

Notes on Richmond Market: Bryan Currier and Dan Noyes sworn in by Chair. Currier gave an overview of the project, please see October 13 minutes for additional information. Sunshine inquired about truck movements to access the loading docks. Currier responded with the path that trucks would access and maneuver within the parking lot in order to back into the loading dock. Discussion ensued juxtaposing the existing conditions at the current market with the proposed new Richmond Market.

Pedersen inquired about the landscaping proposed. Currier responded by pointing out the revisions based on the conditions of the continuance for the October 13 meeting. Revisions include a proposal for both deciduous and evergreen trees. Sunshine inquired about who is responsible for the replacement of diseased and damaged trees with the response being the owner.

Currier further explained that the refrigeration compressor pad was moved to the south from the north of the building to further reduce potential noise issues associated with the pads to the north of the railroad tracks. The applicant worked with staff to provide comments on the issue, both visually and quantitatively. Discussion on the controlling noise level of 60 dB for one hour with the units, at the property line, having 57 dB max as per the attenuation formula for noise. These are represented with the provided spec sheets. Cedar fence and vegetation is proposed and was not factored into the formula. Discussion on the current conditions with the applicant stating that the units are right on the property line with limited sound attenuation.

Sunshine remarked that the programmable sensor will dim the lighting during off hours to 10% but with motion detectors increasing the lighting back to 100%. Sunshine asked how long will the lighting stay at 100% with the applicant responding for a couple of minutes. Sunshine added that kids on bikes could set off the detectors and the applicant replied that that is the intention. Schnakenberg inquired about the configuration of the lights to ensure minimal impact with the residential units nearest the parking lot. Applicant stated the fixtures are downcast cutoff as per the requirement of the TOR zoning regulations. Schnakenberg further inquired about the intensity for the motion detected lights with the possibility to reduce the lighting percentage, applicant was not sure if the program is capable.

Schnakenberg inquired if the applicant responded to the October public comment letter. Applicant stated that the letter was addressed at the October 13 board meeting with the majority of concerns addressed.

Monks referenced staff notes on the requirement to demonstrate the cost of landscaping as per the TOR SPR regulations. Applicant responded that the DRB has the ability to take into account alternative improvements in lieu of planting costs. With the total cost estimate of 2.5 million, the formula would equate to \$25k for landscaping. The sidewalk extension and the proposed plantings with an estimate of close to \$40k, along with architectural features on the building and the gravel wetlands for stormwater control, meeting this requirement should be considered by the board. Monks responded with the comment that sidewalks and other alternative improvements mentioned are not pertinent to the landscaping requirements. Applicant responded that the site is confined and without any existing landscaping. Sunshine inquired about front landscaping, the applicant responded there are two wetlands to be constructed that will require plantings with one to the front.

Sunshine inquired about town engineering review for KAS, Osborne responded that KAS has no issue with the stormwater as designed and has basically been signed off on. The review was relegated to the Town of Richmond Public Improvement Standards of 2016. The State of Vermont will need to sign off on the permit prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy with said approvals obtained by the applicant.

Public Comment: Alison Anand had concerns on the level of noise from the transformers (compressors). Question was asked on how close the nearest residence was to the “compressors”.

Applicant responded that the nearest residence was approximately 300 feet. Applicant went on to explain how the formula is applied as per the regulations. Anand asked about what the noise would be at the residences and applicant responded the regulations require measurements at the property line only. Monks stated that the residences on the Route 2 side were closer than those on Railroad Ave or about 250 feet. Anand asked if the level of noise would be greater with the existing store as opposed to the proposed. Applicant responded that the existing compressors are subject to town regulations and that they are at the property line as opposed to the proposed which are shielded by the building somewhat, however the proposed compressors are larger.

Virginia Clark, as Planning Commission member, inquired about the stone wetlands. Further comment on the inadequacy of following along with what the applicant is pointing to on the screen. Applicant responded that the wetlands are a type of stormwater treatment practice and not an existing wetland.

Sunshine polled the board on next action.

Board voted to move to deliberative session, so voted.

ZAO Update: Potential applications discussed.

Meeting minutes of October 8, 2021 approve unanimously.

Board voted to come out of deliberative session, so voted.

Decisions rendered on the following application: Richmond Market

Motion to adjourn

Approved unanimously

Adjourn: 8:40 pm

Respectively submitted by K. Osborne 12/13/2021