



Town of Richmond
Planning & Zoning Office
P.O. Box 285
Richmond, VT 05477
www.richmondvt.gov

Richmond Development Review Board

February 12, 2026, Meeting Minutes

DRB Members Present: David Sunshine (Chair), Matt Dyer (Vice Chair), Padraic Monks, Matt Parisi, & Robert DiPalma.

DRB Members Absent: N/A.

Staff: Danté DeNault (Zoning Administrator & E911 Coordinator).

Public Attendance: Alan Oliver (58 Browns Court), Toby & Brenda Buxton (1908 Hillview Drive), Andrew Mannix (Item Three Co-Applicant) (105 Hidden Pines Drive), Nate Malley (Item Three Co-Applicant, 269 Sycamore Street, Shelburne, VT 05482), Betsy Hardy (341 Jericho Road, P.O. Box 209), Martha Nye (Browns Court), Paula Kelley, Rachel Gray, Angelike Contis, Ryan Diehl (Item One Applicant), Judy Rosovsky, Danielle Morin (113 Pleasant Street, Unit 2), Bonnie Morin (142 Mountain View Road), Tom Safford, Chelsye & Trevor Brooks (1364 Jericho Road), Jason Osterman (103 Pleasant Street), & MMCTV Erin Wagg.

Start Time: ~7:01 p.m. (note: the timestamps below correspond to the Zoom recording).¹

Summary

Agenda Item # 1: SP2026-001, Vermont Land Trust, Parcel ID: BR0226

- Applicant Vermont Land Trust, represented by Facilities Director Ryan Diehl, presented opening remarks on the proposed site plan amendments to repair and renovate the second floor of an existing accessory structure at 226 Bridge Street for converted use as an infrequent meeting space for organizational wide conferences.
 - o The existing space to be converted is located above the detached accessory garage.
 - Formerly, the space was used as an ADU.
 - Presently, no ADU exists and the space has been unoccupied since Covid.
 - o Light modifications are planned, meaning HVAC upgrades, addition of one parking space, and driveway fortifications for drainage.
 - Applicant does not anticipate that planned fortifications will have a negative impact on the existing rows of mature trees which sit along the property line.
 - Applicant committed to replacing any existing landscaping that does not survive the site work.

¹ Zoom Recording Link:

https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/7rZHvAzyMP29K9SndX_xsNMISXx2z1W2ev7ka-f-0MOWIXbi_oZom27QImePdvt.ywttwkrGR515qTMM?startTime=1770853532000. Passcode: 8GaxK?Pp.

- No additional landscaping is otherwise planned.
 - The DRB agreed not to impose any additional landscaping requirements besides replacing any landscaping that does not survive.
 - While the project is located within the Flood Hazard Overlay District, Applicant will not be amending or modifying any existing structural space.
- Applicant sought a waiver from the hard surface parking requirement.
 - After brief discussion, including the fact that most of the surrounding neighborhood driveways are gravel driveways, the DRB agreed to grant the waiver sought.
- **Conclusion.** This application, SP2026-001, is approved with the following conditions:
 - **[1] Applicant shall replace any landscaping that gets injured by the drainage work.**

Agenda Item # 2: SK2026-008, Lands of Copp/Weaver & Downer, Parcel ID: HV1950

- On February 11, 2026, Applicant's engineer requested that this hearing item be rescheduled to the next available DRB meeting.
 - The DRB agreed, and rescheduled this sketch plan review (SK2026-008) to the DRB's next available meeting on March 11, 2026, at 7:00 PM.

Agenda Item # 3: PS2026-001, Trunk Beach, LLC, Parcel ID: BC0030

- Applicant Tunk Beach, LLC, co-represented by owners Nate Malley and Andrew Mannix, presented opening remarks on preliminary plans to subdivide 30 Browns Court, an existing 0.47-acre parcel into two (2) parcels of 0.23 acres (Lot 1) and 0.24 acres (Lot 2). Applicant's engineer was unavailable to attend this hearing due to a personal conflict.
 - Lot 1 will get a new relocated driveway.
 - Lot 2 will get a six-bedroom duplex and a shared driveway.
- Staff Notes indicated that an existing basement bulkhead fell within the 10-foot setbacks for the proposed shared side boundary line, as such, it was recommended that the lot lines be redrawn.
 - Applicant mentioned that removing the bulkhead was also a possibility to cure the side setback violation.
 - Applicant further inquired about getting a variance from the side setback requirement.
 - The DRB warned that granting a variance for the bulkhead in the side setback would not withstand scrutiny, as it did not pan out in a past case with similar facts.
- DRB member DiPalma inquired about the clearing limits.
 - Applicant explained where the existing tree line would be cut back, noting that the clearing limits are denoted in green on the submitted plans.

- Neighbor Alan Oliver (88 Browns Court) raised some questions and concerns about the development.
 - o Oliver explained that he would like to see more single-family dwelling units created.
 - Applicant explained that even though the zoning district allows for up to four dwelling units, that only two are planned with this subdivision.
 - o Oliver further noted concerns had on residential parking backing up onto the Street, especially because of the Street's narrow size.
 - Applicant noted that the driveway of the proposed duplex will serve a minimum of three cars per unit, one in the garage and two in the driveway.
 - o Oliver sought assurances that the duplex rental will not turn into short-term housing.
 - Applicant expressed intent to rent duplex units' out long term.
 - o Oliver ended his comments by stating that this development is changing the nature of the neighborhood.
- Chair Sunshine asked about storage space for tenants.
 - o Applicant explained that there will be a full, unfinished basement for tenant storage in each of the dwelling units.
- DRB member Monks inquired about Applicant's drainage plan.
 - o Applicant noted that a swale type system will exist between the two parcels, as well as fill brought to control onsite erosion.
 - o Applicant's engineer noted that there is no stormwater system on Browns Court, and that the land has a flat trajectory.
 - Applicant explained that, because the existing land to be developed is lower than the Town Road, that runoff onto Town property will be controlled.
 - Fill will be needed to make the foundation at a reasonable height.
- Neighbor Martha Nye (Browns Court resident) brought the conversation back to parking.
 - o Nye asked if the parking garage will be detached.
 - Applicant affirmed that there will be an attached garage and shared driveway.
 - o Nye asked how many cars can fit into the respective garages.
 - Applicant explained that one car per unit will fit into its respective garages; moreover, the shared driveway will support an additional two cars per unit, for a total of six spots for the duplex.
 - o Nye expressed concern that a parking buildup could spill off Browns Court and over onto Jericho Road.
 - Applicant and Staff noted that the Fire Department reviewed Applicant's plans and gave the preliminary OK.
 - The Highway Department has NOT reviewed Applicant's plans yet.
 - o Applicant's engineer counted the number of units on Browns Court and determined that roughly 20 or so units could be built through the neighborhood before any egress or additional in or out would be needed.

- Nye explained that the parking buildup was not from the baseball games as Sunshine suggested, but more so for school events like graduation.
- Neighbor Betsy Hardy (341 Jericho Road) was curious if the duplex will face Browns Court.
 - Applicant confirmed that yes, the duplex will face Browns Court and have a shared driveway.
- DRB member Monks expressed interest in seeing drainage and landscaping plans in the final subdivision review.
- The DRB voted unanimously to go into deliberative session.
- **Conclusion.** This application, PS2026-001, is approved with the following conditions:
 - **[1] Applicant shall provide a (1) planting plan, (2) drainage plan, and (3) outdoor lighting plan.**
 - **[1.1] Planting plans shall follow Section 640 of the Richmond Subdivision Regulations.**
 - **[1.2] Drainage plans shall follow Section 650 of the Richmond Subdivision Regulations, and**
 - **[1.3] Outdoor lighting plans shall follow Section 630 of the Richmond Subdivision Regulations by conforming to Section 4.10 of the Richmond Zoning Regulations, specifically Section 4.10.2 (General Requirements).**
 - **[2] Applicant shall either move the shared side boundary line or remove the basement bulkhead to comply with the ten (10) foot side setback requirement.**
 - **If the shared side boundary is moved, please also provide an updated draft Warranty Deed accounting for the moved lot lines.**
 - **If instead the bulkhead is removed and the shared side boundary remains unchanged, no updates to the Warranty Deed are needed.**

Agenda Item # 4: CR2026-001, Trew Stone, LLC, Parcel ID: RG0088

- Applicant Trew Stone, LLC, co-represented by Director of Environmental Engineering Adam Feldman (Allstate Materials Group) and Project Engineer Evan Fitzgerald (Fitzgerald Environmental), presented opening remarks on their conditional use application to expand storage and laydown areas at 88 Rogers Lane, including enhancements to existing landscaping and screening.
 - Fitzgerald walked through the proposed site plan, remarking on the areas to be (a) reverted back to pervious conditions, (b) captured in after-the-fact approval, and (c) expanded into.
 - It was confirmed that there are no imminent or long-term plans to expand any buildings or accommodate new employees. Further, no additional traffic demand is expected.
- DRB Chair Sunshine asked for clarification on what the storage area entails.

- Fitzgerald and Feldman clarified that it is a storage area for materials and equipment. Typical materials and equipment include drainage structures, pipe, landscaping equipment, trees, and pallets of stone.
 - Feldman further clarified that no fill, temporary or permanent, is placed onsite.
- Applicants confirmed that onsite wetlands were recently delineated and determined by the State's Wetlands Ecologist to not need a Wetlands Permit.
- Fitzgerald explained that the decommissioned area and added screening are apart of Act 250 compliance, of which the Applicant's are actively working on getting an amended permit too.
 - Applicant also plans to apply for and obtain an operational stormwater permit and a construction general permit.
- Additional screening enhancements were added to the eastern property line to fill in gaps in existing screening.
- No net loss to flood water storage is planned with this site expansion.
- The DRB voted unanimously to go into deliberative session.
- **Conclusion.** This application, CR2026-001, is approved as presented.
 - Applicant shall obtain all necessary Town, State, and Federal permits.

