

I. Call to Order

Members Present: Kevin Lumpkin, Chair; Matt Bacewicz, Vice-Chair; Aaron Guyette; David Weissberger; Elsie Goodrich; Kaitlin Hayes

City Staff Present: Jessie Baker, Eric Vorwald
Guests Present: Suzanne Blain, Doug Weston, Betty Perrotte, Randy Castle, Rick Langlais, Betty Lacharite, Samantha Prue, Ben Rapson, Valarie Guilmette, Marie Miller, Nate Goddard, Doug Johnson, Michael Moran, Jane Moran

Call to Order by: Kevin Lumpkin

Meeting Start Time: 6:34pm

Minutes Recorded by: Eric Vorwald

II. Changes to the Agenda

Mr. Lumpkin indicated he wanted to recognize Mr. Johnson for his time served on the DRB and to welcome Ms. Hayes as the newest member of the Board. He indicated this would be done following public comments. See item IV.

III. Public Comment

None

IV. Introduction of New Member and Comments

Mr. Lumpkin provided an overview of the time and commitments Mr. Johnson had provided to the Development Review Board over the years and provided Mr. Johnson with an opportunity to share any thoughts. Following comments from Mr. Johnson, Mr. Lumpkin asked the members to introduce themselves concluding with newest member; Ms. Hayes.

V. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion by: Mr. Bacewicz

Second: Ms. Goodrich

Decision: 5 – 0

VI. Public Hearing – 9 George Street Conditional Use Request

At 6:48pm Mr. Lumpkin opened a public hearing on a conditional use request for a detached cottage at 9 George Street and requested each person providing testimony swear or affirm their testimony would be true and accurate. Mr. Vorwald provided a brief introduction to the request indicating this was the third time the request had come before the Board for consideration with the previous two times being denied. Mr. Lumpkin provided an overview of the process the hearing would take with the applicant providing a presentation, followed by persons interested in speaking for the application and then

persons speaking against the application. Ms. Hayes indicated that she knows the applicant, but based on the rules of procedure, did not feel there was a conflict of interest. The Board agreed.

Next, Mr. Lumpkin provided information related to a document that was circulated earlier in the day regarding the successive application doctrine. He discussed his request that staff collect information on this issue and that it be circulated to the members, the applicant, and the opposition in advance of the meeting. The purpose of this request was to provide information to determine if the application before the Board was different enough to be considered a new application. He further indicated that the specific discussion on this issue by the board would be addressed during the deliberative session. With no questions or follow-ups on this issue, Mr. Lumpkin invited the applicant to present the request.

Ms. Blain began her presentation by providing an overview of the project and specifically highlighted aspects of this application that were different from the previous application. She highlighted aspects of the parking layout, the cottage design, and similar components. Next, she provided information on herself including her time as a renter and owner of properties that have been upgraded as rentals. Ms. Blain indicated that there was a need for additional affordable housing in the City and this proposal would help fill that need consistent with the City's Master Plan.

Following Ms. Blain's presentation, the members engaged the applicant in several questions. These questions related to the redesign of the cottage, the parking, and similar issues. After this, Ms. Blain provided the Board with responses to the concerns that were identified by the other residents of George Street and included in a petition that was submitted for the record.

With Ms. Blain's presentation complete, Ms. Prue was invited to provide testimony. This testimony related to Ms. Prue's time renting from Ms. Blain when she lived in the City of Winooski. With Ms. Prue's testimony complete, Mr. Rapson was invited to provide testimony. Mr. Rapson also spoke about his time renting from Ms. Blain. With no additional questions for the applicant or their surrogates, Mr. Lumpkin invited persons interested in speaking against the project an opportunity to provide testimony.

Mr. Weston began his testimony by referencing the petition that was submitted on behalf of the residents of George Street. He also indicated that several other residents were attending the meeting with him. Mr. Weston discussed the issues that had been raised at past hearings on this project including on-street parking, the character of the neighborhood, concerns with emergency services accessing the road, increased traffic, and increased levels of density on the street. Mr. Weston concluded by noting that no real changes had been made since the last submission. Several other residents that were attending with Mr. Weston spoke and identified similar sentiments to Mr. Weston. These residents included Ms. Miller and Ms. Lacharite.

Next, Mr. Moran provided testimony as an interested person on the importance of George Street as an access to the school property. He specifically identified access to the playfields and the secondary parking lot.

Following Mr. Moran's testimony, Mr. Castle provided testimony against the application noting this was the third time the application had come forward. He indicated concern for

privacy and expressed concerns about home values.

Finally, two additional residents, Mr. Goddard and Ms. Guilmette provided testimony regarding the impact of the proposal on the neighborhood. Both included comments on density and the issues related to the roadway and school parking.

After the testimony for persons opposed to the application was completed, Mr. Lumpkin invited the applicant back to provide any concluding statements. Ms. Blain stated that she would be willing to install a fence to help screen the property and reiterated the comments related to the school parking and how it impacts the street, stating that this is an issue regardless of the construction of the cottage.

With no other testimony, Mr. Lumpkin closed the hearing at 8:34pm. With the hearing closed, Mr. Lumpkin provided information on the process for the deliberation and that it would be done after the meeting was adjourned in a closed session. The Board discussed acceptance of additional testimony after the hearing, which they decided not to do.

VII. Election of Officers

Motion by: Mr. Weissberger

Second: Ms. Goodrich

Decision: 5 – 0

Mr. Vorwald provided an overview of the existing officers and their terms related to Council appointments. Mr. Weissberger made a motion to reappoint the current slate of officers including Mr. Lumpkin, Chair; Mr. Bacewicz, Vice-Chair, and Mr. Miller (absent from the meeting), Secretary. This was seconded by Ms. Goodrich. All were in favor.

VIII. City Updates

None

IX. Other Business

Mr. Vorwald noted the next meeting would be on August 20th and the deadline for submissions was July 24th. He indicated that there was no administrative business therefore if no applications were submitted the meeting would be cancelled.

X. Adjourn

Motion by: Mr. Bacewicz

Second: Ms. Hayes

Meeting End Time: 8:46pm