

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR April 12, 2017

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, April 12, 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
Greg Richards	Shaun Driscoll

Members Absent:

Others Present:

Dennis Baril
Vic Fecteau
Jim Fecteau
Jeff Olesky

Staff Present:

Chris Violette
Emily Marineau
Carl Rogers
Harry Hinrichsen

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 – SANBORN QUESTIONS WHETHER FECTEAUS HEARING SHOULD BE MOVED TO A CONCEPTUAL. BOARD AGREES TO MOVE BOTH FECTEAU PROJECTS TO CONCEPTUAL.

E. APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the board voted unanimously to approve the March 08, 2017 minutes.

F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW NONE

1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Barre Town School (PRELIMINARY)

Request by the Barre Town School District for preliminary review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property located at 70 Websterville Road; Parcel ID: 006/036.00; Zoned: high density residential; P-17000004.

Consultant: American Consulting

Date: April 6, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a preliminary 2 lot subdivision request for the purpose of subdividing and creating one new lot. The subject parcel is owned by the Barre Town School District and consist of 86 acres and is home to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School. The subject parcel lies in a high density residential zone with access to municipal water and sewer requiring minimum lot sizes of 1/3 acre and 110' of road frontage.

The Town of Barre and the Barre Town Recreation Board, have had a long-standing agreement with the Barre Town School District to operate and maintain the recreation facilities located on the grounds of the school district. For various reasons, the two parties have decided to subdivide the recreation facilities and the school district will convey the 66 acres to the Town of Barre. The school will maintain a right to use the facilities.

The school district will retain 20 acres of land that will have the school, any other buildings directly related to the school, and the parking areas. The school also retains three or four acres of largely wooded land to the Southeast. The configuration of the remaining school property is so that 20 acres can be retained. The 20 acres allows the school to expand in the future if needed and still maintain percent of lot coverage.

The Town will own all the land that they currently operate and maintain. The Town will have to obtain access and utility easements. The main access to the Town's land will be through the existing school parking lot entrance at Websterville Road. The Town land will only have road frontage along Graniteville Road which will be well over the 110' required.

Assuming preliminary approval, this request is also on the agenda for final approval.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Violette states that he doesn't see any reason on why the DRB would not be comfortable with moving this on to a final hearing. Violette states that the Town of Barre has been maintaining the fields and scheduling the events on the fields for a very long time and the school has always used the fields, which will not go away with this subdivision. The school will still maintain the rights to the field.

Reaves wants to check to make sure there will still be easements to the parking lot, field and bike path. Violette states there will be many easements and rights to the field.

Rogers states the recreational board is for this subdivision and the select board has already signed the purchase and sales agreement to the land. Rogers states that there will be several easements in place due to location of sewer and water, possibly electric, they will have more work to do after the subdivision is in place. Rogers wants to point out that the Town has paid for all improvements to the field since the 1970's, they have used many volunteers to help with field work. The parking lot will stay in the school but the town will reserve the right to use the parking lot.

Valsangiacomo wants to make sure there will not be any conflict with the parking lot since there will be two different entities owning the parking lot.

Rogers states that the school and the Town coordinated when events can happen, for instance the school will let the Town know when 8th grade graduation is and the Town will not let the soft ball league have any games that day, this is no different than that they are currently doing now nor will it change after the subdivision. The Town currently does the scheduling for the field now.

Violette states that most of the time there isn't an issue because most of the field use is in the summer when there isn't any school or at night. If there is a time when the field are in use during the day they coordinated that with the school to make sure they have parking.

Sanborn wants to make sure that the parking situation is clearly laid out in in agreement so there isn't any future issues with the parking,

Rogers states that it will be and he doesn't see any problems arising. Rogers also notes that there is seasonal parking along the sides of the fields and by the picnic area.

Thygesen has questions if there is a proposal to expand the current parking lot because when there is a school event there isn't enough parking for people to park in the actual lot. Rogers states that there hasn't been any proposal at this time.

