

**Montpelier Development Review Board
May 1, 2006
City Council Chambers, City Hall**

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Phillip Zalinger, Chair; Kevin O'Connell, Vice Chair; Alan Blakeman; Douglas Bresette; Roger Cranse; Jack Lindley; Guy Teschmacher
Staff: Stephanie Smith, Kathy Swigon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Zalinger at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes

Mr. Bresette made a motion that the minutes of the April 17, 2006 meeting be accepted as drafted. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

I. Consent Agenda

a. Design Review - Sign Permit Application

Property Address: 7 Langdon Street
Applicant: Grace Gilbert
Property Owner: Leeds J. Brewer
Zone: CB-I/DCD
o 36" x 24" projecting sign
o DRC recommended approval with adjustments
Interested Party: Tom Quinlan

Mr. Quinlan, representing the applicant, said that the adjustments recommended by the DRC were acceptable. Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the board grant design review approval to the application with the following adjustment:

An additional wall sign may be installed in the same location as an existing sign, located under the window over the river and with a horizontal format not to exceed 18" x 8" with colors and wording to match the proposed hanging sign.

Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

b. Design Review - Sign Permit Application

Property Address: 52 State Street
Applicant: Kevin Everleth
Property Owner: Steven Everett
Zone: RIV/DCD
o 18" x 24" wall sign
o DRC recommended approval as submitted

Kevin Everleth said that he was in agreement with the DRC recommendation. Ms. Smith explained that the recommendation provided that the sign band will be painted if the shadow of the wall sign was visible after the sign was removed. Mr. Everleth said that he would do the painting himself, if necessary.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion that the board grant design review approval for the sign application

with the following adjustment:

After the existing wall sign is removed, the sign band will be painted uniformly in the existing color, if necessary.

Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

II. Public Hearing: Variance, Conditional Use approval and Site Plan Review

Property Address: 172 Chestnut Hill Road
Applicant: Duane Wells Construction
Property Owner: Adrienne and David Brownlee
Zone: LDR
o Construction of a 10' x 14' kitchen addition
Interested Party: Nathan Temple

Ms. Smith described the application for a variance for the construction of a 140 square foot residential addition and conditional use review. She said that the existing house and lot did not meet the side yard, lot coverage or frontage requirements. She explained that a variance was previously granted for the construction of the house on the lot. She said that the lot was created in 1974. Mr. Temple said that the house was built in 1988.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether there are many other small lots in the area. Ms. Smith said that there were. Mr. Blakeman asked whether the addition would replace the existing porch. Mr. Temple said that a portion of the addition would be located on the porch. He said that the proposed roof over the addition would be lower than the existing roof. He explained that the addition is adjacent to the existing kitchen and will be an enlargement of the kitchen.

The Board reviewed the variance criteria:

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. The size of 0.39 acre lot in the LDR zone creates the unique circumstances requiring the variance.*
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 the property. The enlargement of an existing kitchen is a reasonable use. The addition location is adjacent to the existing kitchen.*
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 small lot size and the location of the existing building.*
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 adjacent property, reduce access to renewable energy resources, nor be detrimental to the public welfare. This will continue to be a residential use in a residential neighborhood. The lack of testimony to the contrary allows the assumption that the proposal will not impair the use of adjacent property.*
5. *That the variance, if authorized, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and will represent the least deviation possible from the zoning regulation and from the Montpelier*

Municipal Plan. The variance requested will not exceed the existing incursion into the sideyard.

6. *The variance will not result in the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.* The use of the land will remain residential.

Mr. Lindley made a motion that the board approve the variance for setbacks and lot coverage. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0 with Mr. Zalinger abstaining.

