

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR March 08, 2017

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, March 08, 2017 at 7:02 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

Members Present:

Mark Reaves	Mark Nicholson
Cedric Sanborn	John Hameline
Jon Valsangiacomo	Charles Thygesen, SR

Members Absent:

Shaun Driscoll Greg Richards

Others Present:

Jay Carr
Lewis Stowell
David Oles
Craig Chase

Staff Present:

Chris Violette
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 Hameline, the board voted unanimously to approve the February 08, 2017 minutes.

F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW NONE

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW

2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS –

APPLICANT: One Bridge Street LLC

Request by One Bridge Street LLC for minor site plan review and approval for the construction of 4 commercial storage units on property located at the intersection on Bridge Street and South Barre Rd; Parcel ID 030/027.00; Zone: High Way commercial; SP-17000001

Consultant: Wilson Consulting

Date: March 3, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of minor site plan review and possible approval for the construction of four separate commercial rental storage buildings. The subject parcel is located in South Barre at the intersection of South Barre Road and Bridge Street. The Zoning at this location is highway commercial. The proposed use is a permitted use in this zone.

The applicant previously sought and received approval for the construction of a 6,000sf commercial building. Those plans have not been able to move forward for a host of reasons so the applicant has changed his plans and is bring this proposal before the DRB.

The proposal calls for the construction of four metal building on concrete slabs of various sizes. Access will be the same as previously approved off Bridge Street. As you come into the site, the building on the right will be 6,400sf, the building on the left will be 9,800sf and two smaller building to the rear of the site will be 1,950sf and 1,500sf.

Site improvements include paved driveway as well as the areas around the storage buildings. The plans show that storm water runoff will be collected by a series of underground pipes collected by surface catch basins. The underground pipe will bring the water to a stoned lined swale along the easterly side of the property (parallel to South Barre Road) and run North to storm water management pond (similar if not identical to what had been previously approved).

Other improvements include landscaping and site lighting.

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; Both the Town Plan and the Zoning Bylaw support this type of development. The Town Plan while not specifically encouraging storage units, the storage units do add value to the land which helps improve the Town tax base. The Zoning Bylaw supports the project by allowing storage units in a highway commercial zone by being a permitted 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 site provides access off Bridge Street approximately 120' from the Bridge Street South Barre Road intersection. Access was a major topic of conversation for the previous approval at this site however a combination of the State not being overly cooperative in providing an access on to South Barre Road directly and the significantly less potential traffic generation from the proposed use, the proposed access in my opinion should be satisfactory.

Once on the site there is paved drives around the entire sites where the buildings are located which should provide adequate safe vehicular movement for the type of use being proposed.

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; Based on the proposed plans and the type of use, the convenience and safety of pedestrian movement shouldn't be a factor. This arrangement is fairly typical of this type of use including the relatively infrequent use by pedestrians. The site is or will be accessed by a sidewalk along Bridge Street. Beyond that it's not anticipated there will be a need for adjacent property access.

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; As mentioned in my opening comments the plans show that storm water runoff will be collected by a series of underground pipes collected by surface catch basins. The underground pipe will bring the water to a stoned lined swale along the easterly side of the property (parallel to South Barre Road) and run North to storm water management pond (similar if not identical to what had been previously approved).

5. The protection of historic or natural environmental features on the property under review, as well as on the adjacent areas; There are no know historic or natural environmental features being impacted with the proposal.

6. The impact of new development on public utilities such as water and sewer infrastructure and on other users/consumers; The site will not be served by municipal sewer or water. Green Mountain Power will supply power to the site and the plans indicated underground power will be utilized on site.

7. Signage that meets or exceeds the criteria established in this Bylaw, Article 7, Sec. 7.5. Any signage will have to follow the referenced section of the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw. No signage is being proposed with this application.

8. The utilization of renewable energy resources; No renewable energy is being proposed on the plans. Site lighting is shown to be LED down casting and shielded.

