

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR APRIL 13, 2016

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearing on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 7:03 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

Members Present:

Mark Nicholson, Chair	Cedric Sanborn
Mark Reaves	Charlie Thygesen
Shaun Driscoll	Jon Valsangiacomo
Greg Richards	John Hameline

Others Present:

Jack Mitchell	Art Shields
Richard Colton	Bob Howe
Jay Carr	Jeff Olesky

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 a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2016 meeting.

- F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)
- G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW
 - 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
 - 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

APPLICANT:

THYGESEN / GRANGE

Request by Charles & Beverly Thygesen and Perry & Kathleen Grange for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Meadow Wood Drive; Parcel ID 022/024.00 & 022/019.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; P-15000021 / 22

Consultant: Chase & Chase

Date: April 7, 2016

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

This is a warned public hearing (continued from the March meeting) for the purpose of a boundary line adjustment between two neighboring property owners. The subject properties are located off Meadow Wood Drive in a high density residential zone with minimum lot sizes of 1/3 of an acre when municipal sewer and off-site water is used.

The Thygesen lot is around 60 acres in size while the Grange parcel is .33 acres. The proposal calls for .33 acres to go from Thygesen to Grange doubling the size of the Grange lot to .66 acres. The Grange lot would also pick up additional 50 feet of road frontage. Both lots will remain conforming as a result of the BLA. There does not appear to be any current feature that would be affected by the proposal such as

building setback, easements etc.

This request was continued from last month to this month based on the fact the applicants had not arrived at an agreement that would allow transfer off the .33 acres. Because there is uncertainty surrounding the transfer of the .33 acres, the board felt another month would allow the two parties to discuss the matter and see if an agreement could be put into place.

As of the writing of this report, I am unaware of an agreement. I guess at this point we will have to see if by the time of the meeting an agreement is in place and act based on that.

The main concern is that if the lot for the BLA is created, it must transfer, it cannot remain a standalone lot and at this point there is no guarantee that it will transfer and be merged.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

If no agreement is in place before the meeting, I recommend denying this request without prejudice.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Thygesen & Valsangiacomo recused.

Thygesen asked that this be continued for another month so he can finalize the agreement with the Grange's.

Nicholson recommends a continuance

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Nicholson, seconded by Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted to continue the request by Charles & Beverly Thygesen and Perry & Kathleen Grange for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Meadow Wood Drive until May 11, 2016; Parcel ID 022/024.00 & 022/019.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; P-15000021 / 22

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes ___ No ___
MOTION BY: NICHOLSON
SECOND BY: SANBORN

ROLL CALL:

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

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

APPLICANT: **THYGESEN / SANBORN & HISLOP**
Request by Charles & Beverly Thygesen and Bruce Sanborn & Pamela Hislop for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Meadow Wood Drive; Parcel ID 022/024.00 & 022/018.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; P-15000023 / 24

Consultant: Chase & Chase

Date: April 7, 2016

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing (continued from last month) for the purpose of a boundary line adjustment between two neighboring property owners. The subject properties are located off Meadow Wood Drive in a high density residential zone with minimum lot sizes of 1/3 of an acre when municipal sewer and off-site water is used.

The Thygesen lot is around 60 acres in size while the Sanborn/Hislop parcel is .33 acres. The proposal calls for .18 acres to go from Thygesen to Sanborn/Hislop increasing their lot to .51 acres. This BLA

would add land to the rear of the Sanborn/Hislop property. Both lots will remain conforming as a result of the BLA. There do not appear to be any current feature that would be affected by the proposal such as building setback, easements etc.

This request was continued from last month to this month based on the fact the applicants had not arrived at an agreement that would allow transfer of the .18 acres. Because there was uncertainty surrounding the transfer of the .18 acres, the board felt another month would allow the two parties to discuss the matter and see if an agreement could be put into place.

As of the writing of this report, there is still no agreement in place that I am aware of. Unless something changes between now and the meeting, I do not believe this request is going to move forward.

