

Town of Richmond
Development Review Board
Draft Debriefing Notes
Meeting of September 8, 2021

These debriefing notes are considered the minutes of the above dated DRB meeting for the Town of Richmond. The full video of the meeting can be accessed at the following link:

<https://archive.org/search.php?query=MMCTV&sort=-publicdate>

DRB Members

Present: David Sunshine (Chair), Roger Pedersen, Mathew Dyer, David Schnakenberg, Padraic Monks

Excused: Alison Anand (alt)

Staff: Keith Osborne

Others present: Dan Noyes, Brian Currier, Paul O’Leary, Ed Neuert, and MMCTV Live

Meeting opened at 7:02 pm

Applications:

Noyes Properties, LLC – Application Area Variance 2021-01 Applicant requests Lot Coverage relief for a proposed new 18,880 sq. ft. Richmond Market at 160 and 198 Railroad Avenue. Specifically, 60% Lot Coverage is requested where the 50% Lot Coverage requirement of the Village Commercial District is the maximum per §3.5.3d of the Richmond Zoning Regulations.

Motion to go into Deliberative Session (Unanimous)

Motion to Deny A.V.2021-21

Introduced by David Sunshine, seconded by David Schnakenberg

Approve: None

Deny: (Sunshine, Schnakenberg, Pedersen, Monks, Dyer)

Abstain: None

Per DRB: The Board notes a representation in the applicant's submission that Lots 4 and 5 are non-contiguous. Upon review, the Board finds that Lots 4 and 5 are contiguous, because the fee owner of Lots 4 and 5 also owns the fee beneath the private roadway that bisects those lots. Based on the foregoing, the Board urges the applicant to consider whether a merger of lots 4 and 5 will allow the applicant to develop the proposed grocery store in compliance with applicable lot coverage regulations.

Notes/minutes: Chair opened meeting and swore in applicants. Brian Currier explained the project including location, constraints and the need for a new Richmond Market. Applicant is seeking a variance of 10% from the 50% lot coverage requirement of the district.

Chair explained that the DRB will need to go through the criteria of all 5 questions and must find that all 5 questions meet the criteria in order to gain approval.

Applicant started with the unique circumstances of the parcel criteria, questions ensued on the need for 90 parking spaces. Applicant states that is what the people who occupy the space have requested. Chair asks

what amount of spaces would need to be eliminated to reach the 50% criteria, applicant stated about 20-25 spaces.

Applicant continued with the strict conformity of the regulations criteria and talked of Lot 4 of Whistle Stop to help with the lot coverage requirement. Schnakenberg asked about reducing the size of the project to meet the standards, applicant states they would have to start over again.

Pedersen inquired about the unnecessary hardship question and the role that Whistle Stop lane played in the current hardship. Applicant states that Whistle Stop is part of the issue but is not the whole story.

Criteria review continued with Character of the neighborhood discussed. Pedersen inquired if Lot 4 of Whistle Stop could be utilized for parking. Applicant states the lot is not contiguous, has steep slopes and if used would still be required to meet the 50% max. coverage. Dyer asked about having Lot 4 combined with the parent lot to help with the coverage issue and inquired if there is anything in the regulations that states that lots must be contiguous. ZA responded that if they were to become one lot, no problems with the regulations would ensue.

Criteria review continued with character of neighborhood and the applicant stated it is now a lumber storage yard so the character should not be an issue.

Final review of the minimum variance/least deviation from the recommendations ensued.

Public comment: Ed Neuert had some concerns with the refrigeration unit and potential for noise as well the placement of a tree line buffer. Parking lot lighting was also a topic broached. Chair states these concerns will be addressed at the Conditional Use Review meeting.

Hearing was closed and motion to move to deliberative session was unanimous

Email me a Hallelujah if you've read this far.

Approval of July 28, 2021 and August 11, 2021 Minutes

Approved: Unanimously

Denied: None

Abstained: None

Decisions rendered on the following applications: Noyes Properties, LLC

Motion to adjourn

Approved unanimously

Adjourn: 8:21 pm