Sanborn would like a final map of the actual lot and where the road frontage will be.

Violette states that he can get a final map that shows the road frontage.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve request by Barre Town School District to move on to a final review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property located at 70 Websterville Rd; Parcel ID 006/036.00; Final approval to be made on May 10 2017.

2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS –

Barre Town School (Final)

Request by the Barre Town School District for final plat review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property located at 70 Websterville Road; Parcel ID: 006/036.00; Zoned: high density residential; P-17000004.

Consultant: American Consulting

Date: April 6, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of a 2 lot subdivision request for the purpose of subdividing and creating one new lot. The subject parcel is owned by the Barre Town School District and consist of 86 acres and is home to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School. The subject parcel lies in a high density residential zone with access to municipal water and sewer requiring minimum lot sizes of 1/3 acre and 110' of road frontage.

The Town of Barre and the Barre Town Recreation Board, have had a long-standing agreement with the Barre Town School District to operate and maintain the recreation facilities located on the grounds of the school district. For various reasons, the two parties have decided to subdivide the recreation facilities and the school district will convey the 66 acres to the Town of Barre. The school will maintain a right to use the facilities.

The school district will retain 20 acres of land that will have the school, any other buildings directly related to the school, and the parking areas. The school also retains three or four acres of largely wooded land to the Southeast. The configuration of the remaining school property is so that 20 acres can be retained. The 20 acres allows the school to expand in the future if needed and still maintain percent of lot coverage.

The Town will own all the land that they currently operate and maintain. The Town will have to obtain access and utility easements. The main access to the Town's land will be

through the existing school parking lot entrance at Websterville Road. The Town land will only have road frontage along Graniteville Road which will be well over the 110' required.

Assuming preliminary approval, this request is also on the agenda for final approval.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

Continue this request to May 10th, 2017, next DRB meeting, at the request of the applicant.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Nicholson, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to continue this request by Barre Town School District date certain to May 10, 2017, this request for final review of a two-lot subdivision of land on property located at 70 Websterville Rd; Parcel ID 006/036.00;

H. SITE PLAN REVIEW NONE

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

Dennis Baril

Request by Dennis Baril for conditional use review to formalize a long existing detached multi-family use located at 15 Bolster Rd; Parcel ID 028/021.00; Zone: High density residential; CUP-17000002

Consultant: None

Date: April 6, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of conditional use review for the allowance of more than one living unit on the subject parcel. The parcel is located in a high density residential zone with fairly compact development and mixed uses. The subject parcel is .37 acres in size with road frontage along Bolster Road.

Currently the property has a single-family dwelling with a detached garage that was built in the early 80's. The garage has an apartment over it which again has existed and been used as an apartment since it was built. The applicants father recently passed away so the

property is now under the ownership of the applicant (ET AL). The applicant (Dennis Baril) would like to make sure that everything is current and it was recently discovered that the garage apartment was never formally approved. However, not approved, they have been paying for two sewer units since 1982.

In accordance with the Barre Town's Zoning Bylaw (Article 2, table 2.1) two unit dwellings are allowed by conditional use permit. While this isn't necessarily a two-unit dwelling because the second unit is detached, the same process should ultimately be followed. The DRB after review of the conditional use criteria can make a finding.

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**
Likely no impact considering it is just one living unit and it has existed for many years so nothing is really being added.
 - b. Educational facilities**
The apartment is not really feasible for families with children so likely no impact on the school.
 - c. Water, sewer, or other municipal utility systems**
No additional impact, use has existed since 1982 and the property has been paying for two sewer units right along.
 - d. Recreational facilities**
Likely no impact
- 2. Conservation or other designated natural areas**
No anticipated impact, use already exist.
- 3. Solid waste disposal facilities**
Minimal impact and use has existed for many years.
- 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 area is mixed use with single-family dwellings, multi-family dwellings, industrial, commercial, and the Town Office is an abutter. The addition of the second living unit, even if it was new, is not likely to be out of character with this area and the purpose of high density

residential zone is to allow two unit dwellings.

- 5. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;**
One new living unit will not generate a significant increase in traffic even if the use was new but there will be not increased noticed because the use has existed for many years.
- 6. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect;**
Zoning Bylaw allows two unit dwellings by conditional use permit
- 7. Utilization of renewable energy resources.**
Nothing is changing with the property so no renewable is being proposed.
- 8. Any required extension or capital expense to the present maintained highway system;**
N/A
- 9. The impact on neighboring uses;**
No impact, neighboring uses are a mixture of single, multi-family dwellings, and commercial uses. In addition, because the use has existed for so long, nothing will change.
- 10. Intrinsic capability of the land and its surrounding areas to support the use;**
Use is existing

(B) SPECIFIC REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

- 1. Minimum lot size;**
Lot size is .37, minimum lot size for this zone is 1/3 acres. The lot conforms
- 2. Distance from adjacent or nearby uses;**
Adjacent uses are within close proximity.
- 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 minimum parking standard for two living units is four parking

spaces. The driveway for this lot is more than capable of handling this parking requirement.

6. Loading/unloading facilities.

N/a

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

As I said in by opening comments this use has existed for quite some time with little or no impact on any of the criteria as well as paying for two sewer units. I recommend approval of this conditional use request to formally acknowledge the second living unit with consideration to any conditions the board may feel is appropriate.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

The board had a brief discussion on the matter and decided to approve the request, since the dwelling has been there since 1982 when it was built and Mr. Baril and his late father have been paying on two sewer units since 1982 and there has not been any negative effect on the road or town in all the years that the building has existed. There is ample parking for the home owner and tents.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Thygesen, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve Request by Dennis Baril for conditional use review to formalize a long existing detached multi-family use located at 15 Bolster Rd; Parcel ID 028/021.00; Zone: High density residential; CUP-17000002

J. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS) NONE

K. CONCEPTUALS

Fecteau Residential Inc

Request by Fecteau Residential Inc for preliminary review of a major subdivision of land and planned unit development that, as proposed, would create 48 new lots with a total of 82 new living units located off Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Rd; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: high density residential; P-17000003.

Consultant: Wilson Consulting Engineer's PLC

Date: April 6, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

While this is on the agenda as a preliminary review, it really is a glorified conceptual review. The applicants have been before the DRB once already for conceptual review but now they have drawings to show the board what the project is proposed to look like. However, because this is still very early in the process, the plans are far from complete and the applicants now that but would like to move through this process likely with several preliminary meetings before moving to final. Normally abutters are notified at preliminary review but for this particular review I did not notify abutters thinking it would be a good opportunity for the board to learn about the project. I will likely notify abutters for next month's meeting.

The applicant is proposing a PUD that will consist of 48 new parcels, 44 for single-family dwellings, 2 for multi-family dwellings, and 2 parcels that will be designated open space. There will also be four new Town roads and municipal water and sewer lines. The applicant has a detailed narrative of their request.

I've include the PUD requirements from the Zoning bylaw in your packets. I have not provided a detailed review of the project at this point in time because the narrative does a pretty good job at that and I would like to see it formally introduced to the board.

As with any PUD, the applicant is going to seek a deviation from many standards required by the Zoning Bylaw. The Planned Unit Development Article (Article 6) allows for many reductions in standards to help preserve open space and reduce the cost of development. Some of the request with this application are somewhat beyond what is typically asked for so we will have to spend some time reviewing those.

Also, typically the first meeting of a PUD is dedicated to making sure the requested number of lots are in conformance with what could be developed if the lot was subdivided by the standards in place for that zone. In this case, the 21 acres is in a high density residential zone which allows for 1/3 acre lots. I haven't seen a plan that shows the lots laid out for a conventional subdivision. The narrative talks about it but normally we would see a plan showing it and showing the usable open space (emphasis on usable).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

This is a good meeting to get familiar with the request.

