

Montpelier Development Review Board
April 7, 2004
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Philip Zalinger, Chair; Sharon Allen, Vice Chair; Alan Blakeman; Roger Cranse; Jack Lindley; Kevin O'Connell; Guy Teschmacher (*Mr. Teschmacher joined the meeting after agenda item A had been completed*), (*David Keller arrived after the start of the meeting, but left before participating in any action on the applications*).

Staff: Gail Lawson, Administrative Officer

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr.Zalinger.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Lindley made a motion that the minutes of the March 15, 2004 be approved. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0. Ms. Allen abstained from voting as she was not present at that meeting.

Consent Agenda

- A.**
- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Applicant: | Shane Farrell |
| Property Owner: | Jeff Jacobs |
| Property Address: | 5 State Street |
| Zone: | CB-I/DCD |
| Purpose: | Sign Permit Application |
- Two wall signs
 - DRC recommends approval as submitted

Mr. Zalinger noted that the applicant was not present. Mr. O'Connell made a motion to approve the sign permit application. Ms. Allen seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved (6-0).

- B.**
- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Applicant: | William E. and Michele W. Snyder, DBA Snyder Properties |
| Owner: | William E. and Michele W. Snyder, DBA Snyder Properties |
| Property Address: | 168-170 River Street |
| Zone: | GB |
| Purpose: | Sketch Plan Review |
- Two lot subdivision

Interested Parties: William Snyder

Mr. Zalinger swore in Mr. Snyder. Ms. Lawson described the project as a two-lot subdivision with each lot occupied by an existing building. The total area of the undivided lot is 1.04 acres. The subdivision will create one 0.518 acre lot and one 0.538 acre lot. Each of the lots would conform with the minimum lot size requirement of 15,000 square feet. The lots would also meet the minimum frontage requirement. Mr. Zalinger asked for a description of the existing improvements on the proposed lots. Mr. Snyder said that there is a retail building on one of the lots and an auto repair shop on the other. He said that the Stingray business occupies #168 and the auto service building is at #170. He also stated that the retail use will remain the same, but he plans to sell the other lot. Ms. Lawson noted that since the application was for a minor subdivision, the applicant may request that the next two reviews be combined. She also said that a final survey will be required. Mr. Zalinger advised the applicant to refer to the comments contained in the staff

report for suggested changes to the plan. Ms. Lawson noted that the staff has recommended shared access. Mr. Snyder said that the site currently has shared access and that he prefers that it remain that way. A Board member raised a concern that the shared access may cause confusion or traffic conflicts. Mr. Snyder said that the site has operated with the shared access for more than 20 years and there have been no traffic problems. He said that the building on the left of the plan has a secondary access.

Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the application be approved with the staff comments. Mr. Teschmacher seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

- C.**
- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Applicant: | Robert Hitzig |
| Owner: | Robert Hitzig |
| Property Address: | 188 Elm Street |
| Zone: | HDR |
| Purpose: | Sketch Plan Review |
- Increase of residential density-Conversion of barn to residential unit

Interested Parties: Robert Hitzig

Mr. Zalinger swore in Mr. Hitzig. Ms. Lawson said that the property in question contains a house divided into four residential units. The applicant is proposing to convert the existing barn to a fifth residential unit. Ms. Lawson indicated that there is sufficient water and sewer service to the site. She said that the five units on the one-half acre lot will meet density requirements. Ms. Lawson questioned whether there would be provisions to meet the parking requirements of one space per unit. Mr. Zalinger said that the parking provision must be shown on the subsequent plan submission. Mr. Cranse asked whether the bottom of the barn is currently used to park cars. Mr. Hitzig responded that the barn is not currently used for parking and that both floors of the barn will be converted to the residential unit. Ms. Lawson noted that the addition of the fifth unit appears to require that the unit be fitted with sprinklers. She recommended that the applicant discuss this requirement with the Fire Chief.

