

**Montpelier Development Review Board Meeting
September 16, 2013**

Subject to review and approval

Present: Philip Zalinger, Kevin O'Connell, Roger Cranse, Daniel Richardson, Jack Lindley, James LaMonda, Josh O'Hara, Michael Sherman, Dina Bookmyer-Baker – staff.

Call to order: Kevin O'Connell called the meeting to order in Philip's absence.

Comments from the Chair: There were no comments from the Chair.

Review of minutes of September 3, 2013: These minutes were not yet available.

100 State Street

Owner: Capitol Plaza Corp. Applicant: Erik Urch, ECS

Design review approval to place a remediation enclosure behind the hotel at 100 State Street

Erik Urch was in attendance to represent the application. They are conducting remediation and wish to construct a temporary enclosure around the materials. It will match an existing enclosure around the AC unit. It will be in place for 1-3 years. Their corrective action plan has been reviewed by the Department of Environmental Conservation.

Dan made a motion to approve the application, James seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

At this point, Philip entered the meeting and took over the Chair's seat.

148 State Street

Owner: Vermont Realtors Association Applicant: Steven Schenker, S2 Architecture

Design review for multiple exterior renovations

Steve Schenker was in attendance to represent the application. Jack made a motion to approve the application as presented, Kevin seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3-5 Cedar Street

Owner/Applicant: Jason and Heather Merrill

Site plan review and variance request to demolish existing structure and construct a 6 unit residential structure

Jason Merrill was in attendance to represent the application. This is a continuation from September 3. He is looking for permission to remove the structure and to be allowed to have the additional residence for the lot size. The building has been vacant for 5 years. The assessment from DeWolfe states that the building is cost prohibitive to rebuild and would exceed the cost of a new building with less units. It has been modified that only historical piece of the building is its age.

The application has two facets, the first is to demolish the property, the second is to increase the density of the lot from 5 units to 6 units.

Roger made a motion to grant site plan approval, Jack seconded, the motion passed with a 6-1 vote, with Dan opposing.

The applicant feels the project isn't feasible without the additional unit. The consensus of the Board was that the language doesn't allow for the extra unit based on the lot size, there would be an additional 400 square feet needed.

The request for the variance was withdrawn.

**Vermont College of Fine Arts Street
Owner/Applicant: Vermont College of Fine Arts
Update Master Plan and sign plan for AIPUD**

Dan and James recused themselves as adjoining landowners. Michael Sherman stood in for them, even though he received a letter that he was an adjoining property owner. The applicants did not have an issue with this.

The parking change is not needed nor is it feasible at the present time, but it has been part of the Master Plan for years.

The three aspects of the Master Plan they are asking approval is name change/ownership change on the Master Plan; converting the tennis courts to parking; and the signage package.

A letter was received from a neighbor raising concerns about lighting. The signage package does not involve changing lighting.

The screening around the proposed new parking lot will be Virginia creeper, which is a vine. A concern was raised by the Board on whether this was a delicacy for deer or an invasive species. The applicant will check into both issues and report for administrative review.

Fred Fayette, who lives near the tennis courts spoke to the Board. He had asked at a neighborhood meeting what was going to happen to the tennis courts and he wasn't told about the parking lot. There is a concern about headlight glare from the parking lot into his house. He was unable to attend the later meeting where the parking lot was discussed. The applicant said that part of the reason the parking lot is going in is because of discussions with the neighbors about overflow parking going onto the nearby streets.

Jack made a motion to move into deliberation, Josh seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment: There was a motion made to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Tami Furry
Recording Secretary