However, I think the most important item for this meeting is to determine the number of allowable units for this PUD based on how the parcel could be developed if done so conventionally for the high density residential zone keeping in mind how many dwellings units per dwelling after receiving a conditional use approval for multi-family dwellings.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

***See additional comments below- two are together.**

Fecteau Residential Inc

Request by Fecteau Residential Inc for conditional use review for 7 4-unit multi-family dwellings and 5 2-unit multi-family dwellings located off Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Road; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: High density residential; CUP-17000001

Consultant: Wilson Consulting Engineer's PLC

Date: April 6, 2017

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE, PLANNING OFFICER

This is a conditional use request but it has not been warned for a public hearing. This request is tied to the applicant's Planned Unit Development (PUD) request heard on this same agenda. I did not warn it because there is much to discuss about this request and thought it would be better for the board to be given an overview before proceeding to a warned public hearing.

The biggest problem at this point that I can see is while the applicant has submitted a detailed narrative for the PUD, I don't think it address the conditional use criteria. I would think by the next meeting that could be done and we'll see about warning it for a public hearing.

The applicant is proposing 7 four unit dwellings and 5 two unit dwellings. High density residential zoning allows for up to two unit dwellings by conditional use permit. The applicant is hoping to incorporate PUD standards into the conditional use request to allow a deviation from the zoning standard allowing four units instead of just two. The applicant also rightfully points out that this parcel is directly adjacent to very high density residential zoning which allows for up to eight living units.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

My suggestion is to hear what the applicant has to present and go from there.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Jon Valsangiacomo is recusing and John Hameline is taking his place.

Jeff Olesky, Wilson consulting Engineers, PLC, provided a map of what the lay of the land would look like if they were to do a typical single-family development. Olesky and Fecteau need to prove that they would be able to get the same number houses that they are proposing in current

duplex format. Olesky states that they have just done a rough sketch that shows the roads and property lines. They can get roughly 52 lots in the current lay out. Olesky lays out the proposed road ways, minimal lot dimensions, sewer and water lines. Olesky notes that there may be some challenges to developing some of the upper lots due to the incline of the back 4 lots.

Sanborn ask if due to the slop of those back lots to the north of the drawing, if they would even be able to develop those lots. Sanborn questioned if they need to take out those lots that cannot feasible developed to a more realistic number. Sanborn also notes that on the map provided the roads come a square end instead of a hammer head and wondering if they would have to give up more lots to make the roadways fit.

Olesky states that they probably would not develop them because it would take a great deal of engineering to design the lots and could reasonable take between 4 to 8 lots out. Which in return would drop the lots down to roughly 48 lots. Olesky states that they did not put a lot of time into the drawing because this is not the plan they want to be developed but if you were to look at the plan they want to be developed then you will see the proposed road networks and doesn't feel that they would have to take away more lots to make the road fit.

Sanborn notes that this plan is the baseline for the next set so it is important they have the correct number of lots that can be achieved.

Nicholson ask if the request is for 48 lots or more, Olesky states that it is substantially high, they are requesting 82 units and 46 lots. Fecteau is looking to build a combination on single-family houses, duplex's an 4-unit housing.

Violette states that if you take the number of lots and times it by 2 then you can get the number of units allowed. Sanborn just wants to be clear with the number of lots and units they are trying to get. Olesky states that they will finalize that number for the next meeting.

Olesky moves on the to the final presentation, he states they are looking at a 21.6 acre parcel with two access points one from Beckley Hill Rd and Daniels Dr. most of the property is open field land, noting that grades range around 5% to open field and then moving up toward the North end of the field they increase 20-25% up by the wood line, with some man made ditches. The drainage runs down the middle toward the cemetery where the discharge station is. Olesky states that the property was evaluated for wet lands which came back to show one area of class 3 wet lands but that is down by the discharge station. Olesky notes that the property is zoned high density residential which he wants to point out that the zone to the west of the property is very high residential and he would like to note that they do have access to City water and sewer lines which are along the town/city line.

