

# BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

## MINUTES FOR July 12, 2017

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, July 12, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

### **Members Present:**

<b>Mark Nicholson</b>	<b>Mark Reaves</b>	<b>Charles Thygesen, SR</b>
<b>Cedric Sanborn</b>	<b>Chris Neddo</b>	
<b>Jon Valsangiacomo</b>	<b>Greg Richards</b>	

### **Members Absent:**

**Shaun Driscoll**

### **Others Present:**

**Paul Taylor**  
**Mike Bilodeau (7:29)**

### **Staff Present:**

**Chris Violette- phone call in**  
**Emily Marineau**

- 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**

***Motion by Sanborn, seconded by Richards, the board voted unanimously to approve the June 14, 2017 minutes.***

**Reaves and Thygesen abstain from the minutes due to their absent last meeting.**

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

**G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW**

**PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

## **Fecteau Residential Inc (Preliminary)**

**Request by Fecteau Residential Inc for preliminary review of a major subdivision of land and Planned Unit Development that, as proposed, would create 47 new lots with up to a total of 90 new living units located off Beckley Hill Road and Daniels Drive; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: high density residential; P-17000003**

Consultant: Wilson Consulting Engineer's PLC

Date: July 05, 2017

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

The applicant has asked for a continuance to the August 9, 2017 meeting while they work on further development of the plans.

One of the main issue that developed out of last month's meeting was discussion about gross area vs net area. As you will recall the Fecteau's pointed out that our current PUD bylaw allows for open space to be calculated based on "net" area not gross. Because our Zoning Bylaw is silent on what net means, the Fecteau's provided information from a few other Town's that do provide guidance on what net means. The board decided to have the Town attorney consider whether the other definitions should be used and if he felt that they should, the Fecteau's could proceed using net open space (excluding public infrastructure). The letter from Bruce Bjornlund is enclosed.

The Fecteau's are proceeding with their plans based on 5% space based on the total net land size of the parcel.

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

Continue to August 9, 2017

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Jon recluse for this applicant hearing.**

Violette states that Fecteau Residential Inc has formally asked for a continuance to next month's meeting. He states they are heavy into design mode.

### **MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

***A motion was made by Sanborn and seconded by Reaves the Development Review Board voted to continue the request by Fecteau Residential Inc for preliminary review date certain to August 09, 2017 of a major subdivision of land and planned unit development that, as proposed, would create 47 new lots with a total of 90 new living units located off Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Rd; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: high density residential; P-17000003***

## **Toni Tofani 2 lot subdivision (Preliminary)**

**Request by Toni Tofani for preliminary review of a two- lot subdivision of open land by deferral (meaning no development is planned at this time), subject parcel is located off West Road; Parcel ID: 005/145.00; Zoned: Low density residential. P-17000006**

Consultant: Trailhead Design & Glenn Towne

Date: July 06, 2017

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

This is a preliminary review of a two-lot subdivision request for the purpose of creating a 4.49-acre lot. The subject parcel is in a low density residential zone which requires a minimum lot size of 2 acre when on-site water and sewer is being used (as is the case with this request) and 200' of road frontage or if no road frontage access by way of a 25' right-of-way (at a minimum). The parcel is located in a residential area off West Road with fairly large lots on combination of wooded and open lots.

The parent parcel is 69.53 acres (lot 6) in size and has over 2,000' of road frontage along Snowbridge Road. While the parcel has road frontage along Snowbridge Road, its main access is from West Road by way of two right-of-way's (50' and 40'). This lot is remaining land from a previous 6-lot subdivision which created numerous lots along West Road (P-11000005 06/28/11).

The proposed subdivision will create a 4.49-acre (lot 7) parcel leaving the remaining land (lot 6) at 65.04 acres. The only development planned at this time for the new lot that I am aware of is a 30'x40' garage (permit just issued Z-17000068). While I'm not sure about plans for this building to have waste water needs, I am aware that an on-site waste water permit from the State of Vermont has been obtained. We'll need clarification on that point, and I have requested a copy of the septic plans.

