

BARRE TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 9, 2015

The Barre Town Development Review Board held a public meeting & hearing on Wednesday, September 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at the Municipal Offices, Websterville, Vermont

Members Present:

Cedric Sanborn, Vice Chair
Charlie Thygesen
Jim Fecteau
Shaun Driscoll

Mark Reaves
John Hameline
Jon Valsangiacomo

Members Absent:

Mark Nicholson

Greg Richards

Others Present:

Mike Lajeunesse

Staff Present:

Chris Violette – Planning & Zoning Director
Heidi Bennett – Board Clerk

A. 5:30 P.M. – SITE VISIT – NONE

B. 6:30 – 7:00 P.M. – PLANS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW

C. 7:00 P.M. – CALL TO ORDER

D. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - NONE

E. APPROVE MINUTES

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Driscoll, the Development Review Board voted to approve the minutes from the 12, 2015 meeting.

F. NON AGENDA ITEMS (max 10 minutes)

G. SUBDIVISION REVIEW

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS
- 3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

H. SITE PLAN REVIEW

- 1) PRELIMINARY REVIEW
- 2) WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS

APPLICANT: HP HOOD, INC

Request by HP Hood, Inc. for the proposed construction of a 63'x 80' and 28' x 80' addition to the existing manufacturing plant located at 219 Allen Street; Parcel ID 005/125.00; Zoned: LDR; SP-15000004

Consultant: Lajeunesse Construction

Date: September 4, 2015

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

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of revised major site plan review in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw Article 5, section 5.6 and (A) under said section. The applicant is before the DRB this month to revise a site plan originally approved in June. The proposed project is located in a low density residential zone by its pre-existence to current zoning. The area is generally mixed use with more residential than industrial, there is other industrial/commercial in close proximity. Lot sizes in this area are fairly large.

The original approval in June was for a 4,080sf addition to an existing industrial building.

The applicant owns and operates a large (20,000sf+) food packaging plant (milk) at the proposed addition location.

The applicant is back before the board this month to alter their June approval by increasing the size from 4,080sf to 7,280sf and changing the location slightly. The addition will still be along the northerly (Barre City) side of the existing building. The new plans changes little in the overall picture because no new impervious service is being created. The addition will be taking the place over existing paved surface. The majority of the addition will be 18 feet high but 2,240sf will be 24 feet high.

Below are the review standards, and my comments, for site plan approval in accordance with Article 5, section 5.6 (F). These comments are similar to Junes.

1.The proposed land development as it complies with or compliments the policies, regulations, standards, and goals of the Town's Zoning Bylaw and its most recently adopted Town Plan;

The proposed addition to this facility promotes economic development and job creation or retention. The Town Plan supports both economic development and jobs so that the project is in compliance with Town Plan.

The project is in compliance with Barre Town's Zoning Bylaw because it is part of a long standing use.

2. The convenience and safety of vehicular movement within the site, and in relation to adjacent areas of vehicular movement. This includes consideration of access management in regards to entrances and exits for the subject site;

The area affected by the proposed project is currently open space that is mostly paved. The applicant uses this area for trucks and a loading/unloading area. The proposed addition will be extending existing warehouse and relocating existing loading docks. Overall very little change in vehicular movement will take place, just moved a little. Access around the building will be maintained. A right-of-way to abutting land is nearby but not affected.

3. The convenience and safety of pedestrian movement within the site, and in relation to adjacent areas of pedestrian movement. Also included for consideration is the relationship to any pedestrian access deemed necessary for adjacent properties and along public roads;

I do not believe there will be any negative impact on pedestrian movement within the site based on the proposed addition. No adjacent property is affected or necessary in this case.

4. Storm water and drainage to insure adequate consideration of storm water runoff and drainage issues in order to minimize the impacts of any development project on the adjacent property, the environment, and the Town. The applicant shall bear the responsibility for obtaining and meeting any and all permitting requirements of the appropriate state agency. The Town Engineer shall review the storm water runoff and drainage plan and shall approve the site plan and sign off on the design before the project may be approved;

The addition is covering existing impervious service. There is an existing stormwater collection system consisting of catch basins and underground pipe. There should be no real additional increase in storm water runoff from this project or impacts to surrounding properties.

