

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR AUGUST 10, 2016

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearings on Wednesday, August 10, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont.

Members Present:

Cedric Sanborn Charlie Thygesen Sr. John Hameline Mark Nicholson
Mark Reaves Jon Valsangiacomo

Members Absent:

Greg Richards Shaun Driscoll

Others Present:

Mark Booth David Rouleau (Rec Board Vice Chair) Doug Farnham (Rec Board Chair)
Carl Rogers (Town Manager)

Staff Present:

Chris Violette – Planning & Zoning Director

- A. **5:30 P.M. – SITE VISIT – NONE**
- B. **6:30 – 7:00 P.M. – PLANS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW**
- C. **7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER**
- D. **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - NONE**
- E. **APPROVE MINUTES**

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, the Development Review Board unanimously voted to approve the minutes from July 13, 2016.

F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW

APPLICANT: Booth - Prelim

Request by Booth Living Trust for preliminary review of a two lot subdivision of land on property located off Jensen Road; Parcel ID: 005/110.00; Zoned low density residential; P-16000007.

Consultant: Wayne Lawrence

Date: August 3, 2016

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

This is a preliminary 2 lot subdivision request for the purpose of creating one new residential lot. The subject parcel is located in a low density residential zone that requires a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres when sewer and water are onsite. The subject parcel is located in an area that is comprised on mostly large residential lots but with some industrial uses nearby. The subject parcel is 48.56 acres (lot 1) in size with a single-family dwelling and two large storage buildings.

The subdivision proposal is to separate the residential dwelling from the rest of the land. Lot 2 would be created at 2.01 acres and would contain the existing house. The two large storage buildings will stay with the remaining land. The existing home already has a functioning onsite septic system and drilled well. The new lot will not have road frontage as proposed but will utilize an existing drive and will be granted a 25' easement across lot 1. Access is from Jensen Road, a gravel Town road.

This request is also on the agenda this month as a warned public hearing for final consideration.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

I recommend preliminary approval of this 2 lot subdivision and suggest moving it to final.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Violette gave an overview of the project from his staff comments.

Sanborn asked about the space between the lot and the road. Mark Booth explained it was left so as to not interfere with future development. Sanborn liked the amount of space there was between the lot and the road.

There was little additional discussion.

MOTION:

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Booth Living Trust for preliminary approval of a 2-lot subdivision on property

located off Jensen Road; Parcel ID 005/110.00; Zoned: low density residential; P-16000007.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes _____ No X

MOTION BY: Reaves
SECOND BY: Sanborn

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson YES

Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES

Cedric Sanborn YES

Mark Reaves YES

*Jim Fecteau

Jon Valsangiacomo YES

Shaun Driscoll ABSENT

Greg Richards ABSENT

*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

Non-members who participated during review: Mark Booth

2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

APPLICANT: Booth - Final

Consultant: Wayne Lawrence

Date: August 3, 2016

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of reviewing and considering final approval for a 2 lot subdivision request for the purpose of creating one new residential lot. The subject parcel is located in a low density residential zone that requires a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres when sewer and water are onsite. The subject parcel is located in an area that is comprised of mostly large residential lots but with some industrial uses nearby. The subject parcel is 48.56 acres (lot 1) in size with a single-family dwelling and two large storage buildings.

This request is assuming that preliminary approval was granted earlier.

The subdivision proposal is to separate the residential dwelling from the rest of the land. Lot 2 would be created at 2.01 acres and would contain the existing house. The two large storage buildings will stay with the remaining land. The existing home already has a functioning onsite septic system and drilled well. The new lot will not have road frontage

as proposed but will utilize an existing drive and will be granted a 25' easement across lot 1. Access is from Jensen Road, a gravel Town road.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

With consideration to the suggested conditions listed below, I recommend granting final approval to this 2 lot subdivision of land:

- 1) All easements and/or right-of-ways, as shown on the final (stamped approved) plans by Lawrence Engineering (project # 16002), shall be created when the need arises in order to fulfill the development as proposed and approved.
- 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 regulations 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 a 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:

Violette gave an overview of the project from his staff comments recommending approval with conditions 1-6.

