

# BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

## MINUTES FOR May 10, 2017

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, May 10, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

### Members Present:

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

### Members Absent:

Mark Nicholson  
Greg Richards  
Shaun Driscoll

### Others Present:

Vic Fecteau      Cynthia Pratt  
Jim Fecteau      Aaron Pacetti  
Jeff Olesky      Pierre Couture  
Mark Browning      Ed Patterson  
Amy Scalabrini

### Staff Present:

Chris Violette  
Emily Marineau  
Carl Rogers

- 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 Reaves, seconded by Thygesen, the board voted unanimously to approve the April 12, 2017 minutes.*

- F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

## G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW

### PRELIMINARY REVIEW

#### **Fecteau Residential Inc (PRELIMINARY)**

**Request by Fecteau Residential Inc for preliminary review of a major subdivision of land and planned unit development that, as proposed, would create 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: May 03, 2017

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

This is preliminary review of a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for land located off Beckley Hill Road with access from Daniels Drive. The proposed PUD would create 48 new lots with a mixture of single and two-unit residential housing. The applicant is still early in the process and plans are not fully developed yet and they understand that several preliminary meetings will be needed moving forward. Abutters have been notified.

The subject parcel is in a high density residential zone with a minimum lot size of 1/3 acre and 110' of road frontage. Water and sewer is being proposed to serve this project. Being a proposed PUD, the applicant is asking for several deviations from zoning standards as is allowed for in the Zoning Bylaw for PUD's.

The subject parcel is 21.6 acres in size with access to two Town roads. The parcel sits behind several lots that front along Beckley Hill Road but the parcel includes a 50' strip of land that runs between two of those lots providing access to said road. In addition, the applicant owns land at the end of Daniels Drive (off Richardson Road) and have access there as well.

The plan creates 48 new lots. Most of the lots are shown to be around 8,700sf in size. While there could be potential for two-family dwellings, 39 of the new lots are likely to be developed with single-family dwellings. Five of the smaller lots are shown with two-family dwellings, while the remaining land, a much larger lot, includes 14 two-family dwellings (as well as the bulk of the common land). Finally, two other lots are proposed for stormwater treatment and common land.

The proposed plan will create four new Town Roads totaling approximately 2,450 feet along with approximately 2,355 feet of sanitary sewer line and numerous manholes. The applicant has indicated that most stormwater collection will be done underground so that there will also be a significant quantity of piping and of course numerous catch basins. While not yet designed, there will also be a stormwater treatment area. While part of the Barre City water system, there will be several thousand feet of water pipe as part of the development. All infrastructure, with the exception of the water line must be turned over to the Town. The water line must be turned over to the City of Barre. At some point during preliminary review, or at a minimum, before final consideration, the applicant must seek Selectboard approval for takeover of the infrastructure. The DRB will also have to see a commitment

from the City of Barre for their ability to serve and take the water system over.

Only a few of the proposed lots will have a stand-alone access along their road frontage. Most of the lots are being proposed to use a shared access for four dwellings. Access on a shared driveway includes numerous lots that have road frontage but the applicants are suggesting the shared access to conserve space and reduce the number of curb-cuts on a Town road.

As was discussed at length last month, one of the very first things to be determined for a PUD is how many lots could be created if the subject parcel was subdivided in accordance with the standards in place for the zone it is located in. The applicants tried to show that last month but have come back with a better plan that shows a potential for 47 lots. If a Conditional Use Permit was granted for all 47 lots for two-unit dwellings, the build out has the potential for 94 housing units.

Last month's meeting included a lot of discussion regarding whether the land being included for potential development was legitimately developable land. This is especially true at the top of the hill (Northeasterly side). The applicants indicated that there may be some difficulty developing all of that land due to terrain. I think the DRB will need more information as to why the steep land is actually in fact developable.

With regard to the PUD standards, the applicant is essentially requesting the very high density residential standards be used for the project. A detailed list is below of the deviations being requested:

- Lot size: 8,700sf lots as opposed to .33 acre (14,374sf)
- Road Frontage: 85' as opposed to 110'
- Lots without road frontage: served by one 25' right-of-way instead of each having its own 25' ROW)
- Shared access: Four lots as opposed to two lots
- Shared curb-cut: Four lots as opposed to three
- Setback: 15' road right-of-way as opposed to 25'; 10' side and rear as opposed to 12'
- Building spacing: 20' as opposed to 30'

The number of total units being requested for this PUD is up to 90 units (47 lots assuming 2 unit dwellings each =94). At this point though the applicant is proposing a total of 78 units, 38 two-family and 40 single-family dwellings. Another factor in determining the total number of units is whether or not a conditional use permit (CUP) would be issued for two-unit dwellings. The applicant is seeking a CUP simultaneously with this application.

It should be noted that last month the plan showed several four-family dwellings, those have been eliminated because of the potential difficulty receiving a Conditional Use permit where the zone only allows two-family dwellings.

The new plans show two roads widened to 26' from 24' as discussed last month to accommodate pedestrian and bicycling. Also, discussed last month and added to the plans is a small parking area at the top of the development near the majority of the two-unit dwellings. This parking area is for the purpose of overflow parking and parking for the common land.

At some point traffic will have to be discussed. The applicants have had a traffic study completed by VHB of South Burlington. The study includes this project as well as another off-Rudd Farm Drive

which is near this project. The total projected residential units considered as part of this study is 130. The study concludes that the proposed PUD will not generate unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions on the adjacent roadway network which includes the intersection of Richardson Road and North Main Street and Beckley Hill and North Main Street, both in Barre City. I've included a copy of the report in your packets. You may wish to have somebody from VHB come in and go over the study with you. The Town could also have an independent look at the study.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

I think this meeting should be used to flush out any remaining concern and come to some concrete determination as to what is going to be allowed. The main sticking point as I remember is the use of one common access for up to four dwellings.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Jon Valsangiacomo – recuses himself from this applicant's hearing.**

Jeff Olesky from Wilson Consulting, confirmed the difference between the two maps that one map is an example of the "traditional" lay out if Fecteau's was to put all single-family dwellings on the parcels. The second map is the lay out that Fecteau is wanting to get approved. Olesky states that they spent some more time confirming the number of lots if they were to do a traditional subdivision if they were not requesting a PUD. Olesky states that there was question if the upper lots would be able to be developed. Under the proposed plan, they are showing it as open land and conserved and not part of the development plan. They originally showed some loose subdivision and it wasn't clear if access was going to be an issue or if the land could be used in a traditional subdivision, they have put a road line in, which is similar to the PUD they are requesting. Due to the grade changes of those upper lots Olesky states it would be tricky to design but it can be done. They have reserved an area for storm water treatment. Olesky states that in the traditional design Fecteau residential Inc would be able to get 47 lots with only 2 lots being accessed by shared access. With the total lot count coming in at 47 lots and if they were to put duplexes on all the lots they come in at a maximum number of 94 units, which is scaled back from the original unit count that they were requesting in the first meeting.

Sanborn ask Violette what he thinks of the lay out and the lot count. Violette states that the lay out is tough but do able. He believes that they have seen worse therefore making it hard to argue that this design couldn't be done. Olesky states that all the lots meet all zone regulations and the Town roads meet all the Town requirements.

Hameline is wondering how lot 3 would be accessed because on the map it looks like it was land locked. Olesky states that it would be accessed from a town road with a shared access to the lot.

Reaves states that in easments it looks like they are trying to scrunch it down. Olesky states that they are and in a traditional PUD they are looking to make the development to have a higher density and reserve open space for the community to use. As part of the PUD they are wanting to take the neighboring very high density and apply that to their parcel.

Violette states that he is counting 48 lots but Olesky states that they are not counting that as a lot because they will turn that into a Town right of way and have that lot in question as a storm water discharge area because they can not build on that lot.

Olesky pulls the map that has the proposed development. They have come back with a revised plan and tried to address the concerns of the board. First Olesky wanted to address the quadplexes that

were in place at the top of the lots and one on the side, they have removed all the quadplexes and replaces them with duplexes and single-family homes. Second item that they would like to get approved is shared access. They talked about a maximum of 2-3 lots being accessed by a shared access and they are proposing 4 lots. Olesky states that Fecteau feels very strongly about having the 4 lots accessed by a shared access. Olesky states that they want to minimums curb cuts on roads B and C. They would have easements in place for the shared access and the shared access would be clearly outlined the deed and covenance of the house.

Reaves asked what the width of the access would be. Olesky states that width of the easement would be 25' as required. Olesky stated that if they pull the map that has the "traditional" subdivision they can see what the lay out would look like if they had only 2 lots on a curb cut.

Olesky states that getting to the total unit count as park of the plan they in vision a maximum of 94 units in a traditional subdivision and they are proposing 78 units, which is drastically less than last month. Fecteau will have most of the duplexes at the top of parcel which will have 14 buildings and a total of 28 units. All those units will be in a home owner's association. They will also place 4 building with 8 units to the East of the map. Violette asks Fecteau's if they are sure that they will put the duplexes where they are located on the map. J. Fecteau states that the duplexes to North and the East of the map will be there but the one duplex to the west of the map may change. J.Fecteau states that they are not sure where the others may go yet or just take off the duplexes off the map and asking in the permit to allow the proposed number of duplexes on any of the lots that have the same building envelope. Fecteau states that it is something to consider.

Sanborn states that in a PUD you have to have 25% open space and that you cannot build on 75% of the land and count the rest of the lot as open space. Sanborn feels that we are looking for 25% open space in a block or throughout the development. Olesky clarifies the in a PUD application you must have 25% usable open space that the community can enjoy, which is proposed in the upper North of lot and down to the South of the map where the storm water treatment area will be. Where the individual lot are not counted in the count. Olesky clarifies that they are not counting the buildable lots as open space. He wants to point out that last month when they presented the 25%open land they were right on the edge of that where now they have increased it to 27% due to taking out the quadplexes.