The main concern is that if the lot for the BLA is created, it must transfer, it cannot remain a standalone lot and at this point there is no guarantee that it will transfer and be merged.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

If no agreement is in place before the meeting, I recommend denying this request without prejudice.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Thygesen & Valsangiacomo recused.

Tygesen asked that this item be removed as no agreement has been reached.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to deny without prejudice the request by Charles & Beverly Thygesen and Bruce Sanborn & Pamela Hislop for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Meadow Wood Drive; Parcel ID's 022/024.00 & 022/018.00; Zoned: High Density Residential; P-15000023 / 24

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes____ No____
MOTION BY: REAVES
SECOND BY: DRISCOLL

ROLL CALL:

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

*Alternate Development Review Board Members

APPLICANT: **BOOTH / SYSTO**

Request by Booth Living Trust and Matthew Systo for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Allen Street & Bridge Street; Parcel ID's 005/128.00 & 030/017.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; P-16000001 & P-16000002

Consultant: American Consulting

Date: April 7, 2016

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing continued from last month to this month for the purpose of a boundary line adjustment (BLA) between two abutting property owners. The subject property is located in a low density residential zone that requires minimum lot sizes of 1 acre when using municipal sewer/onsite water. The area is generally mixed use between residential, commercial, and industrial.

The applicants are proposing a BLA that would see 6.0 acres of land transfer from Mr. Booth to Mr. Systo. The area of land to be transferred is to the Northeast of the Systos Bridge Street property. Mr. Booths property is currently shown to be 16.15 acres with approximately 400 feet of road frontage in two

different locations along Allen Street. The Systo's property is currently 11.94 acres with approximately 340 feet of road frontage along Bridge Street.

After the BLA Booth's property will reduce to 10.15 acres and systo's will increase to 17.94 acres. Road frontage isn't being change on either lot. Both lots will continue to be conforming lots. It does not appear that any significant features are impacted by the proposed BLA.

The only thing that sticks out regarding this BLA is the configuration of land proposed to go to Systo. It appears that Mr. Booth is reserving a small strip of land between what will be Systo's, land of Kaltz, and Mark and Donna Booth. This configuration will create an odd shape to the land of Booth. I'm reasonably sure Mr. Booth is proposing this configuration so that the BLA doesn't separate his lot into two. Another issue is that I'm sure Mr. Booth is trying to keep the land in land use and so it would have to stay contiguous.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Generally this is a simple Boundary line adjustment between two property owners. However, the configuration is not ordinary due to leaving a small strip of land to keep Mr. Booths properties one parcel. Further discuss will be needed with Mr. Booth about this configuration.

If approved, below are suggested conditions of approval.

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.
4. 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.
5. Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.
6. To complete this boundary line adjustment, a deed conveying the 6.0 acres from Booth to Systo must be completed. Said deed or a subsequent deed if necessary must also clearly state that this land is merged, combined as one lot of 17.94± acres.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Valsangiacomo recused / Hameline sitting

CV gave a summary of this agenda item.

CV informed the board that Booth intends to eliminate the strip of land, but is leaving it the way it is because of land use.

CV recommends approval with six conditions.

Sanborn asked what the width of the strip is; CV stated it starts about 10'; Sanborn states it's too narrow and needs to be larger, stating that the land is useless and there's no guarantee that the piece will go away.

Reaves stated that the strip doesn't need to be created.

Nicholson would like to see Booth make an adjustment and suggests a continuance.

Hameline would like to hear from Booth regarding the strip.