The Board reviewed the conditional use and relevant site plan criteria:

Conditional Use

1. *Capacity of existing or planned community facilities.*
2. *Character of the area affected.*
 - a. *Performance standards in 814*
 - 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]*
 - iii. *Emit dust or dirt at the property line [814]*
 - iv. *Emit smoke in excess of Ringmann Chart no.2 [814]*
 - v. *Emit noxious gasses which endanger the health, comfort, safety, or welfare of any person, or which have a tendency to injure or damage property, business or vegetation*
 - vi. *Emit lighting or signs which cause undue glare, which could impair the vision of a driver of any motor vehicle or are offensive to the neighborhood [814]*
 - vii. *Cause fire, explosion, or safety hazard, or create electrical interference[814]*
 - b. *Site plan review standards in 506.C.*
 - c. *Hours of operation.*
 - d. *Cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood.*
 - e. *The noise generated per unit [504]*
 - f. *Any factors judged to have an adverse impact on the area [504]*
 - g. *The cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood [504].*
3. *Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.*
4. *The zoning and Subdivision Regulations in effect [504].*
5. *Provisions to protect the utilization of renewable energy resources [504].*

Site Plan

1. *Pedestrian Access and Circulation [803].*
2. *Vehicular Access and Circulation [804]*
3. *Parking [805 and 807].*
4. *Landscape and Screening [808].*
5. *Outdoor Lighting [810].*

The board accepted the staff's recommended findings regarding the conditional use and site plan criteria.

Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the board grant conditional use and site plan approval for the proposed addition. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.

III. Public Hearing - Request for Conditional Use Approval and Site Plan Review

Property Address: 354 River Street
Applicant: Frank Alexander, Primax Properties
Property Owner: Cathi Cody-Hudson
Zone: GB

- o Construction of a 22,670 s.f. building for retail store, site to include 20,200 s.f. outdoor display area enclosed by an 8' high chain link fence, parking and loading spaces, lighting, landscaping and storm water detention and treatment facilities.

Interested Parties: Dereck Woolridge of Cross Engineering, Frank Alexander of Primax Properties

Mr. Woolridge provided copies of revised plans to the board. He said that the plans had been revised to show a proposed fire hydrant and changes to the site grading. He explained that the grading changes would better balance the cut and fill and would raise the elevation of the site by three feet in some locations. He said that the revised plans also showed a retaining wall on the east side of the site.

Mr. Zalinger said that the board was at a disadvantage since it did not have the staff's comments on the revised plans. Ms. Smith said that the TRC had conceptually discussed some of the changes that were then added to the revised plans, but had not seen those revised plans. Mr. Woolridge said that the largest change was the change to the site grading. He said that the finished floor elevation of the building increased from 151 to 154. He explained that the originally proposed drainage patterns had not changed, but a catch basin was added near the driveway access. He said that a retaining wall was added along the easterly edge of the permanent trailer and equipment storage area. Mr. Teschmacher asked how high the retaining wall would be. Mr. Woolridge said that it would be 3' 6" high at the highest point but tapered down at the ends. Mr. Woolridge said that other changes included a better location for the existing water line and an additional fire hydrant. He said that the proposed trees along the road were changed to a more salt tolerant species, but the number of trees had not changed.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether the TRC had reviewed the changes. Ms. Smith said that the TRC did not see the revised plans, but most of the changes were based upon the TRC's comments on the prior plans. She said that the TRC was aware that the retaining wall would be added. She said that she did not see an issue with the revised plans since the applicant's engineer indicated that the drainage areas had not changed.

Mr. Zalinger asked for a description of the permanent sidewalk display area. Mr. Woolridge said that the area will be used to display seasonal outdoor equipment. He said that it would not be fenced in. He said that the permanent trailer area will be the location of box trailers and smaller trailers that are for sale. Mr. Alexander said that the trailers would be mostly the small metal trailers that people pull behind vehicles to carry mowers or motorcycles. Mr. Cranse asked whether the numbers of customers cited in the staff report were weekly numbers. Mr. Alexander said that they were estimates of daily numbers of customers. Mr. O'Connell asked why the fire hydrant at the rear of the store had not been added. Mr. Woolridge said that it was not needed. He said that Glenn Moore had agreed that it was not required.