Reaves states that they have a hard time counting the storm water treatment as open space because it will not be open for the people to use if they have it all fences off. If they had a pond that would be used by the community or an open field than he could see that being used.

Olesky states that they have not fully designed the storm water treatment area therefore he cannot speak as to what the actual design would be.

Hameline as what the open space is without counting the storm water treatment area. Olesky states that he cannot give a hard number but he believes that are over 20% open land. Olesky states that they will look into the regulations a little more closely and will come back with a better design next month if they need to create more open space or if they just change the design of the storm water treatment area.

Olesky reviews the outlines plan for the storm water collection off the main roads. They will use more or the traditional design of catch basins along roads B ,C D and some of E. Proposed roads B and C will have a designated bike/pedestrian walking lane. They will have lines painted on the road instead

of putting a sidewalk. They will make sure they have signs up promoting safety of the walkers.

Olesky also high lights where they have places overflow parking. They have placed the parking upper North part of the parcel next to where the open space will be. They have also made sure that drive was are long enough for some extra cars to be parked in the driveway.

Reaves would like to see a better plan for the open space. He likes the layout they have proposed. He does feel that the open land to the North of the lot is more accessible than he once thought it was. He does like the changes but would like to see something more planned out for the storm water treatment area.

Thygesen likes what they are doing.

Hameline like that they have addressed just about all the boards concerns, but would like to see what they can do about the 25% open space. He does like the somewhat less densified look and feel of it. He thinks that they have made a strong improvement.

Sanborn would like to see a change in the shared driveways and not have 4 lots on one driveway. He would like to know where all the snow is going to go in the winter. Sanborn is questioning if there is going to be a snow dump. He would like to know about running a spur out to an adjacent open land for future development.

Olesky states that it is something they can look out. Due to grade issues, they can look at doing something up by the proposed parking lot. Olesky ask for clarification about that the board will accept for the shared driveways. They want to limit the number of curb cuts on the town road.

Sanborn agrees that they do not want a bunch of curb cuts but he does not feel that 4 house on one shared driveway should be allowed. He would like to see a different plan drawn up showing access to the back lots different than what is currently planned.

Reaves feels that in a PUD there is language that would allow what they are proposing in this setting. But he does agree that they should have a plan about the snow removal.

Olesky feels that if they make it clear in the deed to the house that the driveway is a shared with the other lots than it will be up to the homeowners to work it out and dispute they may have. The homeowners bought the house with the understanding they have a shared driveway.

Sanborn questions that if they would be willing to put in an area for a playground area. J. Fecteau states that they have not seen a big influx in children in their current development. But it is something they could think about if it could be considered as part of the 25% open land.

**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 47 new lots with a total of 94 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, better plans of connecting roads to abutting land, better***

***determination of protentional lots, better defined open area equaling 25% maybe a proposed playground area.***

1) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS –

**Barre Town School (FINAL)**

**Request by the Barre Town School District for final 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: May 03, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for final consideration of a 2-lot subdivision request that if approved will create one new lot. Preliminary approval was granted at the April 2017 meeting. The subject parcel is owned by the Barre Town School District and consists 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.

No new development is planned with this subdivision. The main purpose of this subdivision is to transfer the recreation land owned by the school to the Town. The Town of Barre, the Barre Town Recreation Board, and the Barre Town School District have had a long-standing agreement that the Town of Barre operates and maintains the recreation facilities located on the grounds of the school. For assorted reasons, the two parties have decided to subdivide the recreation facilities so the school district will convey 66 acres to the Town of Barre. The school will maintain a right to use the facilities.

The school district retains 20 acres of land that will consist of 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 school lot will maintain all of its 800' plus road frontage on Websterville Road.

There will be a need for the Town to obtain numerous easements including access and utility easements (water, sewer, and power). The main access to the Town's land will be through the existing school parking lot entrance at Websterville Road. While the Town will not have any road frontage on Websterville Road (where the access is) there will be over 1,200' of frontage for the new lot along Graniteville Road (as shown on the enclosed tax map).

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

With consideration to the conditions noted below, I recommend final approval of this 2-lot subdivision as proposed by the Barre Town School District.

- 1) All easements and/or right-of-way's that are necessary to preserve access and utilities must be created as the need arises to fulfill the requirements of this approval.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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 .
- 4) An electronic copy of the final approved plan provided to the Planning and Zoning Office within 30-days of final approval.
- 5) 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.
- 6) Failure to comply with any conditions as stated herein, could lead to nullification of this subdivision.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Jon returns for this applicant review**

Rogers states that the Select Board is still working on finalizing the easements, right of ways and a final map. Rogers states that the Select Board should be able to finalize everything and have a final map submitting by the 180-day mark. After a short discussion, the DRB has moved to approve this two lot subdivision.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Hameline, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the request by Barre Town School District for a two-lot subdivision of land on property located at 70 Websterville Rd; Parcel ID 006/036.00; Zones; high density residential with the following conditions as listed above with the addition of number 7 asking for all easements and right of ways be shown on final map, also changing number 3 to 180 days instead of 30 days.*

**H. SITE PLAN REVIEW NONE**

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

**J. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)**

**Aaron Pacetti**

**Request by Aaron Pacetti, on behalf of Cynthia Pratt (LE), for a 10' variance of right-of-way setback (Middle Road) for property located at 22 Middle Rd; Parcel ID 026/046.00, Zone: High density residential. V-17000001**

Consultant:

Date: May 03, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for a variance request. The applicant is seeking a 10' variance of right-of-way (Middle Road) setback for the construction of an addition to the front of their existing single-family dwelling. The subject parcel is in a high density residential zone that requires a minimum street side setback of 25'.