Agenda Item # 5: CR2026-002, Matthew "Matt" Parisi, Parcel ID: EM0112

- DRB member Parisi recused himself prior to the hearing on this Agenda Item (# 5) for having a conflict of interest as the Applicant.
- Applicant Matt Parisi presented opening remarks on his proposal to modify an existing building restraint at 112 East Main Street.
 - On February 21, 2025, Applicant received DRB approval to build a PUD at 112 East Main Street. Unit 1 was for a pre-existing duplex, Unit 2 was for a planned single-family home, and Unit 3 was reserved as common land.
 - Applicant seeks DRB approval to modify the common land reservation, removing the building restraint off Unit 3 and onto a newly created Unit 4, a common parking area.
 - Also planned is additional fencing, two new parking spaces, and a snow removal area, necessitating the need to remove existing lilac.
 - Drainage plans include a new, larger drywell and gutters. Three drywells in total will exist. One existing drywell will be downsized. The other existing drywell will remain unchanged.
 - Applicant explained that the existing dry wells work most of the time, unless a four-inch rainstorm comes through.
 - Applicant also expressed that the water run-off from Route Two contributes to the problem.
- Applicant confirmed that the planned ADU would likely be a rental unit.

- Utilities will not be separate from the single-family dwelling (a/k/a 114 East Main Street).
- Applicant explained that while this proposal has not yet been voted on by the homeowners, he controls the votes and expects the association to approve the proposed changes.
 - At this time, approval from the homeowners association has not been granted.
- Neighbor Danielle Morin (113 Pleasant Street, Unit 2), speaking on behalf of herself and her mother, Bonnie Morin (142 Mountain View Road), requested that existing water concerns be addressed.
 - D. Morin explained the history of the neighborhood. She spoke about how her family once owned the land that is proposed for development, and how the Town in the past would not let development occur there because of the drainage issues from 112 East Main Street and Route Two.
 - When Applicant built the single-family home at 114 East Main Street, stormwater management was not included in the initial plans. The drywells were added after-the-fact.
 - Applicant affirmed that the drywells were put in place after approval was obtained.
 - Applicant further explained that the drainage issues existed before the single-family house at 114 East Main Street was built.
 - D. Morin further stated that the downslope neighbors, including herself, have experienced increased basement flooding. She reiterated that this problem is not new to the last three years, it has been a known problem for well over 43 years.
 - The unique typography and grade of the neighborhood was discussed, including conversations about what surrounding buildings have been previously raised with added fill and the persistent problem of water flowing off Route Two.
- Neighbor Jason Osterman (103 Pleasant Street) spoke about his concerns with increased water runoff from development at both D. Morin's and Applicant's respective properties.
 - Over the last 10 years, Osterman has seen the flooding into his basement increase, particularly after the surrounding development occurred.
 - Osterman is not willing to accept any additional water on his property.
 - Osterman requested assurances that all water is going someplace else and being accounted for with any additional development.
 - Applicant noted that additional grading could be avoided on this project.
- Neighbor Chelsye Brooks (1364 Jericho Road) asked a few questions on stormwater management.
 - C. Brooks asked about the size and depth of the existing dry wells in relation to the downsized drywell.
 - Applicant explained that the current drywell is a bit too small, and needs to be expanded, hence the downsizing and placement of a new third drywell.
 - C. Brooks also asked if Applicant considered pervious pavers for the driveway.

- Applicant explained that because the existing driveway already has good drainage, that pervious pavers are not necessarily needed.
- The DRB voted unanimously to go into deliberative session.
- **Conclusion.** This application, CR2026-002, is continued to the next DRB meeting on March 11, 2026, at 7:00 PM, with the following conditions:
 - [1] Applicant shall submit an Engineer's Certification that all pre- and post-development peak flows for stormwater runoff, excluding off-site run-on (like from Route Two), are being handled on the property, and
 - [2] Applicant shall provide an updated draft of the Declaration of Covenants, Easements, Restrictions, and Liens.

VIDEO TRANSCRIPT

(note: the timestamps below correspond to the Zoom recording).²

DeNault 00:05

Thanks, Erin. Everyone, it's just past seven o'clock. We had a one cancellation tonight. Item Two. That's 1950 Hillview, that's going to be rescheduled for next month's DRB meeting. If you're here for that Item, you might want to consider signing off. It is 7:01. We have an active chat. We have a full DRB board here tonight. David, we are ready to go whenever you are set.

Sunshine 00:37

Welcome everybody to the February meeting of the Development Review Board. For those who are out here in the audience, if you would, if you haven't signed in, please do on the list at the door. And for anybody remotely tuning in, you need to leave your name and address--do you want, Dante?

DeNault 01:02

Yup.

Sunshine 01:05

Ok. We have a number of hearings this evening and so we'll try to work our way through if we get lengthy on one, we may have to continue it so we can make it through the agenda before it gets too late.

And by signing in, you're here. And also, if you wish to attain status as a interested party, which would give you the ability to appeal a decision of the Board or no decision that we may make, then you need to offer testimony in either writing or orally.

So the first matter on the agenda is the Vermont Land Trust. They seek site plan approval to repair and renovate the second floor of an existing accessory structure at 266 Bridge Street for converted use as an infrequent medium, meeting space. This is SP2026-001, and who's going to speak for the Land Trust?

² Zoom Recording Link:

https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/7rZHvAzyMP29K9SndX_xsNMISXx2z1W2ev7ka-f-0MOWIXbi_oZom27QImePdvct.ywttwkrGR515qTMM?startTime=1770853532000. Passcode: 8GaxK?Pp.

DeNault 02:26

We have the facilities director, Ryan Diehl, on, online with us today.

Sunshine 02:31

Ryan, can I swear you in? Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but truth?

Diehl 02:37

Yes, sir.

Sunshine 02:38

Okay. Is there anybody on the Board that feels that they have a conflict with this matter?

Dyer, Monks, Parisi, DiPalma, and Sunshine 02:48

No. I do not. Neither do I. Not here. Nor me.

Sunshine 02:49

Okay, whatcha got in mind for us?

Diehl 02:54

Just real quickly correct that to 226, not 260 Bridge Street.

Sunshine 03:01

Oh, okay, we'll correct our Agenda.

Diehl 03:07

Yeah, just wanted to be specific. Outside of the packet that's in front of you, we're requesting slight alteration to an existing space to be able to utilize it for infrequent conference capabilities for the organization. We have submitted all the requisite materials if you've been able to review them. I would prefer not to go line by line, but I am here for any questions or clarifications as per the scope and scale of the project.

Sunshine 03:38

Okay, why don't you just explain what needs to be done to your property to achieve what you're trying to do.

Diehl 03:47

There is an existing space above our garage units that at one point in time was, to my knowledge, utilized as an ADU to, for the previous property owner, and we're respectfully requesting to do light modifications to that space, meaning some upgrades to the HVAC, adding a parking space, and fortifying the driveway and drainage such that we are able to execute organization wide conference meetings periodically throughout the year.

Sunshine 04:30

Okay. And so it's not going to require you to increase any space that you have, is that correct?

Diehl 04:41

We are not amending or modifying any of the structural space that we have. It's existing.

Sunshine 04:50

And you have modified your parking plan to allow for this?

Diehl 04:55

Correct. Yep. All of that information has been submitted with our Site Plan and code compliance review.

Sunshine 05:03

Does the Board have any questions?

Monks 05:07

Yes, sure. The Staff Notes indicate that might be advisable to have some landscaping. Curious. Your thoughts on that? I'm not entirely sure where it would go. Just, yeah, your reactions to that as to whether it would be helpful for screening the view of this site.

Diehl 05:31

Yeah, we're certainly, you know, open to, you know, modifying the existing landscaping. There is some pretty significant screening with the existing cedar trees that are in place. We would hope that the drainage work does not damage those trees in any way, shape or form. Our landscaping master plan for the property would not dramatically change with this. It's simply a resurfacing of the existing driveway and improving the drainage they're in, as we put in one additional parking space to accommodate increased use. I don't have, I don't have a larger landscaping master plan outside of that, but we're open to suggestions.

Sunshine 06:19

So have you gotten from your site people, any thoughts on whether the site work you're going to do, as far as drainage goes, is going to have any effect on the existing landscaping?

Diehl 06:31

Yeah, we're hopeful that, we're hopeful that it doesn't negatively impact the existing rows of like mature cedar trees that sit along the property and along the driveway border, right near the fence. Those are important to us, and we're hopeful that we are going to execute this in a manner that doesn't impact those outside of that our landscaping plans haven't changed dramatically with this permitting packet.

Sunshine 07:04

Are you willing to commit to replacing any existing landscaping that does not survive your site work?

Diehl 07:15

Certainly.

Sunshine 07:23

Okay, any other questions from the Board? Any questions from anybody, either here or remotely?

DiPalma 07:29

I'd like to know what Staff thinks might be a possible location for additional screening.

DeNault 07:38

As I understand it, there is a one family dwelling in that front principal structure. And so the landscaping requirement was to if, if needed, it was for that middle ground, that backyard, that so called backyard space between the, those back parking areas and that front principal structure.

DiPalma 07:59

So the landscaping would be behind the building?

DeNault 08:00

Potentially, yes.

Sunshine 08:02

Pretty, pretty decent, large yard back there.

Parisi 08:11

So, both buildings are owned by the Land Trust, correct?

Diehl 08:15

Correct.

Parisi 08:18

Primary used for office space, or is there also, and somebody also live there?

Diehl 08:25

There's an ADU in the back that has a residential tenant that we inherited from our previous or, from the previous owner.

DeNault 08:33

And Ryan, is that ADU, is that ADU is being changed--converted with this project. It is

Diehl 08:38

It is not. Nope. This is the space above the garage. This is an entirely separate structure that I believe was utilized as an ADU in previous iterations of this property such that we don't need to change, there's no need for structural changes or remodeling of any sort. We're simply taking an existing space and just hopeful that we can utilize it as an organization for larger conference room meetings that can hold more than 10 people, which is an organizational need.