9. Landscaping and/or screening to assist in mitigating undue impact of the proposed land development upon neighboring landowners; The plans propose grass vegetation around the permitter of the site along South Barre Road as well as numerous new plantings to include Red Maples, River Birch, and White Spruce. A 6' stockade fence is also proposed to shield the closest neighbor to the Northwest of the site (similar or identical to previous approval).

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. Parking for this proposed projected is limited due to the type of use. Generally, people will park at or near their own storage unit. It is rare that multiple storage unit renters would be there at the same time. Parking should be adequate.

DISCUSSION:

Sanborn had questions about landscaping, lighting. Mr. Carr states the landscaping will be pretty similar to the landscaping that was previously approved for a bigger building. Mr. Carr also states that he has a landscaper working with him and they will provide LED lighting for the units.

Thygesen is worried about traffic turning from Bridge Street onto Route 14, he doesn't want to cause any traffic issues. Thygesen is also concerned about the drainage from Mr. Carr's site onto the road Thygesen raises concerns about getting a stop sign in place and not having the landscaping effect the line of sight for people existing the drive way.

Mr. Carr doesn't feel that the storage units will create any more traffic than his previously approved building. Mr. Carr feels that it would cause less traffic. Mr. Carr then referenced a map that shows that storm drains will be tied into the town drainage system. Mr. Carr is planning on paving the drive way once the project is completed hopefully by the fall. He currently has crushed stone. Mrs. Carr is agreeable with providing a stop sign and having his landscapers make sure they do not put anything next to the stop sign.

Valsangiaco is also concerned about the sight lines from turning from Bridge Street to Rt 14. Violette doesn't believe that it would cause an issue and they can make a condition that the landscaping needs to be maintained therefore keeping a clear sight line. Violette states he has driven by and does not feel that line of sight would be any different then it currently is. Violette states that we could write it in as a condition for Mr. Carr to follow.

Lewis Stowell inquired about how many storage units would be on the lot, traffic flow and parking.

Mr. Carr states he will be putting up 4 commercial storage buildings, totaling in 162 storage units on the lot. There will be minimal traffic flow to the storage units. Mr. Carr states he has found that most of the time people pull in to unload their property and do not frequently visit the storage units. Mr. Carr will not provide assigned parking spaces but will have 20 ft runways for people to park in to load and unload, there will room for cars to pass to the next storage unit if needed. Mr. Carr will be offering 1 climate controlled storage building that will have 3 entrances into the building with motion sensed lighting. People would be able to park next to the doors to load and unload. Mr. Carr will not have parking for people to store trailers, if it can not be stored in the storage unit then it can not be stored there.

Violette raises the question about people using the storage shed for businesses.

Mr. Carr states that he does not have that problem now. He does not allow people to use the storage sheds for garage sales, tire sales. Mr. Carr would be happy to include that in the contract that he has his renters sign.

PARTICIPATED:

Lewis Stowell
Jay Carr

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Conditions for the storage units:

1. must incorporate plans from Wilson Consulting
2. add a stop sign to the drive way for exit
3. make sure the landscaping is maintained and does not interfere with sight lines to the north of Bridge Street
4. no business ran out of storage unit except as a storage unit.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve Request by One Bridge Street LLC for minor site plan review and approval for the construction of 4 commercial storage units on property located at the intersection on Bridge Street and South Barre Rd; Parcel ID 030/027.00; Approval is subject to conditions 1 – 4 as noted above in the additional comments.

One Bridge Street LLC

Request by One Bridge Street LLC for site plan review and approval for the filling of land in excess of 800 cubic yards on South Barre Rd (Jockey Hollow); Parcel ID 031/017.02; High Way Commercial; SP-17000002

Consultant: Wilson Consulting

Date: March 3, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing for site plan review and possible approval for the filling of land to change the grade of the property. The subject property was recently subdivided and purchased by the applicant from the City of Barre. The Zoning Bylaw requires that any filling of land more than 800cu yards requires site plan approval.

