

## **I. Call to Order**

Members Present: Kevin Lumpkin, Chair; Matt Bacewicz, Vice-Chair; Harland Miller, Secretary; David Weissberger; Doug Johnson; Elsie Goodrich

City Staff Present: Jessie Baker, Paul Sarne, Eric Vorwald

Guests Present: Greg Pajala, Suzanne Blain, Doug Weston, Dan Heil, Rosaire Larose, Betty Perrotte, Emmy Charron, Justin Tougas, David Epstein, Cam Featherstonhaugh, Sean McMannon, Nate Dagesse, Randy Castle, Ian Metcalf, Alexander Yin, Kelly Fitzpatrick, Paul Boisvert, Tom Barden, John Light, Katie White, Amy Houghton, Bruce Allais, Corey Mack, Peter Burns, Mike Decarreau, Terry Zigmund, Jane Moran, Rick Langlais, Betty Lacharite, Don Lacharite

Call to Order by: Kevin Lumpkin

Meeting Start Time: 6:31pm

Minutes Recorded by: Eric Vorwald

## **II. Changes to the Agenda**

None

## **III. Public Comment**

None.

To read the remote meeting Zoom chat transcript, click here: <https://www.winooskivt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3103/Development-Review-Board-Remote-Meeting-Chat-Transcript>

## **IV. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes**

Motion by: Mr. Bacewicz

Second: Mr. Weissberger

Decision: 5 - 0

Motion to approve both sets of minutes, with correction as recommended by Mr. Johnson.

## **V. Parking Waiver Request – 60 Normand Street**

The hearing on the parking waiver request for 60 Normand Street was opened at 6:45pm.

Mr. Vorwald provided an overview of the project including information on the nature of the parking waiver. Specifically, he indicated that based on the parking standards there is no

minimum standard for a school. The next closest use that would be applied to this project would require approximately 800 parking spaces. With this in mind, a waiver was being requested to establish the minimum number of spaces needed for the school campus redevelopment as outlined in the draft parking waiver language.

Next, Mr. McMannon provided a brief introduction to the project and highlighted several key points before the rest of the project team including Mr. Epstein, Mr. Mack, Mr. Featherstonehaugh, and Mr. Boisvert outlined the specific details of the project and the analysis that was done related to the parking waiver. After the presentation by the project team, Mr. Lumpkin opened the floor to the membership for questions.

Questions and discussions from the members included concerns regarding future staffing and student totals; methodology for peak parking needs; reconfiguration of the exist lanes; overall site circulation; bicycle parking locations; electric vehicle charging locations; ADA accessible spaces; dedicated spaces for the daycare facility; overall layout of the parking including head-in versus parallel parking; possible traffic congestion on George Street with expanded parking area; stormwater concerns due to expanded surface parking; and other issues. The discussion went back and forth with questions and answers from the DRB members and the project team.

After the membership concluded with their questions, Mr. Lumpkin opened up the meeting to members of the public that were interested in providing questions or comments. Several residents along George Street reiterated concerns about traffic and the expanded parking area that is accessed from George Street.

With no other questions or comments, Mr. Lumpkin concluded the discussion on the parking waiver request for 60 Normand Street.

## **VI. Parking Waiver Request – 355 Main Street**

The hearing on the parking waiver request for 355 Main Street was opened at 7:50pm

Mr. Vorwald provided an overview of the parking waiver request for 355 Main Street and indicated that this request was to reduce the overall parking needs for the project below what can be accommodated administratively. The draft parking waiver allows for an applicant to request additional parking relief from the DRB, which is what is requested for this application.

Next, Mr. Dagesse provided an overview of the project and an overview of the information included with the waiver request. He reviewed the parking study that was completed and submitted as part of the application for justification of the waiver. Specifically, Mr. Dagesse is requesting additional relief of six spaces from the minimum required parking to allow 31 spaces instead of 37 spaces to be included as part of the project redevelopment.

Following the presentation by Mr. Dagesse, Mr. Lumpkin opened up the discussion to members of the DRB. Specific questions and comments were related to potential uses for the ground floor commercial space; snow removal; share use parking on the site; street parking and congestion along Main Street; hours of operation for the commercial space; gated access to the parking area; parking needs for the office and commercial spaces; and similar topics. Next, Mr. Lumpkin opened the meeting for public comments and

questions.

During this part of the meeting, concerns were raised related to possible impacts to the adjacent residential areas, specifically along Bellevue Street. It was stated that during the discussion of the waiver language at the Planning Commission, apprehensions were raised as to how the waiver may adversely impact adjacent residential areas. These issues were compounded by an uncertainty to the specific use and transportation demands that might be associated with the commercial space.

