

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
108 Shed Road
Berlin, Vermont

UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Meeting of TUESDAY, July 5, 2016

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

Members present: Karla Nuissl, Vice-Chair; John Friedrich; Josh Fitzhugh; and Shane Mispel, Alternate.
Absent: Robert J. Wernecke, Chair and Henry A. LaGue, Jr.

Staff present: Thomas J. Badowski, Zoning Administrator and Carla Preston, Recording Secretary.

Others present: Krister Adams.

The Board explained its Policy and definition of party status and interested persons to attendees. Copies of the Rules and Policies and Procedure were available as handouts. No one present requested party status.

2. New business

A. 16-028 – The Housing Foundation, Inc. submitted an application to amend its Site Plan to add a storage shed and fence. The property is located in the Medium Density Residential (R-20) District at the Hilltop Apartment Complex, (27 and 57 Poplar Street, 61 Maple Street, and 25 Spruce Street) Berlin, Vermont, Parcel ID S01.001.000 and SA1-.001. Krister Adams, Project Manager for The Housing Foundation, Inc. was sworn in to give testimony on this matter.

The following documents were submitted and admitted as exhibits: **Exhibit #1:** Application for Zoning Permit, 06-028, received on 06/13/2016; **Exhibit #2:** Marked up Site Plan showing proposed fence and shed, dated 05/14/2013; and **Exhibit #3:** May 26, 2016 letter from the Vermont State Housing Authority addressing site plan review criteria.

In response to the Board's inquiry regarding Krister Adams' authorization to present the application, Mr. Adams advised that he works for the company established to manage property owned by the Vermont Housing Authority. He noted that he and one other person from the Development Team are authorized to complete and present applications on its behalf. The application was clear that Mr. Adams had authority to represent the application.

Mr. Adams advised he is the Development Specialist for the Vermont State Housing Authority. The Housing Foundation owns the Hilltop Apartments located in Berlin. He advised that they have done major renovations to the buildings and now wish to build a small utility shed and install a fence. He noted that some trees were removed along the road and the fence would serve as a visual barrier and improve safety. He advised the main purpose of the fence is to discourage children from going near the road. He referred to the Site Plan which showed the proposed location of the wing shaped fence approximately 80 to 100 feet in length.

Mr. Adams advised that the proposed 120 square foot utility shed would be next to an existing shed, located about 100 feet off the road, down a bank and behind another building. The shed would not be visible from the road. The dimensions of the proposed utility shed would be 10 feet by 12 feet and about 8 feet tall, with natural colored siding and gray asphalt shingles. The shed will have windows and a door on the side. Mr. Adams advised that the existing shed is not shown on the

plans but explained where other structures were located and what the drawings on the site plan represented. He noted that the rectangle near the corner represented the playground area. The proposed fence would be located off to the side near the corner and the hill.

Zoning Administrator Badowski advised that notices were sent to abutters. He noted that no concerns were raised by any abutters and none of them are present.

In response to the Board's inquiry about the reason for the removal of the trees and fence, Mr. Adams advised that the pine trees were removed mainly for aesthetic purposes, issues with pine needles, shade, etc. He noted that they have not experienced any issues with children running into the road but want to avoid it and believe the fence will add safety. The fence would be around 75 feet from the edge of the road but at a minimum would be no closer than the 50-foot setback. They are planning on a four feet high vinyl style picket fence since it requires minimal maintenance.

The Board had no issue with the proposed style of fence but asked for further clarification of setbacks. The Board advised it would have been helpful to have shown all existing structures, setbacks, and proposed structures with setbacks on the site plans.

Mr. Adams advised that the setbacks are mentioned on the application(s) and assured the Board that they would be met with the proposed structures. There is sufficient room for the proposed structures to meet the setback requirements which was confirmed by Mr. Badowski.

Mr. Adams addressed the Site Plan Review Criteria.

- a. Safety of vehicular and pedestrian circulation on site and any adverse impacts on the adjacent street network.** Mr. Adams advised that there would be no change or impact regarding access to the site and no impact on vehicular or pedestrian circulation on site.
- b. Adequacy of circulation, parking, and loading facilities.** Mr. Adams advised there would be no change in vehicular or pedestrian circulation on site as a result of this application. The storage shed (riding lawn mower, etc.) would be located at the far end of the parking lot and would not have vehicular access.
- c. Bicycle and Pedestrian Access.** There would be no change or impact on this criterion.
- d. Adequacy of landscaping.** Mr. Adams advised that they are not proposing any additional landscaping. The area where the proposed shed would be located is currently grass.
- e. Hours of Operation.** There would be no change in the hours of operation as a result of this application.
- f. Setbacks.** Mr. Adams advised that all setbacks for the district would be met. The front yard setback is 50 feet, left and right side setbacks are 25 feet and the rear yard setback is also 25 feet.
- g. Adequacy of Exterior lighting.** Mr. Adams advised that no exterior lighting is being proposed for the shed or playground area.

- h. Stormwater and Drainage.** Mr. Adams advised that there would be no impact on stormwater and drainage as a result of this application.
- i. Utilization of renewable energy resources.** Mr. Adams advised that there would be no impact on this criterion. He noted that they have explored solar energy and may consider solar panels on the roof in the future.
- j. Municipal Services Impact Evaluation.** Mr. Adams advised that there would be no impact on any municipal services as a result of this application.
- k. Flood Hazard Review.** Not applicable.

Based on documents presented and testimony heard, Mr. Friedrich made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fitzhugh, to close the hearing with respect to Application 16-028. The question was called and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Review and approval of the Minutes.

Approval of the Minutes of the June 21, 2016 was tabled.

4. Public Comment

Persons present participated in the meeting as noted above.

5. Other Business

6. Status of Findings.

The Board voted to go into deliberative session at 7:16 P.M. and out at 7:22 P.M. to discuss the status of Findings. The Board's decision with regard to (closed) adjourned applications will be reported in its Findings.

7. The next meeting of the Development Review Board is scheduled for **Tuesday, August 2, 2016.**

8. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Carla Preston
Recording Secretary
Town of Berlin