The plan calls for the filling of this parcel to occur in several phases, the first phase will be 6,000 cu yards of dirt that will be obtained as part of the Quarry Street reconstruction project. Overall there could be upwards of 40,000 cu yards of material brought into this site over the years.

The amount of fill being proposed equates to approximately 350 to 375 10-wheel dump trucks. The plan shows access for these trucks to the subject land to be via the adjacent land of the applicant off Bridge Street. That parcel is subject this month to site plan review for construction of four commercial storage units.

The main issues to be concerned about for a project of this size is traffic, access to the site (are flaggers necessary), hours of operation, how is drainage being affected, and erosion control.

The plans submitted show the area to be filled and based on the terrain etc, drainage itself probably isn't a huge concern. However, erosion control will be and the plans establish an erosion prevention and sediment control plan. It is very important that his plan be followed with proper stabilization and continued maintenance.

The other main concern that I see is the truck traffic and how it affects Bridge Street and the Bridge Street South Barre Road intersection. What is the plan for this?

The plans show a temporary stone entrance to help minimize material from the site entering Bridge Street. Whether this will fully work remains to be seen, it is a standard practice.

**STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM HARRY HINRICHSEN,
TOWN ENGINEER**

I have reviewed the site plan for the proposed filling project and have some comments to offer.

There is a segment of water line that has been installed by the City of Barre Water Dept. along the inside road frontage of the easterly side of the Bridge Street parcel. The VTANS So. Barre Road-Bridge Street Improvement Project calls for relocation of the City's water main. The City has been working with the One Bridge Street LLC to establish a new water line location outside the State's Right-of-Way. It is my understanding that although the water line is not yet active, it will be connected to the water line in Route 14 at both ends (at Jockey Hollow and near the intersection of Bridge St.)

The new (and proposed) water line locations should be shown for the section that has been installed as well as for any points of connection that impact lot development (including filling operations). Pipe size and type for the water line should also be provided on the plans.

The areas of the fill should show top of slopes of fill as well as approximate elevation. The estimated quantity of fill should also be provided or noted on the plans.

Existing and proposed drainage structures, drainageways, culverts etc. should be show if there are any. Approximate location, size and materials type should be provided. There is an existing cross-culvert under S. Barre Rd. (Rt.14) located about 400' north of the Bridge St. intersection. The proposed fill area will most likely be impacted by the run-off from this cross-culvert. There should be some form of drainage swale provided on the plans. The typical erosion control associated with the drainage from this culvert should also be called out on the plans.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Nether Harry or I have a problem with the plan after taking into consideration some of the thing mentioned. Below is a summary of our points:

- Show both existing and proposed alignment for Barre City water line on the One Bridge St. LLC parcels. Include size and material type of water line.
- Show more detail on the fill area by providing approximate elevation and top of slope and provide a note for the estimated amount of fill required.
- Show the location, type and size of pipe for the existing VTRANS cross-culvert. Show the drainage swale on the affected One Bridge St. parcel. Show or note erosion control measures for that drainage swale on the plans.
- Hours of operation.
- Expected truck traffic and how that will be handled entering the site.
- Ensuring that the erosion and sediment control plan is followed and maintained.
- Material from the site must not negatively impact Bridge Street.

- Is the approval for the overall project of potentially 40,000 cu yards of material or just the first phase of around 6,000?

DISCUSSION:

Nicholson would like to see a temporary site entrance on Route 14 for the dump trucks to use to enter and exit the fill site. Nicholson also wants to make sure there is cleanliness of the trucks leaving the fill site, he does not want the trucks bringing the fill out onto the road way.

Mr. Carr advised that the fill is coming from a State of Vermont job and he has applied for all the necessary state permits. Mr. Carr believes that the state would be able to get temporary access to the fill site. After discussion, they will ask that the state gets temporary access.

Reaves questioned if the permit request is for 6,000 cu yards or for the full 40,000 cu yards. The board agrees that Mr. Carr should get more than the 6,000 cu yards in case Mr. Carr has the opportunity for more fill.