Sunshine 09:09

So it's not being used as an ADU at this at this moment?

Diehl 09:13

It's been unused since Covid. Correct.

Sunshine 09:19

Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? No? Audience? Anything else from the Applicant?

Diehl 09:27

We're appreciative of the time, attention and energy. Thank you for considering

DeNault 09:32

Okay, does the DRB have to talk about the waiver?

Sunshine 09:36

Yes.

DeNault 09:38

Ryan, would you like to speak about the one waiver request to the hard surface parking requirement?

Diehl 09:45

Yeah, certainly. We were hopeful to achieve a waiver there wherein, like the current driveway and the parking spaces behind that facility are impermeable in terms of their gravel, but they are compacted gravel. I know that there is, there are differing viewpoints, as per the impermeability of that, but we're hopeful that with the existence of public parking directly across the street at the facility that you guys are located at this evening, and the current conditions there, we would be able to waive the requirement to pave any of that surface in hopes that we could kind of help to alleviate, you know, any stormwater issues that might arise from increased runoff from additional pavement that might not be necessary given the size, scope, and scale of the request.

Sunshine 10:44

Okay. There's nothing further, and no one else, any other input or questions. I would entertain a motion. What would the Board like to do?

DiPalma 10:56

Yeah, I make a motion to approve, approve the application to not require any additional landscaping and to waive the hardscaping requirement for the driveway. I would, I would note on that last point that if you look at the neighborhood, all the driveways are all gravel driveways.

Sunshine 11:17

Would you add to that? They'll commit to put, replace any landscaping that gets injured by the drainage work,

DiPalma 11:25

I accept that amendment. Yep.

Sunshine 11:28

Do I have a second?

Parisi 11:31

Aye.

Sunshine 11:32

All in favor?

[collective, unanimous aye's from all five presiding DRB members].

Sunshine 11:34

Well, thank you very much. We have 90 days, or 45 days, to make a decision, and I'm sure we'll do it or to give you a written decision, and I'm sure we'll do it much sooner than that. And appreciate your time.

Diehl 11:48

Thank you for the consideration and your time.

Sunshine 11:51

Thank you.... Okay, next on the agenda, we're skipping number two, which has been withdrawn. Number Three is PS2026-001, Trunk Beach LLC, they seek preliminary approval to subdivide 30 Browns Court, which is an existing 0.47 acre parcel into two parcels of 0.23 acres (lot one) and 0.24 acres (lot two). Lot one will get a new relocated driveway. Lot two will get a six bedroom duplex and shared driveway. Who's going to speak for the Applicant?

Mannix 12:28

I will.

Sunshine 12:30

And you are?

Mannix 12:32

Andrew Mannix, one of the owners,

Sunshine 12:35

Okay.

Malley 12:36

And Nate Malley, the other owner.

Mannix 12:38

Our engineer is not here. He was the engineer from number two. But we decided to come on our own behalf. So our engineer is not here. So if there's any loaded questions, we may not be able to answer them without his assistance.

Sunshine 12:49

We'll try to get those loaded questions right away.

Sunshine 12:54

Let me swear you in. Do you swear for him to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but truth?

Mannix 12:57

Yes, I do.

Malley 12:58

I do.

Sunshine 13:00

And is there any on the anybody on the Board that would have a conflict with this application?

[collective, unanimous no's from the full five-member Board.]

Okay, why don't you tell us what you have in mind?

Mannix 13:11

Well, we bought this residence in the May of last year. It's offset to the right property. Pretty simple to draw a line in the middle of the parcel to subdivide meets all local zoning regs. From what I can tell from density and lot coverage and setbacks, our engineer put together a sketch design that you should have that lays out where the proposed dwelling is. We were notified through notes, there's one question about the existing bulkhead and how that might be handled. We're not, we didn't get a clear answer. Sounds like it the might be qualified as part of the structure, so we're seeking clarity on that today, and outside of that, everything seems pretty straightforward for us.

We do have all of our State permits in hand. We thought we were able to do a simple subdivision. We were told by the Town we could, but three or four months later, we were told that wasn't the case. So we did go ahead and obtain wastewater permits and all those good pieces from the State of Vermont.

Sunshine 14:08

Yep, the State's probably going to want that from you.

Mannix 14:10

Yes, yeah, I have it.

Sunshine 14:19

And if, if I'm correct, this is adjacent to our new paddle ball courts?

Mannix 14:23

Yes, yep, to the right.

Sunshine 14:26

So we might want to talk about some sound deadening.

Mannix 14:29

I'm not too concerned about sound. I think it's actually a value added.

Sunshine 14:32

No, you're not, but your tenants may be.

Mannix 14:35

I think it's a value add for the tenants most likely. But we're happy to consider, it's relatively a large distance away, and we have current tenants in the property now that enjoyed and use the facility and have no objections. Because there is an existing dwelling that is rented.

Sunshine 14:52

Right? Any questions from the Board?

Dyer 14:56

Yeah.... So if you, if it does turn out, which I don't know one way or another that you would have to redraw that line, is that still going to work for you?

Mannix 15:13

Yeah, from what I understand, because neither parcel is up against the fence from a lot size. There's .02 or .03 acres to give either way. It's not ideal, because it's a pretty clean cut straight line. Other options for us is to remove the bulkhead, which wouldn't be too challenging, just a money thing. It's nice to have a bulkhead to be able to load things in and out of a basement. That is an option that would be at our disposal as well if we decided not to do a lot line adjustment, if that's what you guys were required, or if there's a variance, I don't know how variances work. If that's something that I just don't know the definition of.

Sunshine 15:46

I know that in the past, we've come across that same issue of a bulkhead being into the, interfering with the setback. And in that one, it was many years ago, we approved a variance, and it got appealed and got settled against it. So, I would say you may not be able to get a variance. You might want to make it simple by moving the line, but, and your line doesn't necessarily have to be straight true. Could be just a butt out, which is what ended up with that other property.

Mannix 16:25

I see.

Dyer 16:26

Right, you could keep the driveway on that property, get to the back of the driveway and then jet, you know, jog around it that way.... Not that we're giving you advice.

Sunshine 16:42

Any other thoughts from them or questions from the Board?

DiPalma 16:45

I'm just looking at a photograph. I don't know if it's current. It looks like there's a row of trees that separates Lot Two from the Town property. Is that? Is it, is that tree line still there?

Mannix 16:59

Yes, and our site plan does notate the trees that will be removed through that.

Dyer 17:04

So there will still be some trees. Just, yeah, we want

Mannix 17:09

Yeah, we want there to be vegetation between the two parcels. So, if, there's some extremely large white pines, or maybe not white pines, but pines that don't look very healthy, that are through there. There's also undergrowth on either side of those pines, but the pines are poorly maintained through that corridor towards the back. They run all the way in a straight line towards the very back, and there's a lot of just ragweed that's grown up. I'd rather have something more attractive there, that would provide a better visual buffer between the two parcels, because right now it looks like a mess.

DiPalma 17:40

See, all right, I was looking at the wrong site plan, sorry.

Mannix 17:56

And I know in the very like to the very bottom left, the other property owner on the other side of the drive, I think the Town or the owner had to put in four or five small they're about three feet tall. I'd prefer to have something bigger and better than that. That's not very doesn't seem to do much justice right there.

DiPalma 18:12

But am I reading this correctly? That the existing tree line will be cut back to the green line? Is that?

Mannix 18:20

Minimum, yes, yeah, that we don't want trees in the house, so that's where the structure would be, there those, yeah.

Sunshine 18:40

Any other questions from the board?

Sunshine 18:44

Any questions from the public?

Yes, sir.

Oliver 18:48

Yes. Name is Alan Oliver, and I live at 88 Browns Court, property owner of 88 Browns Court.

I recognize that this is infill, following the encouragement by the State to provide housing. I don't object to that in principle. My objection to this is that it's a duplex on less than a quarter acre of land. And I know there's, as a developer, you must have some issues with how much you can do, or becomes flat, or unprofitable.

Mannix 19:22

Yeah, we consider four units is what zoning allows, and we decided not to do four units. Duplex was a better number. That would be more attractive.

Oliver 19:33

I think more single family.

Mannix 19:37

Unfortunately infill housing is tough to accomplish with only single-family housing. You're taking a piece of land that's very desirable, that can support up to four households, and only allowing one to have the benefit.

I'd like to do three or four really, but it just wouldn't. The site's not big enough for it.

Oliver 19:52

You'd like to do three or four. I'd love to see one.

But the other issues that I wonder about is parking. I understand. Well, I see that there's a garage for each unit, and the setback from the Road is what's required. I'm concerned that if there are more people, have guests, or have more than one vehicle per unit, where are they going to park? I don't...

Mannix 20:20

I don't know, but I do believe it, it meets the Town zoning for that lot. I don't know where they're going to park or how that will be handled, but the lot would be wide enough, I would think, to have in the minimum of three cars per unit, so six vehicles parked in the driveway. And I do believe it meets the requirement for parking.

Oliver 20:36

I just don't want to see parking back out onto the Street, because it's a narrow Street to begin with, and I also like some assurance that this is not going to turn into short-term housing along the lines of Airbnb with that type of housing.

Mannix 20:52

I intend to rent them long term.

Oliver 20:57

Good.

Sunshine 20:59

So that one of the issues that come up with some of these smaller dwellings like you're proposing, is lack of storage space for the tenants to put bikes, kayaks, and snow tires.

Mannix 21:12

There'll be a full unfinished basement.

Sunshine 21:14

There will be okay, good answer.

I'm sorry, did I cut you off?

Oliver 21:22

The only other comment I have is, this is changing the nature of the neighborhood. But that's, that's what I have to say. Thanks.

Sunshine 21:36

Thank you. Anybody else, is there anybody in the audience? Oh.

Monks 21:39

Yeah, the Staff Notes, and you know, note requirement to have a drainage plan.