The applicant owns a home at 22 Middle Road and would like to add approximately 10' to the front of the house which would enlarge the existing living room. A 10' variance would mean the house would setback from Middle Road 15'.

Most, if not all, of the houses along the bottom of Middle Road sit well inside the existing high density residential street setback of 25'. The applicant's house sits right on the setback line. The opposite side of the street is very high density residential zone which requires a 15' setback, the same as what the applicant is requesting.

Below is the variance criterion as stipulated by the State of Vermont 24 VSA § 4469 and the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw Article 7, section 7.9.

The applicant has submitted responses to the below criterion.

**1. Are there unique physical circumstances or conditions as to:**

- a. Irregularity, narrowness or shallowness of lot size or shape;**
- b. Exceptional topography or physical conditions peculiar to a particular property;**
- c. Unnecessary hardship due to the above?**

All the houses along Middle Road have existed for a long time and sit closer to the road than current setback allows. This particular house, given the configuration sits a little further back but won't allow for expansion given the current setback requirement. The applicant feels that this configuration and setback requirement has created a hardship so that the applicant can't expand their house.

**2. Are there physical circumstances or conditions that prevent conformity to zoning regulations; And, a variance is necessary to enable “reasonable use” of the property.**

The applicant feels that the physical circumstances that prevent conformity is that zoning on their side of the street requires a 25’ setback whereas on the other side of the road the setback is only 15’ and that the house was built before zoning was enacted. They feel the small addition to their house is a reasonable use of the property.

**3. Is it true that no unnecessary hardship was created by the applicant?**

The applicant did not build the house so they feel that the hardship was not created by them and the age of the house means that living rooms were generally smaller by today’s standards.

**4. Is it true that a variance will not:**

- a. Alter the essential character of the neighborhood?**
- b. Substantially or permanently impair appropriate use or development of adjacent property?**
- c. Reduce access to renewable energy sources?**
- d. Be detrimental to the public welfare?**

The applicant has stated that the character of the neighborhood will not be affected because the entire street is already residential with commercial uses near. Furthermore, the addition as proposed will not be any closer to the road than most of the houses that are already there and in fact will still be further back than many. No adjacent property will be negatively affected and because the house will still meet the very high density residential setback, there will not be any detriment to the public welfare.

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

The addition of 10’ to the front of the house will gain minimal amount of room in the house but it will be important to them to expand as proposed. The applicant feels that this is the minimum deviation from the Zoning Bylaw that provides them with relief.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

Overall some of the criteria are marginal, but given the nature of the request and the fact that most all other houses on the same side of the road sit considerably closer than this house does now and will even with the proposed addition and considering the other side of the road is zoned very high density residential which would allow the setback being requested, and given previous variances issues for similar type of projects, I recommend approval of this 10’ variance request

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Sanborn asked Pacetti the 5 variance questions all of which Pacetti answered in the affirmative. Pacetti states he feels Violette did a great summary of their request. He does feel that because even though their house is further back all of their neighbor's house do not conform to their current zone.

Reaves ask if it is the cottage they are expanding or if it is the main house. Pacetti states that it is the main house they are looking to expand.

Thygesen states that there hasn't been a new house built there in over 100 years and that the house in question does sit back far enough from the road that expanding the house some should not be a problem and he does not feel there should be any problem with granting this variance.

Hameline states that he doesn't have a problem with it, although he is not a fan of variances he does understand that sometimes they do have to be issued.

Valsangiacomo is not a fan of the variance because he feels that places are zoned for a certain reason and if we keep granting variances then no houses will conform to the zone that they are in. Valsangiacomo just wants to make sure that we are staying consistent.

Cynthia Pratt ask that if it is the responsibility of the home owner to check the zone of the house they want to buy.