Access to the new lot (lot 7) is shown to be from West Road. Without road frontage, the new lot will have to have a dedicated right-of-way for access and utilities. I assume, but do not know for sure, that the 40' right-of-way is going to be used because it is shown on the map to go directly to the new lot but the plans are not clear so further clarification is necessary.

This request is on the agenda for final approval as well. However, when the application was submitted it was submitted with plans that were not sufficient. I attempted to contact one of the consultants to get the proper plans submitted, but I didn't speak to anybody for over a week so while they are aware of the need for new plans and I believe that they are in the works, it hasn't happened yet.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend continuing this request date certain to August 9, 2017 so that adequate plans can be submitted and reviewed.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Paul Taylor states that there were 4 lots created on West Rd the easement encompasses 40ft on one lot and 50ft on another so there will be the whole 90ft being used as access. Taylor states that it had been 100ft but one of the homeowners built their house a little closer to the easement than it should have been so they adjusted the easement to make it work. Violette ask how that will work with the other lots and if they are building one access to the 4.4-acre lot, Taylor states they are only building one access. Violette ask if the easement is going be for that lot, remembering that if that needs to build their own driveway they will have the ability too. Taylor states that it could be spilt the access that way but right now the land is being subdivide for Mr. Tofani's brother, with the possibility of maybe one day that road becoming a private road and taken over by the Town.

Reaves questions if the other lot will still have access from Snowbridge road. Taylor states it will.

Sanborn ask if the new lot will have frontage on West road. Taylor states it will not, it will only have 90ft of right of way. Reaves states that easement will be for lot 7 and technical it could serve lot 6 but lot 6 has frontage on Snowbridge.

Sanborn states that normally the board will ask for each lot to have its own dedicated access of 25ft in case someone needs to install their own driveway. Reaves clarifies that they are not asking them to build two driveways now but just have the ability to build two driveways if needed.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

***A motion by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, the Development Review Board moved to approve the request by Toni Tofani for preliminary review of a two-lot subdivision of his land located at West Rd; Parcel ID; 005/145.00; Zoned; low density residential; P-17000006***

- 1) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Toni Tofani 2-lot subdivision (Final)**

**Request by Toni Tofani for final review of a two- lot subdivision of open land by deferral (meaning no development is planned at this time), subject parcel is located off West Road;**

**Parcel ID: 005/145.00; Zoned: Low density residential. P-17000006**  
Consultant: American Consulting

Date: July 06, 2017

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

This is scheduled to be a warned public hearing, see preliminary comments. I assume that preliminary isn't going to be approved so this request will also have to be continued.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I recommend this request be continued date certain to the August 9, 2017 DRB meeting night.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Based on Violette's recommendation and the discussion that is noted above the board would like to see a final plan and an access to the lots laid out better.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*A motion by Sanborn, seconded by Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board moved to continue the request by Toni Tofani for final plat approval date certain to August 09, 2017 of a two-lot subdivision of his land located at West Road; Parcel ID; 005/145.00; Zoned; low density residential; P-17000006*

H. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

**Pierre Couture (CUP Comm center/rec facility)**

**Request by Pierre Couture for conditional use review for the conversion of an existing barn into a community center/recreation facility located at 29 Little John Rd, Parcel ID 006/051.00; Zone: Medium Density Residential; CUP- 17000003**

Date: July 06, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing continued date certain from June 14, 2017.

I haven't heard anything new from Mr. Couture as of this writing to answer any of the questions raised at the May meeting. He asked and was granted a continuance date certain to this meeting but again I've received no follow-up information. Unless he submits something before the meeting and the board finds it acceptable, I suggest another continuance date certain August 9, 2017.

Below are my comments from last month's meeting.

The applicant is proposing to refurbish an existing barn he owns and convert it to a wedding and event venue. The applicant currently operates a similar operation just up the road at Millstone Hill Lodge and has hosted numerous large events including weddings. The applicant hopes to preserve the existing barn by repurposing it and expanding his existing business.

When asked about doing this, I determined that seeking a conditional use permit for a community center/recreation facility fairly closely matched the intended use. The definition is as follows: A building, together with accessory buildings and uses, used for recreational and cultural activities operated for profit for the benefit of the community. Community center/recreational facility is allowed by conditional use permit and is listed under the heading places of assembly.

The plan calls for later this summer, the barn getting a significant renovation preparing it for an event hall. In all the hall will consist of three floors, ground floor is the entrance, the second floor will house the main events hall that will include a kitchen, the third-floor mezzanine will have additional seating. Bathrooms will be located on both the first and second floor.

Parking will be located to the rear of the property access by a second driveway.

#### CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA

Below are the conditional use review standards in accordance with Article 5, section 5.5 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw. **New narratives is Bold**

#### 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:**

**a. Emergency services**

As a public facility, there could be impact on Police, Fire, and EMS. However, the nature of and the periodic use of the facility

especially the fact that it won't be used in the winter seems to lend itself to having little impact on emergency services.

**b. Educational facilities**

Nature and use of this facility will not impact educational facilities.

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

The facility will connect to municipal sewer but will use onsite. The Town has the ability to serve this building and the proposed use. The total number of sewer units will be determined by the Town Engineer. However, it is unlikely given the periodic use of the building that more than one sewer unit will be needed for the events hall. A sewer permit will have to be obtained (\$1,500 per sewer unit)

**d. Recreational facilities**

No impact on existing recreational facilities.

**2. Conservation or other designated natural areas**

While there is no known conservation or designated natural areas, the proposed renovations to the barn that was built in the 1800's likely does in and of itself pose conservation of a historic building whether designated or not. This could potentially be a good adaptive reuse of an existing barn.

**3. Solid waste disposal facilities**

Normal trash disposal will be utilized and will be taken to the nearest landfill facility.

**4. 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 general area that the barn is in is mostly residential, both single and multi-family and relatively dense. There is a large undeveloped area behind and to the East of the barn. As previously mentioned the applicant does operate a similar business about 1,000' up the road. There are some commercial and industrial uses not far away as well as the Town's forest.

The purpose statement in the Zoning Bylaw states the following: This

principally residential district is designed to provide areas where moderate density residential development may occur in a rural suburban setting. It is also important to note that the zoning across the street is very high density residential with the following purpose statement: This district is designed 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.

This criterion is likely the hardest to work around. While the applicant operates a similar type of business close by, this facility will be in close proximity to residential uses and will likely impact them. I think more discussion needs to occur about the impact on the neighbors regarding potential traffic, noise, etc. How might some of the impacts be mitigated. Will there be outside P.A. and outdoor activities?

**The applicant testified last month that any amplification will cease at 10:00pm.**

**Two neighbors attended and testified that the applicant has been very courteous to them in the past. Acknowledge that being close to the event may cause more noise and had some concern about that.**

**5. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;**

Little John Road is a Town class 3 paved road served by Church Hill Road. It is likely that there will be an impact with regard to traffic but to what degree and how much more than there already is because of the applicants existing operation. The Town road network should be able to handle the traffic, its more a matter of how it may affect the neighborhood. More discussion about traffic is warranted.

**This was discussed last month and the applicant is supposed to come back this month with a little more information on traffic.**

**6. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect;**

The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw is silent on the use of a wedding hall. The closet thing allowed in zoning and I think fits is the community center/recreational facility as noted in the opening. Community center/recreational facility is where places of large assembly is contemplated. Community center/recreational facility is allowed by conditional use permit.

**7. Utilization of renewable energy resources.**



No renewable energy resources are being considered to my knowledge.

**8. Any required extension or capital expense to the present maintained highway system;**

No extension to the highway system is necessary and no new capital expense.

