

**R I C H M O N D S E L E C T B O A R D
R E G U L A R M E E T I N G
D e c e m b e r 5 , 2 0 1 6 M I N U T E S**

Members Present: Ellen Kane; Bard Hill; Lincoln Bressor; David Sander; Steve May

Absent: None

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Connie Bona, Finance Assistant; Clare Rock, Town Planner; Mary Houle; Maureen Kangley; Detlev Hunsdoerfer; Bob Stafford; Frederick Barrett; Josi Kytile; Brendan O’Reilly; Chris Granda; Dennis Gile, Fire Chief; Alan Buck, Police Chief; Gretchen Paulsen; Gerald Levesque, Assistant Fire Chief; and Ruth Miller was present to videotape the meeting for MMCTV Channel 15.

Ellen Kane called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

1. Welcome and Public Comment

Ms. Kane asked if there were any comments from the public.

Mary Houle said she was filing a formal complaint that actions of town staff were negatively impacting her, and that she was given the wrong statute on her recent DRB decision and was concerned that evidence spoken about during her appeal hearing wasn’t produced by the town staff member who referenced it during the hearing. Ms. Houle provided a written complaint to the board chair and the Town Manager.

Early Business

Representatives from Buttermilk were not in position to present at 7:00, so the Selectboard took some business prior to the restart of the public hearing.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the minutes of October 3, 2016 and was seconded by Mr. Bressor, and the motion carried 5-0.

Resolution Amending Schedule A of Road Names

Ms. Kane read the resolution. The Manager explained that Patricia Gilbert’s subdivision off of Palmer Lane had three lots served by a private driveway, with the potential for two additional lots, which would necessitate a private road. She requested that this road be named Beatty Lane.

Mr. Bressor offered a motion to approve the resolution amending the Schedule of Road Names to add Beatty Lane as a private road, and was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried 5-0.

2. Items for Discussion with Those Present

Buttermilk LLC – Application # 16-114 for PUD, Conditional Use & Site Plan Review for the construction of a 4-story, mixed-use building at parcel BR0125 and JC0074 located within the Jolina Court Interim Zoning District (Public Hearing continued from 11/21)

1 Mr. May offered a motion to reopen the public hearing, and was seconded by Mr. Bressor, and the
2 motion carried 5-0.

3 Ms. Kane recapped the November 7th decisions on the Buttermilk development application. The 40%
4 residential to 60% commercial requirement would be applied as an aggregate across the development
5 plan, and not on a building by building basis, and the development would be considered a one parcel
6 application. The Selectboard requested that Buttermilk supply additional information on traffic
7 impacts and stormwater management.

8 Brendan O'Reilly and Josi Kytle of Buttermilk continued their presentation of the development
9 application. They had provided a traffic study from Grenier Engineering as well as a design of the
10 infiltration strip and a basin for stormwater management. Mr. O'Reilly also said that he expected the
11 existing buildings to be remediated and demolished by December 21st.

12 Mr. O'Reilly then went through the storm water details. The catch basin was designed to manage a 25
13 year storm event. He said that Highway Foreman Peter Gosselin had objected to the infiltration basin,
14 but had not seen the design presented here.

15

16 The Manager said that Mr. Gosselin had objected to infiltration of water close to the surface, since that
17 would saturate ground just beneath the road surface, destabilizing the road surface. He said if the
18 basin didn't infiltrate close to the surface then there may not be any problems.

19

20 There was some additional discussion on this, but ultimately the Selectboard asked for Peter
21 Gosselin's concerns in writing, and whether or not this design addressed those concerns.

22

23 Town Planner Clare Rock went through several items of the staff report, and addressed the cross-
24 access easements between the two Buttermilk parcels as well as parking/access for the owners of the
25 Blue Seal Feeds building. She asked why the cross access easements weren't executed now. Josi
26 Kytle said there wasn't any real issue but she felt that they should be executed after development
27 approval, because if the approval was denied then a new configuration might call for a different
28 easement.

29 The Selectboard discussed this. Mr. May asked if a memorandum of understanding might be better, or
30 a memorandum of approval. Ms. Kane said that the access easements should be considered as a
31 condition of approval, if granted.

32 The discussion then turned to building height. The interim zoning regulations allowed one building to
33 be not more than 38 feet in height from ground to eaves, and the remaining buildings to be not more
34 than 35 feet in height. The ground level for this building was sloped, creating a varied level, and the
35 Selectboard wanted to determine the best way to calculate building height on this structure.

36 Mr. Hill said that first, he believe that this building was better suited for commercial than residential,
37 and felt that more commercial should be included. Second, he didn't want to put more restriction on
38 future buildings because of the issue of being able to manage future development with these
39 restrictions would be more complex. He would feel more comfortable with these decisions if there
40 were three buildings, not just one.

1 Mr. O'Reilly said that the village was economically viable and vibrant and this building matched that
2 with mixed use, and residential was essential in a village. There was some discussion on these points.