Olesky states that Fecteau is looking to get approval to build single-family homes, duplex's, and 4 unit homes which will include 4 new town roads, the first will come from Daniels Drive and go

up the property providing access to the multi-family unit homes, then having another town road entering in from Beckley Hill with 3 other town roads off of that access point. (map provided) Olesky notes that he has spoken with Harry Hinrichson (Town Engineer) about curb cuts and making sure that the roads meet the towns expectations as far as width. Olesky notes that they are proposing having 8 shared access points to minimize curb cuts on the road, meaning they would like to have 4 houses on a shared driveway, all the right-of-way's would be 50 feet wide, standard two lane width. Olesky notes that they did have a traffic study done which came back stating there is no real negative impact on the traffic network.

Reaves asked if the road that the multi-family units are on a town road or a shared road. Olesky states that it will be shared but it would be with an association to maintain the roadway.

Olesky stated that they are leaving the wooded area to the North undeveloped, where there would be foot trails for property owner to access. Olesky notes that there is going to be a disc golf course going in on the adjacent land at some point.

Olesky notes that there is municipal water and sewer available for this development and Olesky has had preliminary conversations with Barre City for water and they didn't see any issues. Sewer would connect to the Town system.

Olesky states that regarding the PUD and zone of the lot they essentially want to take the very high density residential and apply it to the property with the understanding that the very high density is right next to the property. Therefore, they would be able to meet the zone requirements and PUD requirements.

Nicolson ask if they feel the need for some common parking for people who are visiting home owners.

Jim Fecteau states that it is something that they are willing to consider. J. Fecteau states that at their Barre development they have common parking and people love the extra parking and in Berlin they do not have the extra parking and people complain, so he has not ruled out the possibility of having common parking for this project. Olesky notes all the housing will have garages with a driveway that is long enough for another car to be parked.

Reaves ask if there would be a deeded access to the wooded area above the condos.

J. Fecteau states that he has avoided associations that the sole purpose is to own land, they feel that it would be a lot of maintenance for the owners and they do not want them telling other people they cannot be there, they would grant easements so people could use it. Fecteau notes that the easement would be in the deeds so that way there is no way to dispute who owns the land later, if it were to ever come up.

Hameline ask if the garages are single car or two car garages. Fecteau states that there is a mix of

single and two car garages. It will ultimately come down to the buyers budget. Fecteau notes that when they build a house that has a single car garage they try to make accommodation knowing that people leave the house at different times.

Nicolson referred to the Windy Wood project stating that they proposed duplex and as the development has moved forward, they ended up with more single-family homes because that's what the people wanted.

Sanborn questions if they need any more access point for emergency service vehicle to enter like they did at Country Side development, especially a second way to access the multi-family dwellings at the top. He also goes on to question if there was a house fire would the fire trucks have a hard time getting water to those lots at the north of the map.

Violette states that they wouldn't have made it this far if he didn't think they would be able to get trucks up there and that's why they put in the two main access points from Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Rd. Fecteau notes that they do have 4 fire hydrants in place and the water lines will be looped.

Sanborn is questioning if the land to the North /West can be developed at some point and if so should access be left for it?

Olesky notes that the North end is wooded next to where the disc golf course is going and above that is Washington County Mental Health and to the West is single family homes, he feels it is very hard to say if it would ever be developed at this time.

Violette states he does not feel that that area is overly developable, but he would have to check on a map.

Sanborn noted that they want to treat the proposed PUD like it is zoned very high residential and if so why didn't they go before the Planning Commission and ask for a zone change and then they would be in conformance with what they are asking.