Mr. Alexander explained that the proposed retail store would be a Tractor Supply Company store. He said that the company was a national retailer of products for farmers, ranchers and yard equipment. He said that it would not be a hardware store, but there would be some convenience hardware items. He said that it would also sell pet foods, Carhart-type clothing and plumbing supplies for farm uses. He said that the company had other stores in Bennington and Rutland and was breaking ground on a store in St. Albans. He said that changes had been made to the standard building design in recognition that Vermont is different from other locations. Mr. Zalinger asked whether the proposed fence would be topped with wire. Mr.

Alexander said that it would not.

Mr. Blakeman asked whether the TRC looked at the traffic study. Mr. Woolridge said that the TRC had reviewed the study. He said that the only question had been about the peak hour on Saturdays, but the study showed that the peak hour would not coincide with the peak hour on River Street. Mr. Blakeman asked about a second access drive on River Street. Mr. Woolridge said that the staff and the police chief supported a single access drive. Ms. Smith added that Tom McArdle also supported the single access. Ms. Smith said that Mr. McArdle had also noted that the parking lot drainage design created a situation where the runoff was directed to inlets in the center of the aisles. She said that Mr. McArdle was concerned that the design would require a high level of maintenance in order to prevent unsafe accumulation of snow and ice in the aisle.

Mr. Lindley asked how the lighting would compare to the Cody Chevrolet lot. Mr. Woolridge said that the lighting was designed in accordance with the Vermont outdoor lighting manual. Ms. Smith said that the TRC looked at the proposed lighting fixtures. She said that they were the "night-sky friendly" type and that the lighting meets the code. Mr. Woolridge said that the lights would go on and off based on the outdoor light levels. Mr. Zalinger asked about the lights in the outdoor display area. Mr. Alexander said that the lights in the trailer storage area will not stay on all night. He said that the lights on the building will be on all night. Mr. O'Connell noted that the site was in the general business (GB) district.

The Board reviewed the conditional use and relevant site plan criteria:

Conditional Use

1. *Capacity of existing or planned community facilities.*
2. *Character of the area affected.*
 - a. *Performance standards in 814*
 - 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]*
 - iii. *Emit dust or dirt at the property line [814]*
 - iv. *Emit smoke in excess of Ringmann Chart no.2 [814]*
 - v. *Emit noxious gasses which endanger the health, comfort, safety, or welfare of any person, or which have a tendency to injure or damage property, business or vegetation*
 - 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]*
 - vii. *Cause fire, explosion, or safety hazard, or create electrical interference[814]*
 - b. *Site plan review standards in 506.C.*
 - c. *Hours of operation.*
 - d. *Cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood.*
 - e. *The noise generated per unit [504]*
 - f. *Any factors judged to have an adverse impact on the area [504]*
 - g. *The cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood [504].*
3. *Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.*
4. *The zoning and Subdivision Regulations in effect [504].*

5. *Provisions to protect the utilization of renewable energy resources [504].*

The board found that the site is located in the GB district and no adverse impacts on the performance standards were expected.

Site Plan Criteria (see staff report for complete list of relevant standards). The board accepted the staff recommended findings related to the site plan standards. Mr. Zalinger said that he could not imagine that all of the 96 proposed parking spaces will be needed. Mr. Alexander said that he did not expect that the parking lot would fill up, but Tractor Supply would typically keep at least 90 parking spaces for a store of this size because the customers often drive large pickup trucks and vehicles with trailers. He added that the parking was needed in case of a future change to another retail use. Ms. Smith noted that the DRB could reduce the number of spaces if it felt that was appropriate.

Mr. Zalinger asked whether the public had any questions or comments. Steven Farnham asked whether the business would do mail order supply. Mr. Alexander said that there is a catalogue and internet sales over the company website.

Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the board grant conditional use and site plan approval to the application with the requirement that the TRC review the new plans and approve them before any permit is issued. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. Mr. Zalinger raised the concern that the condition would require an approval subsequent to the board's approval. Mr. O'Connell said that he was concerned that the board did not have the benefit of the TRC expertise on the revised plans. He said that he would withdraw the motion. Mr. Cranse agreed.

