

Town of Georgia
47 Town Common Road North. • St. Albans, VT 05478
Phone: 802-524-3524 • Fax: 802-524-3543 • website: townofgeorgia.com

GEORGIA DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Minutes from August 16, 2022

Board Members Present: Suzanna Brown, James Powell, Greg Drew, Jaime Comstock, Gilles Rainville, Jr., Glen Sjoblem

Board Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Emily Johnson

Others Present:

- 1. DRB Chair Suzanna Brown calls the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. and swore in participants**
- 2. Additions, deletions, or changes in order of agenda items.
None**
- 3. Public Hearings:**
 - a. Sketch Plan Review (SK-007-22) Maddalena Michetti and Jon Zap are proposing a 2- lot subdivision at 453 Polly Hubbard Rd. The parcel is located in the AR-1 and is ±10.09 acres in size.**

Suzanna is made aware that the Engineer Mark, has joined by Zoom

Suzanna reads the general summary of the Sketch Plan, including the road frontages of Lot 1 and Lot 2.

Mr. Day is asked if anything has changed since the Board received the packet?
Mr. Day says no.

Suzanna asks if there's anything that Mr. Day would like to tell us about the packet? Mr. Day replies that the summary is pretty clear. One thing we want to make sure we discuss is the the existing right away that bisex the parcel to a parcel in the rear that is not developed., but could have potential to be developed in the future so we would maintain that existing ROW and there was discussion as to whether we would Utilize that location as an access point or come off from the existing driveway and have shared driveway for the existing house plus a new house . I think we have Leaned towards using the existing driveway and creating

a shared row to create frontage we would need for the new lot, or for the existing lot.

Suzanne asks to pause just for a second, to swear everyone in. The swearing in of all members takes place.

Suzanne asks Bob to clarify the road frontage. It says that Bob has 565' on Polly Hubbard Road, but there doesn't seem to actually be 565'. Emily points out that she may have made a mistake, and apologizes for her mistake. Suzanna points out that according to the map that is drawn, there is 315' on Lot 2 and 120' on Lot 1, and asks for clarification. Mark clarifies that on Polly Hubbard, yes Suzanna is correct. Mark also points out that with the sketch plan, the intention is to create additional road frontage on the proposed 60' ROW. Which Suzanna states would require a waiver. Suzanna also points out there there is 435' of road frontage.

Suzanna asks for questions from the Board;

Greg wonders if the parties are present and he is assured that they are. Greg asks if Maddalena Michetti and Jon Zap actually own the property that created that ROW? That subdivision was your parcel? Ms. Michetti replies that the original parcel was owned by the Schwindells and then it was subdivided into two lots, but that's when he purchased it. The 55 acres behind, the really usable part behind is really where that ROW is crucial. Greg verifies, "to that lot?" Suzanna clarifies that at this time there's nothing developed there. Ms. Michetti agrees, and points out that they have children. Suzanna points out that the possibility of moving the ROW is there because there's nothing that's been built there. Ms. Michetti mentions that she has walked it, and the ROW is in a good spot right now, it leads to a pine portion and beyond that there are fields and then wetlands. Suzanna mentions that they pulled up the old maps from when it was divided and there was a proposed house site at that time.

Greg questions if that was moved to the East, then usable area of Lot 2, that you folks have (pointing the the corner of the room to Greg's right, it would be a slightly better layout and all three of you could share one road cut and it would make it a lot easier for road maintenance. The lady to Greg's right asks where he is proposing the ROW be moved and Greg points out on the map, where the ROW would line closer to parallel with a lot line and follow the line of the property on the map, and points out it wouldn't divide lot two in half, and she agrees. Greg points out that would be an agreement with all parties, because it's your ROW that was put in place by the subdivision that created your lot, not the one that created this Lot 1. Greg points out that it's the Michetti/Zap right to change, not the landowners that it's on right now. However, Greg points out that if they could all put their heads together it would make the planning of this site considerably better.

Greg explains that this is the sketch plan and what this is basically is to kick concepts around, and then the Board will go into deliberative session later tonight and “hash out” what will be suggested in a letter.

Ms. Michetti points out that their first inclination was that the ROW bisects that piece of property, and Greg points out that it makes it awkward for the set-backs that have to be in the area, and Suzanna points out for the usability because someday it’s likely there will be a road down through there and it could be that ½ the property is on the other side of the road, not to say that it will necessarily be high traffic, but you don’t know depending on the development of the property. The question was asked about the suitability of developing the western side of the ROW, is there a building site there? Is that considered buildable land? Greg states it might be, and Suzanna clarifies they are discussing Lot 2. It’s pointed out that there are no wetlands delineated and that the river is just to the left of there. It’s also pointed out that there’s quite a ridge and it’s not flat, in fact it’s quite steep. Moving the house site further West would make sense. Fred Schell asks about a 20’ topographical error, which should read 40’ rather than 20’.

Suzanne asks if there are any other questions; Request is made for copies of the map, and even a larger size map. Accommodations are made for guests with different size maps.

The lady behind Suzanna states their question is whether the ROW can be moved to the West of Lot 2? Discussion is had as to where that would line in relation to the map, and the barn. The Lady sitting to the right of Fred mentions aesthetic features and historical resources but there’s a very old barn foundation located in the corner, which is pretty special that they would like to see preserved.

The driveway would be up the ridge, the ROW is up on the ridge currently and ends up at the bottom of the ridge. Would consider moving it to the bottom of the ridge. Single lady near the window. Existing ROW, they had been discussing moving it to the west, if that’s an option. Mark, Developer would have to come and look at it. Suzanna and Greg agree that Lot 2 would be much more usable.

One guest comments that on Polly Hubbard road, visibility is limited coming off the curve and looking up the hill, it’s kind of blind.

Mark comments that relocation discussion is obviously in ?? hands if they would entertain the discussion of relocating the ROW. If we focused on the lot layout we’re looking at here, and assuming we move forward we’d focus on a site visit, with ?? potential changes to see if it could be agreed upon. Greg refers back to a map that was done previously in 1995 and the end of the easement is on quite a slope. A proposed dwelling was on the toe, quite a slope. Moving a bit to the West would actually get you into flatter land. Additional conversation was had on the map between Suzanna and Greg. Slope measurements are discussed.

The Board's big issue is that you don't have the road frontage on one of your lots, so you are creating a non-conforming lot. Not that you have to, but it's not being divided so that you each get your road frontage. There's not 250' for each of them. Emily points out that considering the parent parcel, there's not a lot of room to play. It's limited on how it can be divided says Suzanne.

Easement across lot 1's driveway, the total road frontage doesn't quite hit 250' each. Suzanne says because there's 435' one lot will be short. In the original paperwork it said 565' but that wasn't correct, so they only have 435' which isn't going to keep the project from going through. They would need a waiver.

Fred says the curve near their driveway, Lot 1 visibility is fine. Plenty of room in both directions, it's not the steepest part says Fred. Having a second one in there, however might change that. Suzanna says it sounds like the 60' ROW through the ?? Lot is going to be looked at being moved, it would be beneficial to just link it to the current driveway which is going to be a proposed 60' ROW and pull off of that. That would make Lot 2 much more usable. Suzanne points out that it is just a suggestion. Sight lines for a new driveway wouldn't have to happen. Sharing the drive might improve Lot 2. Driveway standards have changed, and the current driveway might have to be updated/changed.

Gilles asks about a gas line at the bottom of the map. There's discussion about the gas lines on the map.

Greg says there will have to be a waiver to ask for road frontage and one for ROW for Lot 2.

Fred asks if there's another sketch hearing planning meeting. Suzanna says they will give recommendations and then we will get together. There's a question as to how they received notice of the meeting so close to the meeting. Emily explains they went out last week, it doesn't require to be warned 15 days in advance but the final does. It will be posted on the website, it will be posted around town where it's supposed to be and it will be in the St. Albans Messenger 15 days prior. and Suzanna explain it doesn't have to be warned, but everyone present will be alerted to the next meeting.

Gilles makes the motion to close the hearing, Greg seconds, All are in favor of closing the hearing.

b. Final Plat Review (FP-004-22) Jean & Gary, Jr. Gilmond are proposing a 2-lot minor subdivision at 2555 Ballard Rd in the AR-2 zoning district.

Glen and Jaime were not there for the sketch, Emily explains that she did not send them the materials. They will abstain from the vote.

Suzanna reads the general summary of the Final Plat Review.

Suzanna asks if there is anything that has changed since the Board received the packet? Answered No.

The Developer and Mr. Gilmond gave an overview of the proposed project.

The property of 10.2 acres with residential properties across Ballard Road, one residential property to the South and the Ballard Farm covers part of the land to the South, and the Fitzgerald property has a 60' ROW that goes back to the Fitzgerald property. Across from that is Mark Gilmond's house.