Sanborn suggests a continuance so Booth can come to the meeting and discuss the plans.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted to continue the request until by Booth Living Trust and Matthew Systo for a boundary line adjustment for property located off Allen Street & Bridge Street May 11, 2016; Parcel ID's 005/128.00 & 030/017.00; Zoned: Low Density Residential; P-16000001 & P-16000002

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes ___ No ___
MOTION BY: SANBORN
SECOND BY: REAVES

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson YES
Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES
Cedric Sanborn YES
Mark Reaves YES
*Jim Fecteau ___
Jon Valsangiacomo RECUSED
Shaun Driscoll YES
Greg Richards YES
*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

APPLICANT:

WINDY WOOD HOUSING, LLC

Request by Windy Wood Housing, LLC for revised final approval to a previously approved planned unit development (app. 12/2007 plan 2146) for property located off Windy Wood Road; Parcel ID 009/115.01; Zoned: Medium Density Residential; P-16000003

Consultant: None

Date: April 7, 2016

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of revised final approval of a planned unit development (PUD) originally approved in December of 2007 (P-07000015). Windy Wood Housing, LLC is before the board this month to follow-up with a revision that they presented in January of 2015.

Windy Wood Housing has a permit for a 64 unit PUD that consists of single and multi-unit housing. The approval process for this project consisted of 8 meetings over two years beginning in 2005. The project is approved to include a combination of new Town and private roads. The Windy Wood Housing Homeowners Association will control and maintain the private roads. Several hundred feet of new water and sewer line have already been constructed as well as four houses. A small portion of two roads, one that will be part of the Town road (Hickory Way) and one of the private roads (Hawthorne Place) has been constructed.

In January of 2015 the principals of Windy Wood Housing presented a conceptual plan that would realign the private road known as Edgewood Brook Road. The original revision proposed then was to have Edgewood Brook Road come back out onto Windy Wood Road instead of being a large looped road and terminating where it began inside the development. This original proposed revision also eliminated the Town road of Hickory Way connecting to Wildwood Drive on the backside of the development.

After discussion about the conceptual revision it was clear that the DRB preferred not to have Edgewood Brook Road eliminate the large loop and terminate at Windy Wood Road but rather keep the original configuration of Hickory Way connecting to Wildwood. Having a second access onto Windy Wood Road was deemed not practical due to concerns about site distance and the desire to have another way out of the development that didn't involve Hill Street.

The plan presented by Windy Wood Housing for this revised final alters the configuration of Edgewood Brook Road but keeps the Hickory Way connection to Wildwood. Edgewood Brook Road will now have a smaller loop or circle with an island and still terminates where it begins at Hickory Way.

The reason for the revision is because between the original approvals back around 2007 and late 2014, the wetland rules changed and where many of the houses off Edgewood Brook Road were not in a wetland or the wetland buffer, they now are based on the new rules. The development of Edgewood needs to be shifted to the East a little and doesn't allow for the large loop originally proposed. The new configuration will have houses on both side of Edgewood Brook Road as opposed to largely all on one side as currently

approved. The planned stormwater system shifts as well as a result of the proposed revision.

The number of units stays the same at 64.

Not significant but I'll point out that I've been told by developers that one other slight revision may include the construction of a swimming pool at some point behind the common building off Locust Common.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Overall the development stays intact for the most part. The revision definitely changes the configuration of Edgewood Brook Road and the location of the houses along it but still works within the confines of the development as a whole. The overall open space as required by a PUD shouldn't change greatly as a result. While losing the open land in the large loop, there is more space to the West behind the newly located houses. The road remains private so that there isn't any significant impact to the Town and the Town road known as Hickory Way still connects to Wildwood.

I recommend approval of this revised final approval with the understanding that all of the findings and conditions of the December 21, 2007 approval letter are still in effect unless alerted by this approval.

Suggested condition:

This revised final applies to the private road known as Edgewood Brook Road and the associated house layout and infrastructure associated with it. The remainder of the development other than possibly the swimming pool is still governed by the original approval and conditions associated with it granted on December 21, 2007.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

CV provided a summary of this agenda item.

Don McKnight/Skylark Terrace – concerned about his buffer; CV stated that this project pulls away from his property.