MOTION:

On a motion by Sanborn, seconded by Reaves, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by Booth Living Trust for final approval of a 2-lot subdivision on property located off Jensen Road attaching the 6 conditions as noted in the Planning Officer's notes; Parcel ID 005/110.00; Zoned: low density residential; P-16000007.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes X No

MOTION BY: Sanborn
SECOND BY: Reaves

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson YES

Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES

Cedric Sanborn YES

Mark Reaves YES

*Jim Fecteau

Jon Valsangiacomo YES

Shaun Driscoll ABSENT

Greg Richards ABSENT

*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

Non-members that participated during review: Mark Booth

H. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS) LARGE SIGN REVIEW

APPLICANT:

Barre Town Recreation

Request by the Barre Town Recreation Board to erect 24 sf sign at 44 Brook Street (Town Forest parking area) which will be 20 sf larger than normally allowed in a residential zone. Request is in accordance with Article 7, sec 7.5 (B) whereas the DRB, after holding a public hearing, can allow a larger sign if it is determined that the character of the neighborhood is not negatively affected. Property is owned by the Town of Barre; Parcel ID 023/064.00; Zoned: very high density residential; AU-16000003.

Consultant: None

Date: August 3, 2016

STAFF REPORT/REVIEW COMMENTS FROM CHRIS VIOLETTE,
PLANNING OFFICER

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of considering a request in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, Article 7, section 7.5 (B) 1 whereas the applicant would like to install a sign that is larger than allowed in the zone the property is located in. The applicant is proposing to install one 24 sf sign. The zoning for the subject parcel is very high density zoning which allows signs up to 4 sf in size.

This is a request not seen all that often by the DRB, and prior to 2008 was handled by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Our Zoning Bylaw considers the possibility that some signs may be requested that don't fit the bylaw, and the bylaw allows the DRB to review individual requests during a public hearing. If after holding the public hearing the DRB determines that the request will not sustainably change the character of the area, the proposed signs can be permitted.

The applicant in this case is the Barre Town Recreation Board. The property involved is owned by the Town of Barre and is used for parking for people using the Town Forest. The only sign currently being used is a 3 sf sign that announces Town Forest parking at the entrance.

The Recreation Board is asking for a 24 sf sign that would resemble signs seen in State Parks. I'm not sure of the exact location of the proposed sign but would likely be somewhere clearly visible from the road.

The DRB is being asked to allow a sign that is approximately 21 sf larger than allowed. In doing so, the DRB must determine that the proposed sign will not affect the character of neighborhood.

The neighborhood around the Town Forest parking lot is densely populated with a mix of single and multi-family dwellings on relatively small lots. The Town Forest parking is somewhat shielded from the neighborhood by a garage that is used to store things associated with the forest.

Personally I think a larger sign will look out of character with the neighborhood, not sure how it can't; and there aren't any other signs close to that size or design anywhere near this location. The question is how much and if it is substantial. I'm not sure why such a large sign is necessary other than the proposed sign will also indicate the different recreational opportunities available in the forest. I will be interested to hear from representatives of the Rec Board and see how the sign is justified and why it can't be smaller.

I also question whether the landowner, in this case the Town of Barre, is okay with putting up a sign like this on the property.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

I have concerns about the sign and the character of the neighborhood but would like to hear from the Rec Board.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Violette gave an overview of the project from his staff comments reiterating his concern about the size of the sign in relationship to the public's expectation to see a sign of that size in that area.

Nicholson ask Violette if he had received any public comment about the sign? Violette replied no.

David Rouleau, Vice Chair of the recreation board and active supporter of the Town Forest, explained that he has had several people approach him about not being able to find the parking lot for the Town Forest.

Rouleau stated that the board is trying to be sensitive to the neighborhood with regard to the design of the sign and at the same time trying to fit the recreation symbols on the sign. Small signs didn't allow them the space they felt was needed to get all the symbols on the sign.

