

## BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

# MINUTES FOR MAY 12, 2010

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public hearing on May 12, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

### **Members Present:**

Mark Nicholson, Chair      Cedric Sanborn  
Paul Malone                  Shaun Driscoll  
Skip Bancroft                Jon Valsangiacomo  
Charlie Thygesen – 7:12 p.m.

### **Members Absent:**

Mark Reaves

### **Others Present:**

Linda Aylward	Kate Radigan	Jan LaPerle
Paul LaPerle	Carolyn Baker	Shannon Aylward
Michelle Bello	Lou Bello	Ralph Cote
Marc Conti	Manuel Carcoba	Vic Fecteau
Perry Kiser	Debbie Lefebvre	Lisa Lamdin
Mike Bilodeau	Tara & Steven Simpson	Greg Lord

### **Staff Present:**

Chris Violette – Planning & Zoning Administrator  
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. APPROVE MINUTES**

***On a motion by Mr. Malone, seconded by Mr. Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted to approve the minutes from the April 14, 2010 meeting.***

- E. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)**

**F. SUBDIVISION REVIEW**

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**APPLICANT:            **PARROTT****

**Request by Gerald & Kathy Parrott for final approval of a 2-lot subdivision on property located off Taplin Road; Parcel ID 007/004.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; P-09000023**

Consultant: Rick Bell

Date: May 7, 2010

Enclosures: None

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

This is a warned public hearing for final consideration of a 2 lot subdivision of land after receiving preliminary approval last month. The applicants are proposing to create a new lot (lot 2) of 3.58 acres for the purpose of development with a residential dwelling which leaves 120 acres of undeveloped land. On-site water and sewer will serve this lot after obtaining a state waste water permit. Access will be direct from Taplin Road.

Plans appear to be acceptable for final consideration but final plan submission will also need to include the septic details.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend final approval of this 2 lot subdivision request with the following conditions:

1. Final plan submission shall include details of the septic design
2. All easements and/or right-of-ways, as shown on the final (stamped approved) plans by Richard W. Bell Land Surveying, Inc. shall be created when the need arises in order to fulfill the development as proposed and approved.
3. One (1) (18" x 24") recording plat must be submitted to the Planning office for filing in the Town of Barre land records in accordance with Barre Town subdivision regulation and state statute within 180-days of approval.

4. Three (3) sets (24" x 36") paper copies of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning Office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
5. One (1) (24" x 36") mylar copy of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
6. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that a proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to come before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.
7. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV gave a brief recap, stating this is a final warned hearing. Plans received today, including a plat; still waiting for septic information.

CV recommends final approval with conditions.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Mr. Malone, seconded by Mr. Bancroft, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Gerald & Kathy Parrott for final approval of a 2-lot subdivision on property located off Taplin Road; Parcel ID 007/004.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; P-09000023; Approval is subject to conditions 1 - 7.*

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes X No \_\_\_  
MOTION BY: MALONE  
SECOND BY: BANCROFT

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson <b><u>YES</u></b>	Paul Malone <b><u>YES</u></b>
Charles Thygesen, Sr. <b><u>ABSENT</u></b>	Shaun Driscoll <b><u>YES</u></b>
Cedric Sanborn <b><u>YES</u></b>	Mark Reaves <b><u>ABSENT</u></b>
Ernest (Skip) Bancroft <b><u>YES</u></b>	*Jon Valsangiacomo <b><u>YES</u></b>
*Jim Fecteau ___	

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

**APPLICANT:            **BILODEAU****

**Request by Michael Bilodeau for final approval of a 2-lot subdivision on property located at 130 Richardson Road; Parcel ID 008/010.00; Zoned: Very High Density Residential; P-1000005**

Consultant: Brad Ruderman

Date: May 7, 2010

Enclosures: None

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

This is a warned public hearing for final consideration of a 2 lot subdivision of land after receiving preliminary approval last month. The applicant is proposing to divide his current .7 acre lot into two lots of .3 (lot 1) and .4 (lot 2) respectively. The lot as it exists today is developed with a single-family residential dwelling as well as a large steel storage building. The proposed subdivision would place the two buildings on separate lots. Lot 1 will contain the dwelling and is served by municipal sewer and water while the other building as we learned last month doesn't have a sewer connection at this time, I'm not sure about water.