Violette states that it is and he states that we get people coming in the office often questioning the zone they are in and what is allowed. He also states that on the flip side that most people cannot anticipate what addition they might be doing in 20 years. Violette also states that zone changes do happen after someone buys a house. He is not sure if that is what happened in this case.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

***On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Thygesen, the Development Review Board voted 4-1 to approved Request by Aaron Pacetti, on behalf of Cynthia Pratt (LE), for a 10' variance of right-of-way setback (Middle Road) for property located at 22 Middle Rd; Parcel ID 026/046.00, Zone: High density residential***

***Reaves YES                      Thygesen YES  
Sanborn YES                      Hameline YES                      Valsangiacomo NO***

**K. CONCEPTUALS**

**Fecteau Residential Inc (CUP for 2 unit dwellings)**

**Request by Fecteau Residential Inc for conditional use review for the construction of several multi-family dwellings as part of a proposed PUD on land located off Beckley Hill Road and Daniels Drive; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: High density residential; CUP-17000001**

Consultant: Wilson Consulting Engineer's PLC

Date:                      May 03, 2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for conditional use review for the proposed construction of up to 31 two-family dwellings on land that is currently being considered for subdivision and Planned Unit Development (PUD). The subject parcel is 21.6 acres in size and is in a high density residential zone. Land surrounding the proposed development is generally residential in nature with mostly single-family dwellings but there is some multi as well.

High density residential zoning, article 2, table 2.1 allows two-family dwellings by conditional use approval. Article 3, section 3.3 (E) allows new structures to have up to two living units. The applicant is currently proposing to build 19 duplexes as part of their Planned Unit Development (PUD) off Beckley Hill Road. They are asking for a total of 31 two-family dwellings because they would like the option to add an additional 12 duplexes in the future.

Please see the maps included in the DRB packets for the subdivision and PUD for a layout of the proposed duplexes.

This review is for the duplexes only which at this point is for 19 although as mentioned in total the applicants are seeking 31. The scope of this review should not consider the remainder of the proposed subdivision because the single-family lots do not require a CUP. The total number of housing units to consider is 62.

**CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA**

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

**GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL**

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

**1. The impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities:**

I think it would be hard to argue whether a development of this size adding 62 total new living units will not have an impact on the existing Town services. The questions is how much and whether it can be absorbed. Its also important to remember that it won't happen all at once.

**a. Emergency services**

Police, Fire, and EMS will likely see an impact as a result of the current proposal for 38 new units. Judging where capacity is and how much additional demand the proposed units will have is not easy.

Police: Currently the Barre Town Police Department is made up of 8 fulltime officers that provide 24-hour coverage. There are those that say the Police Department is already under staffed. The Police

Department is aware of this proposal but hasn't weighed in as of yet.

Fire: The Barre Town Fire Department is a call-paid fire department with a 30-person force that responds to calls when called. A call-paid department is only different from a volunteer department in that they get paid hourly for each call. The Barre City Fire Department is a career department and is located less than a mile from the proposed development. Barre City is relied upon, by mutual aid agreement, for any life safety for near simultaneously response to all calls in Barre Town including the area where this development is proposed.

Given the nature of the new construction it is unlikely that the addition of 19 or 31 new houses with 38 or 62 units of housing will cause significant strain on the fire department.

EMS: Barre Town has its own career ambulance service staffing two stations full-time and another Monday – Friday during the day hours. EMS has been made aware of this proposed development but has yet to offer an opinion on the impact.

**b. Educational facilities**

The addition of 19 or 31 additional living units in Town could have some impact on the educational system. That impact is hard to predict not knowing how many kids will actually live in these duplexes. However, the Barre Town School from a capacity standpoint is well below what it was built for. Staffing may be a different story but it is hard to believe that as this development is built the school won't be able to keep up with whatever impact is realized. Also, unlike in the past, school funding actually improves the more kids you have in the system.

Overall the impact should be manageable.

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

The proposed duplexes will be served by both municipal water and sewer. Barre City will supply the water, Barre Town the sewer. An ability to serve letter will be necessary from the City before a final approval is granted. Regarding sewer, 38 units equates to 11,400 gallons of flow every day, while 62 is 18,600. Barre Town sewer is treated at the Barre City waste water treatment plant where Barre Town has a specific reserve. While there is plenty of capacity at this point in time, the Town Engineer should weigh in on any potential impact that this additional flow may have.

Green Mountain Power is the power supplier for this area of Barre Town. The developer will work with GMP during the development

process. It is unlikely that this development will negatively affect the power utility.

**d. Recreational facilities**

Barre Town's main recreation facility is located adjacent to the Barre Town Middle and Elementary School. However, Barre Town has numerous "neighborhood" playgrounds. There are no municipally run playgrounds in the area of this proposed development. Impact on existing facilities should be minimal and easily absorbed. However, it might be responsible to consider if not a playground as part of this proposed development, space be left for one given the potential for children to live here.

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

The subject area is not known to be impacted by any conservation or other designated natural areas. The applicants has had a wetland study done and no significant wetlands were found to exist.

**3. Solid waste disposal facilities**

Solid waste will be handled like any other residential use. The applicants will be responsible for providing receptacles for trash removal and trash will be taken to existing landfills. The addition of the proposed units should not have a negative impact on solid waste.

**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 purpose statement for high density residential zoning says the following: "This district is designed to encourage continued predominantly residential development at relatively high densities in established neighborhoods close to village centers which have both public water and sewer service".

