flatter than if the new driveway came directly off of the frontage on Beckley Hill Rd.

DECEMBER 13, 2023 STAFF REPORT: This is a **preliminary subdivision review**, whereas the applicant is requesting approval of a proposed 2-lot subdivision of land owned by them. The parcel subject to this request is located off Beckley Hill Road and is located in a low density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 2 acres and 200' of road frontage.

The subject parcel has existed in its current configuration for over 50 years. The parcel is approximately 12.78 acres in size and hosts an existing solar farm. (The applicant also owns one of the abutting parcels, where a single-family dwelling served by on-site water and septic is located.) Currently, the subject parcel has approximately 725' of road frontage along Beckley Hill Road and approximately 421' of road frontage along Nichols Road. The parcel features an open area to the west and a wooded area to the east.

The applicant is proposing to create one new lot, identified as Lot 2 on the plan submitted by Chase & Chase, and will contain 2.00(±) acres. Lot 1 is shown to be the remaining land (including the solar farm) and will reduce to 10.78(±) acres in size. Lot 2 will receive approximately 201' of road frontage, with the remaining road frontage being retained by Lot 1.

There are plans to place a new single-family dwelling on the undeveloped Lot 2 following subdivision approval. To support residential use, the proposed lot has a design for a septic system, and potable water will be provided by a drilled well.

The only hiccup for this subdivision request is Section 3.2 of the Zoning Bylaw. The newly proposed lot would be the third homesite accessed by an existing private right-of-way off of Beckley Hill Road. Section 3.2 of the Zoning Bylaw states that, "Shared driveways are discouraged and will only be considered for up to two lots." However, the DRB does have the authority to exempt this requirement during subdivision review.

It is recommended that the plans be amended so that the proposed access to the new lot comes directly off of Beckley Hill Road.

Assuming Section 3.2 of the Bylaw is addressed, and assuming the state wastewater permit is updated, there is nothing else that would keep this proposal out of conformity with the Subdivision Ordinance or Zoning Bylaw.

A final warned hearing is warned for this agenda and assumes preliminary approval being granted.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant proposes to subdivide his 12.78(±)-acre parcel. This would create a new 2.00(±)-acre lot for family to place a new dwelling on. The applicant will keep the remaining 10.78(±) acres of land (including where the existing solar farm is). With the inclusion of the specified shared curb-cut in the updated plan, I see no other concerns. Therefore, I recommend granting preliminary approval and moving it to a final public hearing which is warned on this same agenda

COMMENTS:

Mr. Garbacik provided an overview of his staff report as stated above.

Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone to speak about the proposal. Mr. Morris (Chase & Chase) and Mr. Calcagni available.

Highlights of discussion (participants: Sanborn, Morris, Garbacik, Calcagni & Otis)

- Shared curb cut (three driveways)
- 50' wide right-of-way existing
- 25' wide right of way for new lot and existing shared driveway
- Written responsibility agreement amongst property owners who share the curb cut.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Otis, the Development Review Board voted to continue prelim review to date certain February 14, 2024: a request by Vincent Calcagni for preliminary review of a two-lot (2) subdivision of land located at 375 Beckley Hill Road; PID: 008/020.00; zoned low density residential; P-23000009. Vote 5-0-0.

E. WARNED FINAL PUBLIC HEARING(S)

1). **APPLICANT: BOLUS/3-LOT SUBDIVISION**

Request by Robert & Margaret Bolus for a final review (possible approval) of a **three-lot (3) subdivision** of land located at 340 School Road; Parcel ID: 011/001.05; Zoned Medium Density Residential; **P-23000007**.

Consultant: American Consulting Engineers & Surveyors, Inc

*Plans submitted by American Survey Company. Dated June 1, 2023, entitled "A Subdivision Survey in Barre Town, Vermont for **Robert Bolus**".*

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK,
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER**

See preliminary hearing staff report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

From what I see, there are two issues to address before this subdivision request can be approved. One issue is how each new lot will be accessed. The other (perhaps more important) issue is how wastewater will be disposed of. Access to lots can probably be addressed in one night, but wastewater disposal will be trickier.

It is likely that this will need to be continued another month to address the wastewater disposal. There are three options the applicants have to address this:

- A. Municipal sewer: Obtain easements to run forced main sewer lines from Richardson Road through the neighboring properties to the newly created lots. Shared pump stations will not be permitted (per Josh Martineau).
- B. Deferral: Defer all site-specific information for development of the newly created lots. When development is sought, the property owner(s) at the time will be required to go before the DRB to get the deferral lifted.
- C. On-site septic design: Alter plans so that the new lots are served by on-site septic instead of municipal sewer. Septic designs will be required, so this hearing will have to be continued for at least another month if this option is selected.