Both lots conform to zoning as we discussed last month as proposed. The main issues surrounding this proposal, other than information needed on the final plans, is the lack of sewer service for lot 2 and the fact that the subdivision ordinance requires it or a deferral be placed on the lot. I have sent a deferral form to the applicant but the plans should also make reference to the fact lot 2 is under deferral and will have to come back to the Development Review Board before further development occurs.

As of this writing I haven't received new plans so all the lacking information from last month is still outstanding. These items include complete abutter information, driveway sight distances, contours (or a waiver request), metes & bounds for the boundary lines, width of the easements across lot 2 in favor of lot 1 for the sewer and water lines.

Abutters have raised concerns regarding this proposal, however after examining their concerns I don't find where any of them directly relate to provisions within the subdivision ordinance that would prohibit this request. Certainly the addition of a few more cars, either for the exiting dwelling or one on the other lot if ever developed that way, isn't going to be a burden for the roads in that area. Regarding the ground contamination question, I'm pretty confident that if that is a concern, and I'm not sure that it is, it will be dealt with at such time as a prospective buyer comes along and a title search is done.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

With consideration to outstanding information being submitted, I recommend approval of this 2 lot subdivision request with the following conditions:

1. All necessary information as outlined in staff's comments be submitted on final plans.
2. A letter of deferral must be submitted to the Planning Office for recording in the land records, along with the \$8.00 recording fee, that will defer the development of lot 2 as shown on the plans of Brad M. Ruderman & Associates, Inc. until such time as plans that meet the requirements of the Town of Barre subdivision ordinance are submitted and approved by the Development Review Board. The submission of the deferral letter must be received within 30 days of approval.
3. All easements and/or right-of-ways, as shown on the final (stamped approved) plans by Brad M. Ruderman & Associates, Inc., shall be created when the need arises in order to fulfill the development as proposed and approved
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 Barre Town subdivision regulation 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 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
6. One (1) (24" x 36") mylar copy of the final approved plan must be submitted to the Planning office within 30-days of approval unless a request to extend is made and approved by staff.
7. No changes to the approved plan can be made unless first reviewed by either the Town Planning Officer, or the Town Engineer for a determination of significance. If it is determined that an proposed change is significant, the plan will be required to go back before the Development Review Board for approval of the proposed change.
8. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.
9. Approval of plans pending Town Engineer's approval.
10. Driveway aprons to be paved.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV gave brief recap stating this is a final warned hearing; slight acreage change from preliminary. The existing lot which contains a single family dwelling and storage building will be separated, each having their own access. A deferral is required within 30 days. Updated plans were received May 12, 2010, pending approval by Town Engineer, plans seem acceptable.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Mr. Malone, seconded by Mr. Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Michael Bilodeau for final approval of a 2=lot subdivision on property located at 130 Richardson Road; Parcel ID 008/010.00; Zoned: Very High Density Residential; P-10000005; Approval is subject to conditions 1 - 10.*

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes X No \_\_\_  
MOTION BY: MALONE  
SECOND BY: DRISCOLL

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson **YES**  
Charles Thygesen, Sr. **ABSENT**  
Cedric Sanborn **YES**  
Ernest (Skip) Bancroft **YES**  
\*Jim Fecteau \_\_\_  
Paul Malone **YES**  
Shaun Driscoll **YES**  
Mark Reaves **ABSENT**  
\*Jon Valsangiacomo **YES**

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

**G. SITE PLAN REVIEW**

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**APPLICANT:            **WCMHS****

**Request by Washington County Mental Health for site plan approval for the proposed construction of a 23,600 sq ft building with associated drives, parking, utilities and stormwater treatment system on property located at 260 Beckley Hill Road; Parcel ID 008/030.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; SP-10000001**

Consultant: DeWolfe Engineering

Date: May 7, 2010

Enclosures: Letter date May 4, 2010 to Mr. Philip Zalinger,  
Letter dated May 6, 2010 from Mr. Zalinger asking for a continuance.  
Letter dated May 12, 2010 from interested party Walter & Susan  
Poczobut.