Mannix 21:47

Yes. So, Brian, who was unable to join us tonight, Currier, the engineer from O'Leary & Burke, said that there would be definitely fill that's brought to control site erosion, as well as the property itself. He noted there's no stormwater system on Browns Court, and noted that it's a really flat trajectory through there, and not aware of any current issues in any site work that he's done in any other parcels.

He can answer questions pertaining to that, but I can't really get into the engineering factors behind it, but that was on his radar as well as the builder. But there's nowhere to tie into so there was going to be like swale type functionality between the two parcels, of course, to keep runoff controlled, and then it's a qualified construction crew to manage like the during progress site work, but there would be some fill that would be needed to control that erosion,

Sunshine 22:35

And that would control any runoff onto the Town property?

Mannix 22:41

Town property, yeah, there's actually a small--it's not level between where our build site would be and the Town--we're actually lower. We're like in a dip. And the other existing structure is higher up as well. So they would actually need fill to make the foundation just at a reasonable height, either way, based on the swale right there.

Sunshine 23:03

Good.

Parisi 23:03

That brings up a good point. I run that route often, so I see what you're talking about. That new lot is going to, is significantly lower than the existing home.

Mannix 23:12

I wouldn't, well, it's lower as in they brought fill in to build the driveway where it is.

Parisi 23:19

Sure, are you, but you're going to have to some way, elevate the structure.

Mannix 23:25

We will move the driveway.... So the current driveway will get moved. That's going to get graded out, and then that fill, that Earth there will level the ground, and they'll have fill there to, they talked about bringing the foundation up to the same height as the other, but it would be very silly to do. So they wanted to bring it lower than the property to the right. It's not going to be the same height of the foundation if that makes sense.

DeNault 23:55

And we do have a comment from Martha online. She's raised her hand, Martha, if you want to unmute yourself.

Nye 24:04

Okay, yes, I think the question has been raised, at least from the audience, but I still want to go back and talk a little bit about it, and that is the issue of parking. I heard something about the it's not up to the owner to put in the parking the driveway. Is that true that the garage will be separate from all of this?

Mannix 24:28

No, there's an attached garage, okay?

Nye 24:33

Okay. And that will, how many cars will go into that attached garage?

Mannix 24:37

There'll be one per unit, with a driveway that'll support an additional two cars per unit, so there will be six spots.

Nye 24:45

So there will be space for six cars or six. Yeah. Okay, okay. And this may not appeal or be part of the planning, but one of the issues with Browns Court is the traffic that, with additional housing, is going to go out into Jericho Road. And is that part of your concerns, or is that just my own concern?

Mannix 25:13

I believe the Fire Department did a preliminary review of any safety hazards, and they said there was no issues with it.

Nye 25:19

Okay. Is that before you put out your plan?

Mannix 25:22

After, they reviewed the plan.

Nye 25:23

After, okay, okay.

Sunshine 25:27

Who gave that opinion?

DeNault 25:29

That was a informal conversation I had with the Fire Department Martha. I chatted with Jerry and showed him the plans once the application was out. Hence why it was informal.

Sunshine 25:36

Has the Road Commissioner been approached on that question?

DeNault 25:42

Highway has not been.

Mannix 25:42

Brian Currier, with O'Leary Burke, counted the number of units and said there's roughly 20 that could be built through that neighborhood before any egress or additional in or out would be needed. He said there's plenty of opportunity for growth there before they'll need to add more roads or more ways in and out. That was an initial concern of his before he even took us on as clients.

Nye 26:03

Okay, okay,

Sunshine 26:07

Does, I guess I'm wondering, how would that be affected by, does that include the potential traffic for the paddle bowl courts?

Mannix 26:18

Yeah, I would raise that as a comment that if we can't add units there, the Town shouldn't have, you know, big events happening at a ball field, that would seem like it would be counter--that would cause an issue as well, especially those events wrap up during like peak commute hours, when we're talking about baseball games at a softball field or practice there, or any community events that will occur at the park that must increase traffic as well. So I don't know that adding homesteads for folks will have the same impact that increased town activities at the park would.

Sunshine 26:46

Martha, what kind of traffic problems happen when the baseball, when there's baseball games?

Nye 26:53

There, there isn't that much from that. But what happens is that this space is used by parents to drop their kids off, and they walk up to school--sometimes there's a lot of traffic for events like, who knows graduation. Adults come over there to play games, but it's mostly the kids, and I think maybe ... there may be 20 to 30 cars along the side there. And I think, I think one of the things that, although you said you've addressed it, I think the pickleball courts are going to have up to I think there's space for 25 parking spaces for the pickleball people, and that's going to add pretty dramatically.

And they're going to be playing, they won't be playing in the winter, and they won't be playing at night, but that's going to add, they're going to play from eight in the morning until sunset, and their, Pickleball is very popular, so those courts are going to be full.

Mannix 28:04

With all respect, I don't know that that should impact whether or not a conforming subdivision should be approved.

Nye 28:12

Even though it's added traffic?

Mannix 28:14

Correct.

Nye 28:16

Okay,

Sunshine 28:20

That's Martha, that's just the opinion of the Applicant.

Nye 28:24

Okay, okay.

The other, this, again, doesn't really relate necessarily. But as I'm a community member and love living here at Browns Court, Browns Court is used by the elementary school. They bring their kids over here. And I think it's kind of nice. They bring their kids over here to practice their bicycle skills. They

ride up their, they get on their bike up just, just a little bit beyond Mary Harvey's house, coming down Browns, Browns Court, right around the corner, and go past Mary Claire, Mary Claire's house, and then turn around and come back up. And having additional, I don't know, it doesn't really relate to your plan, but it's certainly an issue for us here on Browns Court.

Sunshine 29:27

Let me ask you a question, that lot two is with six bedrooms, three bedrooms per unit, okay.

Do you have a question?

Hardy 29:37

Yeah, so, I'm, my home is on Jericho Road, but my backyard is.

Mannix 29:44

I met you. I came to your door. Yes, yeah.

Hardy 29:48

So I'm just curious. And I, you may have already gone over this, but I arrived a little bit late. I'm curious about the duplex, if it's going to face Browns Court. Or, it is, and it'll have two driveway, one on each...

Mannix 30:02

One driveway.

Hardy 30:04

...one driveway, and that will.

Mannix 30:07

One shared drive that feeds the two garages....

It'll be like a street facing everything. It's just like a traditional house on the road....

So it's attached to the dwelling in the middle.

Hardy 30:25

Oh, in the middle.

Mannix 30:27

You pull right into the garage.

Hardy 30:30

Yeah. I see, okay, thank you.

Sunshine 30:35

Oh, I see, okay. I'll just look at that slide.

DeNault 30:38

I'll just scroll through the garage plans.

Sunshine 30:46

You okay with that answer?

Hardy 30:46

Yes, thank you.

Sunshine 30:48

Any other input, questions from remote or in here?

Martha, did you have another question?

Nye 31:00

No, no, I'm fine. Thank you very much for your time, and thank you for all that you do.

Sunshine 31:08

Any other questions from the Board?

Monks 31:13

Not a question, I think you know, if we get to the next phase, we'd like to see the drainage plan and landscaping plan, and we can make that a condition of any decision as well I suppose.

Sunshine 31:23

I agree, yeah.

And, you know, you're asking to your applicant, Application is for rental units.

Mannix 31:37

They will. That was the intention, yes.

Sunshine 31:40

If the time comes when you desire to sell them, you need to come back here.

Mannix 31:45

They're deeded as a duplex. What do you mean? I need to come back here if...

Sunshine 31:48

You were going to sell them as individuals.

Mannix 31:52

Yeah, understood.

Sunshine 32:01

Okay.

Parisi 32:03

It might be worth going through that process all now, save you a lot of time and money. The PUD process.

Sunshine 32:12

Anything else from the Board or the audience? No, I'd entertain a motion. What would the Board like to do?

You want to have some discussion on this, or are you comfortable? Are you comfortable with it?

Dyer 32:26

Let's go into Deliberative session, I'd move to go to deliberative unless.

Sunshine 32:30

Okay, all in favor of going into deliberative session?

[Collective, unanimous ayes from all five presiding DRB members].

Okay, so we're going to go into deliberative session. When we finish our, all the other applications, and we'll try and do that this evening, and we have 45 days to give you a decision. We'll try to be faster than that.

Mannix & Malley 32:54

Thank you. Thank you.

Sunshine 33:02

Whizzing right through this. Okay, next on the agenda is CR2026-00, Trew Stone LLC, they seek conditional use approval to expand storage and lay down areas at 88 Rogers Lane, including enhancements by or for existing land landscaping and screening.

Hi, there.

Fitzgerald 33:31

Efficient hearings. I'm glad we showed up when we did.

Monks 33:34

We had one drop so.

Fitzgerald 33:37

Sorry about that...

Dante said eight is probably realistic, 7:30 to be safe. So, we showed up at 7:30.

Sunshine 33:51

Why don't you state your names?

Feldman 33:54

My name is Adam Feldman. I'm with Allstate Materials Group, it's the parent company of a Trew Stone, LLC. I'm not, I'm the Director of Environmental Engineering for All States/Trew Stone.

Fitzgerald 34:10

Evan Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald Environmental, I'm the engineer on the project.

Sunshine 34:14

Okay, let me swear you in. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but truth?

Fitzgerald & Feldman 34:19

I do [x2].

Sunshine 34:20

Anybody on the Board have any conflicts with this application or the applicants?

[Collective, unanimous no's from the full five member Board].

Okay, why don't you tell us what you have in mind here?

Feldman 34:35

Sure. I just want to start that. You know, as of August, All States acquired Hutchins LLC, yeah, which, which was the former owner of this property. Just wanted to come up, yeah, from the Springfield and Hartford, Connecticut area to meet you all. Yeah, since I'm new in the area.

Sunshine 34:54

But nice day to drive up.

Feldman 34:57

It was gorgeous. It was gorgeous.