If it is the case that the applicants and the Board agree that everything can get settled this month, here are some proposed conditions:

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont permits may be necessary (*e.g.* Department of Environmental Conservation, etc.). If permits are required, they shall be obtained and complied with in accordance with any requirements or conditions of approval.
2. Issuance of this permit does not imply approval of any other municipal permits.
3. (A) [IF APPLICANTS WISH TO SERVE NEW LOTS WITH MUNICIPAL SEWER] All easements necessary for municipal sewer connections to be possible (as determined by the Town Engineer) shall be obtained. For all new easements obtained, an easement deed shall be recorded in the Barre Town Land Records.

(B) [IF APPLICANTS WISH TO DEFER DEVELOPMENT] Development of Lots 5B & 5C are deferred to a later time. To complete the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance and lift the development deferral, the owner(s) of the parcel (at the time of the request) shall return before the Development Review Board for approval of site-specific information (including septic design).
4. An easement agreement outlining responsibilities of costs and maintenance of the common curb-cut that is a minimum 20 feet wide by 30 feet deep (approved with this plan) shall be composed, signed

by each affected property owner, and recorded in the Barre Town Land Records. This easement agreement shall run with each affected parcel.

5. [IF EASEMENT-IN-COMMON PROPOSAL IS APPROVED] An easement agreement outlining responsibilities of costs and maintenance of the common access easement (approved with this plan) shall be composed, signed by each affected property owner, and recorded in the Barre Town Land Records.
6. One (1) 18" x 24" recording plat shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Office for filing in the Barre Town Land Records in accordance with the Barre Town Subdivision Ordinance and state statute within 180 days of approval.
7. Three (3) sets of 24" x 36" paper copies of the final approved plan shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Office within 30 days of approval, unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
8. An electronic copy of the final approved plan shall be provided to the Planning & Zoning Office within 30 days of approval.
9. Plans submitted used for review of this permit shall become part of the approval. No changes to the approved plan shall 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.
10. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein could lead to nullification of this subdivision. **Plus, any conditions the Board wishes to add or amend.**

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board voted to continue the public hearing date certain to February 14, 2024: a request by Robert & Margaret Bolus for a final review (possible approval) of a three-lot (3) subdivision of land located at 340 School Road; PID: 011/001.05; Zoned Medium Density Residential; P-23000007. Vote 5-0-0.

2) **APPLICANT: CALCANI/2-LOT SUBDIVISION**

Request by Vincent Calcagni for a final review (possible approval) of a **two-lot (2) subdivision** of land located at 375 Beckley Hill Road; Parcel ID: 008/020.00; Zoned Low Density Residential; **P-23000009**.

Consultant: Chase & Chase Surveyors & Septic Designers, Inc

*Plans submitted by Chase & Chase Surveyors & Septic Designers, Inc. Dated October 11, 2023, entitled "Subdivision Survey: **Vincent Calcagni**, Nichols Road & Beckley Hill Road, Town of Barre, Vermont".*

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK,
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER**

See preliminary review staff report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

The applicant proposes to subdivide his 12.78(±)-acre parcel. This would create a new 2.00(±)-acre lot for family to place a new dwelling on. The applicant will keep the remaining 10.78(±) acres of land (including where the existing solar farm is). With the inclusion of the shared curb-cut, I see no issues with this request.

It should be noted that Vermont Enhanced 911 Addressing Standards will require the access off of Beckley Hill Road to be reclassified as a private road. Section 4(a) of the State's Addressing Standards says, "A shared driveway of any length having three or more developable lots on it shall be defined as a private road. All structures on the new private road shall be readdressed according to Section 5 & 6. Private roads shall be named as per Section 2." The State's Addressing Standards *do not* differentiate between shared curb-cuts and shared driveways.

I recommend granting approval of this 2-lot subdivision with the following conditions:

PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant is hereby notified that State of Vermont permits may be necessary (*e.g.* Department of Environmental Conservation, etc.). If permits are required, they shall be obtained and complied with in accordance with any requirements or conditions of approval.
2. Issuance of this permit does not imply approval of any other municipal permits.
3. An easement agreement outlining responsibilities of costs and maintenance of the common curb-cut (approved with this plan) shall be composed, signed by each affected property owner, and recorded in the Barre Town Land Records. This easement agreement shall run with each affected parcel.
4. One (1) 18" x 24" recording plat shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Office for filing in the Barre Town Land Records in accordance with the Barre Town Subdivision Ordinance and state statute within 180 days of approval.
5. Three (3) sets of 24" x 36" paper copies of the final approved plan shall be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Office within 30 days of approval, unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
6. An electronic copy of the final approved plan shall be provided to the Planning & Zoning Office within 30 days of approval.