The lot is treed, and in this area here (points to the map) there is a tree line that's added to the plan based on topography. The subdivision line is identified on the map. The existing and proposed residences are noted, as well as barn, garage and shed. There is some shallow bedrock in that area, and some steeper slopes, not identified as greater than 25% slopes, but steeper than the rest of the lot. The rest of the lot is quite flat. He has identified the edge of the existing meadow, there are some primax soils on site, and he references a map that was in the submittal that showed the primax soils are mapped. Pointing out a certain area on the map, it's mentioned that this area wouldn't qualify as primax soils even if they are due to the shallow bedrock. What he thought was that they would try to keep the development towards Ballard Road and the area he points out on the map will most likely stay in farm production. The plan is minimal impact if anything to the existing property. Proposed well on site at the front of the lot and the new waste water disposal system for Lot 1 will be on Lot 2, and they've identified the replacement area on Lot 2 for the existing house that has existing waste water system. The waste water permit has been received from the State of Vermont and they have submitted their curbcut application. They have shifted the driveway just a little bit so that as cars come up the hill, they will be shining their headlights into the trees, not into the windows of an existing white house. That's really the only change since the presentation of the sketch.

Request for questions is made by the Developer.

Suzanne mentions in reference to the proposed topography, the Board is always amazed at how many times they see a plan and they say, "we're not going to change anything, here's our topography" and then they put the foundation of their house on top of the ground and build up all around it. Suzanna is curious to know, what the plan is for the driveway. The developer points out that the driveway is not very steep, the land does slope down, he doesn't know exactly what the slope is, and Suzanna points out that it's 20' across from Ballard all the way down to the back of the house. Contours are discussed.

The Developer points out that he intends to build the house up a bit for a couple of different reasons, one is that with a foundation, there will be some foundation drain, and they'd like to drain that without sump pump, and there will obviously be some excess material that we waste on site by up. They usually identify the existing floor based on a happy medium. Taking into consideration driveway slopes, the excess

build that might be from putting in the foundation, this will be elevated (points at map) a couple feet above the existing and then back here, about 4' or so above existing. Suzanna asks if the house will sit down from the road, similar to the house next door and the Developer says that's yes. He explains that they will have to import a lot of material to bring it up even. Suzanna asks about a paved driveway? Mr. Gilmond says the driveway won't be paved right off. Perhaps in the future, the new home owner will decide to pave it. Currently, the other two homes have crushed stone driveways. Mr. Gilmond's daughter and her husband are building the home, and the cost of materials is quite expensive. Mr. Gilmond does not believe a paved driveway will be a priority at this point.

Greg has a question; It says proposed driveway in accordance with VTRANS B-71 without culvert? The Developer says that because they don't need a culvert here, they go back to the drain plan. Since there is no roadside swail here, (points to the map) that the road is the high point and everything runs off and so we are putting in a driveway and obviously that will be a little bit elevated, so we are grading in a swail on the upper side of the driveway to capture any water that runs from up above and then there will be a sheet falloff the proposed driveway and continue in the same direction that it currently is. Water to the North and to the South that runs through that area. Mr. Gilmond notes that he drives his brushhog through there regularly to keep the weeds down, and it's very dry in those areas. Mr. Gilmond believes it will be a pretty setting as they have no intention of touching or moving any of the maple trees currently there. It's noted that the area near the trees might once again be home to horses in the future.

Suzanne asks if there are any questions; There are no questions

Greg moves to close the hearing, Jamie seconds, all were in favor. Hearing ended.

Review & approval of the August 2, 2022 meeting minutes.

- 4. Gilles makes the motion to accept the minutes with the changes, James seconds, all in favor. Jamie Comstock abstained.**
- 5. Greg Drew motioned to enter deliberative session, James Powell seconded. All were in favor. The DRB entered deliberative session at 7:44 pm.**
- 6. Greg Drew motioned to exit deliberative session, Gilles Rainville seconded. All were in favor. The DRB exited deliberative session at 9:54 pm.**
- 7. Glenn Sjoblom motioned to end the meeting, Jamie Comstock seconded. All were in favor. The Tuesday August 16, 2022 DRB meeting ended at 9:55 pm.**

DRB Coordinator Tasks:

- Draft decisions for SK-007-22 and FP-004-22

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Fletch Stanley, Minute-taker