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

This request is the continuation of the public hearing that was opened and continued to this meeting last month. This site plan application involves review of the proposed construction of a 23,000 sq. ft. square foot building that would allow Washington County Mental Health Services (WCMHS) to abandon their existing building at 260 Beckley Hill Road and relocate to this proposed building which would be located on the same lot. Last month's staff report detailed the plans of WCMHS with regard to the site plan criteria. Due to a question over whether the uses currently being housed at 260 Beckley Hill Road would conform to the town's Zoning Bylaw if they were to relocate, and how the process would work in making that determination, I requested that the board not take any testimony until we figured out the proper sequence of events. The hearing was opened but no testimony taken and a motion and vote occurred continuing the request to this month.

During the last several weeks leading up to the May DRB meeting, I have worked with WCMHS's attorney, Phil Zalinger and town attorney Bruce Bjornlund to first get a better understanding of WCMHS current use at 260 Beckley Hill Road and second, to determine whether or not the uses conform to zoning and if not how they would figure into a relocation if they are preexisting nonconformance's. In the end, I determined with support from Bruce, that the current uses, a daycare and child and family services are not currently conforming to Barre Town's Zoning Bylaw. The end result is that as nonconforming uses, they cannot just relocate without following the process as determined within the Zoning Bylaw. I wrote Mr. Zalinger a letter, dated May 4, 2010, with my determination and options that I believe are afforded them within the bylaw. A copy of that letter is attached. As a result of that letter, WCMHS, through Mr. Zalinger, has asked for a continuance of this hearing to the June 9<sup>th</sup> DRB meeting.

My letter to Mr. Zalinger pretty much spells out the situation. It is my belief that without further proceedings outside of the site plan application, it would be impossible for the WCMHS application for site plan approval to be approved based on criteria 1, conformance with the bylaw currently in effect. I suggested to them that they withdraw their application, or keep asking for continuances, while they seek a determination from the DRB whether a greater detrimental effect on the community will result by enlarging or expanding the two nonconforming uses at 260 Beckley Hill Road. The continuation request

will allow them time to determine what their course of action should be.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

My recommendation is to open this public hearing, do not take any testimony, and continue this request as asked for by the applicant to the June 9, 2010 DRB meeting.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV read letter submitted by Phil Zalinger, Attorney for WCMHS requesting a continuance until June 9, 2010.

CV recommends a continuance date certain.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Malone, the Development Review Board voted to continue the request by Washington County Mental Health for site plan approval until June 9, 2010 for the proposed construction of a 23,600 sq ft building with associated drives, parking, utilities and stormwater treatment system on property located at 260 Beckley Hill Road; Parcel ID 008/030.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; SP-10000001*

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
MOTION BY: BANCROFT  
SECOND BY: MALONE

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson <b><u>YES</u></b>	Paul Malone <b><u>YES</u></b>
Charles Thygesen, Sr. <b><u>ABSENT</u></b>	Shaun Driscoll <b><u>YES</u></b>
Cedric Sanborn <b><u>YES</u></b>	Mark Reaves <b><u>ABSENT</u></b>
Ernest (Skip) Bancroft <b><u>YES</u></b>	*Jon Valsangiacomo <b><u>YES</u></b>
*Jim Fecteau ___	

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

**H. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)**

**APPLICANT:            SIMPSON**

**Request by Steven & Tara Simpson for Conditional Use Approval to allow placement of an RV as temporary residence while their dwelling is being constructed at 149 Sunset Road; Parcel ID 009/139.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; CUP-10000002**

Date:                    May 7, 2010

Enclosures:    Letter dated March 27, 2010 from the Simpson's explaining their request.

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

This is a warned public hearing in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, Article 4, section 4.4 whereas the applicants would like to live in a travel trailer (RV) on their property while their house is being constructed. Said article allows the use of RV's as temporary dwelling limiting the duration to 14 days. Upon holding a public hearing during the conditional use review process, the DRB can allow RV's as temporary residential uses for up to one year.

The main reason this provision is in our zoning is to ensure that consideration is given to proper sanitary facilities. The obvious concern is sewerage disposal. As the applicants letter and my comments below will show, provisions are being made for the proper handling of waste water.

Below are the standards the must be reviewed during a conditional use permit application. Because ultimately the use of this property is for a single-family dwelling which for the most part isn't any different than what is being proposed, most of the criteria are not really applicable. The applicant has secured all necessary permits for the construction of their home (Z-100000033) except the state waste water permit which has been applied for.