**9. The impact on neighboring uses;**

See character of the area #4 above

**10. Intrinsic capability of the land and its surrounding areas to support the use;**

The land and the surrounding area can likely handle the periodic proposed use.

**(B) SPECIFIC REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL**

**1. Minimum lot size;**

1.0 acre with municipal sewer, onsite water. Parcel size is 12.8 acres.

**2. Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;**

Nearby residential uses are in very close proximity (across the street)

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

The applicant proposes to create a new parking lot behind the existing barn accessed by a new driveway. It is unclear how many vehicles that the

new parking lot will hold so more information would be helpful. Having said that, there is plenty of field that could likely also hold parked cars.

**Parking was discussed last month and the applicant is planning to come back with more detail regarding the parking area.**

**In addition, it is important for the DRB to know that the applicant is also seeking additional curb-cut authorization from the Planning Commission. The property already has two curb-cuts, one to the house and one to the front of the barn. The third curb-cut would provide access to the event parking behind the barn. The Planning Commission heard the request at its May meeting but continued it to the July meeting so that the applicant could consider other options.**

**6. Loading/unloading facilities.**

N/a

Discussion beyond what I've already mentioned above also centered around how many events would be held, hours of operation, alcohol served on site or BYOB (Cornerstone pup will be doing catering. I had hoped to have a new narrative from the applicant before writing this but it hadn't been submitted in time. If submitted, it will be included in your packets.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Violette states that Mr. Couture called asking for the board to continue his hearing next month.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*A motion was made by Sanborn, seconded by Valsangiacomo the Development Review Board voted to continue this request by Pierre Couture date certain to August 09, 2017, for final review of a conditional use permit for community event center/ recreation center located at 29 Little John Rd; Parcel ID 006/051.00; Zone: medium density residential; CUP-17000003.*

## **Mike Bilodeau – CUP Mobile Home Park**

**Request by Mike Bilodeau for conditional use review in accordance with Barre Town Zoning Bylaw Article 4, sec 4.15 for the creation of a 4-unit mobile home park on open land adjacent to 770 East Barre Road (Rt. 302); Parcel ID 006/068.01; Zone: highway commercial; SP-17000003**

Consultant:

Date: July 06, 2017

**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 Article 4, section 4.15 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw whereas the applicant is proposing to create a four unit mobile home park. The subject parcel is in a highway commercial zone along East Barre Road (Rt. 302) behind and to the left of the Dollar General. The parcel subject to the request is 1.21 acres with municipal water and sewer available.

The applicant has been looking at developing this lot for some time with a residential use but the zoning prevented any sort of single-family housing and multi-family housing would have had to be at least 8 units. Creating the mobile home park as allowed for in zoning seemed to be his best option and he'd like to proceed that way.

I've included the applicable section of zoning which includes a requirement that a mobile home park also get site plan approval as well. Site plan approval is warned on this month's agenda as well.

The applicant submitted a rough narrative for the CUP criteria which is included in your packets. I've offered a few more details and some of my own thoughts based on what I know of the project. From what I understand these mobile homes will be quite small at 8'x53' and only one bedroom units.

**CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA**

Below are the conditional use review standards in accordance with Article 5, section 5.5 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw.

**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:**

**a. Emergency services**

The addition of four single-family one-bedroom mobile homes should have little impact on the emergency services.

**b. Educational facilities**

Again, as the applicant suggest, four single-family one bedroom mobile homes will not have a great impact on educational services, they don't appear to be conducive to families.

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

Municipal water and sewer is available to service these mobile homes. Barre Town's municipal sewer system has the capacity to serve, each mobile home will have to obtain its own sewer allocation permit (\$1,500 each). The applicant will need to secure an ability to serve letter from the City of Barre with regard to domestic water service.

How these services are going to provided should be reviewed during site plan review.

**d. Recreational facilities**

Like the educational services, these four mobile homes shouldn't have any impact on existing recreational services and no new ones will be required.

**2. Conservation or other designated natural areas**

There is no know areas of conservation or other designated natural areas.