Now, it really wasn't a bad deal, but I wanted to meet everyone in person and say hello. And I'll let Evan kind of go over what our plan is to keep the same use of our property, but just expand it a little bit on it.

Fitzgerald 35:18

Sure. Good. Thank you. Dante, are you able to pull up on the screen like the overview site? Yeah. So this project is really an expansion of the outdoor storage and lay down area on the property. There's no new buildings being proposed, no new structures above ground, structures, and no plan to add employees or accommodations for employees, including parking, etc. The expansion is a combination of after-the-fact approval and new expansion, and that's what's shown in the color coding here on the plan. So I can just kind of walk you through that. The, in the application, I did provide a bit of a history on past applications and approvals, and I will note the last application that was submitted on behalf of Hutchins was actually for an expansion of the office building, that was in 2022, the Board and the Town did approve that project. I don't believe we ever got a Zoning Permit after conditional use because Hutchins opted not to do that building expansion—it was in the middle of Covid, some things changed, and they decided they didn't want to expand that building. It was it became more expensive.

Sunshine 36:43

That would have expired by now. Is that correct?

Fitzgerald 36:46

Yeah. So there's no, there's no, I did make a note in the application letter, there's no plans, imminent or even long term at this point, to go forward with any building expansion or additional accommodation of employees. So, I mentioned that because really our reference point for what was approved in terms of usage and coverage of the property was the last approval that that the Town gave, which was in 2015, and that coverage is shown in green on this plan. Since that time...

Sunshine 37:26

And that's been carried out?

Fitzgerald 37:32

Yes. And in fact, there's, there exists today substantially more coverage than what is shown there in green. That is the yellow. So the yellow is what is there today and, and in fact, the yellow and the red was, what was there up until recently, the red in the upper, upper right-hand corner, the northeast corner of the property, is an expanded lay down area that has since been decommissioned. And I should note,

Sunshine 38:16

So, when you say lay down area, what do you mean?

Fitzgerald 38:18

Okay, that's a construction term for just a storage area for materials and equipment. Hutchins is a contractor in the business of construction. There's often materials that come off the job site temporarily or are stored on the site, on this property, prior to going out to a construction site, right?

Feldman 38:43

Drainage structures, pipe. You know, some landscaping equipment. You know, a pallets of stone. You have some trees, things of that nature. You say typical construction material.

DiPalma 38:57

You don't temporarily place removed fill onto site?

Feldman 39:03

No.

DiPalma 39:05

Okay, so it's actually equipment of some sort?

Feldman 39:07

Yes, yeah. It's, you know, a lot of it is just on a native, you know, a ground. It's not like, you know, like we're digging it up or anything like that. We're just setting materials.

Fitzgerald 39:27

So, yeah, if you could pan to the south there, you'll notice that the yellow does, there's a road that's shown there in yellow, and that is that was put in sometime around the Irene flood in 2011 because, as I think you probably know, this area is a backwater flood zone for the Winooski River. It comes up into Rogers Lane area and actually prevents, you know, access to ingress and egress out of this property temporarily during floods. So, Hutchins, being a contractor, laid some gravel down in this road for an

emergency exit at that time. So that's what that additional yellow is. And there's no plans.

Sunshine 40:19

Is that being currently used?

Fitzgerald 40:20

No. No, only in that emergency situation. And in fact, we're proposing a gate there to just, you know.

Feldman 40:31

A lockable gate that, yeah, we don't want anyone using that--only for emergency access.

Sunshine 40:35

Have you had issues with people using it?

Feldman 40:37

No.

Fitzgerald 40:38

Not that, not that I'm aware of, no.

Feldman 40:40

But if it's there, yeah, we wanted to make that very clear. And it was part of our act 250 Permit, actually that we wanted to gate. Yeah, so we're doing that in parallel of this as well.

Fitzgerald 40:53

So the orange that you see here is the actual, from here forward, is the proposed expansion of storage area to the south, and, essentially it's framed by constraints on east and west, those being buffer zones of a class two wetland. And actually, we've coordinated with the state of Vermont Wetlands Ecologist who's been out on site, looked at these wetland boundaries. We've had a bunch of correspondence. She asked for, Tina Heath, the wetlands ecologist, asked for a 10 foot buffer on top of that 50 foot buffer. So we respected that. And that's essentially the limits east and west of this expansion, future expansion to the south. And then, Dante, if you could just pan to the south a little bit more,, yeah, back up, that limit right where your blue cursor is, bounding that kind of southeast corner, there's a sewer that serves, a sewer line that serves the mobile home park there, and there's an easement on the property for that, and we're basically staying 20 feet back to be safe from that, that sewer line. There is...

Sunshine 42:20

That sewer line goes over to their disposal field in Jericho, right? Is that the one?

Feldman 42:26

Is that the one pump station down?

Fitzgerald 42:31

I actually don't know where it goes.

Hutchins, I'm sorry, All States has an on-site wastewater disposal, you know, on this property, so I don't know a lot about.

Feldman 42:52

We just knew that we had to stay out of that easement because it's there. Yes, so we made sure that we were not going to expand or anything, you know, on a top of their sanitary sewer in case there are any repairs needed.

Fitzgerald 43:07

If you go back up to the north, Dante, I'll just explain again the red area that's being decommissioned as part of some coordination with Act 250 and, I think I mentioned this, but we're concurrently going through approval for the same site plan with Act 250. That application has been submitted, and we did a bunch of pre-application coordination with various staff from ANR and the District Commission. And All States decided to basically, but it was better to pull out of this area that's shown in red, because it's beyond the screening. That was another topic I wanted to touch on. You see, there's existing screening that was part of prior permit approval conditions there, and there's additional screening that we've proposed.

Feldman 44:05

It's an existing berm there that had about 20 trees on it. And I believe that Dante had made a comment that he'd like to see a few more trees there. Yes, so we added a row behind the berm of roughly what, 20 more trees or so there. We pulled everything out of the other, you know, and I made sure that the wetlands buffer was clear. Yeah, we had delineated it with large rocks to keep anyone out of there in the future. And then, if you scroll down, Dante, we added landscaping features to the southern part of the property. I don't know if it's shown on here, but where the existing screening photos are, where you're adding a row of trees in there to, you know, to enhance screenings, you know, for any residents.

Trying to be proactive to your comments.

Fitzgerald 45:02

And then, I think the last thing I wanted to mention is that this is a large enough site that it's considered a three acre site under the stormwater permitting. We, Fitzgerald Environmental, helped Hutchins, All States, get a 9050 stormwater permit, basically retrofitting an existing pond, stormwater pond, on the property. There's enough capacity we've determined in that pond to accommodate this additional one and a half acres to the south. And so there is a grading plan and a stormwater plan in this plan set if, if you want to see it, Dante can keep scrolling, that will essentially bring stormwater from this area to the north, first in an open grass swale and then piped over to the pond in the North. And as part of this approval, and the Act 250 approval, will be getting an amendment to that 9050 stormwater permit, as well as a construction general permit for the construction phase.

Well, and lastly I'll mention, you know, we are in the floodplain. That's why we're here for conditional use, and our grading and is all no net, no net change. We are, this whole area is below the base flood elevation of three-oh-three-five, and so, basically any material that's, you know, cut from the swale is going to be placed on site. Any material that's, that's cut away and replaced with fabric or gravel to create a gravel surface for the storage area, that material that will be cut away, the native material, will go to another portion on-site or off-site that's outside of the Flood Hazard Area. So there'll be no net, no net loss of flood water storage, which is something we'll have to meet at a, you know, explain at a higher level, even in Act 250, under Criterion 1d.

Sunshine 47:18

The improvements, or the, what you're proposing here, is that going to cause any further more employees, or more traffic, or anything like that?

Feldman 47:27

It's no change to our operations and no more employees. It's simply expanding the lay down area to temporarily store some pipe, yeah, so what, we're not as cramped up by the building, right?

Sunshine 47:39

So it won't cause any additional traffic either?

Feldman 47:42

No, No.

Operationally, we stay the same.

DiPalma 47:48

Is the existing lay down area natural terrain? Or is it an impervious surface, pervious surface?

Feldman 47:55

It's a combination of both, just from over in the red, you know, just from driving on it, it's a compact, but we're going to be restoring that area.

DiPalma 48:09

I'm thinking about the yellow. What is that currently?

Fitzgerald 48:12

That is, it's kind of a mix of area that's had some gravel laid down on it, and some areas where equipment is just tracked. And it's, honestly, certain times a year when it's raining, it's a bit muddy. So this, the drainage that we're proposing is, is going to help that.

Feldman 48:38

We treated it as impervious.

Fitzgerald 48:42

It is all, yeah, it is all effectively considered impervious.

Feldman 48:45

It's not that we're paving anything. It's that, if it compacts, we want it to treat it as impervious, yes, so we could size our drainage appropriately, yeah, but it's going to help. Actually, when we put in the new drainage.

DiPalma 48:55

So, in the proposed expansion area, are you going to change the surface of the land in any way--removing trees, adding gravel, anything like that?

Fitzgerald 49:06

Adding gravel, yes, I believe. I mean, it's a, it's a sandy soil. It's well drained. So there are other parts of the property, like, like Adam said, that are the red area--also well drained, where equipment had just

been tracking over grass and even like storing culverts in grassed areas. And that was working fine. The area that's orange, there's actually a number of small trees that Landshapes, the landscaping company, had planted out there temporarily that, and now they've grown, you know, they were going to use those on a job. Now they've grown so big. They, they're, well, they're not so big. You know, there's, they're probably three, four inches in diameter. And, you know, 10-15 feet tall. The whole area isn't covered in those trees, but they're some rows of ornamental trees.

Sunshine 50:03

Are you going to leave those there?

DiPalma 50:05

Sorry, so I assume they'll be removed?

Fitzgerald 50:07

Those will be removed.

Sunshine 50:08

Removed? Okay.

Dyer 50:12

Dante did you see somebody was trying to get in? Sorry.

DeNault 50:15

Yes, no, thank you.