The area affected by this development is all residential. To the Northwest is The Richardson Road area that consist of dozens of dense single-family dwellings on lots similarly sized to the proposed lots. There are also several multi-family dwellings in this area. To the North is a Washington County Mental Health building but beyond that is another residential development as there is along Beckley Hill Road including all the way down through the City.

The addition of the proposed residential living units appears to more than meet the stated purpose of the zone it is located in. Furthermore, the municipal plan has designated this area as a growth area mainly because of its existing development pattern and proximity to municipal services.

There is not doubt that adding this many residential units will have an impact but

it is in and area planned for dense development.

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

The development that will host the proposed duplexes will have two separate accesses to municipal roads. Beckley Hill Road will likely be the main point in ingress and egress. Beckley Hill Road is a Town class 3 pave road that runs from North Main Street in Barre City to the intersection with Mekklesen Hill Road in Barre Town. The second access will be via Daniels and Rudd Farm Drive to Richardson Road (all Town class 3 paved roads) which intersects with North Main Street in Barre City.

A traffic impact study was done in conjunctions with the subdivision and the Planned Unit Development. The study looked at a potential of 130 total residential units and concluded that there wouldn't be a significant impact. The main point of concern with the subdivision request focused on by the traffic study was the potential impact on both the North Main Street intersections.

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

Article 2, table 2.1 allows two-family dwellings after conditional use review. Additionally, article 3, section 3.3 (E) allows new structure to have no more than two units per structure. This request conforms to zoning if a CUP is issued.

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

No renewable energy resources are proposed at this time.

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

The extension of municipal service will be necessary because of the proposed subdivision and Planned Unit Development. New unfractured to be built includes a couple thousand feet of sewer and water line as well as a stormwater management system. All of the expense of constructing the infrastructure will be borne by the developer but the Town will be asked to take it over. Several new roads will be constructed as well and turned over to the Town. Again, the cost of road construction will be absorbed by the developer.

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

The neighboring uses are the same as is being proposed, residential. While the addition of up to 62 new residential living units will have some impact, the use is the same so the impact should be minimal.

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

The land is callable of handling the use.

(B) SPECIFIC REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

1. **Minimum lot size;**

The minimum lot size for high density residential zoning is 1/3 of an acre. The subject parcel is 21.6 acres in size.

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

The residential neighboring uses are within a quarter mile or less of the proposed new dwellings.

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;**

Off Street parking will be required. The Zoning Bylaw requires two parking spaces for each residential unit. As proposed there is room for up to at least four parking spaces for each duplex.

6. **Loading/unloading facilities.**

N/a

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

There is a lot to consider with the proposal to add up to 62 new living units in 31 residential buildings. Traffic may be the biggest issue to address. But overall the idea of compacting more development in this area makes sense. The Zoning Bylaw allows for it and the Town Plan plans for it in this location. I'm not sure I'm ready to suggest approving it at this meeting, but I think it is something that makes sense.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Jon Valsangiacomo – recuses himself from this applicant's hearing.**

Reaves is looking for clarification because he thought that a PUD approval would encompass the conditional use permit. Violette states that he is correct but the unit count comes from the lot count request in the PUD in order to get the conditional use permit. The total number of units needs to get approved before they can move on in the PUD.

Olesky thanks Violette for the great summary of the project and he does not have much to add and opens up to questions from the board.

Reaves-no questions

Thygesen- no questions

Hameline- no questions

Sanborn states that he took a ride down into the Rudd Farm Rd development and feels that is shaping up nicely and looks good.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*A motion was made by Reaves, seconded by Thygesen for the Development Review Board to unanimously approve the request by Fecteau Residential Inc for a Conditional Use Permit for a total of 31 new building with a total of 62 new living units located off Daniels Drive and Beckley Hill Rd; Parcel ID 008/035.00; Zone: high density residential;CUP-17000001.*

**Pierre Couture (Community center/Recreational Facility)**

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

Consultant:

Date: May 03,2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of conditional use review to consider the conversion of an existing barn into a community center/recreational facility. The subject parcel is located on Little John Road in a medium density residential zone.

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

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

The modification of the existing barn will take place in phases. First, they will dismantle the back half

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

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

#### CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA

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

##### GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

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

#### 1. The impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities:

##### a. Emergency services

As a public facility, there could be impact on Police, Fire, and EMS. However, the nature of and the periodic use of the facility especially the fact that it won't be used in the winter seems to lend itself to having little impact on emergency services.

##### b. Educational facilities

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

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

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

##### d. Recreational facilities

No impact on existing recreational faculties.

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

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

potentially be a good adaptive reuse of an existing barn.

**3. Solid waste disposal facilities**

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

**4. The character of the area affected as defined by the purpose(s) of the zone within which the project is located, and specifically stated policies and standards of the municipal plan;**

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

The purpose statement in the Zoning Bylaw states the following: This principally residential district is designed to provide areas where moderate density residential development may occur in a rural suburban setting. It is also important to note that the zoning across the street is very high density residential with the following purpose statement: This district is designed for land centrally located where town water and sewer facilities are available and where, due to reasons of utilities, location and existing intensive development, higher density is appropriate.