Sanborn likes the plan and recommends approval.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded Reaves, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Windy Wood Housing, LLC for revised final approval to a previously approved planned unit development (app 12/21/07 P-07-15 plan 2146) for property located off Windy Wood Road; Parcel ID 009/115.01; Zoned: Medium Density Residential; P-16000003; Approval is subject to conditions from previous subdivision.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes X No ___
MOTION BY: SANBORN
SECOND BY: REAVES

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson YES
Charles Thygesen, Sr. RECUSED
Cedric Sanborn YES
Mark Reaves YES
*Jim Fecteau ___
Jon Valsangiacomo RECUSED
Shaun Driscoll YES
Greg Richards YES
*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

H. SITE PLAN REVIEW

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

APPLICANT: ONE BRIDGE STREET

Request by One Bridge Street for major site plan review for the proposed construction of a 6000 sq.

**ft. commercial building with parking and erosion control on property located off Bridge Street;
Parcel ID 030/027.00; Zoned: Highway Commercial; SP-15000005**

Consultant: Wilson Consulting Engineers

Date: April 7, 2016

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

This is a warned public hearing for the second of two required hearings for the review of a major site plan. The first hearing was held in December of 2015 and continued over the next several months until now. Generally the plan met with approval of the board with the biggest issue centered on access to the site. The applicant has spent the last several months working with VTrans to obtain a curb-cut permit (commonly referred to as an 1111 permit) for access to South Barre Road also known as VT Rt. 14.

Much has happened over the last few weeks and I'll try to explain it all as well as I can. There are several different components which makes this whole thing a bit complicated. The site plan isn't complicated but the access is, given its location.

As mentioned Mr. Carr, who is the principal of One Bridge Street, was talking to Vtrans long before he presented the first site plan application. Mr. Carr had to invest a substantial amount of money to purchase the property and leveling it. Part of his property is also planned to be acquired by the State for the intersection project. Mr. Carr's discussions with Vtrans continued right up and until after the first site plan public hearing in December. Through all of that it always appeared as though a Vtrans curb-cut permit to Rt. 14 wouldn't be a problem especially after moving the proposed curb-cut further away from the knoll to the South.

During the discussions with Vtrans, I'm told that others within the state got involved and in the end Vtrans determined that they'd prefer to construct the curb-cut to One Bridge Street themselves as part of the planned Rt. 14/Bride Street/ Sterling Hill Road intersection improvement project. That project is currently slated to begin no earlier than July of 2017.

At the same time, the Town of Barre is working on a sidewalk project that will extend from Rt. 14 to the new Bridge on Bridge Street. This grant funded project is likely also to be constructed in 2017.

Vtrans has decided that with the One Bridge Street project and other increases that are likely to the traffic on Bridge Street, that they would like to preserve the ability to install a left turn lane on Bridge Street that would allow traffic to turn North on Rt. 14 towards Barre City. The turn lane is not justified now and would only be constructed in the future if it was deemed necessary. The problem is, there is not currently enough right-of-way on Bridge Street to accommodate a left turn lane.

As a result of the lack of right-of-way to install a left turn lane on Bridge Street, the State is asking that Barre Town essentially require One Bridge Street to provide the Town with the land on the North side of Bridge Street between One Bridge Street existing curb-cut and Rt. 14. If the land can be obtained by the Town, the State will construct the portion of the sidewalk from Rt. 14 to the One Bridge Street curb-cut as part of the intersection improvement project and saving the Town the cost of doing so. That section is currently part of the overall Bridge Street sidewalk project.

On April 1, 2016, the Town (represented by Harry Hinrichson, Carl Rogers, Elaine Wang, and I) met with Vtrans, One Bridge Street and the Town's sidewalk engineer from Dufresne Group. The meeting was intended to make sure everybody was on the same page with regard to expectations and allow the three engineering groups to work on plans that match. After the meeting Wilson Consulting was able to finalize the One Bridge Street plans.

The new plans are largely unchanged with the exception of a longer paved drive to the North that will connect to the Rt. 14 curb-cut. Additional parking is also included in this area. Another change is that the sidewalk from Rt. 14 to the One Bridge Street curb-cut on Bridge Street is shown along with showing the land that will need to be conveyed to the Town of Barre. Finally, a new stormwater retention area is proposed.