Monks 50:18

Trying to join the meeting?

Dyer 50:19

Yeah, yeah, trying to join the meeting. Popped up a couple times and I didn't want to interrupt, but.

DeNault 50:26

Yeah, they are in.

Sunshine 50:28

Before we get to that, let me ask the Board, does the Board have any questions?

Monks 50:34

Just curious on the site plan, that, on the far west side and the expansion in the mustard colored area, what are all the cube, square shaped things? Are those, pallets, stone, what are they, they're smaller than trailers?

Feldman 50:55

Yeah, it's not trailers. That's a, that's a mix of pallets, of like our landscaping stone, and then probably some, even some little flower pots, actually, for our landscaping business.

Fitzgerald 51:06

A lot of those, I think, are the pallet stuff.

Feldman 51:10

Yeah, and then right up front, I think it's some tables of like the little planters.

Monks 51:19

Thanks.

Sunshine 51:23

Any other questions from the Board?

Okay, we'll open it up to, Tom, do you have a question? You can unmute yourself?

Monks 51:34

I think that's just the cursor.

Sunshine 51:37

Oh.

Monks 51:38

Is that Dante's hand?

DeNault 51:43

Oh, yeah, if there's anyone in the chat that, that would like to speak on this project, now would be the time to do so.

Monks 51:49

Yeah, if you can't raise your hand, just go ahead and unmute.

Sunshine 51:54

Anybody in the audience have questions?

Okay, I don't see anything in the Staff Notes that we haven't covered.

Is there Dante?

DeNault 52:17

I believe that covers everything.

Sunshine 52:22

Okay. What would the Board like to do?

Monks 52:30

I'd move we'd move it to deliberative session.

Sunshine 52:37

Okay, all in favor of moving to deliberate session?

[collective, unanimous ayes from all five presiding DRB members].

Sunshine 52:41

Fine. So we're going to discuss this in deliberative session, and then we're still required to give you a decision within 45 days, and we'll try to be faster than that. Thank you very much for coming and thank you. Appreciate your input....

Dyer 53:09

Thanks for making the drive.

Sunshine 53:18

Okay, number five on our agenda is Matt Parisi. He is seeking a conditional use approval to modify a building restraint at 112 East Main Street.

That is CR 2026-002. Matt, I imagine you're going to have to recuse yourself?

Parisi 53:43

Yes, I have a conflict of interest on this. Since it's my, my application.

Sunshine 53:56

Anybody else on the Board have feel they have a conflict?

54:00

Dyer, Monks, DiPalma, and Sunshine 54:01

[No's from Dyer, Monks, DiPalma, and Sunshine].

Sunshine 54:05

Matt, let me swear you in. Do you tell the truth? Agree to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Parisi 54:10

Yes, I do.

Sunshine 54:14

Why don't you tell us what you have in mind here?

Parisi 54:16

So, back when we went through this Planned Unit Development about a year ago. There was a pre-sub application and then a final application. And I spoke with Keith and Dante about this. I wasn't under the impression that the final application was all the final requirements or restrictions. In any case, here we are now, and I do want to build an ADU at some point, attached to my existing single-family home on, what is currently lot three.

And there was a restriction...

Sunshine 55:03

Dante, can you put that up for us?

DeNault 55:04

Yeah, sure thing. Do you want the plat or the plan?

Sunshine 55:12

Plan.

DeNault 55:13

Plan, sure thing.

This is the proposed plan.

Sunshine 55:37

Okay,

DeNault 55:37

We'll focus on the back.

Sunshine 55:40

So we're talking about the shaded area.

Parisi 55:42

That's correct.

So anyway, so, yeah, I would like to do that. The, we tried to address all concerns from previous applications on this application, in addition, we're going to expand the snow storage area by removing the lilacs and then continuing an existing, a now existing fence line, between our properties, and potentially planting some more trees as well. Dante has pictures of the, do you have those, might be helpful for people to kind of see that.

So the landscaping was a requirement, the fencing and the trees were actually, it was just trees were a requirement for the final PUD application a year ago there, last summer.

I'll just wait for him to open them up.

Yeah, so that's, that's the lot as it currently sits. So where you're kind of looking at where my truck is would be a little bit farther forward of where the ADU is. So it's going to kind of be in where the snow area is there. And those lilacs will be removed because they're taking up a significant amount of storage, like snow storage space, and more fencing will be added, as well as probably more arborvitae for screening. The, yeah, so that's the other side there. Yeah, so exactly, actually, that picture was the best one, probably to show it, yeah. So that's kind of the backside of like the arborvitae right there. And you can see that the neighbors, the Morins, installed black chain link fence, and then I also installed a wooden fence up to the part where the lilacs are. I'm going to extend that fencing all the way to the existing picket fence there, as well as probably add one more tree and depending on where we decide on the final location for the snow. Obviously, this year especially, it's actually been even more evident that you need more, we need more store, snow storage there, and, yeah, we'll lose a little bit of screening but I think the, I think having more, I wish I had taken a picture, like I just plowed today, but having more snow storage will be, I think, much helpful for drainage and just kind of having enough room to maneuver in the parking lot.

Sunshine 58:23

So you're pushing the snow up against that fence that's there now?

Parisi 58:25

That's correct, yeah. Well, that's where I will be. Currently, you can actually kind of see the backside of the old, where the pile is right now, it's kind of right next to that, yeah, so that's about probably 10 feet, give or take, from like the property boundary. And our, if you can see on those pictures, right there, we are separating our fences, so their fence wouldn't be hit, because my fence will be on the property line. So it will be, you know, in theory, protected. What other improvements are we looking to make?

Sunshine 58:57

Where's the property line in the middle between the two fences?

Parisi 59:01

No, it's actually, my fence is like spot on within an inch or two of the property line on my side.

If we go back to the site plan, I think we can see, yeah, so the other proposed improvements are making a much lighter, sorry, much larger dry well. This ADU will have gutters. The existing house has gutters now, and they're all piped underground into the dry well. The existing drywall is about 12 feet deep, and it's about 12 by 12 feet. It handles a majority of the stormwater runoff. When we have the really crazy events, it's, really nowhere can hold it. So, during the big, like the big four inch rainstorms, it, no matter what we do, it basically it blows off. I mean, you guys can see it if you ever stand there on Route Two. It just comes off Route Two, and it's game over. But this handles most of the storms. It handles most of the roof, rooftop runoff. We're locating it farther into my property, as well as farther towards the middle, because of concerns there were about the existing dry well, and how during those storms, it does blow over the top into the kind of four corners of the property boundaries there which you can kind of see.

So there'll be, there's, there currently are two dry wells there for water retention. The biggest existing one in the southwest corner there will be made smaller, probably not that much smaller, but small enough that the foundation won't be on the dry well. And the newest, big one there you can see is where the--it's kind of in the center of the property--and then there's another one we built that's working really well that takes the gutters from the east side right there. It's kind of highlighted. He can zoom in a little bit, you can kind of see [an] existing dry well that says, where's that note, yeah, approximate location of crushed stone roof drain drywell. Yeah, that's the improvements we're looking to make. We're not going to do a separate addressing for it. It's going to be part of like the existing home. It won't have separate utilities for it. It will always be kind of attached to that, that house.

Sunshine 1:01:50

What's your plans for that, is it going to be a rental unit?

Parisi 1:01:54

It will probably be a rental unit. Yep.

Sunshine 1:01:58

And you don't want them to have their own metering?

Parisi 1:02:00

No. Because, quite frankly, the cost of, of trying to run more conduit down this really tight area is, is not, it's just not worth it for me. I'd rather just charge them a little more in rent. And it's just not worth it, right?

Sunshine 1:02:19

Right. What's your heat, what's your heat gonna be?

Parisi 1:02:21

I'll actually, probably, I actually just had a gas line run to our house last fall, and I'll probably actually have a boiler installed with a on demand hot water. Probably will have heat pumps as well for cooling. The other reason I'm not going to separate utilities, like, put it on separate utilities, is, at some point, both my parents are aging, and my dad is 82 and they live up on Robins Mountain and then, I'm not entirely sure they'll be there forever. So that's, that's another potential use for it, probably closer than I would like.

Sunshine 1:03:06

If you don't want to charge your parents.

Parisi 1:03:12

So yeah, I guess that is the, I think that kind of lays out everything I have to--oh, we're going to add one more parking space too by getting rid of those lilacs, and we have, Dante can speak to this, but we have way more parking than we currently would require. I think they're required for three spaces, and I've got like six, so yeah. Is there any?

DiPalma 1:03:47

So, Matt, this whole parcel is governed by the, this declaration to benefit the community, is all of the land which is not under a building common land?

Parisi 1:04:03

So, yeah, there are, there are footprint lots that are slightly bigger than the building. You can actually see the dashed lines of those around the buildings there, right? And those are, those are the, that's the separate ownership now, that, as it stands now. So we will incorporate, in fact, you can kind of see a preliminary dash line of how the engineer slash surveyor is going to section off now, part of Lot three into Lot two. You can kind of see those dashed lines.

DeNault 1:04:37

I think they might show better here.

Parisi 1:04:40

Yeah, so this is actually a preliminary plat for that.

DiPalma 1:04:48

So the community now has two members?

Parisi 1:04:52

The community, yes, currently it has two, two, yeah, two, two units on there.

DiPalma 1:05:00

And has this plan been approved by the association?

Parisi 1:05:07

Yes. I mean, we're going to modify all that. I mean, it's essentially our, I am the association.

DiPalma 1:05:13

You are, you control the votes?

Parisi 1:05:14

Yes.

DiPalma 1:05:16

Okay.

Sunshine 1:05:18

Well crafted.

Parisi 1:05:21

So, I didn't really want to update everything until we go through, but I think we could probably, I was hoping that can obviously be a condition that all the legal paperwork be updated before a building permit is issued or a zoning permit is issued.

Sunshine 1:05:38

Probably like to see it at your final.

Parisi 1:05:42

Well, this is, this is not going to have a final--this is just the conditional use review.

