

**RICHMOND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
APPROVED MINUTES FOR JANUARY 9, 2013 MEETING**

---

Members Present: David Sunshine, Chair; Brian Werneke, Vice-Chair; Stephen Ackerman; Fred Fortune

Members Absent: One vacancy

---

Others Present: Cathleen Gent, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB; Ruth Miller, taping for MMCTV Comcast 15; *also see attached sign-in sheet.*

---

Sunshine called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Sunshine welcomed the public. He requested that everyone sign in. He also encouraged members of the audience to participate in the hearings. Sunshine noted that, if a neighbor is at the hearing and wishes to have interested person status for purposes of appealing a decision, that person must speak during the hearing about the project.

Sunshine encouraged members of the public who might be viewing the proceedings on cable television to apply for the current vacancy on the DRB.

1. Public Hearing - Woodland Road LLC and Kevin Kennedy – Application #12-189 for a subdivision amendment associated with the Greystone Subdivision (original owner Carl Parker) to adjust the boundaries between 320 Greystone Drive (parcel GS0320/ Greystone subdivision Lot 6) and 400 Greystone Drive (parcel GS0400/ Greystone subdivision Lot 8) and to adjust the building envelopes for both parcels.

Sunshine swore in James Prevo (Woodland Road LLC/ 320 Greystone Drive/ Lot 6), Kevin Kennedy (400 Greystone Drive/ Lot 8), and Chris Haggerty (surveyor consultant).

Haggerty introduced the project. He said that, due to some clerical problems during the Greystone subdivision process, a number of subdivision amendments have been needed over the years. He noted that there is an installed and approved septic system on Lot 6 and a single family house is located on Lot 8. Last year, emergency site alterations were needed on Lot 8 for the embankment area. Haggerty explained that this application includes three components: 1) Adjusting the boundary line between lot 6 and Lot 8; 2) revising the building envelope for Lot 6 to avoid a steep grade, where building is really not possible; 3) revising the building envelope for Lot 8 to enlarge the building envelope in keeping with town standards, because a portion of the house is not in the current building envelope.

Haggerty explained that the boundary line between Lot 6 and Lot 8 was established in a 1995 survey plan. In 2005, the DRB approved a boundary line adjustment between the two lots. However, a property deed was not recorded, as required, therefore the 2005 amendment is not in effect. Haggerty reviewed the location of the proposed boundary. He then went on to discuss the building envelope change for Lot 6, showing that the current building envelope is partly over an embankment. For Lot 8, the proposed building envelope provides a more functional layout that meets the requirements for development. Haggerty distributed a plan showing a close-up of the required front setback line for Lot 8. Ackerman, who was DRB liaison for the project, said the three requested changes make sense, based on a site visit. Prevo said they are trying to clear up the boundary and building envelope questions to move forward with selling the parcel.

Sunshine opened the hearing to the public. No comments were offered.

Motion made by Fortune, seconded by Werneke, to close the hearing and approve application #12-189. Voting: 4 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

2. Subdivision Sketch Plan Review: Peggy Farr Revocable Trust: 400 Huntington Road (HU0400.a)  
Chuck Farr and Mike Burke (consulting engineer) joined the DRB at this time for an informal discussion. Burke discussed the location of the parcel, which is the large field along Huntington and Hinesburg roads, including the existing farm complex and house. He said that a family member would like to move

1 to a house on a new lot along Huntington Road and a second lot would also be created there. Burke  
2 added that 10,000 square feet of developable land are located on each of those two parcels. There are  
3 two concepts for laying out those two parcels, one with two parcels side by side along Huntington Road  
4 and the other concept with one lot in front and the other in the rear. Farr said they prefer the concept  
5 with the lots set up in a front/back orientation.  
6

7 Burke then discussed the existing farm house. It is currently in the floodplain. With the proposed maps  
8 that Richmond has submitted to FEMA as part of its appeal, the floodplain line is close to the house.  
9 The issue is that they cannot meet the requirement for 10,000 square feet developable area outside of  
10 the floodplain for that new parcel. The DRB discussed whether a waiver or variance might be  
11 appropriate. The fact that the house is pre-existing might be a factor in considering a variance.  
12

13 Denise Curley, neighbor to the east of the grey house and the silos on Huntington Road, said she and  
14 her husband are concerned that their privacy will be reduced with the addition of a new parcel and  
15 house next door. For instance, the back yard will no longer be private. Farr and Fortune responded that  
16 some of the impacts could be mitigated with screening, etc. In response to a question from Curley, Farr  
17 said that a duplex could be built on either lot, however, building duplexes is not their intent. He added  
18 that they might build a single family house on the rear lot and keep the existing grey house for rentals.  
19 Farr said the project works within both the current and the proposed zoning (with ½ acre lots). The  
20 DRB encouraged Farr to talk with the neighbors as the plans for the subdivision are developed.  
21

22 Burke said that a survey and an elevation certificate will be done regarding the exact location of the  
23 floodplain and they will likely apply for a FEMA letter of map amendment for the new lot containing the  
24 farm house. He said it is very unlikely that the Farris can get the 10,000 square feet of developable area  
25 for that parcel, even if they include a narrow strip along Huntington Road. The DRB said they would  
26 consider a variance request, but could not make any commitment beyond that. Burke added that the  
27 Farris would be comfortable if there were conditions placed on the level of development on that site.  
28 There was a brief discussion about the level of flooding with Tropical Storm Irene. Burke and Farr  
29 briefly discussed the next steps for the project.  
30

31 3. Heidi Bormann - informal discussion about 24 Baker Street (BA0024)

32 Bormann said she owns a duplex at 24 Baker Street and is working with David Sunshine on  
33 development ideas, including a way to utilize the barn. Bormann said she would like to use the historic  
34 structure for an additional housing unit. Based on the definition of multi-unit housing which requires a  
35 "single structure," Bormann is interested in learning what the DRB would think about some type of  
36 connection between the buildings and presented a rendering of a trellis system to connect the duplex  
37 and the barn. Some other issues that would have to be addressed include the lot coverage and  
38 setbacks. The DRB looked at the requirements for a residential PUD and Werneke noted that it is not  
39 likely that her project would qualify, per Section 3.2.3.a) of the zoning regulations, regarding acreage.  
40 The DRB members agreed they support the project. Werneke said there does not seem to be a way to  
41 do it with the current bylaws, although it could be done within the proposed bylaws that were defeated.  
42

43 4. DRB Report for 2012 Town Report – The DRB approved the draft report.  
44

45 5. Meeting Minutes – December 12, 2012

46 Motion by Ackerman, seconded by Fortune, to approve the minutes with no amendments. Voting: 4 in  
47 favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.  
48

49 6. Deliberative Session

50 At 8:50 PM, motion by Ackerman, seconded by Werneke, to go into deliberative session. So voted.  
51

52 At 9:24 PM, motion by Ackerman, seconded by Werneke, to come out of deliberative session. So voted.  
53

54 7. DRB Actions – The DRB did not take any formal actions.  
55

56 8. Adjournment

57 At 9:27 PM, Fortune made a motion, seconded by Ackerman, to adjourn the meeting. So voted.  
58

59 Respectfully submitted by Cathleen Gent, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB