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

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

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

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

The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw is silent on the use of a wedding hall. The closet thing allowed in zoning and I think fits is the community center/recreational

facility as noted in the opening. Community center/recreational facility is where places of large assembly is contemplated. Community center/recreational facility is allowed by conditional use permit.

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

No renewable energy resources are being considered to my knowledge.

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

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

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

See character of the area #4 above

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

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

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

**1. Minimum lot size;**

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

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

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

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

N/a

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

N/a

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

The applicant proposes to create a new parking lot behind the existing barn accessed by a new driveway. It is unclear how many vehicles that the new parking lot will hold so more information would be helpful. Having said that, there is

plenty of field that could likely also hold parked cars.

**6. Loading/unloading facilities.**

N/a

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

While I believe this is potentially a great adaptive reuse of an old barn, I have concerns about the impacts on the surrounding neighbors. More information is necessary to determine the impact and how it will be mitigated. I do believe that after having attended events in converted old barns that these types of things are popular and could be an asset to the Town. Generally, I am supportive of the use but am concerned about neighbor impact.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Jon returns for this applicant review**

Pierre Couture states that himself and his sister own the property, after their mother passed away they restored the house and have been wanting to do something with the barn. Couture believes that the barn might possibly be the oldest barn in Barre. They have been having more and more people request barn weddings and right now at their current location up the street they have to rent out a tent for the wedding because the current lodge does not have space for that. He would rather invest the tent rental into the barn. He states that as event space the whole barn is too much therefore he would like to dismantle the other half of the barn and store it in the lower basement of the barn to eventually create and addition or use the wood for personal use. Couture states they just went through the process of selling the land to the Vermont Land Trust creating the extra money they need to start and complete the barn renovations. They have been coming up with a plan to change as little as possible. There will be ample parking located behind the barn. They will have a full kitchen in the barn which will be subcontracted to Corner Stone.

Ed Patterson, who live across the street from the barn states that Couture has spoken to him about the proposed project and he just wanted to come because they were not sure what it was meant by "Community Center". Patterson understands now how it was classified as community center/recreation facility. Patterson states that if he had paid more attention when the Town Forest Rec went in he would have fought it because of the amount of traffic and the speed of the people who drive by. He states that he has lived there for 10 years and Couture's events have never caused any issue.

Reaves ask what is the number of people attending these events? Also, what is the season he is/will be running.

Couture states that he typically has 125-150 people. He states that the events run from June until October.

Amy Scalabrini is wondering if he is going to be having winter weddings since the barn is all enclosed.

Couture states that he will not be having winter weddings/events. He is not looking to take it to that level nor is the whole barn going to be heated. The kitchen and a small amount of the building will be insulated.

Hameline ask what the number of weddings/events he would have in that time. He also ask if they

can have two weddings going at one time.

Couture states that they currently have 10-12 weddings and they hope to grow that number. Couture states that they cannot have more than one wedding at a time. The lodge up the street will be rented in conjunction with the barn down the street. Right now, they rent the lodge for lodging and place a tent on the land for the wedding therefore the lodging would just be lodging and the barn would be the wedding location.

Valsangiacomo states that if they added a few more events wouldn't necessarily add that many more cars but maybe a few more weekends that people would be going there for.

Sanborn would like to know if you made it an event center if there was a band or DJ what would the hours of operation be and how does that noise effect the people around him, parking out back is there going to be lighting, question where the parking would be.

Hameline would like to see more on hours of operation and how they will be handled.

Couture states that they have a 10pm curfew on amplification, he stated that they have it listed in the wedding packet so the people know that the DJ or band must end then. The wedding festivities can continue but they cannot amplify. Couture feels that because the neighbors did not come to this meeting that means they have done a good job with their current weddings events and people are confident that he will continue to do the same at this location. Violette agrees that we did not get any calls or people stopping in the office to ask any questions.

Patterson states that in the 11 years they have never been bothered by noise and he is sure they will hear the noise a little more since it will be closer but Couture has always had respectful events.

Couture states that all the parking and main entrance will be in the back of the property and they will have an entrance in the front of the barn primarily for handicap and kitchen catering.

Reaves states that for the noise amplification ending at 10pm the board could always make that a condition, which Couture already has in his contract.

Hameline asks if they will be serving alcohol there or if it will be BYOB.

Couture states that The Corner Stone has a liquor license so it would be up to them to get the bartender if needed.

Sanborn would like to see something more formal in writing next month addressing the above concerns on parking, outdoor lighting, noise restrictions, traffic, hours of operation.

Hameline asks about sewer and water. Couture states they will connect to the town and they are drilling a well to serve the barn and house.

Scalabrini asks if Couture is going to be partnering with The Corner Stone then are they going to be able to rent out the space for their events?

Couture states that The Corner Stone would be telling people to contact Couture about booking an event, just as he will refer all wedding events to use the Corner Stone for the caterer.