Ms. Allen made a motion to approve the application with the staff comments. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

- D.**
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Applicant: | Twin City Harvest Church |
| Owner: | Stephen and Andrew Ribolini |
| Property Address: | 407 Barre Street |
| Zone: | GB |
| Purpose: | Conditional Use Approval |
- Change of use from retail and service to church

Interested Parties: Pastor Andy Berkeley

Mr. Zalinger swore in Pastor Berkeley as a representative of the property owners. Mr. Zalinger then asked Pastor Berkeley whether the church was incorporated and whether he was an authorized agent of the corporate entity. Pastor Berkeley responded affirmatively to both questions. Ms. Lawson advised the Board that after the staff report was sent out, a letter was received containing additional information. She said that there is an issue regarding the ability of emergency services to serve the building if it is used as a public gathering place. The proposed church would occupy a 1,400 square foot unit within a multi-unit building containing a carpet cleaning business and a flooring business. Ms. Lawson said that she had received an e-

mail from the Fire Chief regarding fire safety requirements. She also said that the submitted plan was not up to date and does not fully reflect current site conditions. Ms. Lawson described the parking area based upon her recent site visit and said that there appeared to be room for about 30 parking spaces. She also noted that the church would be using the parking space when the businesses are closed.

Ms. Lawson read the Fire Chief's recommendations for conditions including a partition wall, second egress door, ventilation, smoke alarms, fire extinguishers and occupancy limits. Ms. Allen asked whether the fire requirements are contained in the City code. Ms. Lawson responded that they are probably in the code, but that the specific standards are not contained within the zoning ordinance. Ms. Allen asked whether these issues are really within the Board's jurisdiction. Ms. Lawson said that the criteria for conditional uses require that the project not unduly burden municipal services. A Board member said that the Board should not be making technical decisions on the fire code requirements. Mr. Zalinger said that the Board's jurisdiction should focus on the nature of the use. He added that there is no clear road map for the conversion of a retail use to a public assembly space. Mr. Zalinger also said that the Department of Labor and Industry may have jurisdiction, but the Board does not have the authority to make a conditional use determination conditioned upon fire code requirements. Ms. Lawson suggested that the conditional use permit could require that the project comply with all City code requirements. Mr. Zalinger said that many projects have multiple tiers of requirements under the jurisdiction of many authorities and it is not the Development Review Board's role to enforce all of those other requirements. Ms. Allen said that the fire code is not within the Board's authority and the Board lacks the expertise to enforce the fire code.

Mr. Zalinger advised the applicant that the site plan is really out of date and does not reflect the relocation of Barre Street which may have increased parking opportunities on the site. Mr. Zalinger said that the site plan does not contain adequate detail to allow the Board to consider the conditional use criteria. Ms. Allen agreed that more current information is needed on the plan. She noted that the staff report had recommended that the application be recessed to the May 3 agenda. Ms. Lawson confirmed that the staff report recommended that the application be recessed to May 3. Mr. Zalinger said that the plan must be revised to show where parking will occur, entrances and exits, site circulation, etc. Ms. Allen made a motion that the application be recessed to the May 3, 2004 DRB meeting commencing at 7:00 p.m. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion and asked whether the May 3 date gave the applicant enough time. Pastor Berkeley said that it would. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

The Chairman proposed a brief recess in the meeting.

- E.**
- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Applicant: | Walker Motors, Inc., Wade Walker |
| Owner: | Sierra Holdings LLC |
| Property Address: | 265 River Street |
| Zone: | GB |
| Purpose: | Conditional Use Approval/Site Plan Review & Sign Variance Review |
- Demolition, renovation and addition of existing facility
 - Improvements to parking, access, lighting, landscaping

Interested Parties: Wade Walker; Thomas McArdle, City of Montpelier

NOTE: There was a failure of the tape recorder at the beginning of this hearing. These minutes reflect staff notes and the recorded portion of the hearing.

Chairman Zalinger swore in the interested parties. Mr. Walker provided a description of existing signage and overview of the sign variance request. The Board reviewed staff comments and then considered the variance criteria, making the following findings:

1. That there are unique physical circumstances or conditions, including irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of lots size or shape, or exceptional topographical or other physical conditions peculiar to the particular property, and that unnecessary hardship is due to such conditions, and not the circumstances or conditions generally created by the provisions of the zoning regulation in the neighborhood or district in which the property is located. **There are unique physical circumstances, including but not limited to the proximity of existing buildings to Routes 2/302.**
2. That because of such physical circumstances or conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the provisions of the zoning regulation and that the authorization of a variance is, therefore, necessary to enable the reasonable use of property. **The sign is intrinsic to the current business and location and strict application will result in a sign not easily viewed from these state highways.**
3. That the unnecessary hardship has not been created by the appellant, and the hardship relates to the applicant's land, rather than personal circumstances. **The hardship relates to the location of the Ford and Jeep ground signs relative to the proposed new construction.**
4. That the variance, if authorized, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or district in which the property is located, substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use of development of adjacent property, reduce access to renewable energy resources, nor be detrimental to the public welfare. **The application for the sign will not change the character of the neighborhood. The property has been the site of an automobile dealership since the 1940's. The approval of the variance will not impair the use of adjacent properties, reduce access to renewable energy, or be detrimental to public welfare.**
5. The variance, as authorized, represents the minimum variance to afford relief and represents the least deviation possible from the zoning regulation and from the Montpelier Municipal Plan. **The proposed 'Jeep' sign is consistent in size with other signs of similar type, both on premise for which a previous variance was granted, and elsewhere in the city.**
6. The variance will not result in the initiation of a nonconforming use of land. **The use will not change as a result of the variance.**