**3. Solid waste disposal facilities**

Solid waste will be the responsibility of the landowner as I understand it. Solid waste much be collect in an approved manner and disposed of properly. This is most commonly done by using a trash hauler or taking solid waste to places that offer drop off service. In any case, the additional of four single-family dwellings should not but a burden on solid waste disposal facilities.

**4. 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 character of the area affected is best described as mixed use. Even though the zoning is highway commercial in this area, there is a mixture of commercial and residential, some of the residential is multi-family.. Below is the purpose statement for highway commercial zoning:

*This district allows for large, higher intensity commercial developments such as automotive oriented businesses that either by their volume or by the nature of their business require larger lots than those in the other commercial districts. Uses include those generally associated with the traveling public such as overnight accommodations, gas stations, grocery stores and restaurants, which inherently see more traffic from customers and deliveries than office buildings.*

So, while it is hard to describe a mobile home park as really fitting into the purpose statement for the zone, it is allowed by zoning in this zone. With regard to the lot it sits on, it is a back lot and relatively small so it may not be overly conducive to commercial development anyway.

#### **5. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;**

Access to the proposed park will be by way of an easement using the existing Dollar General entrance from East Barre Road. East Barre Road, also known as US Rt. 302 is a Federal/State class 1 paved road. The addition of the four mobile homes won't cause a noticeable increase in traffic that can't be handled.

I do question whether a new State access permit is required because of the change of use of the access. The access is already shared by Dollar General and the applicant's business that is located adjacent to it. Adding a residential use may require an amended State permit and the applicant should check into this and see if a new letter of intent from the Agency of Transportation is required.

Access to this site and the home should be shown in more detail during site plan review.

#### **6. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect;**

Article 4, section 4.15 allows for mobile home parks in highway commercial zones. Site plan approval is also required. The applicant must meet several conditions including needing a minimum of 10,000sf per mobile home for the overall lot size, at least one-off street parking space for each home, home can't be any closer than 20' to one another, and out buildings must be at least 15' away from another home.

Notable here is that it is likely that the 10,000sf requirement limited the applicant from placing more than 4 mobile home at this site.

#### **7. Utilization of renewable energy resources.**

It is not expected or required that any renewable energy resources will be used with this project.

**8. Any required extension or capital expense to the present maintained highway system;**

There will be no extensions to the highway system.

**9. The impact on neighboring uses;**

Because the location of the proposed mobile home park is in a mixed-use area with single and multi-family uses nearby and a retail commercial business right next door, it's hard to see how there would be a negative impact on neighboring uses. I guess that if there is any impact it might be on the project but that is the applicants concern.

**10. Intrinsic capability of the land and its surrounding areas to support the use;**

I am unaware of any issues that wouldn't allow the land to support the use. The Jail Branch River is not far away and the applicant knows that a 50' buffer has to be maintained.

**(B) SPECIFIC REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL**

**1. Minimum lot size;**

Minimum lot size in a highway commercial zone is 2 acres. The lot size of the subject lot is 1.2 acres but it was created prior to highway commercial zones being established and therefore is grandfathered.

**2. Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;**

Nearby uses are in close proximity to this proposed development.

**3. Criteria as adopted relating to site plan review pursuant to Article 5, Sec. 5.6 (6) of this bylaw;**

The proposed use is also seeking a concurrent site plan approval (SP-17000003)

**4. Any other standards and factors that the bylaw may require;**

N/a

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

The Zoning Bylaw allows for only 1 parking spot per unit. However, our normal parking requirement calls for two parking spaces for each unit. I'd prefer to make sure there is enough room for two vehicles at each unit.

**6. Loading/unloading facilities.**

N/a

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

As far as the conditional use permit goes, it appears as the applicant meets the requirements. We do need to get an ability to serve letter from the City of Barre for domestic water and a determination as to whether an amendment to the access permit is required. All other required site conditions as stated above will also have to be followed. Also any applicable State laws that govern mobile home parks will have to be followed as well.

