

**RICHMOND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
 REGULAR MEETING
 APPROVED MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 12, 2014 MEETING**

Members Present: Mike Donohue; Fred Fortune; Anne McLaughlin; Marvin Carpenter (DRB Alternate)

Members Absent: David Sunshine, Chair; Stephen Ackerman, Vice-Chair

Others Present: Cathleen Gent, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB; Ruth Miller, taping for MMCTV Comcast 15; *see attached list*

Motion by Fortune, seconded by McLaughlin, to nominate Carpenter to chair the meeting due to the fact that neither the chair nor vice-chair was present. Voting: 5 In favor: Donohue, Fortune, McLaughlin, Carpenter; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Carpenter called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

1. Zachary Properties of Richmond, LLC (hearing continued) – Application #13-138 for appeal of zoning permit #13-122 to remove barrier and fill, which was issued to John and Shirley Giroux for property located at 24 East Main Street (parcel EM0024). Zachary Properties of Richmond, LLC owns parcel 38 East Main Street (parcel EM0038). Both parcels are in the Village Commercial zoning district.

Gent said she has received emails from the attorneys for Zachary and for Giroux, requesting that the hearing be continued until the DRB May 14th meeting. Motion by Fortune, seconded by Donohue, to continue the hearing until May 14th. Voting: 4 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

2. John Cleary & Gloria Brgant – Application #14-004 for Richmond Zoning Regulations Conditional Use Review for expansion of stone materials/products business (Section 5.6) and second curb cut (Section 4.4) at 198 Governor Peck Road (parcel GP0198) in the Industrial/Commercial zoning district (Section 3.7).

Carpenter swore in Charles Swanson, applicant representative, who reviewed the site plan. Swanson noted the property location (on Governor Peck Road), reviewed the right-of-way limits which were shown along the edge of the road, discussed a boundary adjustment with neighbor Alan Marcelino; and generally discussed the general area of wetland flags, which are outside the parcel, however, the 50-foot buffer is within the parcel. Swanson pointed out the office location and a two-car garage. He discussed the principal access to the property, which is a driveway across a bridge. As part of this application, Swanson said the owners are requesting approval for a second driveway access, namely a 60-foot commercial opening to allow delivery of materials to bins and to allow customer pick up of materials. Swanson noted that a “no-name” brook [and later determined to be called Governor Peck Road tributary] weaves through the parcel. He also said that the sign which was installed after the original site plan approval has not been moved and will not be modified and that there are no plans for exterior lighting. Swanson reviewed the location of a proposed loading zone and a new guardrail that will extend from Summers Street to the original driveway entrance. The reason for the guardrail is to reduce access to the property and to not allow parking along the road. He noted that there is a steep river bank that needs guardrail protection. Swanson said that he has seen school buses pull off and park in the area that will no longer be accessible for public parking. Swanson also discussed that, behind the rail, there will be a path that is wide enough for a small vehicle (bobcat) only to deliver materials to the southern end of the property. There will also be a loading and unloading zone.

Swanson said there are no proposed changes to the two buildings, one of which houses a two bedroom apartment on the second floor in addition to the office and garage. He said there are two parking spaces for equipment and noted the location for five proposed parking spaces – at 9 feet by 18 feet – for customers.

Gent handed out an email from Swanson which included the specific square footage calculations for each impervious area of the parcel. Swanson noted that the lot coverage requirement is met.

1 The DRB asked questions about whether five customer parking spaces is enough. Swanson replied
2 that he thinks five are enough, given that the business often makes deliveries. In response to a
3 question, Swanson said the hours of operation are 7 AM to dark during the peak season and earlier
4 during other times of the year. McLaughlin asked about the guardrail materials. Swanson said they will
5 be constructed to a highway standard, since the guardrails are in the town road right-of-way.
6

7 McLaughlin said that, as the DRB liaison, she did the site visit with Gent and she observed the area
8 where the guardrail will be, the second access, and the new parking spaces. She said it is difficult to
9 park there now and that the guardrail will improve road safety. She noted that there is a narrow
10 opening between the stream bank and the new guardrail and that trail might be used by the public.
11 Carpenter asked about the general percentage of business by phone versus on-site customers.
12 Swanson said often phone orders are placed and the equipment is loaded and then leaves the
13 property, noting that very few people stop in as customers.
14

15 The DRB asked if the parking spaces were going to be marked in some way and Swanson said that
16 they would not because the parking area is gravel. The DRB asked about deliveries to the parcel and
17 Swanson replied that deliveries are usually once a week and less often with the larger stone.
18 Swanson acknowledged that the business has increased significantly since it was approved in 1998.
19 He noted that there is enough room for the business but the owners have to get it organized to make
20 the operation work better.
21

22 Swanson and the DRB discussed the flooding that has occurred there in recent years. Swanson said
23 the gravel is better than a hard surface in the event of a flood and asked for a waiver on behalf of the
24 applicants from having to install concrete or asphalt for parking or the driveways.
25

26 Fortune asked about whether any landscape screening is proposed. Swanson said they did not think
27 screening was needed, given the location. He said they could do some type of stone wall. McLaughlin
28 said screening along the road would eliminate room for the trail for the small vehicle (bobcat).
29 Carpenter noted that the DRB must approve the second curb cut as a conditional use.
30

31 There was no public comment.
32

33 Motion by Fortune, seconded by Donohue, to close the public hearing for application #14-004. Voting:
34 4 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.
35

36 Marcelino left at that time.
37

38 3. Other Business

39 A. Cochran Ski Area – Clarification of DRB decision for application #13-077 regarding parking for year- 40 round use

41 Joshua Diamond introduced himself and said he was attending on behalf of the Cochran Family LLC
42 and the Cochran Ski Area. He referenced the DRB decision for application #13-077 with two parts of
43 the decision that are ambiguous to the owner and ski area, namely the parking capacity limitations with
44 respect to parking, not the number of persons on site during non-ski season and direction about how to
45 make the parking work without valet parking. The DRB discussed the questions briefly, but asked
46 Diamond to attend the March 12th meeting for further discussion.
47

48 B. Jean and Gary Bressor – Subdivision Sketch Plan Review: 69 Thompson Road

49 Gent said that the Bressors have requested that the DRB postpone this item until the March 12th
50 meeting. The DRB members agreed to that request.
51

52 C. Meeting Minutes: January 8, 2014

53 The DRB offered one edit to the minutes. Motion by Fortune, seconded by Donohue, to accept the
54 minutes as amended. Voting: 3 in favor (Donohue, Fortune, McLaughlin); 0 opposed; 1 abstention
55 (Carpenter).
56

57 D. Mail – Letter from Andrews Family and Town Response

58 Gent explained the request for a technical review fee refund. There was no discussion.
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

4. Deliberative Session

At 7:45 PM, motion by Fortune, seconded by McLaughlin, to enter deliberative session for application #14-004 (Cleary/Brgant). So voted.

5. DRB Action

Motion by McLaughlin, seconded by Fortune, to approve application #14-004 (Cleary/Brgant) with conditions. Voting: 4 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

The DRB briefly discussed the Cochran request for clarification. Gent said that the DRB decision included a condition that the applicants present a new proposed format for annual ski volume information and for non-ski season use and parking volume. She said the condition specifies that the Town Planner/Staff to the DRB will review and modify, as needed, the proposed format and then the DRB makes the final approval of the tables. The DRB members asked Gent to request that Cochran's provide the new proposed formats during the March DRB meeting.

6. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:25 PM, Fortune made a motion, seconded by Donohue, to adjourn the meeting. So voted.

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