(A)    GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

The following standards are enabled through 24 VSA § 4414 (3) (A)

1. The impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities, to include but not limited to: **No impact**
2. Emergency services: **The same as for the permitted single-family dwelling about to be constructed.**
3. Educational facilities: **The same as for the permitted single-family dwelling about to be constructed. The applicant already lives in Barre Town**

4. Water, sewer, or other municipal utility systems: **Sewer will be onsite, with a gravity fed in ground primary leachfield. The secondary field is a mound system.**
5. Recreational facilities: **The same as for the permitted single-family dwelling about to be constructed.**
6. Conservation or other designated natural areas: **No impact**
7. Solid waste disposal facilities: **No impact**
8. 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 subject parcel is located in a low density residential zone. The surrounding area consists primarily residential uses with farming nearby. By its nature as a low density zone, the lot sizes tend to be fairly large in this area. The subject lot is 10.2 acres in size.**
9. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity: **The same as for the permitted single-family dwelling about to be constructed.**
10. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect: **Residential use is a permitted allowed use, the use of an RV for temporary residential purposes is allowed after issuance of a CUP.**
11. Utilization of renewable energy resources: **No Impact**

The following standards are required by this bylaw

12. Any required extension or capital expense to the present maintained highway system: **N/A**
13. The impact on neighboring uses: **The use of the RV is temporary. The applicant is proposing to construct the septic system (state permit applied for) and tie the RV into it while at the same time drilling the well for water supply. If the RV is utilized before either the septic system or the well has been finished, the applicant has arranged with Calkins to have their septic tank on the RV pumped weekly. Sanitary provisions should be adequate and given the nature of this proposed use and existing uses, the impact on surrounding uses should be minimal.**
14. Intrinsic capability of the land and its surrounding areas to support the use: **The use is well supported by the land**

(B) SPECIFIC REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

1. Minimum lot size: **Minimum size is 2.0 acres, actual size, 10.2 acres**
2. Distance from adjacent or nearby uses: **Several hundred feet**
3. Criteria as adopted relating to site plan review pursuant to Article 5, Sec. 5.6 (6) of this bylaw: **N/A**
4. Any other standards and factors that the bylaw may require: **N/A**

5. Possible requirements by the DRB that the applicant install, operate, and maintain any and all devices which may be used to prevent or reduce fumes, gas, dust, smoke, odor, noise, vibration, or any similar nuisance. Performance standards shall be specified by the appropriate State regulatory agency: **N/A**
6. Off-street parking requirements in accordance with standards outlined in Article 3, Sec. 3.9 of this bylaw: **N/A**
7. Loading/unloading facilities: **N/A**

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

In reality this proposed use is minimal in nature and temporary. As long as proper considerations are being made for septic, I really don't see this proposal as a problem, and recommend approval.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

CV stated that the Simpson's would like to live in an RV on their land located off Sunset Road while their dwelling is being constructed.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Thygesen, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Steven & Tara Simpson for Conditional Use Approval to allow placement of an RV as temporary residence while their dwelling is being constructed at 149 Sunset Road; Parcel ID 009/139.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; CUP-10000002*

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes \_\_\_ No X  
MOTION BY: BANCROFT  
SECOND BY: THYGESEN

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson **YES**  
Charles Thygesen, Sr. **YES**  
Cedric Sanborn **YES**  
Ernest (Skip) Bancroft **YES**  
\*Jim Fecteau \_\_\_

Paul Malone **YES**  
Shaun Driscoll **YES**  
Mark Reaves **ABSENT**  
\*Jon Valsangiacomo **YES**

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

I. VARIANCIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

**APPLICANT:            CONTI OIL**

**Request by Marc & Christine Conti D/B/A Conti Oil for a 62' variance from front property line as the property abuts a residential line where a 100' setback is required between industrial and residential zones. Property is located at 97 Websterville Road; Parcel ID 006/040.00; Zoned: IND; V-10000004**

Consultant:    EF Wall

Date:            May 7, 2010

Enclosures:    Site map  
                    Narrative dated April 22, 2010

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of considering a variance request under Article 7, section 7.9 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw where as the applicant is aware in advance that the minimum setback for their proposed project can't be met. The subject parcel is zoned industrial and is currently used for heating oil distribution.

