

Montpelier Development Review Board

April 2, 2007

City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Philip Zalinger, Chair; Jack Lindley; Alan Blakeman; Jeremy Hoff; Guy Teschmacher; Roger Cranse; and Ylian Snyder.
Staff: Kathleen Swigon.

Call to Order:

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

Minutes:

Mr. Blakeman moved approval of the Minutes for the March 19, 2007 Development Review Board meeting. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The minutes were adopted 5-0 by Members Lindley, Blakeman, Hoff, Cranse, and Teschmacher. (Mr. Zalinger abstained.)

I. Design Review and Site Plan Review – CB-I/DCD

79 Barre Street

Applicant: Stephen Ribolini

- Installation of Storage Shed

Ms. Swigon told the committee this application is for a site plan review and design review for the installation of an outside storage cabinet for hydrogen gas cylinders. The cylinders are presently stored in a building on the adjacent property and the Fire Inspector would like them stored outside of the building. That is the reason for the application. The Design Review Committee did review the application and recommended approval with options.

The options are:

1. The color of the cabinet may be white or black.
2. Reflective tape may be placed on bollards. There will be two bollards in front of the cabinet to protect it from vehicles.
3. The applicant may install signage that is required for safety purposes. There is some potential signage that may have to go in to tell people not to smoke in the area.

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Mr. Ribolini. He told Mr. Ribolini what the DRB does with respect to the design review elements of the application is if the applicant is in agreement with the Design Review Committee's recommendations the DRB won't revisit the issue. The DRB will take the advice of the Design Review Committee. We need advice from the applicant that he is in agreement with the Design Review Committee's recommendations. Mr. Ribolini said he was.

There is the site plan review element of the application, which the DRB has jurisdiction over. The Design Review Committee doesn't have any jurisdiction over this. The DRB have to review the site plan issues.

Mr. Zalinger asked Mr. Ribolini to explain where the cabinet was going to be located on Barre Street. Mr. Ribolini said you probably wouldn't see the cabinet from Barre Street. It is located at the rear of the building. On the sketch in the upper right hand corner next to seven parking spaces.

Mr. Zalinger asked if it provided enough access for deliveries and pickups. Mr. Ribolini said it does. There would be very few because it isn't something they use on a daily basis. It is very similar to what stores have for propane tanks.

Mr. Zalinger explained the site plan issues that are involved in their review are vehicular access and circulation. There will be bollards constructed to protect the cabinet from vehicles. The Board reviewed the relevant performance standards in Section 714 and found the application to be in compliance. Mr. Ribolini said he would accept a condition to comply with all building and fire codes with the project.

Ms. Snyder moved to recommend design review and site plan approval for the application at 79 Barre Street with the Design Review Committee's recommendations and staff recommendations that the applicant meet all fire and building regulations and recommendation for flood plain approval. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously 7-0.

II. Preliminary and Final Subdivision and Amended Planned Development Review

97 Cedar Hill

Applicant: Bernard X. Chenette, P.E.

- Three lot subdivision of land within previously approved planned development
- Interested Parties: Jeff Carrigan, 23 Wilson St; Deb Bizzozero, Hill Street

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Mr. Chenette and other interested parties.

Ms. Swigon said this application is for preliminary and final review of a subdivision and an amended planned development. The applicant is proposing to subdivide an existing 15.98 acre lot into three lots. Lot 1 will have 8.34 acres; Lot 2 will have 6.71 acres; Lot 2A will have 0.93 acres. The existing multi-family residential buildings and all of the required parking, and sidewalks and infrastructure, will be located on Lot 1. Lot 2 will have a paved parking area that is between two of the buildings. The balance of Lot 2 is a wooded area. Lot 2A will be a vacant lot.

The DRB saw this application at sketch plan review. The layout basically hasn't changed, but the applicant has added more information as a result from the discussions at sketch plan review. One point related to open space and common land – the regulations provide that the Development Review Board may require certain lands be designated as open space and held privately or in common. The applicant has now submitted a site features plan that shows portions of Lot 1 and Lot 2 being reserved for open space. A total of 9 acres between the two lots would be reserved open space, and the owners of each of those lots would be responsible for management and maintaining the open space.

In terms of the general development standards under site protection and design, the building envelopes have been added and topography has been added to the site features plan. The building envelope for Lot 2A includes slopes of 18 to 20 percent. It appears that a driveway could be located in a way to avoid excessively steep slopes, but water and sewer service for Lot 2A will run through the wooded area onto Lot 2 to connect to the infrastructure at the Cedar Hill Apartments as opposed to Hill Street because there is no service out there. Staff recommended a condition on any approval that prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant would submit information showing that the steep slopes will be protected during construction.