Rouleau did state that they could look at a smaller sign if that would help the board.

Rouleau stated the base of the sign would be made out of a granite block and that the sign itself is modeled after the State Park signs.

Reaves asked Rouleau about the existing large sign structure currently on the property. Rouleau explained that what Reaves is referring to is a large kiosk which allows for information to be posted about the forest. That sign is to the right of the property and sits next to the woods.

Reaves noted that the proposed sign isn't going to be any larger than the kiosk that is already there and that has seemed to work out okay and within the character of the neighborhood.

Hameline stated that for him if it's going to stay that size it should be placed further back from the road and toned down a little.

Sanborn thought that maybe the symbols could go on the kiosk and make the existing signs a little larger and clearly note the parking location.

Hameline asked what is the problem that is trying to be solved? Rouleau stated that people put the address in their GPS's and it takes them there; but all they see is a two bay garage and it doesn't look like a public parking lot. A new sign would help people know for sure they have arrived at the Town Forest Parking lot.

Carl Rogers, Town Manager, said when this area was developed for parking the Town fully intended to keep this area low key so that it would blend in with the neighborhood. That is one reason the parking is behind the garage and why a brown sign was used. The brown sign is consistent with recreation information signs. He noted that maybe the job was done too well blending the parking lot in with the surroundings.

However, Rogers stated that before we go to a larger sign maybe an attempt can be made to do something better but less obtrusive. Maybe putting letters on the garage and placing the signs so that they are more visible from both directions on Brook Street or a sign that better emphasizes parking, maybe using different colors.

Sanborn agreed with Rogers's ideas and thought maybe those should be tried first.

Rouleau noted that seminars he has attended suggest that a nice looking sign might be a good way to promote a use because people are inclined to take photos with the sign and post those pictures on social media.

Valsangiacomo stated that he actually thinks that a nice sign with a granite base could enhance the parking area, spruce it up a little.

Hameline asked where the sign would go? Rouleau showed the board a street view picture and noted that the sign would likely go near the apple tree set back from the road and to the left of the garage.

Violette asked whether the colors on the pictures, supplied by the Rec Board, were fully representational of the actual colors? He noted that the State Park signs appear to be a bit darker in tone with regard to the green and the yellow isn't as bright. Rouleau stated that the color can certainly be adjusted to whatever the DRB would like stating they certainly could be toned down.

Valsangiacomo asked whether the Rec Board could come back with a plan A and B with regard to sign size, design, and location.

Nicholson polled the board on whether they are okay with a 4'x6' sign with a similar style and color to the State Park signs but using a granite base. Other than Sanborn, the board generally supported the Rec Board's proposal but thought a little smaller sign might be more appropriate and looked forward to seeing what they can come up with for the next meeting. Sanborn liked the idea of using smaller signs.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

Motion made by Reaves, seconded by Sanborn, to continue the request by the Recreation Board for a larger sign at 44 Brook Street to the September 14, 2016 DRB meeting.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes ___ No X ___

MOTION BY: Reaves
SECOND BY: Sanborn

ROLL CALL:

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

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

Non-members that participated during review: David Rouleau & Doug Farnham

I. CONCEPTUAL SUBDIVISION REVIEW

J. OTHER

Violette informed the DRB that he had recently met with Jim Fecteau, of Fecteau Residential, and they discussed future development in the Richardson Road and Beckley Hill Road area. Fecteau supplied information and maps and wanted the board to have some time to review the material before the next meeting.

K. FOLLOW-UPS

Violette gave a brief update on the hiring of a new Zoning Assistant.

L. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE
TOWN
MISCELLANEOUS

M. ROUNDTABLE

N. ADJOURN!

Motion by Sanborn, seconded by Thygesen, all voted to adjourn at 8:02pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chris Violette

Mark Nicholson, Chair

Cedric Sanborn

Mark Reaves

Jon Valsangiacomo

Jim Fecteau

Charles Thygesen, Sr.

Shaun Driscoll

Greg Richards

John Hamelin