Violette states that what they are asking for is part of a PUD so they would be in conformance, but would need a conditional use permit for multi-family units.

Sanborn feels that a PUD should have a lot less lots and more open land and he feels that they are asking to develop the vast majority of the land there. Sanborn also feels that you cannot count where you are storing storm water as part of the 25% open land.

Olesky states that the law states that you can use the storm water holding as part of the 25% open land, if there are no structures on the land.

J.Fecteau asked what the process of getting the zone change would take, Violette explains the process and it could take up to six months to complete.

J. Fecteau states that Act-250 requires them to meet energy efficiency stretch codes with all their houses, which goes above and beyond the current energy efficiency guidelines.

Hinrichson ask if the detention area is going to be used for anything other than a detention area.

Oleskey states they are not sure 100% on what they are doing at this time, they are still reviewing the plans and seeing what the needs will be. They must still figure out grades of the land and the drainage. Olesky states they will have a more stable plan at the next meeting.

Violette notes that Fecteau's understand there will be multiple preliminary meetings moving towards the final hearing.

Nicholson states that he is a fan of the project, he feels that this is the way developments should be going, they have paved roads, water and sewer hook ups. But he would like them to firm up the number of lots they can get and the number of units they want to have in place.

Hameline, would like "firmer" final plan, he doesn't have a problem with the waiver request but he doesn't want to get in the position of being accused of spot zoning one area for a specific use.

Driscoll, likes the lay out and does believe there will be push back from some people but feels that it is on its way to being well thought out and engineered. He would like to see the final layout for the storm water drainage.

Richards, feels they will have push back and would like to see the plans a little further along and decided on because the public will pick every little thing apart and if they have things more decided then it won't be as easy for the public to pick apart.

Thygesen, stated he would like to know about snow removal, and is concerned about the traffic flow, other than that Thygesen feels they are doing a good job.

Reaves, would like to see other land saved as the 25% undeveloped land, he doesn't feel that saving the land that is going to be used as the storm water collection can be earmarked as part of the 25% and the open wooded area as well, but other than those things he feels they are headed in the right direction.

Sanborn, has issues with 4 driveways on one access, open land that is useable for everyone. Sanborn feels that it is more a single-family development which would need a zone change instead of a PUD.

Fecteau states that having the 4 driveways on one access was better than having all those curb cuts on the main road. Fecteau states that two of the four houses will have road frontage.

Reaves asked about having sidewalks for people to walk along since they will have open land with trails.

Olesky states they are not putting in sidewalks but can make the road a little wider and paint a stripe on the roadway giving walkers a safe place to walk. Olesky also goes on to talk about possibly making the roadway a little wider and still be able to meet town requirements. They will have a asset plan for the next meeting.

Reaves and Sanborn both feel that Fecteau should have gone for the zone change a while ago. Reaves feels that some of the requests that Fecteau is asking for would have been solved by the zone change. Both Reaves and Sanborn feel that the zone change would have been granted because they are asking for the property to be looked at and approved for very high density residential standards which is the zone that is right next to the property. They would like to see them explore the zone change request.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

No motion was made on this request but the Development Review Board would like to move forward with the request by Fecteau Residential Inc for preliminary review of a major subdivision of land and planned unit development that, as proposed, would create 48 new lots with a total of 82 new living units located off Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Rd; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: high density residential; P-17000003/ CUP-17000001 with the following revised plans, common parking, better determination of protentional lots, better defined open area equaling 25%, preferred independent ROW

L. FOLLOW-UPS: NONE

M. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE
TOWN
MISCELLANEOUS

N. ROUNDTABLE

O. ADJOURN!

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Nicholson, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn @ 8:54 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Emily Marineau

Mark Nicholson, Chair

Cedric Sanborn

Mark Reaves

Jon Valsangiacomo

Jim Fecteau

Charlie Thygesen Sr.

Shaun Driscoll

Greg Richards

John Hamelin