Wetlands have now been identified on the property. The building envelope for Lot 2A contains a considerable area of wetlands. The applicant has added a schematic for a building to show it could be located on the lot outside of wetlands. Staff recommended a condition that any future development, except for the driveway and utilities, be located outside of wetlands.

There are forested hillsides on the property. It slopes down from proposed Lot 2A at a considerable slope. There is a recommendation that limits of clearing be shown on any plan prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.

A park impact fee would be required, also.

Mr. Zalinger said the open space is going to be preserved as open space. If it is open space, it can be used for recreation but there will be no recreational improvements on the property.

Mr. Chenette said that currently there are a number of walking paths throughout the hillside, so those allow for some recreation. They are not planning to improve it in terms of swing sets, etc.

Mr. Zalinger inquired about how many units were at Cedar Hill. Mr. Chenette said there is a total of 36. There are children living there. There aren't a lot of children, but there are some.

Mr. Zalinger asked if Mr. Chenette could tell what class the wetlands were. Mr. Chenette said they were class 3 wetlands and are free from any state regulation. Mr. Zalinger said this means for the DRB's edification the only limits on development of those wetlands come through the zoning ordinance and not through the Agency of Natural Resources.

Jeff Carrigan, a resident at 23 Wilson Street, commonly known as the old frisbee property on the map. As an abutting property owner he wants to maintain an interest in any developments on the land. He doesn't have any objections to the application now.

Deb Bizzozero, an abutting property owner on Hill Street, said the walking paths are actually deer trails. She doesn't have any objection to the application. She just came to the meeting to find out where it was going to be. She has a couple of acres of land that doesn't appear on her survey, and she just wanted to feel comfortable that this plan didn't include any of that land.

Mr. Chenette said they want to receive subdivision approval for financing reasons for the rest of the property. The plan in the future will be additional apartment units on Lot 1 in the parking area primarily, as sort of an infill. They will leave the hillside as it is. Lot 2A is just a very small lot up off of Hill Street that they plan to access through a driveway along the contour. Probably a single family home is all that can fit there and really work.

Mr. Zalinger said that judged by staff comments it sounds like they were challenged to fit that there as well. He said he didn't feel Bernie's response commits the applicant to that or anything else. It is just anecdotal evidence of what they plan for the near future. This property has been before the Zoning Board of Adjustment many times in the past in their efforts to craft a more modern up to date use of the property.

Mr. Lindley asked how the maintenance of the bollard system working now in terms of being able to collect water and preventing it from coming down into the back yards of the houses on Berlin Street. Is it working well now? Mr. Chenette said it is working very well now. They have invested a lot in stone line swales and new culverts, and things are finally working the way they should.

Mr. Lindley asked if there is an infill developed the system they have for drainage now won't be impacted adversely in any way. Mr. Chenette said they will need a storm water discharge permit from the state and review everything with Tom McArdle and the City of Montpelier.

Mr. Zalinger asked Mr. Chenette if he had reviewed the staff comments and observations. He asked him if he had any objection to the recommendations included in the staff comments. He said he was fine with their recommendations.

Mr. Lindley moved approval for the preliminary and final review of the subdivision for 97 Cedar Hill Lane incorporating the staff comments. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously approved 7-0, and subdivision approval was granted.

III. Site Plan Review – GB

51 Berlin Street

Applicant: Damartin Quadros

- Creation of a drive-through lane, removal of parking spaces and associated site changes.

To Be Continued

Ms. Swigon said they received new plans for the application last Friday, so it will be on the agenda for April 16th.

Other Business:

Ms. Swigon reminded members of the joint meeting of the boards and commissions. Most members from the boards will be present. The idea of the meeting is to get all of the various boards and commissions together so you are talking and the lines of communication are opened up.

Ms. Swigon said they received a notice from the Environmental Court that the 138 Main Street application relating to the doorway at Mr. Illuzzi's property that Mr. Illuzzi has filed an appeal.

Adjournment:

Mr. Lindley moved adjournment, with Mr. Blakeman seconding the motion. The DRB adjourned on a vote of 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Swigon
Administrative Officer

Transcribed and prepared by:

*Joan Clack
City Clerk & Treasurer's Office*