The board is questioning how many events they would allow during the time frame they are open for the season. Couture wants to make sure the board doesn't restrict the event number too much because he will need to be able to make money to keep it running.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Hameline, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to continue this request by Pierre Couture date certain to June 14, 2017, t for final review of a conditional use permit for community event center/ recreation center located at 29 Little John Rd; Parcel ID 006/051.00; Zone: medium density residential; CUP-17000003 with the following revised outdoor lighting, parking plan, noise ordinance, traffic, hours of operation, number of events expected.*

**Pierre Couture (Apartments)**

**Request by Pierre Couture for conditional use review for the establishment of a 2-unit residential dwelling located at 29 Little John Rd, Parcel ID 006/051.00; Zone: Medium Density Residential; CUP- 17000004**

Consultant:

Date: May 03,2017

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of conditional use review of a proposal to convert space within an existing barn into two residential living units. The subject parcel is located on Little John Road in a medium density residential zone. The area is mostly residential in nature with some commercial and industrial nearby.

The applicant owns the barn that is also on this agenda to convert the same barn into an events hall. As part of that project, the applicant is proposing to create two apartments on the ground floor level.

The Barre Town Zoning Bylaw allows up to two living units in a medium density residential zone.

**CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA**

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

**GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL**

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

- 1. The impact on the capacity of existing or planned community facilities:**

**a. Emergency services**

The addition of two apartments should have little impact on Barre Town's police, fire and EMS.

**b. Educational facilities**

The apartments are not likely to attract people with kids based on the applicant's description so there should be no impact on the Town's educational facilities.

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

The barn will be connected to the Town's municipal sewer system. Each living unit will have to have its own sewer unit assigned to it. Sewer permits will have to be obtained for each (\$1,500). Water will be onsite.

**d. Recreational facilities**

No impact

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

No impact

**3. Solid waste disposal facilities**

No substantial impact.

**4. The character of the area affected as defined by the purpose(s) of the zone within which the project is located, and specifically stated policies and standards of the municipal plan;**

The general character of the area is residential with a mixture of single-family and multi-family dwellings. The addition of two more living units located in the barn should have no impact on the character of the area.

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

The Barn is located on Little John Road, a Town class 3 paved road. The addition of two living units should have no impact on the roads or traffic as a whole.

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

Barre Town Zoning Bylaw allows two unit dwellings in a medium density residential zone after the issuance of a conditional use permit.

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

No renewable energy resources are being used.

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

N/a

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

Neighboring uses are mostly residential, little to no impact on is expected.

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

The land will have no problem supporting the proposed use.

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

**1. Minimum lot size;**

Minimum lot size is 1.0 acres with municipal sewer. The parcel is 12.8 acres.

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

Nearby uses are residential and in very 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;**

Two parking spaces will be required for each unit for a total of four parking spaces reserved specifically for the two living units.

**6. Loading/unloading facilities.**

Na/

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:**

The addition of two living units to the renovated barn will have little to no impact and I recommend approval.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Violette starts that after talking with a board member it was pointed out that the house is on the same parcel therefore they cannot allow a 2-unit apartment in the barn, but they could allow a 1 apartment. The Zoning Bylaws will not allow 2 additional units.

Couture states that he was looking to originally have an apartment for the bride to get ready in and then in the winter have the apartment be a rented out. They have currently been renting the lodge out in the winter to traveling nurses.

Violette states that Couture could still have a room for the bride to get ready in but not call it an apartment.

Couture states that he will only be heating the first floor of the barn where he would have the apartment and storage.

Sanborn states that they cannot approve the 2-unit apartment in the barn but Violette points out that they would be able to approve 1 apartment since it is less than what the applicant applied for.

Sanborn would still like to see a final site plan for the apartment and a parking plan.

Couture states that the renter will have 2 parking spots where the wedding venue parking is.

**MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:**

***On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Hameline, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to continue this request by Pierre Couture date certain to June 14, 2017, this request for final review of a conditional use permit for apartments located at 29 Little John Rd; Parcel ID 006/051.00;***

***After a brief discussion, Reaves withdrew his original motion and submitted a new motion. This was seconded by Hameline.***

***A new motion was made by Reaves, seconded by Hameline the Development Review Board voted unanimously to approve the request by Pierre Couture to allow the one unit apartment located at 29 Little John Rd; Parcel ID 006/051.00; Zoned Medium density residential. CUP-17000004***

**L. FOLLOW-UPS: NONE**

**M. CORRESPONDENCE**

STATE  
TOWN  
MISCELLANEOUS

N. ROUNDTABLE: Valsangiacomo is questioning if next time if we have a big project that we know will take a while if we have a small project go first so that way they aren't waiting an hour or so for their 5-minute hearing. The Board thinks that it something that can certainly be decided that the start of the meeting.

John Hameline states that he is moving and his term is up so this will be his last meeting.

Violette thanked Hameline for his 5 years of service as an alternate on the board and wished him luck on his new adventure.

O. ADJOURN!

***On a motion by Hameline, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn @ 09:58 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