

Montpelier Development Review Board
December 6, 2010
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Approved

Present: Philip Zalinger, Chair; Alan Blakeman, Daniel Richardson, Jack Lindley, Roger Cranse and Ali Sarafzadeh.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:

Phil Zalinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Review of November 1 and 15, 2010 Minutes:

Upon motion by Mr. Blakeman and Mr. Richardson the Minutes of the November 1, 2010 Minutes were approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

Upon motion by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Lindley the Minutes of the November 15, 2010 Minutes were approved on a vote of 4 to 0.

I. 34 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD

Design Review, Site Plan & Conditional Use Approvals

Owner: James Blouin

Applicant: Vintage Trailer Supply Co. – Steve Hingtgen

Retail/Office Use.

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Steve Hingtgen, Applicant.

Mr. DeSmet said the applicant is requesting design review, conditional use and site plan approval for the proposed retail and office uses at 34 Barre Street. Historically there has been a retail use there but it has been silent for more than six months so it needed reapproval. Retail is a conditional use in a historic structure. This is a National Register building. He is doing very minor changes and just looking for a change of use. The building was built in 1947.

Mr. Zalinger said they recently approved another retail eating and drinking establishment there, but it was withdrawn.

Mr. DeSmet said they never enacted the permit.

Mr. Zalinger said they would deal with the design review elements first. The Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board and after they have reviewed something so they don't revisit their issues unless there is a discrepancy between what the applicant has sought and what the Design Review Committee has approved. On November 23rd the DRC recommended approval with an adjustment to the scope. Their adjustment was that the proposed window replacement on the front façade will not be part of this application. The minutes indicate that the applicant agreed to that adjustment.

Mr. Hingtgen said they recommend they hold back on the window and put in a separate application because they wanted more information and he didn't want the entire application to be delayed. He is satisfied with that agreement.

Upon a motion by Mr. Lindley and Mr. Cranse for approval of design review for 34 Barre Street approval was granted on a vote of 6 to 0.

The DRB discussed site plan approval for 34 Barre Street next.

Mr. DeSmet said the most germane point to site plan review is parking. There are approximately 11 parking spaces at this location. One space is required for every 250 square feet of net floor area. Retail and office require the same amount. There is approximately 2,600 square feet which is approximately 10 spaces so they have met the requirement. There is also on street parking along Barre Street. The parking plan for the site plan is the same as for the proposed eating and drinking establishment.

Mr. Zalinger said the site plan criteria don't appear to be either affected by the application or applicable.

Mr. Blakeman asked Mr. Hingtgen what kind of recreational vehicles he is talking about.

Mr. Hingtgen said this business doesn't deal with the vehicles themselves. Basically, they do parts so you won't see any recreational vehicles on site except for perhaps once in a great while. The vehicles they deal with are 1950's and 1960's air streams, the silver bullet stuff from that era. They are the general store and reproduce the parts for those. There might be a light assembly but there is no manufacturing on site. This is retail business so they buy things and sell things. They deal with vintage travel trailers which are the classics from the 1940's to the 1970's, but their focus is on the 1950's and 1960's Air Stream brand which is the most collectible. It is something that is a hobby with everyone in the country except in our area. They do a combination of some walk in and mail order. Unit 2 is behind this building and they have not considered that in their site plan. It is a separate lease to a different business. They did not try to claim all of the parking because they knew that use was back there. There seems to be adequate parking for them. He marked "P" for the spots they would use for their unit. There are others there and he simply didn't account for them.

Mr. Zalinger asked if it was part of the same building.

Mr. Hingtgen said it is an add-on but it is all attached.

Mr. Zalinger asked if he would be shipping and receiving from this location.

Mr. Hingtgen said they will definitely be receiving and shipping. The amount of receiving they do is one of the UPS trucks every day and a Fed-X truck occasionally, and once every week or two they will see a semi-trailer back up. The outgoing is all small parcel and also walk-in retail. They have people who come from Canada just to visit their store and he has had people from California come just to visit their store.

Mr. Zalinger asked if he could explain to the Board how the semi-tractor trailer will make a delivery and everything will leave plus the volume that is delivered by the semi and then go out by parcels.

Mr. Hingtgen said a good example might be a pallet of paint or paint stripper. That particular item might come in once every four months and then that would go out in boxes or to people walking in. There has been a paint store there for a long time and they have had more volume than that coming in by semi. Their customers are retail so they don't send out skids full of stuff.

Mr. Zalinger said the parts themselves aren't large.

Mr. Hingtgen replied no. It is rare they would send something that would require going on a skid. 99.8 percent of the time they are dealing with a UPS box.

Mr. Lindley said when the other operation were in for a permit there were issues where the city line was and Downing Street. Has that been resolved?

Mr. DeSmet said it was resolved. The first site plan made it look like the DRB was going to try to give parking on city property which was inappropriate so Mr. Blouin and the Public Works Department figured out where the line was which is represented on the site plan accurately.

Mr. Blakeman asked how many employees he would have.

Mr. Hingtgen said within the next two years probably five full-time.

Upon motion by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Lindley for site plan approval for 34 Barre Street it was granted on a vote of 6 to 0.

Mr. Zalinger said finally they have conditional use approval. Conditional use criteria are set forth in the ordinance. It requires the DRB to make a determination that the proposed use, the activity that is conducted there, does not adversely affect the following criteria:

1. The capacity of existing or planned community facilities. It is clear that this kind of retail use at this location which has historically been conducted is not going to stretch the capacity of the city to provide facilities.
2. The character of the area affected as defined by the purposes of the zoning district in which the project is located meets the standards in the plan. The proposed district is CB-II. This is a retail use in a CB-II and seems to be entirely consistent with the character of the area.
3. The traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity... Once again, retail use in a long established retail location is consistent and will not adversely affect traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.
4. The zoning and subdivision regulations in effect... Clearly this involves no new construction and is simply the adaptation of an existing building.

It appears that the conditional use criteria are all going to be met.

Upon motion by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Lindley for conditional use approval at 34 Barre Street conditional use approval was granted on a vote of 6 to 0.

Adjournment:

Upon motion by Jack Lindley and Alan Blakeman the Development Review Board adjourned on a vote of 6 to 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack