



Minutes
Moretown Development Review Board
Thursday, March 21, 2024
-Draft-

The meeting was held in person at the Moretown Town Office and online via Zoom.

Members Present: Greg Nagurney, Craig Oshkello, John Riley (Chair), David Russo
Staff Present: Carol Chamberlin, Zoning Administrator
Applicants Present: Adam Hostetter, Brendan O'Reilly
Others Present: Kim Clark, Larry Clark, Cary Friberg, Kate Gaylord, Trevor Gaylord, David Laskey, Diane Levin, Bob Lindemann, Cindy Lindemann, Gunner McCain, Carl Yalicki

John Riley called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm.

Application #24-01CU: Conditional Use Application by Adam Hostetter and Brendan O'Reilly to create a Planned Unit Development, converting an existing barn and workshop to multi-unit dwellings at 7386 VT-100B (Parcel ID 08-069.000) per the applicable portions of Section 5 of the Moretown Zoning and Subdivision Regulations.

A site visit was held prior to the hearing, attended by the Adam Hostetter, Brendan O'Reilly, George McCain, Craig Oshkello, John Riley, David Russo, Carol Chamberlin, Kim Clark, Larry Clark, Cary Friberg, Trevor Gaylord, David Laskey, Diane Levin, Bob Lindemann, Cindy Lindemann, and Carl Yalicki. The location of the current buildings was observed, with the applicants providing a broad overview of the changes proposed for those structures. The site for a potential new structure, to house an additional four dwelling units, was outlined by the applicants; construction of this unit is not part of the current application.

To begin the hearing, Gunner McCain provided an overview of the plans for developing the existing structures into a PUD, explaining that the existing three-bedroom residence will remain a single-family residence (SFR) and that the barn structure is proposed to become five two-bedroom units. The original application materials included that the newer workshop building at the western end of the parking area was to be developed into a three-bedroom unit, but the applicants indicated at the meeting that this was no longer intended. Mr. McCain also indicated that construction of what is included on the site plan as Building #4 is not part of this application, but has been included for the sake of transparency, as his PUD calculations allow

for 11 dwelling units on the property and the applicants may apply for development of the additional units to be contained in that building in the future.

Mr. McCain explained that the only proposed external changes included in this application are the addition of a covered porch on the front of the current barn building, providing safe, comfortable access to the proposed dwelling units, as well as a deck on the back of the barn building, for use by the dwelling units. Otherwise, the application is for a change in use to residential.

The following matters were raised and discussed during the hearing:

- Landscaping – No landscaping plan was submitted, as not many changes are proposed. A walkway is proposed for access to the first floor of the barn building from the parking area.
- Lighting – It was noted that walkway lighting will likely be a requirement resulting from evaluation by the fire safety team. All exterior lighting to be installed will be downcast and shielded, and not illuminate any more area than that necessary for safety. Outdoor lighting will also be motion-sensored and on timers.
- Act 250 jurisdiction – It was confirmed that there is Act 250 jurisdiction on the parcel, and that the application for an amendment to the current permit is currently in progress.
- Wastewater permitting – The parcel's wastewater permit will require an amendment in order to provide additional capacity; soil testing is completed, and adequate capacity has been determined to exist.
- Stormwater permitting requirements – Mr. McCain explained that minimal impervious surface is being created through construction of the porch, and so no construction stormwater permit is required. If/when the proposed Building #4 is applied for, stormwater permitting needs for that development will be evaluated.
- The addition of porches/decks/walkways – The applicants explained that architectural renderings are not yet available, but that the porch on the road side of the barn building is intended to provide safe access to those units, and that the rear decks will likely be 10 feet wide, with privacy between the units. Currently there are no plans to cover the deck areas.
- Common mailbox area – The Board asked what is planned for a common mailbox area, and the applicants responded that they would work with the local postal carriers to design a location and configuration that makes the most sense for them and the residents.
- Ownership and type of residences – The units will not be sold as condominiums, but will be rental units, with a focus on providing affordable workforce housing (not subsidized units). The applicants indicated that there is no intent to use the units as short-term rentals.
- Open space dedication and allowable PUD density – The application materials include demarcation of the higher elevation portion of the site to be dedicated as open space, with that area being 52% of the 4.8 acres located to the south of Route 100B. The calculation of the PUD density bonus provided indicates a capacity for 11 dwelling units. These calculations are outlined in Section 5.5(D) of the Land Use Regulations. The

additional acreage (approximately one acre) located to the north of Route 100B is not included in the density bonus calculation.