Sunshine 1:05:47

Oh, okay.

DeNault 1:05:47

Yeah. This is a, this is operating as an amendment to the PUD...

Sunshine 1:05:50

To the PUD, okay.

DeNault 1:05:52

...which has to go through conditional use review. And notably, the, that, that Unit Three common land condition was not designated as a permit critical condition explicitly, so the DRB may remove the development restriction without doing the *Hildebrand/ Stone Club Highlands* Test.

Or that's how I saw it anyways.

Monks 1:06:21

Agreed.

Sunshine 1:06:22

Thanks, any questions from the Board?

No questions. Let's see. I don't see anybody in the audience here. Is there any questions out in the remote land?

DeNault 1:06:37

Yes, I think there's two questions. We have D. Morin, if you want to go first, you're up.

D. Morin 1:06:45

Yeah, so I represent two thirds of the adjusted properties on behalf of my mom, Bonnie Morin, which is the four unit owner, and then myself. I want to start off by saying, you know, I want to be a good neighbor. I've grown up in Richmond. I built a house here because I'm a mental health counselor. I've been a volunteer soccer coach for over 25 years in the community. So this place really means a lot to me. I want to be cordial and like kind neighbor. So this, I just want to say that, because I'm not trying to be oppositional in any way, but I just want the Town to speak to, especially the water concerns of adding another property to what has been a really significant flood zone. I heard Matt say himself, you know, just tonight, that, as, like in certain circumstances, there are unique weather circumstances which aren't so unique anymore, because they're happening almost every summer, if not every other, which projects water down that whole bank, onto my property, the Osterman's property, and all the adjacent properties. I don't want to beat a dead horse. This is nothing to do with Matt or what he's proposing, but historically, my dad owned the property sold to Matt, and the Town told him for years that he could not do water work to build any units to that existing property. Then all of, I was also told I could not separate my property with two owners, all of those rules have changed, and one of the Town's main complaints to my dad years ago was that based on the water flow, based on the runoff from Route Two, that it was going to create not just an uncomfortable circumstance for neighbors, but an inappropriate amount of water added to the already problematic situation of water flow from Route Two down. So, when Matt built this house, and again, the Town approved it, I have nothing against that happening, right, because the rules change. I get that; however, we have had, because the water drainage system was not planned appropriately before the building was developed, and it was this haphazard thing happening after where he was also seeking help from neighbors to pay for drainage when it wasn't like planned out ahead of time. I'm just wondering what the plan is to make this better for all the neighbors. When the Town initially had said no buildings can be added because of the problematic factor with the drainage. So adding another unit to this problematic situation seems to just increase this situation. So I'm very concerned, and I know my mom is as well. So again, as two thirds of the neighbors. It's not that I don't want him to be able to, you know, have another place and all these things, but the Town dug in deep and said, we'll never let you do this. Then one house was built without a great plan, and now we're talking about another structure. So, I just don't understand how, in this flood plain, how there would be a helpful situation to incur for all the flood damage with, like, so many of my neighbors have water in the basement year after year, and it's just getting worse. So I just, I just, I'm curious about the, this Town stance on this concern, because this was the Town's stance the entire time is that this is not a thoughtful plan to add any buildings. Now we're talking about another building here. So again, it's less about Matt's proposal and like, the Town stance on how to address the real problem of water flow from Route Two. And then if you add another property, like, I don't know that that's actually possible, the water has to go somewhere. And if you're taking away areas for drainage, like, we're very concerned, very concerned.

Sunshine 1:10:51

Matt, do you have some thoughts on that?

Parisi 1:10:53

Yeah, so we, we obviously tried to take that into consideration when I was working with the engineer by building an even larger dry well, the, where the location of that dry well is actually going to--the main issue was the southwest corner, specific, specifically Jason's house here, Jason Osterman, who is actually, I'm not even bordered with him, but you've got the four unit right there--the Morin four unit--and then you got Danielle's lot here, and then you have his house. And there's a natural low point that's been there forever, as far as I'm concerned, at the back of his parcel there. And it's kind of yeah, right there essentially. And so water is always pulled there before any buildings, any of my buildings, were built. So that's, that's something that's always happened. Now to try to address that, we have decided to obviously move that dry well farther onto my property and farther towards the center of the property, where there's actually another natural low point between Danielle's duplex and my house currently. The, how do I say this, the, when that duplex was built, the grade was raised, Danielle's duplex, the grade was raised about four feet all around the entire property. So there's, that kind of has, the natural watershed from Route Two, kind of naturally would run down all the way down to the railroad. So that is, kind of become an area where it kind of, it kind of blocks it essentially now. But irregardless of that, the best place to hold the water is basically in the center between our two properties, not on the corner there, where it then goes into Jason's property. And so that's what we're aiming to do. We are aiming to reduce the runoff from our buildings and our parcel. But I can't speak to what happens on Route Two. I mean, there's also, there's been arguments about that for years now regarding the fact there's not enough stormwater drains and so on and so forth. So, you know, I guess, speak to VTrans about the issues coming off of Route Two there. But yeah, I mean, I think we've done what we can, and we, she's right, we did not plan dry wells originally way back, because we didn't, we didn't see how bad the problem is going to be until that December flood, December of '23 and so, yes, those were added afterwards, but now they've obviously seen them be used actually, the one that is on the east side there is working tremendously well, and the one over on the west side works well until it's overwhelmed by runoff from Route Two. So, we're going to move it farther in, and we're still going to keep that other one, and there's not going to be any rooftop drainage into the existing one on the southwest border there.

D. Morin 1:14:06

And I just want to name one thing too. I know you're speaking to the problematic area on Jason's side, but I know Annalise or, the neighbors to my right like, they've had water--significant water damage the last three years--as well as the Mack's. So it's actually a problem on all sides, and because my dad has owned the other property for 40, 43 years with my mother, like this has been a water situation for 43 years. So it's not like a new problem. And I know the flooding with global warming is, it's increasing, right? Like so. But this is not like, a new the last three years' problem, this is like a 43-year place where water is built up, and we have documentation throughout that this has always been a factor.

Sunshine 1:14:52

Yeah, let's let one person talk at a time here, please.

Parisi 1:14:54

Yeah, I don't disagree with you at all. I, we, we all can agree on that. However, I think there's, again, this has been spoken many times there, when your duplex was built, the grade was brought up, you're

essentially, a moat, your, your, your property is up almost four feet from the surrounding, the surrounding area. So for the other neighbors, I mean, I've spoken to them before I even built my house, when your house was built, your duplex, that's when they had to put in the sump pumps because of the runoff from the east side of your property.

D. Morin 1:15:32

I have thoughts about that, but I think we're talking about your plan, not the old plan so.

Parisi 1:15:37

I'm just saying that my plan doesn't bring anything to bear with regards to runoff on their property.

Sunshine 1:15:44

Yeah, yeah, I think we've, we've heard what you've said. And that's probably something the Board can...

D. Morin 1:15:49

Yeah, great. I appreciate that,

Sunshine 1:15:52

... and we appreciate you bringing that up.

D. Morin 1:15:53

But, and again, I just want to speak to the grade. The grade was done thinking that no one would ever be able to build a house where Matt built, if that makes sense. And we spoke to all neighbors talking about offering to remove trees, offering for my dad to pay for the drainage through the Mack's, to pay for all the plumbing, to try to help the problem for all properties, because it was something that has impacted the four unit since he owned it, so he went to all of the people, tried to create a drain proactively to help the problem. So the grade was done under the consideration that no building would ever be built at your establishment per the Town's direction at that time. So again, not trying to be confrontational, but the grade was added knowing all those factors trying to help, not to hurt, and not thinking that development was ever possible, if that makes sense.

Sunshine 1:16:49

Okay.

Parisi 1:16:50

The one other thing I'd like to point out is, I tried, also at the end of the last project, to get the permission from the Morin's to actually fix that swale. I was actually working with Jason, Danielle, and Don and Bonnie, mostly Don, to try to actually build the swale that was necessarily to put it down onto Pleasant Street and then obviously, farther down onto the, you know, past Pleasant Street. And they did not give us permission to do that, so I was going to pay for that out of pocket. Anyways.

Osterman 1:17:27

So I'd like to just kind of give my perspective on this. So my name is Jason Osterman, can you, can you see me? Sorry. My name is Jason Osterman. I'm at 103 Pleasant Street. So I'm neighbors with Danielle and sort of catty-corner neighbors with, with Matt. And I mean, he is right. We've tried to work together on this and do the best job that we can. I think it's fair to say that it is very evident that my property, now being the lowest property around, has borne the brunt of quite a lot of the extra

runoff--not only from the recent developments with either Danielle or Matt's property, but also the increase in flooding that we seem to get a lot. So, you know, the reality is, over the last 10 years, 103 Pleasant Street, this property, has seen increased watershed from both Danielle's property and now from Matt's property. So it's had an increase twice in that 10 years. And, you know, I don't need to go back over the recent history. I think Danielle actually did a relatively good job with that. And, you know, it is very clear that my property has been, is born the brunt of quite a lot of not joined up thinking within zoning. There has not been a sewer here. There has never been a solution to Route Two, the laws have been, the zoning has been relaxed to improve things for some reasons, but there is nothing that is helping me here in terms of, you know, dealing with water on a municipal level. And the result is that, you know, my yard gets inundated regularly. And I think, you know, the, the dry wells and things like that help, but they're not alleviating the problem. I mean, there's photographic video evidence of that. You know that, we are, our backyard basically gets inundated pretty regularly--and it's not just from the flood events--it is the lowest part of this entire area now. So, having said all that, I'm not really willing to accept any more water on my property. So, if this goes ahead, then I need to be assured that that water is going to go somewhere else. I don't know how that works in terms of documenting that, or engineering that, or proving that, but, you know, if we're going to allow even more development, I want it to be on the record that this is a problem that we have tried to solve it with--I think it's fair to say varying results--that the weather is not going to improve this problem, and that I will not allow any more water on my property based on more development around the area. So, with that being said, I'd be open to your suggestions about how to actually see that happen.