Below is the original summary of the project:

Mr. Carr is proposing the construction of a 5,975sf commercial building at the intersection of Bridge Street and South Barre Road (VT Rt. 14). The subject parcel is zoned highway commercial and is located in a mixed use area with a combination of both commercial and residential uses in close proximity. The subject parcel size is 2.8 acres in size with several hundred feet of road frontage along both Bridge Street

and South Barre Road. Board members may remember that this parcel had significant regrading done over the summer.

Mr. Carr is proposing to construct a 5,975 sf building that will be used for commercial purposes. At this point in time Mr. Carr has one potential tenant (Dunkin Donuts) that would use approximately 1,500 sf of the South end of the building along the Bridge Street. The use of the rest of the building at this time is unknown but will likely be either commercial or office use.

Below is the site plan criteria (Article 5, section 5.6 (f)), I will provide more information as part of each. Enclosed in your packets is a narrative from Wilson Consulting providing comments to each as well.

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 project is in compliance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw with regard to use. Being a highway commercial zone, both commercial restaurant and office building are permitted uses. Many other commercial uses are also allowed in this zone. The highway commercial zone is Barre Town's primary commercial area.

The Town Plan supports this project in several sections related to land use and economic development. This area is designed to provide economic development in the form of tax revenue and job creation.

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 plan calls for access to the site from both Bridge Street and South Barre Road. Traffic entering from Bridge Street will be directed to the right around the building and can either exit out the South Barre Road or continue around the building and exit out on to Bridge Street. Traffic entering from South Barre Road will have the option to travel along the westerly side (I'll call the back side) of the proposed building or directly to the East side (front) and have the option to exit onto Bridge Street or go around the building and back to South Barre Road. All traffic on the back side is limited to one-way with two lanes, one for a stacking lane for the proposed drive-thru and one travel lane.

The entrance and exit lanes to and from Bridge Street are proposed to be separated by a small grassed island. As proposed the exit will have left and right turn lanes. The grass island as shown on the plan may have to be altered a little to accommodate trucks.

As mentioned the backside of the building has two lanes. The proposed restaurant use will utilize a drive-thru with an ordering point and pickup window. The applicant states that there will be enough space in this location to queue 8 or 9 vehicles. This is likely adequate but hard to know for sure. The bypass lane on the outside is a good idea. The setup is similar to what McDonalds currently utilizes just down the road.

I spoke to the consultant about truck turning abilities within the site. They have taken that into consideration and believe that for the type of delivery trucks that Dunkin Donuts uses and what other potential tenants would likely use, there is enough room to adequately allow trucks to maneuver around the site. There is also a truck pull-off area that will accommodate a place for delivery trucks to park and for the pickup of trash and recyclables.

Ingress and egress to the site could be a concern. I've talked at length to both Mr. Carr and the consultant. The Bridge Street/South Barre Road intersection is widely known to be difficult, especially for traffic entering South Barre Road from Bridge Street. The intersection is scheduled for a State safety upgrade in 2017 which will greatly improve the traffic flow at that intersection. The plans for improvement include widening the intersection along with installing a traffic light. In addition, South Barre Road just to the North of the intersection will be slightly realigned and lowered.

The applicant and consultant have been working with the Vermont Agency of Transportation (AOT) for the past several months. The site plan takes into consideration alterations to South Barre Road and how it affects this lot. At the same time they have been discussing the proposed access from the site onto South Barre Road. While they have yet to apply for a state curb-cut permit to receive a letter of intent for that access, the discussion right along has been that there would be one there. The developer has indicated the access detail will be worked out before the final public hearing.

Update: Any reference to using the curb-cut to Rt. 14 is subject to when the curb-cut is actually constructed which at this time is not 100% known. The State is going to build the curb-cut as part of their intersection project. However, we don't know exactly when that is going to begin. I'm told by several

sources from the State that it is very likely the 2017 time frame is solid but not certain when it will actually begin or when the actual curb-cut will be built.