5. The protection of historic or natural environmental features on the property under review, as well as on the adjacent areas;

The applicant's facility has been located at this site for many years. While it has grown over the years with numerous additions here and there, there has never been any indication of historic or natural environmental features to be concerned about. There is no reason to think that conclusion has changed.

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

Because of the nature of the applicant's business they are a high volume water user and a high contributor to Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and as such are charged 48 sewer units now. Like the last time I am uncertain whether the addition will require more sewer units to be allocated. The Town Engineer will review during the permit process.

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

No new signage is being proposed with this project.

8. The utilization of renewable energy resources;

The applicant has not indicated that any renewable energy is going to be used with this project or at all.

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

No new landscaping is being proposed with this project.

10. The adequacy of parking as well as loading and unloading facilities including their impact on surrounding traffic patterns, in accordance with the provisions established in Article 3, Sec. 3.6 of this bylaw.

The proposed addition while taking current paved area away, no parking is actually being affected. I'm not sure if parking demand increases as a result of the addition because I'm not sure what the purpose of the addition is for. Hood already has a considerable amount of room for parking their trucks. Additionally there is a fairly large parking lot across Allen Street that provides parking for employees. Unless this addition generates many more employees, which I don't think is the case, parking should remain adequate.

While a little considerably larger than the first proposed addition approved back in June, the overall affect is small. The plant has operated at this location for a long time with numerous additions over the years. The addition should have little effect on the overall impact to the area with regard to aesthetics, traffic, and stormwater runoff. The addition would seem to support economic development.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS:

The project was easily approved in June with no public input or concerns of the board then. The new proposal while larger changes little in the grand scheme of things. I recommend approval of this new request.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

CV gave a summary of this agenda, which was heard last month as well. This month is for an expansion of the approval received last month.

Thygesen asked about traffic flow; Mike Lajueneese stated there's plenty of room for traffic flow.

MOTION & RECOMMENDATION:

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board voted to approve the request by HP Hood, Inc. for the proposed construction of a 63'x 80' and 28' x 80' addition to the existing manufacturing plant located at 219 Allen Street; Parcel ID 005/125.00; Zoned: LDR; SP-15000004.

DISCUSSION:

CONDITIONS Yes X No ____
MOTION BY: REAVES
SECOND BY: VALSANGIACOMO

ROLL CALL:

Mark Nicholson ABSENT
Charles Thygesen, Sr. YES
Cedric Sanborn YES
Mark Reaves YES
*Jim Fecteau YES

Jon Valsangiacomo YES
Shaun Driscoll YES
Greg Richards ABSENT
*John Hameline YES

**Alternate Development Review Board Members*

3) CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

I. CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

J. VARIANCES (WARNED PUBLIC HEARINGS)

K. FLOOD HAZARD REVIEW

L. APPEALS OF ZONING ADMINISTRATORS DECISIONS

M. OTHER

Earl Greer is interested in purchasing 5.6 acres on South Barre Road and would like to subdivide, however the parcel lacks the minimum road frontage of 200'

CV gave a brief description since Mr. Greer was not in attendance. The DRB is not in favor of subdividing a non-conforming lot and instructed staff to inform Mr. Greer that the only way would be to pick up additional road frontage from Valliere if he's interested in subdividing.

N. FOLLOW-UPS

The Board asked what the status of The Phoenix House and their conditional use approval is - CV stated he hasn't heard; stated that the DRB and SB are split on how to handle the situation and will check with Rogers.

O. CORRESPONDENCE

STATE
TOWN
MISCELLANEOUS

P. ROUNDTABLE

Q. ADJOURN!

On a motion by Reaves, seconded by Valsangiacomo, the Development Review Board voted unanimously to adjourn at 7:34 p.m

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Bennett

Mark Nicholson, Chair

Cedric Sanborn

Mark Reaves

Jon Valsangiacomo

Jim Fecteau

Charlie Thygesen Sr.

Shaun Driscoll

Greg Richards

John Hamelin