Mr. Carr would like if the board could approve 20,000-25,000 cu yards. After a lengthy discussion, the board is going to allow 25,000 cu yards of fill and for the second phase he will need to apply and come back to the DRB for approval.

Sanborn has concerns about the trucks entering and exiting the fill site. Sanborn would like to know if the State is responsible for obtaining proper flagging for those trucks entering and existing the fill site.

Mr. Carr does not have the answer but he is assuming that since it is a State job that they would be in charge of that, he is just accepting the fill on his land. Mr. Carr will check with the State to make sure that they will provide proper flagging.

Violette is concerned that the State will not grant temporary access to Route 14 or provide flaggers.

Reaves feels that we could make it a condition and the state would have to follow the condition. After a discussion, the board decided to make it a condition for the state to use Route 14 with proper flagging in place.

Reaves questioned if they should set time frames that the trucks can move the fill. After discussion, they settled on Monday-Saturday 7am-5pm.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Suggested by Reaves for the following conditions:

1. **25,000 cu yards of fill (with erosion control maintained)**
2. **obtain proper traffic control for trucks entering and exiting**
3. **keep exiting trucks clean from tracking fill onto the main road**
4. **ask and let the state know that the DRB is asking for temporary access to the fill site on Route 14 not Bridge street**
5. **operating hours Monday- Saturday 07:00am- 5:00pm.**

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, to approve the Request by One Bridge Street LLC for site plan review and approval for the filling of land in excess of 800 cubic yards on South Barre Rd (Jockey Hollow); Parcel ID 031/017.02, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the 25,000 yards of fill; Approval is subject to conditions 1-5 noted above in additional comments.

PARTICIPATED:

Lewis Stowell
Jay Carr

H. SITE PLAN REVIEW NONE

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS) NONE

J. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS) NONE

K. CONCEPTUALS

Request by David and Karen Oles for conceptual 2 lot subdivision review on property located at 32 Tree Top View Lane; Parcel I 010/028.01 zoned low density residential.

Consultant: Wilson Consulting

Date: March 3, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is simple a conceptual review for the purpose of the application discussing a proposed two lot subdivision with the DRB. The main issue here is that the location of this land is on a previously approved shared private road. The road is shared by two other properties.

I will provided more information subsequent to this report either in advance of the meeting or at the meeting.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Violette spoke with Mr.Oles about subdividing his parcel on the Tree Top View. Mr.Oles does have enough land to subdivide but there is no road frontage. The Private road serves the 3 lots. This private road has always gone very well. Mr. Oles would like to divide his lot in half. He is here for the conceptual review because they do have an association for the current 3 lots and it does say this private road is only for 3 lots. They would have to get the article amend from 3 to 4 and the DRB to approve the subdivision. Chase states that the private road is 40 ft and owned by the association not the town. Violette and Chase states that the road is not built to town regulations. It states in the Association that the road is not meant to be taken over by the town at any time. Chase states that the original plans did states it was meant for 4 lots but the 4th was combined making it a 3 lot. Sanborn has raised question that is the road in good condition to add another lot. Chase states that he has passed people on the road there has been enough room. Violette questions how the association is working? Mr.Oles states that he does the plowing and every 5 years they add crushed gravel to the road. They have a set percentage that each lot has to contribute and it had been going well. Valsangiacomo asked if the other home owners were on board with adding another lot. Mr.Oles states they are. The subdivision would be going to his son.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

The DRB would consider approving this 2 lot subdivision once they see an agreement in writing from the other two land owners that they approve adding another lot and amend the current association from 3 to 4 lots on the private road.

L. FOLLOW-UPS: NONE

M. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE
TOWN
MISCELLANEOUS

N. ROUNDTABLE

O. ADJOURN!

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Hameline, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn @ 8:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emily Marineau

Mark Nicholson, Chair

Cedric Sanborn

Mark Reaves

Jon Valsangiacomo

Jim Fecteau

Charlie Thygesen Sr.

Shaun Driscoll

Greg Richards

John Hamelin