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;

Pedestrian movement within the site is similar to any commercial use. Parking is mainly along the side of the building with direct access to building side-walks. A small amount of parking is located across the parking lot along Bridge Street so that pedestrians will have the potential to have conflicts with but it would be minimal and generally acceptable.

The plans also incorporate a sidewalk from the proposed Town sidewalk. The applicant has been working with the Town and actually shows the Town sidewalk. The Town sidewalk along the north side of Bridge Street will hopefully be constructed next year.

Continued cooperation and coordination with this project and the sidewalk project will be necessary.

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;

The site disturbance for the proposed project is currently under the 1 acre threshold for a State stormwater permit. Potential future development of the site will likely change that but at this point no state stormwater is necessary according to the applicant.

The stormwater will mostly be directed to the north away from the property and towards the Steven's Branch river drainage area. This is accomplished by using a series of grass lined swales (along South Barre Road) and underground catch basins and piping. A small amount of the stormwater along the Bridge Street road frontage of the project will be directed towards Bridge Street into the existing Town stormwater collection system.

The drainage to the north will head towards abutting property of the City of Barre which is currently undeveloped. **Update:** The new plans show a stormwater retention area to the North near the boundary line with Barre City. This plan should control the rate in which water is disbursed via an underground pipe to the roadside ditch. The retention area is designed to manage a 50 year storm and is designed based on Vtrans specifications for discharging into their roadside ditch.

The plans also call for erosion and sediment control on the site following accepted industry standards and the State of Vermont requirements.

The Town Engineer has reviewed the plans and approves as shown.

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 associated with this project.

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

Both municipal water (Barre City) and sewer (Barre Town) are available to this site and will be utilized. The plans show potential flows in gallons per day. The Town of Barre has sufficient capacity to provide the sewer allocation and while not yet specifically signed off on, it is anticipated the City of Barre has water capacity to serve the project as well.

A letter from the City showing an ability to serve will be necessary before final approval.

The actual number of Town sewer units will be determined at the time of construction by the Town engineer. One sewer units allows for 300 gallons a day of low. The fee per sewer unit is \$1,500. It is possible that the overall water consumption of the building won't be the determining factor for sewer allocation, each use may be required to have its own sewer unit regardless of sewer flow in accordance with the Town's sewer policy.

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

No signage is proposed at this time but all future tenants and sign utilization will have to comply with the section of zoning referenced above.

8. The utilization of renewable energy resources;

The applicant states that solar arrays may be utilized on the roof but not specific plan at this time.

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

The applicant has been proactive in a couple of areas related to landscaping and screening. The plans have a landscaping page calling for a combination of trees, shrubs, grass, and fencing. Along the road frontage there will be grassed areas along with some shrub plantings. Care has to be taken not to interfere with drivers views and it appears the plans take that into consideration.

The tree planting along with a stockade wooden fence is proposed at the Northwest corner of the site along Bridge Street where the project is closest to an abutting property with a residential use. This is done in an attempt to shield this house as much as possible form the site and to provide noise dampening.

The screening and plantings along the abutter property line is a good idea. While the ordering point and noise from a speaker is further back and away from the residential property, the window will not be that far away. The attempt at mitigating noise is a necessity.

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 plans have a parking plan and show that in accordance with the above referenced section of the Zoning Bylaw, 47 parking spaces are being provided for a building that requires 30 spaces. The overall sf of the building dictates the parking. Zoning requires 1 parking space for every 200sf of building size. Two handicap parking spaces are included in that number.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

The main points (I think) that were discussed after the first hearing related to access to Rt. 14 to alleviate Bridge Street from handling all the traffic and the drainage onto the abutting property of Barre City. While the drainage issue appears to be solved and we now know that there will be access to Rt. 14, we don't know about the timing. When will the building be constructed and when will the curb-cut to Rt. 14 be built? At this point it looks to be very likely that both will be done in 2017 but exactly when is unknown. It is possible that there could be a period of time (length unknown) when One Bridge Street is up and running (likely with a Dunkin Donuts) without the access to Rt. 14. The big question is for how long and can we live with only the one curb-cut. This warrants further discussion at the hearing between the board and One Bridge Street.