7. Plans submitted used for review of this permit shall become part of the approval. No changes to the approved plan shall 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.
8. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

Plus, any conditions the Board wishes to add or amend.

MOTION

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Ms. Labrador, the Development Review Board moved to continue the public hearing to date certain February 14, 2024: a request by Vincent Calcagni for a final review (possible approval) of a two-lot (2) subdivision of land located at 375 Beckley Hill Road; PID: 008/020.00; Zoned Low Density Residential; P-23000009. Vote 5-0-0.

3) **APPLICANT: Grandfield / Revised Subdivision** (Final)

Request by Robert Grandfield to **amend a previously approved subdivision amendment** (2-lot merger, P-20000009, Plan 2295), **reverting one lot back to the original two lots** approved for Cary & Janice Smith/Scott Brook Meadow in 2005 (7-lot subdivision, P-05000053, Plan 2075) on land off of Lower Usle Road (owned by Ryan W Brown and Ronald & Deborah Brown); Parcel ID: 005/095.02; Zoned Low Density Residential; **P-23000010**.

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER

This is a **warned public hearing** for revised subdivision approval in accordance with Section 105 of the Barre Town Subdivision Ordinance. In 2005, Cary & Janice Smith subdivided land off of Lower Usle Rd, resulting in 7 new undeveloped lots (AKA the Scott Brook Meadow subdivision). The Browns own 2 of these 7 lots, and in July 2020 Ryan Brown came before the DRB for revised subdivision approval to merge the 2 into 1 undivided lot. Presently, the Browns' lot is still undeveloped, and they have a potential buyer in Mr. Grandfield, the applicant of this request. Mr. Grandfield is looking to revert the Browns' undivided lot back into two contiguous lots (as shown in the approved plan from 2005) before the closing of the sale.

Presently, the Browns' lot is 4.74 acres with 400' of road frontage. This lot is located in a low density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 2 acres and a minimum road frontage of 200'. This request is to revert the one lot back into the two lots shown on the 2005 survey as **Lots 3 & 4**. Lot 3 will have 2.45 acres with 200' of road frontage, and Lot 4 will have the remaining 2.29 acres with 200' of road frontage. The 2005 Scott Brook Meadow plan is already on file in the Planning & Zoning Office, and a plat has been recorded in Slide #390 of the Barre Town Land Records.

Municipal water and sewer are not available at this location. The parcels are accessed via Lower Usle Road, a Town Class 3 unpaved road. As shown in the approved plan, Lot 3 is accessed by a shared

curb-cut with Lot 2, and Lot 4 is accessed by a shared curb-cut with Lot 5. Septic designs are included in the approved plan from 2005. The State wastewater permit for Lot 3 was recently updated to move the location of the proposed leach field.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

This is a simple subdivision amendment reverting the subject 4.74 acres from one lot back to its original two lots. No new plans need to be filed, as this proposal matches what is shown on Plan 2075 (approved in 2005) on file in the Planning & Zoning Office. I recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. Issuance of this permit does not imply approval of any other municipal permits.
2. Plans submitted used for review of this permit shall become part of the approval. No changes to the approved plan shall 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.

COMMENT:

Mr. Reaves opened the public hearing and swore applicant. Mr. Garbacik provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Reaves asked if there was anyone to speak on this. Mr. Grandfield (applicant) stated he had nothing to add. Mr. Garbacik mentioned that Mr. Bill Smith (abutter) called the office to express his support to unmerge the lot.

Mr. Sanborn asked why to amend the original subdivision, instead of a new plan with land of Brown's making a two-lot subdivision. Mr. Garbacik explained that he would reference each plan referring to the original subdivision.

Mr. Sanborn expressed concern reverting to the original plan— there must have been changes to the plan in the last nineteen years. It was explained by Mr. Garbacik that there had been changes to the original plan a few of the lots have been merged.

Discussion ensued amongst Sanborn, Reaves, Garbacik regarding if the original plan is valid meets the 2024 regulatory standards.

MOTION:

On motion by Mr. Sanborn, seconded by Mr. Neddo, the Development Review Board moved to continue the public hearing to date certain February 14, 2024: Request by Robert Grandfield to amend a previously approved subdivision amendment (2-lot merger, P-20000009, Plan 2295), reverting one lot back to the original two lots approved for Cary & Janice Smith/Scott Brook Meadow in 2005 (7-lot subdivision, P-05000053, Plan 2075) on land off of Lower Usle Road (owned by Ryan W Brown and Ronald & Deborah Brown); Parcel ID: 005/095.02; Zoned Low Density Residential; P-23000010. Vote 5-0-0.

F. OTHER

1) APPLICANT: Henderson / Conceptual Subdivision

Conceptual discussion with Matthew Henderson regarding a potential **two-lot (2) subdivision** of land located at 32 Hillside Avenue.

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM BRANDON GARBACIK,
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR/PLANNING OFFICER**

This is a **conceptual discussion** with Matthew Henderson regarding a potential 2-lot subdivision off of Hillside Avenue. As you all recall, Kris Jurentkuff was present at the DRB meeting from October 2023 to discuss a potential 2-lot subdivision off of Hillside Avenue. It was the consensus of the Board at that meeting that Section 3.2 would not make a subdivision possible unless either:

- Access to the lot was served off of East Barre Road (Route 302), or;
- The existing access easement serving 32 Hillside Avenue is built to Town Highway standards AND the town decides to take it over as a designated Town Highway.

Since the October conceptual discussion, however, more research has been conducted as to the viability of a proposed subdivision being accessed off of Hillside Avenue without having to build the easement to Town Highway standards. I am including two plans approved by the DRB/PC with this packet, as well as a plan showing what is being proposed for this conceptual subdivision. The first Town-approved plan shows a 4-lot subdivision (including what is now Mr. Henderson's property) approved in 2008 (Plan 2137). The second plan was approved by the DRB in the spring of 2021, in which two lots from the previous plan were merged into one undivided lot ahead of Mr. Henderson purchasing that property (Plan 2303).

There are two things to note on Plan 2137. One is the inclusion of a 60' wide x 200' deep common access easement for a shared curb-cut to serve Lots 1 & 2 (as well as the Munson property), with a 20' x 200' paved apron. Mr. Sanborn might recall that he threw out the possibility of whether a shared curb-cut would work at this location, but for the most part it was not discussed as an option. However, looking back at the approved plans, it appears that a shared curb-cut has already been approved for this location, making this option viable in carrying out the proposed subdivision.

The other noteworthy item in this plan is the inclusion of an easement reserved for stormwater detention. This development was originally approved as a 25-lot subdivision in 2002. In 2005, the plan was revised as an 8-lot subdivision. Then in 2008, it was revised again as the 4-lot subdivision you see on Plan 2137. This stormwater detention easement was included as part of the original plans and remained in each subsequent plan. The reason this particular easement is noteworthy is that it is in the exact location of the newly proposed lot as shown in the informal plan showing the proposed subdivision.

In Plan 2303, however, you may notice two things. For one, the common easement for the shared curb-cut is described as being 60' x 20' instead of 60' x 200'. This appears to be a typo. The other thing to note in Plan 2303 is that it does not include the note for the easement reserved for stormwater detention.

A couple weeks ago, I spoke with Craig Chase of Chase & Chase about these discoveries. Given the new information, he is confident that Chase & Chase will be able to provide a subdivision plan using the shared curb-cut for access to the proposed lot. The easement reserved for stormwater detention is likely unnecessary due to the Rocky Ridge/Steven Young development not amounting to the scale of development originally planned for.

Mr. Henderson will be in attendance at this meeting. He is trying to find out whether it is realistic for him to once again try and move forward with this proposed subdivision request.

COMMENT

Mr. Garbacik provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Highlight of discussion amongst Sanborn, Reaves, Garbacik, Henderson, Labrador

- Shared curb-cut dimensions
- History of the original subdivision having a private loop road
- Expand 20' paved apron, to a 60' expansion
- Shared curb-cut vs private road
- Private road built to town standards

G. FOLLOW-UPS - None

H. ROUNDTABLE - None

I. ADJOURN!

On motion by Mr. Neddo, seconded by Mr. Otis, the Development Review Board adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Spaulding, Board Clerk

_____ Mark Reaves, Chair	_____ Jon Valsangiacomo
_____ Angela Valentinetti	_____ Chris Neddo
_____ Cedric Sanborn	_____ Angela Labrador
_____ Gerald Otis	_____ Jim Fecteau (alternate)
_____ Gina Galfetti (alternate)	