Mr. O'Connell made a motion to approve the applicant's request for variance of the relocated two-sided Jeep sign, totaling 99 square feet, as described in the documents received 2/27/04 and testimony of the applicant.. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

The Board next consider the application under conditional use/site plan authority. Mr. Walker described the Phase II and III development proposal and Ms. Lawson highlighted the essential elements of the plan, as follows:

1. The application is for the proposed partial demolition and renovation of an existing building, construction of two additions on either side of the remaining building, and

- associated improvements to parking, lighting and landscaping for use as a automobile sale and service facility. This is the second and third phase of a three phase project.
2. Phase I, the construction of a car display area, was permitted last fall and is still under construction.
 3. Phase II is the partial demolition of an existing building and construction of a 8,500 sf structure attached to the remaining portion of the existing building to the south.
 4. Phase III is the construction of a 9,315 sf structure attached to the remaining portion of the existing building to the north.
 5. Future access to this property is closely tied to the redesign of the Route 2/302 intersection. The applicant was asked to provide proposed conditions for both the interim and intersection redesign for staff review. As approved by the DRB, both designs for the northernmost two driveways will be the same as shown on sheet C1.
 6. The building additions meet the setback requirements for the General Business District, which are 30 foot front yard, 20 foot side yard, and 20 rear yard. The main entry way is proposed to be 30 feet tall requiring an additional 10 feet of setback, requiring a 40 foot front yard setback. The proposed setback is 45 feet. The remainder of the building is proposed to be under 20 feet and meets the 30 foot yard setback. The building meets the side and rear yard setback requirements.

Ms. Allen asked about the roundabout proposed at Routes 302 and 2. The applicant responded that the roundabout would be a City project and that the driveway locations reflect the comments of the City staff. Mr. McArdle said that the plans reflect the City's preliminary redesign of the intersection. The City will make application to the Board for the redesign as soon as the plans are ready. Mr. McArdle confirmed that the changes to the driveways reflect the City's comments.

Ms. Lawson explained that the conditional use criteria are triggered pursuant to Section 205.B. of the ordinance which requires conditional use review of projects involving buildings containing a cumulative total of more than 10,000 square feet of non- residential space.

The Board then issued the following findings with regard to the conditional use criteria and site plan standards:

1. The capacity of existing or planned community facilities [504]: The project will result in a significant improvement of the traffic flow in the portion of the City affected by the project.
2. The character of the area affected [504.]: There will be no change to the area. This application proposes the continuation of an established use in existence well before adoption of the zoning ordinance. The applicant is proposing to move the building back into the setback to better comply with requirements. The proposed use will represent an improvement to the character of the area.
 - a. The performance standards in Section 814 of the ordinance [504.]
 - i. No use shall emit noise at the property line in excess of the standards set in the Montpelier code of Ordinances, Chapter 11, Article 10 [814.]
 - ii. Emit odor which is offensive at property line [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
 - iii. Emit dust or dirt at the property line [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
 - iv. Emit smoke in excess of Ringmann Chart no. 2 [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.

