

# BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

## MINUTES FOR JULY 8, 2015

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearing on Wednesday, July 8, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

### **Members Present:**

Mark Nicholson, Chair  
Charlie Thygesen  
Greg Richards

Mark Reaves  
John Hameline  
Shaun Driscoll

### **Members Absent:**

Jon Valsangaicomо

Cedric Sanborn

### **Others Present:**

Michael Lajeunesse  
Laurie Brown

Jerry Booth

### **Staff Present:**

Chris Violette – Planning & Zoning Director  
Heidi Bennett – Board Clerk

**A. 5:30 P.M. – SITE VISIT – NONE**

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

**C. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER**

**D. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - NONE**

**E. APPROVE MINUTES**

***On motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the June 10, 2015 meeting.***

**F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)**

**G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW**

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS
- 3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

H. SITE PLAN REVIEW

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**APPLICANT: H.P. HOOD, INC.**

**Request by HP Hood, Inc. for the proposed construction of a 60'x 68' addition to the existing manufacturing plant located at 219 Allen Street; Parcel ID 005/125.00; Zoned: LDR; SP-1500003**

Consultant: Lajeunesse Construction

Date: July 2, 2015

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of major site plan review in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw Article 5, section 5.6 and (A) under said section. The applicant is before the DRB this month for the first of two public hearings because of a proposed 4,080sf addition to an existing industrial building. The proposed project is located in a low density residential zone by its pre-existence to current zoning. The area is generally mixed use with more residential than industrial commercial in close proximity. Lot sizes in this area are fairly large.

The applicant owns and operates a large (20,000sf+) food packaging plant (milk) at the proposed addition location. The addition will be proposed to the back of the existing building. The land where the addition is being proposed is currently paved parking lot.

Major site plan review is required because both the addition and the overall size of the building exceed 4,000sf.

Below are the review standards, and my comments, for site plan approval in accordance with Article 5, section 5.6 (F)

**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 addition to this facility promotes economic development and job creation or retention. The Town Plan supports both economic development and jobs so that the project is in compliance with Town Plan.

The project is in compliance with Barre Town's Zoning Bylaw because it is part of a long standing use.

**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 regards to entrances and exits for the subject site;**

The area affected by the proposed project is currently open space that is mostly paved. The applicant uses this area to move trucks and other vehicles around the back side of the building. The addition will pinch

the area around the back side of the building but there is room to still get vehicles around the building. There may be a need to do some work and possibly a small amount of paving between where the proposed building will be and the property line to accommodate vehicles.

**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;**

Again open area currently used for vehicles and to a lesser degree pedestrian especially those that aren't employed by the applicants. I do not believe there will be any negative impact on pedestrian movement within the site based on the proposed addition. No adjacent property is affected or necessary in this case.

**4. Storm water and drainage to insure 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;**

With the exception of a small grass area that will be disturbed with the proposed addition, most of the land affected by the project is already impervious. The elimination of the small grass areas will have little impact of creating additional storm water runoff. The parking lot has a stormwater collection system consisting of catch basins and underground pipe. There should be no real additional increase in storm water runoff from this project or impacts to surrounding properties.

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

The applicant's facility has been located at this site for many years. While it has grown over the years with numerous additions here and there, there has never been any indication of historic or natural environmental features to be concerned about. There is no reason to think that conclusion has changed.

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

Because of the nature of the applicant's business they are a high volume water user and a high contributor to Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and as such are charged 48 sewer units now. Whether the addition will require any additional sewer allocation I don't know. Harry, the Town Engineer should be consulted. I will try to have an answer before the meeting.

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

No new signage is being proposed with this project.

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

The applicant has not indicated that any renewable energy is going to be used with this project or at all.

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

No new landscaping is being proposed with this project.