Mr. Lindley made a motion that the board grant conditional use and site plan approval to the application based on the May 1 submission to the City and with the staff recommendations. Mr. O'Connell said that the TRC might identify an issue with the plans subsequent to the board's approval. He said that he was not satisfied because there was no mechanism for the TRC to change the plans that had been submitted that night. Mr. Zalinger noted the applicant would need permits from the Department of Public Works and the Building Department. He said that those approvals would allow the TRC to influence the project and he was satisfied that the process would be adequate. Mr. O'Connell suggested delaying action for two weeks to allow the TRC to review the plans. Mr. Alexander said that he would prefer action that night, but the company wants to be good neighbors. Mr. Lindley said that he thought that there would be adequate chances for additional technical review. Mr. Teschmacher said that he was bothered by the three-foot elevation increase. Ms. Smith said that she believed that the issue was discussed by the TRC and that the TRC requested that a detail of the retaining wall be added to the plans. Mr. Cranse said that he thought that the plan was thorough, but was persuaded to lean toward caution. Mr. Lindley said that he would withdraw his motion. Mr. Cranse agreed.

Mr. O'Connell made a motion to continue the application to May 15, 2006. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-2 with Mr. Bresette and Mr. Lindley voting against the motion.

IV. Public Hearing - Request for Conditional Use Approval and Site Plan Review

Property Address: 186 River Street
Applicant: James Barrett
Property Owner: James Barrett
Zone: GB

- o Construction of five mini-warehouse buildings including access and lighting.

Interested Parties: James Barrett, Reuben Sherman, Robert Morris, Casey Connell

Ms. Smith described the application for the construction of four mini-warehouses. She said that she understood that the fifth mini-warehouse building shown on the plans as building #8 was no longer proposed. Mr. Barrett said that was correct. He said that he was proposing four steel buildings similar to those that already exist on the site. He said that there would be no electric on the inside of the buildings and no water or sewer service to the buildings. He said that the building color would be a barn red with white doors.

Ms. Smith noted that the existing railroad right of way runs through the site. She said that there is an easement agreement for access from Pioneer Street to building #6, but the easement does not extend beyond that to the proposed buildings. Mr. Barrett said that there was not issue in getting the easement. He said that staff finding #2 was erroneous.

Mr. Barrett said that there was a 30' vehicle turnaround area. He said that he has turned tractor trailers around in the area. He said that he thought that the fire hydrant issue had been resolved in his previous application. Ms. Smith said that the turnaround issue related to turning a fire vehicle around on the site in a situation where a fire was occurring. Mr. Cranse asked whether the Fire Chief saw Mr. Thetford's memo of February 15. Ms. Smith said that she did not know if he saw the plan. She said that she thought that it was unlikely that a 30' turnaround was adequate based upon the fact that the required turnaround for dead end streets is a 100' radius. Mr. Zalinger said that he was not comfortable making a decision without up to date testimony on the fire issues.

Mr. Lindley made a motion to table the application to have a representative of the Fire Department appear before the board to respond on the issue.

Mr. Bresette asked Mr. Barrett what he had done to get the needed right of way from AOT. Mr. Barrett said that he was waiting for the agency to draw up the lease. Mr. Zalinger said that it appeared that there were more than a few issues between the applicant and the AOT.

Reuben Sherman said that the property in question adjoins residential properties. He said that the lighting should use cutoff fixtures. He said that the land as been filled. He asked whether the fill and the existing concrete slabs had been approved. MS. SMITH said that there were no permits on file. She said that the project would have to go through a Flood Plain review based upon the 1982 flood mapping. Bob Morris said that he lives across the street from the site and is concerned with the lighting. He said that the light from the previously constructed buildings shone directly onto his property. Ms. Smith said that the lighting on those buildings was changed to cut-off lights. Casey Connell asked whether any landscaping was proposed between the buildings and the river. He noted that beavers had taken down many of the trees along the river. Mr. Barrett said that he was not proposing any landscaping as the beavers would take it down. Mr. O'Connell noted that the board may require 3% of the construction cost in landscaping.