- v. Emit noxious gasses which endanger the health, comfort, safety, or welfare of any person, or which have a tendency to injury or damage property, business, or vegetation [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
- vi. Emit lighting or signs which cause undo glare, which could impair the vision of a driver of any motor vehicle or are offensive to the neighborhood [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
- vii. Cause fire, explosion, of safety hazard, or create electrical interference [814.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
- b. The site plan review standards and approval conditions in Section 506.C, excluding uses exempt from site plan review [504.]: *See below under site plan criteria, as outlined in Article 8.*
- c. Hours of operation [504.]: There are no proposed changes in the hours of operation.
- d. The cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood [504.]: There are no known adverse impacts.
- 3. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity [504.]: The proposed site plan will improve traffic flow, as testified to by Thomas McArdle, Assistant Director DPW.
- 4. The Zoning and Subdivision Regulations in effect [504.]: All dimensional zoning requirements will be met. Parking is satisfactory.
- 5. The utilization of renewable energy resources [504.]: N/A

Mr. O'Connell made a motion to approve the conditional use/site plan application with the staff comments as clarified by Mr. McArdle. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. In response to a question from a Board member, Ms. Lawson confirmed that proposed condition #4 of the staff report should be struck. Mr. Zalinger said that the status of the landscaping plan was unclear. He asked which portions of the plans show what will exist after development. The applicant replied that sheets C1 and C2 show the species lists, but the grassed area needs to be clearly shown on the plan. He said that the shrubs were to be removed from the part of the plan near the roadway because they were likely to be killed by road salt. Ms. Lawson said that there may be sufficient area to plant perennial flowers in the area adjacent to the roadway after the road work is completed. She added that the staff wanted to see more detail on the landscaping near the customers' entry sidewalk and in the grassed area where display vehicles are proposed to be displayed. Ms. Allen said that the plan must clearly show all landscaping. Mr. Zalinger asked whether there were plans to put large block letters on the display vehicles or any pennants in the area. The applicant said that there were no such plans and that the failure to show the display vehicles on the plan was an oversight. Mr. Zalinger said that the Board will be looking for a revised landscaping plan.

The motion for conditional use approval was unanimously adopted (7-0). Mr. O'Connell made a motion to grant final site plan approval. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously (7-0).

F. Applicant: Green Mountain Community Baseball (GMCB),
Eddie Walbridge, President
Property Owner: City of Montpelier
Address: Ballfield Road
Zone: MDR
Purpose: Conditional Use/Site Plan Review

Interested Parties: Richard DeWolfe, P. E.; Eddie Walbridge; Brian Gallagher; Heather Battistoni

Note: There was a failure of the tape recorder in the beginning of the hearing. These minutes reflect staff notes and the recorded portion of the hearing.

The application was represented by Eddie Walbridge, Brian Gallagher and Rick DeWolfe. Mr. Cranse recused himself from participating, stating that his employer is a sponsor of the Green Mountain Community baseball club. Chairman Zalinger asked anyone in the audience wishing to speak to identify themselves. Adjacent property owner, Heather Batistoni, at 565 Elm Street indicated an interest in participating. Chairman Zalinger swore in all parties and Ms. Batistoni.

Ms. Lawson provided a brief description of the significant elements of the application. "Phase 1" site plan review for 2004 preseason construction work including relocated and new fencing, installation of a warning track, batting cage, replacement flag pole (80' high), press box renovation and construction, new lightning consisting of two wall-mounted light paks placed on end points of the grandstand shining down on seats below the roof of the grandstand, paving, drainage improvements, enclosure of rear of existing grandstand for storage, concessions, changing rooms, new 12' x 24' souvenir stand, installation of pay phones and a grease trap and plumbing for the concession stand. The signage changes proposed under separate application will need to be revised and a variance requested, as it includes an additional 748 square feet of temporary signs in excess of that previously approved by the Board.

Mr. DeWolfe described the improvements to be made this spring prior to the start of the baseball season. These include bullpens and mounds, a batting cage (to be taken down at the end of the season and made available free of charge to the public when not used by the ball team) and wall mounted lights at the grandstand. He said that the proposal to enclose the rear of the existing grandstand would be moved to the Phase 2 improvement application because of the need for a sprinkler system.

Mr. Gallagher said that the average attendance last year was 1,600. He said that he really does not anticipate a significant increase when the new grandstands are built and estimated a possible peak attendance of 3,000 persons for special events. Mr. O'Connell asked what the capacity of the facility is and whether there has been any consideration of capping the attendance. Mr. Gallagher responded that there was plenty of space and that a cap has not been considered. Mr. O'Connell said that it is important to know the capacity of the recreation facility. Mr. Gallagher said that he could check with the Fire Chief regarding any concerns related to emergency services.