If the items mentioned above are met, I recommend approval. If questions still remain, I would suggest a continuance date certain to August 9, 2017.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Based on Violette staff comments and that the applicant was not present at the start of his application review the board agree with Violette in continuing this application to next month's meeting. The board would like to see a more detailed plan of what Mr. Bilodeau has planned for the mobile home park.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*A motion was made by Sanborn, seconded by Valsangiacomo the Development Review Board voted to continue this request by Mike Bilodeau date certain to August 09, 2017, for final review of a conditional use permit for a 4-unit mobile home park on open land adjacent to 770 East Barre Rd; Parcel ID 006/068.01; Zone: highway commercial ; SP-17000003.*

**J. SITE PLAN REVIEW NONE**

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW

**Mike Bilodeau – Site Plan Mobile Home Park**

**Request by Mike Bilodeau for minor site plan review in accordance with Barre Town Zoning Bylaw Article 4, sec 4.15 for the creation of a 4-unit mobile home park on open land adjacent to 770 East Barre Road (Rt. 302); Parcel ID 006/068.01; Zone: highway**

**commercial; CUP-17000006**

Consultant: Brad Ruderman & Associates, inc.

Date: July 06, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of site plan review in accordance with Article 4, section 4.15 of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw. The applicant is proposing to create a four-unit mobile home park and site plan review and approval is required.

The applicant has provided a engineering sketch of the proposed project. The sketch shows access from East Barre Road (US Rt. 302) by way of an existing access that is currently shared with another lot owned by the applicant and the Dollar General Store. What is currently a 25' easement to the lot in question is shown to be increased by the applicant to a 50' wide easement. No actual driveway is shown.

As noted as part of the conditional use review I am wondering whether an amended access permit is required from the State of Vermont.

The four mobile homes are depicted on the subject lot as being 25' apart from one another and meeting the required zoning setback and setback from the Jail Branch River. A 20 separation is required.

The mobile homes are proposed to be small homes at 8' wide and 53' long. No access to the homes is shown and no parking areas are either. Zoning requires a minimum of one parking space for each home, two would be better.

The mobile home will be served by municipal sewer and water. As noted in the conditional use permit request, the Town can serve these lots with sewer, most likely the city does as well, but an ability to serve letter must be obtained.

Nothing on the plans or a narrative discuss how stormwater is going to be handled. More detail on that will also be required.

Finally, no landscaping is be shown but should and what kind of lighting is being proposed.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

There are a lot of unanswered questions, many might be answered at the hearing. Overall, I see no problem with the proposal but at this point I am hard pressed to recommend approval until more detail is provided.



**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Based on Violette staff comments and that the applicant was not present at the start of his application review the board agree with Violette in continuing this application to next month's meeting. The board would like to see a more detailed plan of what Mr. Bilodeau has planned for this site. The board would also like to see a letter from the City of Barre stating they will serve these mobile homes. The board would also like to see a plan for storm water treatment.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

***A motion was made by Sanborn, seconded by Valsangiacomo the Development Review Board voted to continue this request by Mike Bilodeau with date certain to August 09, 2017, for preliminary review of site plan for a 4-unit mobile home park on open land adjacent to 770 East Barre Rd; Parcel ID 006/068.01; Zone: highway commercial ; CUP-17000006..***

2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

**K. CONCEPTUALS**

**L. FOLLOW-UPS: NONE**

**M. CORRESPONDENCE- NONE**

STATE  
TOWN  
MISCELLANEOUS

**N. ROUNDTABLE:**

**O. ADJOURN!**

***On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn @ 7:30pm.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Emily Marineau

---

Mark Nicholson, Chair

---

Cedric Sanborn

---

Charlie Thygesen Sr.

---

Mark Reaves

---

Shaun Driscoll

---

Jon Valsangiacomo

---

Greg Richards

---

Jim Fecteau

---

Chris Neddo

DRAFT