

# CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## Project Review Committee

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

### Approved Minutes

September 27, 2018

#### Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Byron Atwood, Barre Town Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jerry D'Amico, Roxbury Commissioner (Alternate Seat)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laura Hill-Eubanks, Northfield Commissioner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Janet Shatney, Barre City Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bob Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner

1  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

Staff: Clare Rock

Guests: Jim Fecteau and Jeff Olesky, consultant Wilson Consulting Engineers

#### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Byron Atwood at 4pm.

#### Adjustments to the Agenda

None.

#### Public Comments

None.

#### **Projects of Substantial Regional Impact**

Fecteau Residential, Inc presented by Jim Fecteau - Fecteau is proposing the construction of a residential Planned Unit Development consisting of 48 new lots and a max of 90 units in Barre Town.

Fecteau distributed a 3-page handout which included the phased site plan. The consultant had large scale drawing of the various site plans. The following project information was presented and discussed:  
Project location: the project is located between Beckley Hill and Richardson Road. Specifically off the end of Rudd and Daniels Drive. The new neighborhood will connect Daniels Drive to Beckley Hill Road. The parcel is 21.6 acres and is proposing one lot containing 28 units, plus 44 lots, 18 of which may have two units and the balance will be single family homes. A total of 90 units.

Phase I will be to connect Daniels Drive to Beckley Hill and construct 49 units. Phase 2 will be 28 multifamily or more single-family, up to 13 units. Phase 3 will be more single family, up to 13 units or 28 multifamily. The duration of the project will be 15+ years, dependent on absorption rate. The homes will be manufactured, modular structures with a \$200,000 or under price range which is considered affordable.

The current parcel is a vacant field, with a class 3 wetland, which the state has signed off on. The plan has been permitted at the local level as a PUD and is located within the HDR district and adjacent to the very HDR district. During the PUD process the very HDR density standards were applied to the parcel. It will be served by Town of Barre sewer and City of Barre water, power by GMP.

1  
2 Four acres / 25% will be retained as open space via an easement. There are no environmental  
3 constraints (no floodplains, jurisdictional wetlands or prime ag soils.)  
4

5 There are no sidewalks on the adjoining roads and there will be no sidewalks in the new development  
6 but there will be a wide shoulder with a painted line for pedestrians. Six new street lights will be added  
7 and 22 new street trees. A full traffic study will be done by VHB and presented to Act 250. The  
8 stormwater will be collected by curbed roads with subsurface catchment. The project has a stormwater  
9 construction permit but does not have its discharge permit.  
10

11 Regarding the Act 250 process, the application filed on September 22, 2018, but the application was  
12 only uploaded on to the Act 250 website earlier this week. There has been no hearing date set and  
13 expect this will be a major application.  
14

15 Discussion followed about regional impacts and conformance with the regional plan. It is expected to  
16 add new students and could have impacts on the Richardson Road and Route 2 intersection. The  
17 proposal is infill between 2 existing neighborhoods and does connect neighborhoods. It's located in a  
18 regional center and creates new housing. It is located on the boarder of Barre Town and Barre City. The  
19 regional plan discourages development on slopes greater than 25%, the maximum slopes on the site are  
20 between 20-23%. Staff has not had a chance to review the whole application. Review of the *Project*  
21 *Review Committee Procedures* and the *Operating Guidelines for the Review of Projects*, last amended  
22 June 1, 2010.  
23

24 *B Wernecke made a motion to confirm the proposal is of Substantial Regional Impact, seconded by*  
25 *Brabant, all in favor. Motion carried.*  
26

27 *B Wernecke made a motion to continue discussion on the proposal until the next meeting or prior to a*  
28 *hearing date (whichever is sooner) to provide staff the opportunity to review the application and provide*  
29 *comments to the committee in preparation of a hearing, seconded by J Brabant, all in favor. Motion*  
30 *carried.*  
31

### 32 **Updates on other Act 250 & Section 248 Applications**

33 Staff will provided an update and overview of applications that have been received and as listed on the  
34 September 24, 2018 Summary Sheet. Discussion followed about the staff notes on the Summery Sheet.  
35 Application 1 – Rock asked if the Committee had reviewed this application during the 45-day Advance  
36 Notice period – they had not. Staff suggested the best time to weigh in on Section 248 application is  
37 during that timeframe. Staff referenced letters which had been submitted in the past in response to  
38 Section 248 applications which do not meet SRI. Committee doesn't think we should be sending letters  
39 which state we have no comments or that we “waive the 45-day” period. Discussion followed about  
40 what this waiver means.  
41

42 Discussion followed about the need for a more consistent review process and an explanation of a staff  
43 determination on SRI or not. The draft committee procedures provided a clearer process but these will  
44 not be adopted or approved by the Commission until after the Regional Plan Committee has completed  
45 their work (see below.)  
46

47 J Brabant talked about Washington Electrics (WashCo) commitment to renewables and how rate payers  
48 have to pick up the loss when there is fluctuation between supply and demand and when a utility has to

1 dump excess energy generation. The suggestion was made to invite them to a future meeting and to  
2 also consider this aspect of rate-payer increases in the Preferred Siting criteria. Brabant suggested this  
3 committee review all renewable projects which are proposing 150kW or greater.  
4

#### 5 **Updates from Regional Plan Committee**

6 L Hill Eubanks stated that the regional Plan Committee is working on developing best practices for towns  
7 in there process of approving a preferred site. This would include a robust community engagement  
8 component and developing an accompanying flow chart which would outline a process. Discussion  
9 followed about having the utilities weigh in on the process and PUC's flawed process as the rate payer  
10 has to subsidize many of the renewable energy projects. It was a goal of renewables but the law which  
11 came out of the legislature as a result was terrible.  
12

#### 13 **Meeting Minutes**

14  
15 *B Atwood made a motion to approve the July 26, 2018 minutes, seconded by L Hill Eubanks, all in favor.*  
16 *Motion carried.*  
17

18 *B Wernecke made a motion to approve the August 30, 2018 minutes, seconded by J Brabant, all in favor.*  
19 *Motion carried.*  
20

#### 21 **Next Meeting**

22 The next meeting is scheduled for October 25, 2018 and we will have Preferred Site Request. B  
23 Wernecke is unable to attend this meeting.  
24

#### 25 **Adjournment**

26  
27 *L Hill Eubanks made a motion to adjourn at 5:10 pm, seconded by J Brabant, all in favor. Motion carried.*  
28