Ms. Battistoni raised concerns that the mid-field and left field lights that shine at her home and asked whether they could be adjusted during the game. The applicant indicated that they could not be adjusted. Ms. Battistoni asked about screening of the lights. She said that the permit should be conditioned on the screening. Mr. Gallagher said that the City would have to approve any screening since it would be placed on City property. Mr. Walbridge said that the trees would have to be 35 feet high to screen the lights. The Board reviewed photographs showing the lights from Ms. Battistoni's property. Ms. Battistoni stated that she had contacted the NCAA and was advised that they have no standards for the lighting. Mr. Walbridge responded that the lighting is designed by an engineer to ensure the safety of players. He offered to purchase and have trees planted if Ms. Battistoni obtained the City's permission for the planting. Paula Cody, a neighbor of Ms. Battistoni, also spoke regarding the light screening issue.

Ms. Battistoni described her issue with noise from the infield and from the speaker system. Mr. Gallagher said that it is possible to adjust the direction of the speakers in specific areas to direct the sound away from the property lines. He said that the applicant is willing to work with the neighbors to address sounds from

the public address system. He also said that he does not know the average decibel level from the system. Mr. Zalinger asked the applicant to develop a proposal that provides measurable data regarding existing sound levels.

Ms. Allen asked for a description of the souvenir stand. Mr. DeWolfe said that the rotary concession stand would be converted so that two windows would be available for the purchase of food and drinks. This change will result in the relocation of the souvenir stand to a temporary location behind the dugout. The applicant intends to move the souvenir stand to a permanent location under the grandstand when approvals for the grandstand are obtained.

Mr. Zalinger noted that no concrete provisions had been offered to remedy the issues regarding the speakers and lighting. He said that these items could be addressed administratively in a subsequent report or discussion with the administrative officer. Mr. DeWolfe said that the speakers are currently aimed at the field from their location in the grandstand. He stated that they will be moved from that location and will be redirected toward the grandstand. Mr. DeWolfe indicated that he did not have a photograph at this time. Mr. Zalinger replied that a photograph was not necessary and that the issue should be addressed with the Administrative Officer. Mr. DeWolfe said that he is not an acoustic engineer, but could describe the changes in the location and direction of the speakers. Mr. Blakeman said that a discussion of acoustics would be appropriate. Mr. Zalinger said that the discussion did not need to come from an acoustical expert, but the applicant should provide a representation showing the changes in the numbers and locations of the speakers. Ms. Allen indicated that she would like to see information on the size of the speakers and a comparison of the sound output. Mr. DeWolfe said that he could easily provide a comparison of the speaker wattage. A Board member responded that a comparison of decibel levels should be provided. Mr. DeWolfe said that such a comparison was possible, but was beyond the level of information that he understood that the Board wanted. Ms. Allen clarified that she was really looking for a description of the strength or wattage of the speakers. Mr. Zalinger added that the information could be provided in a letter describing the speaker system that existed and that which is proposed. He asked when such a letter could be available. Mr. DeWolfe said that the information could be submitted by the first week of May.

Mr. Zalinger asked how the lighting issue could be addressed. Mr. DeWolfe said that he was willing to look at the site to see if it is physically possible to plant trees on City owned property in the area in question. He said that a response would be possible by May 3. Ms. Lawson asked for clarification of whether the submission would be made to the Administrative Officer's office prior to the Board's meeting on May 3. Mr. DeWolfe said that it could be submitted during the day on May 3. Mr. Zalinger said that the Board needs to be satisfied that issue is being addressed in an acceptable manner. He said that the Board could take action on the request for approval of the project only if it is satisfied that the remaining issues are not so substantial that they will affect the site plan. Those issues can be addressed with the Administrative Officer as conditions of approval. Ms. Allen asked for clarification of the process. She said that her understanding was that the applicant would find satisfactory solutions and work them out with the Administrative Officer. The Board could then sign-off on the changes. Ms. Allen expressed her concern that there is an opportunity to refuse to grant a permit if the solutions are not satisfactory. Mr. Zalinger said that the conditions of approval could require that an acceptable solution to these two issues be worked out with the Administrative Officer. Ms. Allen said that would be acceptable and that she wants to be sure that these issues are addressed. Mr. Lindley said that there will be other opportunities to fix any outstanding issues because the applicant will be before the Board for other applications.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion to require that Green Mountain Community Baseball address:

- a. the positioning of some kind of light cover, whatever the form, to prevent light from shining to the south, and
- b. address the overload of noise directed to the south.

The motion failed due to lack of a second. A suggestion was then made that these items be administratively reviewed and approved if satisfactory, and staff report back to the Board.

Ms. Allen recommended the motion state that the remedies discussed at the Board meeting be addressed with the Administrative Officer. Ms. Lawson suggested that any Board approval be granted conditioned upon the submission of written documentation on light and sound issues prior to issuance of a zoning permit. If the information submitted to the Administrative Officer is unacceptable, the issues must be addressed in the Phase 2 application. Ms. Lawson said that in order for the Board to retain jurisdiction on these issues, the hearing must remain open. Ms. Allen said that she was concerned that the Phase 2 application might not be submitted until after this season. Another Board member said that he would be comfortable even if the problem is not solved until after the season. Mr. Blakeman asked whether a date should be put into the motion.

Ms. Lawson referred the Board to Section "E" of the staff report entitled Final Staff Recommendations. She suggested adding language with regard to these two issues (lighting and noise) as a condition of approval. Mr. DeWolfe said that item #6 in section E actually addresses Phase 2. He added that he was unsure of the meaning of item #9. Ms. Lawson said that item #9 clarifies that planning staff and the Technical Review Committee would conduct annual reviews of off-site parking agreements, rather than the Board. Mr. DeWolfe said that he had no problem with that. Ms. Lawson explained that item #6 is intended to identify the information that must be submitted for Phase 2. She also said that item #8 included language that the staff had added to clarify a provision from the Board's April 21, 2003 approval with regard to the signage plan and other issues. Mr. Zalinger suggested that the Board add the following conditions to the draft conditions in Section E of the staff report:

1. That measures to mitigate the public address system sound from affecting neighbors be designed and submitted to the Administrative Officer for review by May 3, 2004. (As suggested by Mr. DeWolfe.)
2. Plans for planting screening trees on either the recreation field premises or the Battistoni property to mitigate the impacts of lighting upon the Battistoni residence are to be submitted to the Administrative Officer by May 3, 2004.

Mr. DeWolfe suggested that the wording be changed to "on or off the City property" in case there is another landowner who wants trees on their property. Mr. Zalinger agreed that the wording could be "on recreation field premises or other private property." A question was raised asking whether the language would limit the screening only to trees. Mr. DeWolfe said that any constructed screening would require further approval from the Board.

Mr. Lindley made an amended motion to grant conditional use and site plan approval for Green Mountain Community Baseball with conditions 1 through 9 of Section E of the staff report and the two additional issues discussed at this meeting. Mr. Lindley said that he had intentionally included condition #6 in the motion. Ms. Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0 with Mr. Cranse recusing himself.

The Board next conducted a pre-application review of Phase 2 site plan improvements, which include two new grandstands, team rooms, concession stand, bathrooms, first aid room, security wall mounted lights,

drainage improvements, chain link fence, relocated score board and new replay board in fence line.

Mr. DeWolfe said that a grant is available for improvements to the baseball facility. These would include two additional grandstands providing a total of 1,000 to 1,200 additional seats (500 to 600 seats in each new stand). As part of the project team rooms, a concession stand, bathrooms, a first aid room and lights would be installed under the grandstands. Also, proposed are drainage and irrigation improvements. Mr. DeWolfe said that the left field fence would be replaced with a chain link replica of the "Green Monster" that is at Fenway Park. Similar to Fenway Park, the scoreboard would be relocated in line with the left field fence. A video replay board is also proposed. In response to several Board members' questions regarding the nature and size of the video replay board, Mr. DeWolfe said that the exact dimensions are unknown, but that it would be similar to the existing score board. He added that there would be no sound associated with the replay board. A Board member said that it is important that the size and scale of the baseball facility remain consistent with the character of Montpelier. Another member added that it will be interesting to see the growth of attendance this season in order to get a handle on the scale of facility needed.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion that the Board grant approval of the sketch plan for Phase 2. Ms. Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0 with Mr. Cranse recusing himself.

Other Business

1. Ms. Lawson distributed copies of a Notice of Appeal of the Board's approval granted to Joan and Kenneth Senecal for a sewer extension and four new residential dwellings submitted by Michael E. Nelson and dated March 25, 2004, received March 26, 2004. Mr. Nelson owns property at 431 North Street.
2. Ms. Lawson provided copies of a letter dated March 29, 2004, from Beverly Harrington objecting to the Board's approval of a second story addition to property at 18 Hubbard Street.

Adjournment

Ms. Allen made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:05 p.m. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously (7-0).

Respectfully submitted,

Gail M. Lawson
Administrative Officer

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

These minutes are subject to approval by the Development Review Board. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are acted upon.