

DRAFT

WEST RUTLAND, VT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (DRB) 2nd Revision
Continued Public Hearing Minutes, 7:00 pm , July 3 2023
W. Rutland Town Office Conference Room (35 Marble St.)

DRB Members Present: Michael Moser (Chair), Tim Ponto (V-Chair), Deborah Higgins, Jon Wallace, Ron Ryan
Also present: Jeffrey Biasuzzi (Zoning Administrator & Recorder), Agents for Applicants: Matt Moore (Evernorth), Patrick Griffin (Enman & Kesserling Engineering); area residents Paul Gilman and Patricia Merrill; and Jefferson Moser

Call to Order: Following a (warned) visit of the Project's site, Chairman Moser called the Continued Public Hearing for Application 23-09 to Order at 7:08 pm.

Following re-opening the Public Hearing of Application 23-09 (a request from the Housing Trust of Rutland County for a Multi-family construction project at 376, 398, & 416 Main Street (hereafter referenced as the Project). The Chairman asked for additional public input on the proposed Project.

P. Gilman stated his concerns about pollution run-off from the parking lot, asking why oil-traps were not in the site plan. He repeated previous concerns about the building's total height being out of place in the village. He was opposed to a "low-income housing project" being in the Town.

P. Merrill asked why W. Rutland was selected for the project and not Rutland City, stating that the City offered advantages (public transportation, more shopping and services options).

J. Biasuzzi noted that the DRB had been sent an email from Chris More (sent 6/30/23, 9:20 am) received by the ZA and emailed to DRB members on 7/3/23. D. Higgins Moved to have the email read into testimony all approved, and Motion passed. J. Biasuzzi read the email aloud (Attachment 1).

M. Moore stated that parking lot oil traps are not a requirement in Town Zoning.

P. Griffin stated that VT Storm-water and VT Rivers agencies both reviewed the project and issued approvals without requiring any oil trap systems. Mr. Griffin also responded to C. More's concern about elevating the structure would result in increased flooding elsewhere, by reiterating the Project's engineered flood modeling and analysis determined that there was an insignificant increase in risk of flooding.

P. Moore asked if the zoning rules had been amended to accommodate this Project. The ZA replied that a comprehensive update of the (2008) rules had been started over a year before learning of this project. This cover-to cover Zoning review addressed a wide variety of current zoning issues, including housing. Housing trends were already favoring more productive utilization of urban locations, allowing greater coverage of property within walking distance to services.

M. Moore asked if the nearby Ambulance Station was required to address oil trap (that project did not require oil traps). M. Moser noted that the Ambulance application was reviewed under the 2008 zoning regulations.

P. Griffin testified that the Project would increase the impervious surface area by about one-eighth of an acre or about 0.02% of the existing 64 acre watershed area currently draining through the project site.

J. Wallace asked why the Project did not consider a storm-water filtration system. P. Griffin stated that there are site related restrictions. J. Wallace felt that the "right thing to do" was to include pollution prevention designs. M. Moore asked if Mr. Wallace's issue was treating parking lot storm water. Mr. Wallace believed that wetland protection was important. M. Moore proposed the Board's decision include a condition to mitigate parking lot storm water.

R. Ryan asked if there was a study of possible pollution sources. P. Griffin stated a study was done.

P. Merrill expressed concern that liquids from the Project Dumpsters would drain on to the site.

T. Ponto expressed his concern about ground level living areas being so close to the Rt. 4A travel lanes.

M. Moore responded that the Project conforms to Vtrans Site (setback) distances.

J. Wallace asked why Evernorth is investing in "affordable" (i.e. subsidized rental) housing. M. Moore stated Evernorth has invested in various type of housing projects. Currently it prefers housing projects that combine public funding with private investment capital.

M. Moser asked for a balloon display at another site visit to demonstrate what the 50 foot high ridgeline of the proposed structure look like.

M. Moser asked the Board Members if they had any further questions. J. Wallace Moved to continue the Hearing to 6: 30 on 7/19/2023, so to observe a balloon exhibit of roof height and provide applicants with time to prepare a parking area pollution mitigation solution. All Members voted to approved to continue the Public Hearing at 7:00 pm 7/19/2023, at Town Offices; and Motion passed.

The proceedings ended at 8:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Jeffrey Biasuzzi

Approved:

Zoning WR

From: chris more <skittlestaz65@gmail.com> on behalf of chris more
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2023 9:20 AM
To: zoning@westrutlandvt.org
Subject: New build-up

Frist I have to apologize for not being able to attend the meeting on July 3rd due to pervious commitments. Frist question hope to go about getting so things like these meetings are advertised in newer ways such as website or town facebook so the whole town is aware. I understand its posted on buildings by permits but now days who what's to walk on others property. The newspaper has become outdated 90% of people I know don't receive it anymore.

Second the small steam behind the site flows into the Castleton river. There is no way to stop the added pollution going to that fragile system. This ecosystems it will flo to is a Audubon society protected wetlands. Not sure how adding pollution is protecting the wetlands.

Third the study thats was done about flooding still did not cover the rasie in elevation of the site. When you rasie any item it causes a dam. The town does not need anymore flooding. So if this building is built and the citizens are right and it causes more flooding what is going to be done to help those who property has been effected.

Fourth When the Ambulance service wanted to come to town which would benefit the the whole town and surrounding areas the board would not give them a variance for building, they had to purchase so many more feet of land. What makes the project better then them. It will not benefit even a 1/4 amount of citizens that the ambulance service will. You have to be fair across the board. What is not done for one should not be done for another just because more might like one projects more then other. When the ambulance service was trying to permit coming to town there was a issue with pulling out of the lot they are on. There will be way less traffic with ambulances there then the bank that was there or the cars we are adding with this building. Why has it not been addressed to possibly putting in a light for them and access elm not main.

Lastly see attached I'm not sure how many people in the town actually knew the board changed this paragraph in the Zoning. Once again it comes into fact of how the town is notified of things the board does. Not sure if that's to keep people from attending meetings and making the meetings are easier or or just the fact procedures haven't been updated in many years.

Thank you for your time.

Zoning WR

From: chris more <skittlestaz65@gmail.com> on behalf of chris more
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2023 9:52 AM
To: zoning@westrutlandvt.org
Subject: Building email
Attachments: 20230630_094420.jpg

Sorry this did not attach

Structures Careful consideration shall be given to the location of proposed conditions, existing vegetation, and the location of fragile features (including slopes, streams and identified habitat and natural areas). The Board may require the location of structures to ensure that development:

is not visually visible from public roads and properties, does not stand in contrast with the surrounding landscape patterns and features, and does not serve as a visual focal point; and down-grade of ridgelines and prominent knolls, is designed so that the height of the structures does not visually exceed the height of the adjacent tree canopy, and is serving as the visual backdrop to the structure;

and does not adversely affect natural and scenic resources and fragile areas identified in the Wetland Town Plan, including wetlands, streams, critical habitat, steep slopes, and unstable soils and/or soil types that are generally unsuitable for development and require site septic disposal.

and landscaping. On wooded sited, existing forest cover shall be maintained and proposed structures to interrupt the façade of buildings, provide a forest canopy, and/or soften the visual impact of new development as viewed from adjacent properties. The Development Review Board shall consider the location of structures relative to existing vegetation, and may require additional tree canopy or a amount of clearing adjacent to proposed development to provide screening.