The applicants are proposing to construct a concrete spill containment structure around their above ground petroleum storage tanks. These tanks have been in existence since the early 1970's long before containment devices were required, now however, regulations mandate the need for these containment areas. The proposed containment structure the applicant would like to construct consists of 4 feet high concrete walls and a slab that would measure 47 feet wide and 76 feet long. In addition, a loading/off loading area would also be constructed along the front side. The size of this structure is necessary to adequately encompass the five storage tanks.

This project does not meet the minimum required setback and a variance is being requested because it is less than 100 feet from a residential zone (Article 2, table 2.2). The actual setback is only 38 feet, 62 feet short of what it is supposed to be. The adjacent use happens to be the railroad with residential uses beyond that. The railroad land according to the zoning map is not actually zoned much like roads aren't. For the purpose of determining the adjacent zone and required setback, I referred to Article 2, section 2.3 "Zoning map and interpretations of zoning districts". When reviewing this section, I considered (E) to make my determination for which setback needed to be used. The provision under (E) states that if an area is not zoned, the area in question shall be considered to be in the most restrictive zoning district immediately adjoining it. The zone adjoining it is very high density residential.

The applicant submitted a letter (enclosed) detailing their plans along with why they believe they meet the five variance criteria. I think it is important to note that the applicant points out that the tanks were installed before zoning which I don't believe is correct. However, I think it is highly possible that permits for storage tanks were not necessary at the time because tanks until recently generally were not considered structures and as such I doubt the town would have made them get permits. The 100 foot setback requirement was likely in place at the time the tanks were installed but if the tanks didn't need a permit the setback wouldn't have been considered back then.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

A variance request of 62 feet is being requested which overall pretty benign and likely necessary because relocating the tanks in order to meet setback may not be possible or at a minimum is a pretty significant hardship. While the applicants did place the tanks in their present location so somebody could argue the hardship was created by them, if setbacks weren't required to be met in the early 70's as I believe is likely the case, then they really can't be faulted for that. Because this business has been located at this location for many years without problem and the proposed project is nothing more than a concrete wall with natural screening between this use and the residential use with over 38 feet of setback, I really don't see this project having an effect on the neighborhood. Not having heard any testimony or concerns from neighbors, at this point I see no reason why this request shouldn't be granted.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Jon Valsangiacomo recused to due to conflict

Greg Lord answered the 5 Criteria on behalf of Conti Oil.

1. Are there unique physical circumstances or conditions as to:
  - a. Irregularity, narrowness or shallowness of lot size or shape:
  - b. Exceptional topography or physical conditions peculiar to a particular property;
  - c. Unnecessary hardship due to 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?
  - b. substantially or permanently impair appropriate use or development of adjacent property?
  - c. reduce access to renewable energy sources?
  - d. be detrimental to the public welfare?

**YES**

5. Is it true that the variance represents the minimum deviation from regulation and plan to provide relief?

**YES**

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Marc & Christine Conti D/B/A Conti Oil for a 62' variance from front property line as the property abuts a residential line where a 100' setback is required between industrial and residential zones. Property is located at 97 Websterville Road; Parcel ID 006/040.00; Zoned: IND; V-10000004*

**DISCUSSION:**

CONDITIONS Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
MOTION BY: BANCROFT  
SECOND BY: SANBORN

**ROLL CALL:**

Mark Nicholson **YES**  
Charles Thygesen, Sr. **YES**  
Cedric Sanborn **YES**  
Ernest (Skip) Bancroft **YES**  
\*Jim Fecteau \_\_\_

Paul Malone **YES**  
Shaun Driscoll **YES**  
Mark Reaves **ABSENT**  
\*Jon Valsangiacomo **RECUSED**

*\*Alternate Development Review Board Members*

**J. FLOOD HAZARD REVIEW**

**K. APPEALS OF ZONING ADMINISTRATORS DECISIONS**

**L. OTHER**

M. FOLLOW-UPS

N. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE  
TOWN  
MISCELLANEOUS

O. ROUNDTABLE

P. ADJOURN!

***On a motion by Mr. Bancroft, seconded by Mr. Malone, the Development Review Board voted to adjourn the meeting of May 12, 2010 at 7:40 p.m.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Bennett

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Nicholson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cedric Sanborn

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ernest "Skip" Bancroft

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Reaves

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Fecteau

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charlie Thygesen Sr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Malone

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shaun Driscoll

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon Valsangiacomo