Sunshine 1:20:18

And that's something the Board can discuss, either an open session or deliberative session, but we appreciate your comments and your input.

DiPalma 1:20:29

Just so I understand the argument. It sounds like that there's, whether there's buildings here or not, there's a lot of water running off of Route Two down the hill towards, towards Pleasant Street...

Osterman 1:20:44

For everybody, yeah.

DiPalma 1:20:45

... for everybody. Does the existence of an extra structure contribute to that problem? And if so, how does it contribute? Just so I understand what the argument is.

Osterman 1:20:57

Well, so, obviously, you've had, Matt said he's going to have gutters that go to a dry well, and that's fine, but you know, when you build a new property, you grade it so that the water goes away from that building, and that water is always going to find its way to the lowest point around and that's basically my backyard at this point.

DiPalma 1:21:12

But if you didn't, if that building wasn't there, there's still going to be water running across that parcel towards the lowest point, which sounds like is your property, unfortunately.

Osterman 1:21:26

Yeah. And it's, and it's, you know, if.

DiPalma 1:21:29

So I'm just wondering if this project is the problem, or it's the broader problem of water coming off of, off of Main Street to all of your properties.

Osterman 1:21:37

Well, I believe it's all of it really. You know, as Danielle said, this goes back decades. There's never really been a solution for this. Everybody experiences this. You know this house experienced it before either Danielle or Matt's properties were built. But each time this happens, it gets worse, so.

DiPalma 1:21:54

Okay, thank you.

Parisi 1:21:57

I just want to speak and say I think we can actually avoid any grading with this, because I'm going to actually build the property with a, like that building higher up, to make the connection. So I think we can actually avoid most of the grading issues that were, like that Jason is speaking to. I think we can essentially dig the hole for the foundation and, since I'm going to raise the ICF forms out of the ground probably, we usually do eight or nine inches, I'm probably going to keep them 16 inches out of the ground. We can avoid actually having to change the existing grade at all, which, if we go back to the site plan, I know that's going to cause problems for where the connector is there. I'm going to have water pooling up back there, but that'll be my problem, essentially, to deal with.

DeNault 1:22:56

We do have a comment from Chelsye Brooks [1364 Jericho Road] in the chat. Chelsye asks, the existing dry well is being moved and made smaller than the than the another added. Matt, can you speak to the difference in size and depth?

Parisi 1:23:07

Yeah, I think, I think when the engineer was resizing the existing large dry well in the southwest corner, he honestly made it a little bit too small. Our intention is to keep it about as big as possible. I mean, quite frankly, if I had the lot coverage, I'd probably, I'd probably make it, I'd probably dig it all up and fill most of it with stone to solve a lot of problems for me. But we don't really have that, that option necessarily. So, anyways, the new one will be about the same size cubically as the existing one, and there will be three of them, so those should be more storage than there is now.

Sunshine 1:24:04

Any other comments from the Board or the public? Anybody else out there?

DeNault 1:24:15

If anyone else is in the, is in the chat and would like to make a comment, now is your time. Danielle and Jason, thanks for leaving your address. Chelsye has another comment. If that building wasn't there, there would be an entirely pervious surface grass to help absorb the water. Have you considered pervious pavers? Question to Matt.

Parisi 1:24:33

Well, pervious pavers for what, like regarding?

DeNault 1:24:40

I would assume your parking lot, er, your parking area.

Parisi 1:24:42

Oh, that, that has eight (8) to twelve (12) inches of sub base, and then it has plant mix on top of that, so that actually drains really well as far as the driveways go, better than pavers because pavers do have, obviously, they're somewhat solid, and we're not going to, it's a large driveway to build entirely in pavers, and we're not going to pave it. I think that that answers that.

Sunshine 1:25:15

Okay, I, for one, would like to see this go to deliberative session. I think we need to discuss it.

Parisi 1:25:23

I would second that.

Sunshine 1:25:25

All in favor?

[collective ayes from all four presiding DRB members, minus Matt Parisi, who recused himself for Hearing Item Five only].

Okay, Matt, you're familiar. We have 45 days.

That's the end of our applications. Dante, is there anything else that the Board needs to discuss before we would move to go into deliberative session?

DeNault 1:25:43

No, I think we're ready to move into deliberative session.

So again, for anyone online, if you haven't left your, your name, your address, and your location, please do so to be added to the attendance list. If not, have a great evening. Keep an eye on the Town's website for the DRB decisions or reach out to me, thanks. I'm going to stop the recording right now.

[first deliberative session, all five presiding DRB members present].

DeNault 1:26:13

All right, we're back on the record.

Sunshine 1:26:14

And we're out of deliberative session, and we're considering application. PS2026-001, Trunk Beach, LLC. Do I have a motion to approve it?

Dyer 1:26:32

I move to approve with the conditions we discussed, that Dante wrote down.

Monks 1:26:39

Related to a planting plan, a drainage plan, and outdoor lighting.

DiPalma 1:26:45

And a movement of the, of the boundary line.

Monks 1:26:48

Yes, absolutely.

Sunshine 1:26:51

Or, or take away the bulkhead.

Monks 1:26:53

Yeah, or otherwise complying with the setback requirement.

Sunshine 1:26:58

Yeah. All in favor?

[collective unanimous ayes from all five presiding DRB members].

Sunshine 1:27:03

Any against? No, okay.

Next, Trew Stone, LLC, application CR2026-001. What we'd like to do with that one?

Sunshine 1:27:16

I'd entertain a motion to approve it.

DiPalma 1:27:18

Approve it as presented.

Dyer 1:27:21

Okay, second.

Sunshine 1:27:24

And obtain their 250 permit.

DiPalma 1:27:26

Right.

Monks 1:27:28

All required permits.

Sunshine 1:27:29

All required permits, yeah.

All in favor?

[collective unanimous ayes from all five presiding DRB members].

Okay, I'd entertain a motion to come out of the, or come out of, come out of open session and go in the deliberative session.

DiPalma 1:27:41

So moved.

Parisi 1:27:43

Second. Enjoy guys, have a good evening.

[second deliberative session, all four presiding DRB members present minus Matt Parisi who recused himself on Hearing Item Five].

DeNault 1:27:51

And we are back live with the DRB, minus Matt, who recused himself.

Sunshine 1:27:58

So I would move that we continue the hearing for Matt Parisi. And that he give us further information regarding stormwater and modification or amendment of his covenants.

Dyer 1:28:25

Second.

Sunshine 1:28:26

Do I have a second, Matt?

All in favor?

[collective ayes from all four presiding DRB members, minus Matt Parisi, who recused himself for Hearing Item Five only].

And we need to continue this to a date certain. So I say we continue it to March 11.

DeNault 1:28:42

March 11. 7:00 p.m. Here.

Sunshine 1:28:43

And if that doesn't work for him, we can continue that.

DeNault 1:28:45

Sounds good.

Alright, I believe that concludes all the business David.

Sunshine 1:29:00

All in favor of adjourning?

[collective ayes from all four presiding DRB members, minus Matt Parisi, who recused himself for Hearing Item Five only].

DeNault 1:29:04

Sounds good. I will stop the recording.

end of video transcript

CHAT TRANSCRIPT

(note: the timestamps below correspond to the Zoom recording).³

00:17:37. Richmond Town Host: Item Number 2 (1950 Hillview) has been rescheduled to next month's DRB meeting.

00:34:51. Richmond Town Host: Martha you are up next.

00:39:14. Richmond Town Host: I haven't forgotten about you Martha, you are still on deck.

00:42:05. Richmond Town Host: Thanks for your comment Martha, please leave your name, address and number/email in the chat to be recorded in the attendance sheet.

01:08:00. Jason Osterman: None from me.

01:22:29. D. Morin: yes.

01:26:00. Richmond Town Host: Thanks for your comment Danielle, please leave your name, address and number/email in the chat to be recorded in the attendance sheet.

01:28:26. D. Morin: Correct. Which is why it doesn't make sense that adding another property wouldn't be a problematic factor.

01:29:07. D. Morin: The runoff is already problematic. Adding will only make it worse for all members of Pleasant Street.

01:31:24. Chelsye Brooks: The existing drywell is being moved and made smaller then another added. Can you speak to the difference in size and depth? Existing dimensions vs. what the proposed new dimensions will be?

01:36:20. Richmond Town Host: Jason, please leave your name, address, and number/email in the chat to be added to the attendance sheet. Thank you.

01:36:35. Richmond Town Host: Chelsye, I see your comment. You are on deck.

01:36:45. D. Morin: Danielle Morin.

01:37:02. D. Morin: 113 Pleasant Street, Unit 2 Richmond, VT.

01:37:05. D. Morin: Bonnie Morin.

01:37:11. D. Morin: 142 Mountain View Road.

01:37:18. D. Morin: Richmond, VT 05477.

01:39:48. Jason Osterman: Jason Osterman 103 Pleasant Street, Richmond VT 05477.

01:40:05. Richmond Town Host: Reacted to "113 Pleasant Street,..." with 👍

01:40:08. Richmond Town Host: Reacted to "Jason Osterman 103 P..." with 👍

01:40:12. Chelsye Brooks: If that building wasn't there, there would be entirely pervious surface (grass) to help absorb water. Have you considered pervious pavers?

³ Zoom Recording Link:

https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/7rZHVvAzyMP29K9SndX_xsNMISXx2z1W2ev7ka-f-0MOWIXbi_oZom27QImePdvct.ywttwkrGR515qTMM?startTime=1770853532000. Passcode: 8GaxK?Pp.

01:40:46. Chelsye Brooks: For the parking area. To offset the impervious you're adding with the ADU.

01:41:58. Trevor Brooks: Trevor Brooks, 1364 Jericho Road Richmond.

01:42:01. Chelsye Brooks: Chelsye brooks[,] 1364 Jericho road Richmond 05477.

end of chat transcript