**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.**

The proposed addition while taking current paved area away, no parking is actually being affected. I'm not sure if parking demand increases as a result of the addition because I'm not sure what the purpose of the addition is for. Hood already has a considerable amount of room for parking their trucks. Additionally there is a fairly large parking lot across Allen Street that provides parking for employees. Unless this addition generates many more employees, which I don't think is the case, parking should remain adequate.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

This is a fairly straight-forward request with little impact. I recommend approval of this request and wonder if the board wants to consider waiving the second meeting and grant final approval of this request.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV gave a summary of this agenda item and the manufacturing plant.

Mike Lajeunesse stated that storm water permit won't be needed; stated the roof on the new addition will have roof drains.

CV suggested waiving the second hearing if the Board so chooses.

Jerry Booth the addition is to save money in the long run on production.

Hameline asked about additional sewer units; CV stated that he will check with Harry Hinrichsen, but doesn't think any more will be necessary.

Nicholson stated he's in favor of foregoing the next meeting.

Reaves stated he's in favor, but doesn't want to hurt the applicant. CV stated that with the lack of abutter participants they can't appeal.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Richards, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by HP Hood, Inc. for the proposed construction of a 60'x 68' addition to the existing manufacturing plant located at 219 Allen Street; Parcel ID 005/125.00; Zoned: LDR; SP-15000003*

**DISCUSSION:**

*On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll the Development Review Board voted unanimously to waive the second warned hearing.*

CONDITIONS Yes \_\_\_ No X  
MOTION BY: REAVES  
SECOND BY: RICHARDS

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson YES  
Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES  
Cedric Sanborn ABSENT  
Mark Reaves YES  
\*Jim Fecteau \_\_\_

Jon Valsangiacomo ABSENT  
Shaun Driscoll YES  
Greg Richards YES  
\*John Hameline YES

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

**APPLICANT:            **COMMO****

**Request by Don & Lynn Commo for conditional use approval to allow a multi-family dwelling for property located at 527 Cummings Rd; Parcel ID 009/148.02; Zoned: Low Density Residential; CUP-15000001; Continued from June 10, 2015**

Consultant:     None

Date:            July 2, 2015

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

The applicant is still working on this trying to get a State waste-water permit and likely won't have it for the July meeting so she is requesting a continuance to the August meeting.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend continuing this public hearing to the August 12, 2105 DRB meeting.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV provided a brief recap, stating he's spoken to the State and the Assessor about what's a bedroom and what isn't. The definition is broad.

CV recommends a continuance.

Laurie Brown stated she's opposed to an apartment being there.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

**On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to continue the request by Don & Lynn Commo for conditional use approval until August 12, 2015 to allow a multi-family dwelling for property located at 527 Cummings Rd; Parcel ID 009/148.02; Zoned: Low Density Residential; CUP-15000001.**

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
MOTION BY: REAVES  
SECOND BY: DRISCOLL

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson <u>YES</u>	Jon Valsangiacomo <u>ABSENT</u>
Charles Thygesen, Sr. <u>YES</u>	Shaun Driscoll <u>YES</u>
Cedric Sanborn <u>ABSENT</u>	Greg Richards <u>YES</u>
Mark Reaves <u>YES</u>	*John Hameline <u>YES</u>
*Jim Fecteau _____	

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

**J. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)**

**K. FLOOD HAZARD REVIEW**

**L. APPEALS OF ZONING ADMINISTRATORS DECISIONS**

**M. OTHER**

**N. FOLLOW-UPS**

**O. CORRESPONDENCE**

STATE  
TOWN  
MISCELLANEOUS

**P. ROUNDTABLE**

**Q. ADJOURN!**

***On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to adjourn the meeting of July 8, 2015 at 7:23 p.m.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Bennett

---

Mark Nicholson, Chair

---

Cedric Sanborn

---

Mark Reaves

---

Jon Valsangiacomo

---

Jim Fecteau

---

Charlie Thygesen Sr.

---

Shaun Driscoll

---

Greg Richards

---

John Hamelin

DRAFT