- Water supply and wastewater disposal – The existing water supply and wastewater infrastructure will remain in use; at least one new well will be drilled, and one new leach field developed. Should Building #4 be developed in the future, a new well will likely be needed to serve those units. Mr. McCain explained that the future building would likely be served adequately by the existing and currently proposed septic capacity, and that no interference with existing nearby water supplies is anticipated by the drilling of new well(s) for this proposed development. Neighbors will be notified if/when construction of Building #4 is applied for. Mr. Hostetter and Mr. McCain confirmed that Vermont's Wastewater and Potable Water Supply Rules require that the Clarks' existing water supply be considered when the PUD's additional capacity for each is applied for.
- Blasting – No blasting is anticipated by the applicants to be necessary.
- Structural dimensional changes – Internal dimensions of the new units to be housed in the barn building are not yet finalized, but it was confirmed that there are no changes to the footprints, height, or other exterior dimensions of the existing buildings other than the addition of the porch and deck areas on the barn building.
- Parking – Mr. McCain indicated that the current parking area is more than sufficient to serve the proposed units and that no new parking area is included in the application; he noted that the current impervious parking area may be reduced slightly as part of the development.
- Proposed use of the current workshop building – The applicants confirmed that they no longer plan to develop the workshop, located at the western end of the property, into dwelling units, but explained that they may instead incorporate an additional unit in the barn building, bringing the total units in that building to six. They noted their understanding that PUD standards speak to the number of dwelling units provided rather than the number of bedrooms included in the development. They indicated that the workshop building would likely continue to be used for storage/garage space. Mr. Riley made note that the initial application and associated hearing warning did not include this request, but that because the result is actually less intrusive in nature, he did not believe that any noticing issue would be created by the Board's consideration of this request as part of the application.
- Tree removal and wildlife considerations – The applicants indicated their preference for not removing any existing trees, but acknowledged that if the maples near the house have become hazardous, they should potentially be removed. Ms. Clark pointed out that there is an active wildlife corridor between her residence and this property; it was stressed by the applicants that the fourth building is conceptual at this point and that this type of information will be taken into consideration when determining the precise location of that building if it is applied for in the future.
- Privacy/fencing – Mr. Gaylord asked about the installation of privacy barriers along the boundary between the parcel and his house, and the applicants noted that nothing is planned at this point. Mr. Gaylord indicated that this is not currently a critical concern for him, particularly as there is no longer any plan to convert the workshop into residential units, but may become pertinent if Building #4 is constructed in the future.
- Trash disposal – In response to questions, the applicants explained that trash disposal would likely be set up through small dumpsters fenced in on the property. They

indicated their willingness to have a condition included in approval of the application that would require that adequate disposal facilities be provided, and that those facilities be screened from view and protected from wildlife.

- Future development plans – There was some discussion of the need for a survey to be completed if the fourth building is proposed to be developed. Mr. McCain indicated that a survey would be undertaken at that point, and indicated that there is likely the ability to maintain a setback of larger than the currently required 10 feet from the Clarks' property line.

In discussions during the hearing, the applicants noted for those present some of the other redevelopment projects they have been involved in, and explained that the timing of this proposal and the need for related permitting likely indicates that construction would begin in the spring of 2025, and be completed later that year.

Mr. Riley outlined the next steps in the application/review process, explaining that the Board is allowed up to 45 days to issue a decision, after which there is an appeal period before any permit issued is valid. He let those in attendance know that they will be provided with a copy of the Minutes when drafted and the Decision when issued, as well as notice of the Act 250 Application being filed.

MOTION: A motion to close the evidentiary portion of the hearing and enter Deliberative Session passed unanimously.

The meeting entered Deliberative Session at 7:36 pm and returned to open session at 7:56 pm.

Annual Reorganization

It was agreed to postpone the Board's Reorganization until a future meeting.

Other Business

No other business was taken up by the Board.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:59 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Chamberlin, ZA