I support this project and overall think it is a benefit to Barre Town. Having said that we have to be responsible and make sure that the safety at the intersection of Bridge Street and Rt. 14 is not worsened by this project. Knowing that the intersection is going to be improved, including a new traffic light, and access to Rt. 14 is going to be available, the intersection will be much safer even with any new traffic from the One Bridge Street project. Suggested condition below is approved.

1. The site plan by Wilson Consulting Engineers PLC of Cabot, Vermont, dated June 19, 2015 with revisions as approved and or amended by condition of approval if necessary, shall be incorporated into this approval and shall be followed unless proposed changes are first reviewed by town staff and if determined to be insignificant approved by staff.
2. In order to preserve the ability to install a left hand turn lane from Bridge Street, One Bridge Street shall subdivide and convey to the Town of Barre the area shown on the site plan (2,788sf).
3. All required state permitting shall be obtained. If any state permit or other requirement cannot be obtained or met, this approval will be declared null and void.
4. All other permits including but not limited to, water (City of Barre), building permit, access permit from the Town of Barre, and sewer shall be obtained before construction begins.

5. The Town Engineer must determine how many sewer units that will be required to meet the expected sewer flow. The applicant shall pay the \$1,500 allocation permit fee upon applying for connection to the municipal system.
6. If a sign is desired, the applicant shall follow the Barre Town ordinance with regard to signage 71.13-59.77.
7. Best management practices shall be followed with regard to sediment and erosion control with such measures being monitored regularly to ensure that they are providing as indented and adequate control. Said sediment and erosion control measure shall be removed once vegetation has been established and the need for them has abated.
8. A fire department lock box shall be installed at the owner's expense and at a location to be determined by the fire department for each separate tenant unless one master key can be used.
9. Delivery and trash removal hours are limited to between the hours of 6 am – 9 pm.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

CV stated this is the second required warned public hearing. The originally hearing took place in January, with continuances being granted for the previous months.

CV provided a brief summary of this agenda item.

CV stated that the State of Vermont won't be ready to move forward with the road reconstruct until 2017. The construction of the building won't happen until 2017.

Jeff Olesky—would like to give his appreciation to the Town staff and thank them for all the help.

Valsangiacomo—wants to know if the traffic study is for phase 1, 2 or both. Olesky stated phase 1 only.

Valsangiacomo stated the traffic study should show the full project and not just for phase 1. CV added that for phase 2, they'll be in back in front of the DRB.

Thygesen—asked if there is going to be an exit on the North end of the property; will there be a right hand turn? AOT will be handling the RT 14 infrastructure and Olesky doesn't believe there will be a turn lane.

Valsangiacomo—what size of trucks will be delivering; Olesky believes WD50 (trailer of 30')

CV is comfortable with the access, especially with the access off RT 14.

Valsangiacomo—wants to know how long the Town can live without the additional curb-cut. CV stated he doesn't know the timing, but does know it will be built.

Sanborn likes the landscaping plan; feels that the DRB overstressing the trucks going in and out of the property. LED lights, downcast.

Valsangiacomo stated that he appreciates the work that's been done; biggest concern is Bridge Street—it's a bad intersection.

Sanborn recommends approval.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by One Bridge Street for major site plan approval for the proposed construction of a 6000 sq. ft. commercial building with parking and erosion control on property located off Bridge Street; Parcel ID 030/027.00; Zoned: Highway Commercial; SP-15000005; Approval subject to conditions 1 – 9.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes X No _____
MOTION BY: SANBORN
SECOND BY: REAVES

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson YES
Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES
Cedric Sanborn YES
Mark Reaves YES
*Jim Fecteau ___
Jon Valsangiacomo NO
Shaun Driscoll YES
Greg Richards YES
*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

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 Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted to adjourn the meeting of April 13, 2016 at 8:30 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