After additional discussion with the applicant, the public, and the membership, Mr. Lumpkin asked for any additional questions or comments. Hearing none, Mr. Lumpkin concluded the discussion on the parking waiver request for 355 Main Street.

## **VII. Preliminary Plan Review – 64 LaFountain Street Planned Unit Development**

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Lumpkin asked if the membership wanted to continue or postpone the rest of the items to a future meeting. The membership agreed to continue.

Mr. Vorwald provided an overview of the project including the status of the Planned Unit Development. Specifically, he indicated that the plan was before the DRB as a preliminary plan and would need to come back as a final plan before any formal action could be taken. He also reminded the DRB that this project had come before the DRB twice before as a sketch plan and comments on both sketch plan reviews were provided to the applicant. He also indicated that the comments had been incorporated into this updated preliminary plan. Mr. Vorwald concluded by stating that the purpose of this review was to identify any additional comments for the applicant to take into consideration before their final plan submission.

Mr. Heil, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the preliminary plan. Included with the application were responses to each of the previous comments provided by the DRB on the sketch plans. Mr. Heil noted each comment and indicated how it had been addressed on the preliminary plan. This included elements such as orientation of the units; adding sidewalks; including a turn-a-round for fire apparatus; increasing the setbacks around the project; conducting additional investigations on soils and wetlands; including information on site lighting; and other design elements for the project.

Following Mr. Heil's presentation, Mr. Lumpkin opened the meeting to the membership for questions or comments. Specific questions were primarily focused on the fact that the project proposed a private road. It was noted that there was little information related to the standards for private roads or how they were permitted in the City. Mr. Vorwald indicated he would follow-up with the Director of Public Works to get additional detail on this issue to share with Mr. Heil. Other questions were related to parking and how it would be met on site.

Next, Mr. Lumpkin opened the meeting to other interested parties in attendance. Specific questions that were raised related to stormwater and how it would be handled on site. It was noted that portions of the property are often wet or experience ponding during rain events. There were also questions about ownership and if the project would be controlled by the developer or if the units would be individually owned.

After additional discussion with the applicant, the public, and the membership, Mr.

Lumpkin asked for any additional questions or comments. Hearing none, Mr. Lumpkin concluded the discussion on preliminary Planned Unit Development Submission for 64 LaFountain Street.

### **VIII. Conditional Use Request – 9 George Street**

The hearing on the conditional use request for 9 George Street was opened at 9:15pm

Mr. Vorwald started off the discussion by providing an overview of the project and indicated that this had been reviewed by the DRB at their meeting in October. He stated that the previous submission was denied by the DRB due to a lack of specific detail related to lot coverage and parking. Mr. Vorwald noted that the applicant had since engaged an engineer to prepare a detailed plan that addressed the concerns of the DRB since the last meeting.

Following Mr. Vorwald's introduction, the applicant provided an overview of the project in context with the neighborhood and provided information on the changes that had been made to the design since the last submission. Specifically, changes to the parking, a new entrance for the main house, and other walkways were noted on the updated site plan. Following this presentation, Mr. Lumpkin asked for comments or questions from the membership.

Mr. Weissberger asked for clarification between a detached cottage and an accessory use, based on comments submitted in advance by an adjacent property owner. Mr. Vorwald described the differences between the two including the permitting process that would be followed for each. Other questions from the membership included details on parking, driveway surfaces, locations of parking, size of the detached cottage including possible occupancy, occupancy of the primary house, bedrooms in the primary house, and other site specific questions. Next Mr. Lumpkin opened the meeting to those in attendance for questions or comments.

Questions and concerns from those in attendance included issues of parking and accessibility of George Street; concerns over impacts to the character of the neighborhood; concerns regarding property values; drainage concerns and runoff due to additional impervious surface; how conditions would be enforced and violations be tracked; concerns that the hearing should have been postponed until people could gather in person; and other issues related to the density of the area.

Following this discussion, Mr. Lumpkin asked for any additional questions or comments. With no additional comments, Mr. Lumpkin concluded the discussion on the conditional use request for 9 George Street.

### **IX. City Updates**

None

### **X. Other Business**

Due to the time, the DRB decided to hold deliberations at a future date. Mr. Vorwald stated that he would solicit times and dates where the membership could convene early next week to deliberate.

### **XI. Adjourn**

Motion by: Matt

Second: Harland

Meeting End Time: 10:04pm

DRAFT