3

4 Chris Granda spoke about the interim zoning committee's discussions on height and the
5 residential/commercial ratios. He urged the Selectboard to consider the original thoughts and reasons
6 for the standards.

7

8 There was additional discussion on the building heights. Ultimately it was agreed by the Selectboard
9 that this building would be considered a 38 foot high building. Window wells below grade would not
10 contribute to this measurement.

11 Gretchen Paulsen said if we don't have a ladder truck to rescue someone from a tall building they why
12 are we talking about should the building be allowed higher?

13 Brian Carpenter supported the building design, and the responsible use of the 38 foot limit to the
14 eaves.

15 Ms. Rock continued through the staff report. There was a discussion on parking needs and the mixed
16 use of the building. Ms. Kane said that the board would need to continue the public hearing. The
17 board requested comments from Peter Gosselin on the storm water infiltration basin. Ms. Rock said
18 that the issue of the parking surface needed to be addressed.

19 Mr. Hill offered a motion to carry the public hearing for the Buttermilk application until December 19,
20 2016 at 7:00 pm. Mr. May seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

21 Public Safety Building

22 Members of the Public Safety Building Committee were present to talk about the redesign of the
23 building. The new building was somewhat smaller than the last, but able to accommodate the police
24 station, fire department and a community room and kitchen. Bob Stafford explained the changes, and
25 the visits to additional stations – the Hinesburg Police Department and the Jeffersonville/Cambridge
26 Fire Department. There was discussion with the board, especially regarding the cost estimate for the
27 land which was over \$2 million. The general consensus was that this was unrealistic and true costs
28 would be much lower. Mr. Stafford explained that these were rough estimates based on a concept and
29 not a design cost.

30 Ms. Kane said we needed to be mindful of the impact to the taxpayers, and costs were important.

31 Mr. Sander explained that in Cambridge, they were given a number and asked to design a building
32 around that. Mr. Stafford said you had to be careful that you get the building you need, not the
33 building that costs a dollar, and wasn't in favor of that approach.

34 Mr. Barrett agreed and didn't want to try and "back in to" a price.

35 There was discussion on what it would take to proceed. Mr. Stafford asked that the Town Manager be
36 given authority to seek estimates for design and building costs, and authority to negotiate with
37 property owners. The Manager suggested that \$10,000 may be needed to estimate the costs associated
38 with the building. The Selectboard, excepting Mr. Bressor who dissented, agreed but requested that an
39 identification of where this \$10,000 would come from should be brought to the December 19th
40 meeting.

1 Richmond Rescue Budget – Taylor Yeates

2 Taylor Yeates, President of Richmond Rescue, updated the Selectboard on Richmond Rescue’s annual
3 report, statistics, and financial information. The annual contribution from the town was requested to
4 go from \$68,289 to \$70,680. The squad was in great shape and they were implementing paramedicine
5 and getting good results. Their State grant was approved, and the needle exchange was planned to be
6 implemented by January 15, 2017, at the Richmond Rescue building. The Selectboard thanked Mr.
7 Yeates for his work and for all Richmond Rescue does for the community.

8

9 **3. Other Business**

10

11 Appointment of Health Officer

12

13 The Manager explained that for more than a year, Health Officer Wright Preston had asked for the
14 town to find a replacement because he no longer had enough time to devote to the Health Officer
15 position. Recently, Taylor Yeates had expressed an interest in the position. Mr. Preston had
16 submitted his resignation, effective today, and the Manager asked the board to consider Mr. Yeates.

17

18 Mr. Bressor briefly left the room.

19

20 Mr. Hill offered a motion to accept Mr. Preston’s resignation as Health Officer effective December 5,
21 2016 and appoint Mr. Yeates as Health Officer as soon as possible. Mr. May seconded the motion and
22 the motion carried 4-0.

23

24 Mr. Bressor returned.

25

26 FY2018 Budget

27

28 Ms. Kane said that the board needed to decide a limit for the budget, and suggested a two cent increase
29 in the tax rate. The Manager explained that he had sealed budget requests and now the Selectboard
30 needed to consider how to move forward. Overall spending is up by \$135,803 but non-tax revenues
31 have been decreased – yielding a tax increase of \$167,221 or 3.69 cents (5.54%) increase.

32

33 The Selectboard briefly discussed a few items and requested a special budget meeting for December
34 12th at 7:00 pm. Department heads were invited to attend and justify their budget increases.

35

36 Reports from Selectboard and Town Manager

37

38 Reports were briefly discussed.

39

40 Approval of Warrants

41

42 Warrants were reviewed and approved.

43

44 Items for the next agenda were reviewed. The Selectboard requested the Winooski River Bank issue
45 and the advisory question discussions to be on the next agenda. They requested that the only
46 presentation be the Buttermilk discussion.

47

48 **4. Adjourn**

1 Motion by Mr. Sander to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Hill. So voted.