Mr. Barrett said that the flood plain issue has been raised each time he proposed development on the property. He said that the site has always been out of the flood plain. He said that the access road is 25 feet wide and only a 20 foot wide access is required. Ms. Smith said that she was not sure whether the required fire lane width is in addition to the access road width. Mr. Barrett said that there is a 37' wide access with the railroad right of way.

Mr. Lindley noted that he had place a motion on the floor to table the application to have a representative of the Fire Department appear before the board to respond on the issue. Mr. Bresette seconded the motion. Mr. Zalinger asked which meeting date the project could be tabled to. Ms. Smith said that it could be taken up again at the June 5, 2006 meeting. The board approved the motion unanimously.

VI. Public Hearing - Appeal

Property Address: Sherwood Drive

Appellants: Wally and Laurel Farnum

- o Appeal of the Administrative Officer's decision to accept a permit application from the Family Center of Washington County as a permitted use. The appellants contend that 205.B.2.b of the Montpelier Zoning and Subdivision Regulations was not applied.

Interested Parties: Wally and Laurel Farnham, Le Lauber, Ron Shems

Mr. Teschmacher said that he worked for Black River Design and had previously recused from this matter, but was not sure if he needed to recuse on the appeal question. Mr. Zalinger said that the appeal had to do with procedural aspects. He said that he did not think there was a need for Mr. Teschmacher to recuse on the procedural matter if he could be objective. Mr. Farnum said that he did not object to Mr. Teschmacher's participation in the appeal.

Ms. Smith explained that the appellants maintain that the Administrative Officer accepted the application for the development of an 8,500 square foot child care facility as a permitted use when it should have been combined with the application for a change of use of an existing 3,700 square foot building from a place of worship to a community center. She said that the appellants maintain that the combined application would require conditional use approval. Ms. Smith said that the applications were received separately and were for two separate uses. She said that some cross easements would be required for shared access and stormwater management, but those types of easements between sites were not unusual. She said that the two lots were in separate, non-affiliated ownership. She said that the lots would not be combined under ordinance section 304 even if they were owned by the same entity as they each met the minimum lot size for the zoning district. She said that a community center and a child care facility are defined separately in the Montpelier Zoning and Subdivision Regulations and are listed as separate uses in Table 206.

Mr. Zalinger asked why section 205.B.2.b was not applicable. Ms. Smith said that there were two separate applications on two separate parcels. She said that the parcels could be sole independently. Mr. O'Connell noted that the section also refers to cumulative development approved in the same development. Ms. Smith said that the ordinance defines development as "the division of a parcel of land into two or more parcels, the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alteration, relocation or enlargement of any building or other structure, or any mining, excavation or landfill, and any change is use of any building or other structure, or land, or extension of use of land."

Mr. Blakeman asked what the process would be if the board determined that the applications were one project. Ms. Smith said that the application would have to be warned for conditional use approval. Mr. Bresette said that there were two separate properties with defined property lines. He said that, at its last

meeting, the board had acted on a variance and did not consider the fact that an adjacent parcel was commonly owned. Mr. Blakeman asked who owned the temple parcel. Ms. Smith said that it was owned by the Jehovah's Witness. Mr. Blakeman noted that the other parcel was owned by Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Farnum noted that the last sentence of item 2a in the staff report left out the word "or". He said that the sentence should be "This requirement shall be cumulative and shall include all structures approved after the effective date of this regulation on the same parcel or in the same development." In response to staff comment #5, he said that both proposed uses are classified as institutional. In response to staff comment #6 he said that the childcare facility cannot function without the staff housed in the other building. In response to comment #7, Mr. Farnum said that the projects will be built, owned and operated by the same entity and are, in reality, the same development. With reference to comment #8, he said that he did not see why a developer would go through the legal expense of providing shared access and cross easements if they owned both parcels.

Mr. Farnum said that the Family Center stated at previous public meetings that the child care center would be a 12,000 s.f. building. He said that the applicant had three preapplication meetings with the City staff. He said that the first indication that the public had of a change was in February when the applicant stated that the size of the building was reduced to 8,500 square feet due to the concerns of the neighbors. Mr. Farnum said that he believed that it was determined that the only means of considering the child care facility as a permitted use was for the applicant to reduce the childcare center to less than 10,000 square feet and to keep the applications separate, but neither facility can stand on its own. He said that they will operate as an integrated facility. Mr. O'Connell asked why the projects could not be two separate developments. Mr. Farnum said that they were inexorably linked and that staff for the childcare facility will be housed in Kingdom Hall.

Lee Lauber, the Executive Director for the Family Center of Washington County, said that the Kingdom Hall building will be used for family support outreach activities and meetings with families. She said that a wide range of staff will be housed in the building. She said that the staff offices are used to meet with families and parents and that the staff also will leave the site to meet with families at off site locations. She said that the use of the building will be a community center. Mr. Bresette asked whether there would be space for the childcare staff or childcare activities in Kingdom Hall. Ms. Lauber said that there would not be such space. She said that the Family Center does have monthly staff meetings, but they would not be likely to be held in the Kingdom Hall building because no large meeting space was planned there.

Ms. Lauber said that the size of the childcare center was reduced in response to concerns raised by the neighbors. She said that the child care center will have a large indoor play and class room space. Mr. Zalinger asked whether the staff would typically leave when the children left at the end of the day. Ms. Lauber said that was correct. She said that there would be a play group one day per week that would be staffed by the child care staff. She said that there would also be a parent support group in the living room of the child care center one evening per week that would be staffed by the Kingdom Hall staff.

Ms. Lauber said that her office would be in Kingdom Hall. She said that the Associate Director for child care would have an office in the child care center. Mr. Lindley asked what would happen to the staff that is presently at the Barre location. Ms. Lauber said that the family support programs currently operate out of the Barre location. Mr. Lindley asked whether the staff in the Barre location interfaced with the staff at the Vermont College in Montpelier. Ms. Lauber said that there is one Associate Director for Finance who presently operates out of the Montpelier location.

Ron Shems, attorney for the Family Center, said that he agreed with Ms. Smith's memo. He said that the definition of lots says that lots can be separately owned or used and that is the intent of the Family Center for

these two lots. He said that it is not clear whether there has been a final action that is ripe for an appeal. He said that he believed that the review of the applications had to go forward. Mr. Zalinger asked Ms. Smith whether she thought the decision was ripe. Ms. Smith said that she did think it was ripe as it was a decision of the Administrative Officer. Mr. Shems said that Ms. Smith issued a recommendation to the board, not a final decision that was appealable. Mr. Zalinger noted that the board did not go forward with site plan hearings because Ms. Smith's decision was appealed.

Mr. Zalinger used St. Monica's as an example where there is a church, a school and a convent on the site. He said that he saw that as a campus use. He said that the family center conducts several different activities and the two sites could be described as a kind of campus. He said that the situation was similar to a company that owns two fast food chain stores adjacent to each other. He said that the functions are different and the uses are different.

Mr. Lindley said that he believed that the board had enough evidence to go to a deliberative session. Mr. O'Connell agreed. Mr. Zalinger closed the record on the appeal. He said that the board would have to hold a deliberative session and issue findings.

Other

The board discussed the letter from Fecteau Homes regarding the technical assistance funds. They agreed to accept the applicant's proposal to provide funds for the Level I traffic study, water supply and sewer demand analysis with the provision that an additional \$7,000 will be provided by the applicant if a Level II traffic study is needed.

Adjournment

Mr. Bresette made a motion that the meeting be adjourned at 10:30. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Swigon
Administrative Officer

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.