

Shaftsbury Development Review Board
Shaftsbury Town Hall, 61 Buck Hill Road

February 20, 2013 at 7:00pm

Minutes

DRB members attending: Megan Donckers, Chair; Chris Ponessi, Vice Chair; David Mance; Tom Huncharek; Mitch Race; Jay Palmer, Alternate

DRB members absent: None

Others Attending: Charles Stewart, John Tiffany, Phyllis Porio, Margy Becker, Karen Mellinger, Lon McClintock, Jim Secor, Jason Dormetsch.

Called to Order - The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Acknowledged that a quorum was present.

Conflict of Interest – Chris Ponessi recused himself from Hale Mountain. David Mance disclosed he worked with MSK in the past but didn't feel it was a conflict of interest. Lon McClintock stated he had no problem with David Mance participating in the Town Garage hearing. Megan Donckers disclosed she received an email from Owen Beauchesne regarding the Hale Mountain F&GC hearing just before the meeting started which other DRB members had not received. She also received an email from John Tiffany asking if the board had received the revised list of items needing permits sent by the Hale Mountain F&GC. She responded by telling him that the board did receive his information prior to the meeting.

The Chair explained to the audience that there is now a separate sign in sheet for those wishing to testify for each permit application. Anyone signing needed to make sure they were filling out the proper one.

Megan D. postponed approval of minutes until the next meeting. Based on discussion during the Feb. 6th meeting, the Hale Mountain hearing was moved to the next item on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING – Permit # 12-9334 (Old permits # 12-8922 through 12-8934 inclusive)
Hale Mountain Rod & Gun Club, Rod & Gun Club Road, Site Development Plan Review.

Chris P. recused himself.

Tom H. asked if it was a new permit. Megan D. responded that same permit application was being used but has been amended base on the revised list of items needing permits recently submitted.

During the previous meeting (February 6th), the board requested the permit application list match the court order list and to update the site plan to include the driveway and town highway previously missing. The board noted that all the information was present.

Megan D. asked if there was any more public comment or discussion. John Tiffany was asked if he had anything else to include. He didn't.

David Mance moved to close the hearing and take it to deliberative session. Tom H. seconded. There was no discussion. The vote was unanimous. Chris P. didn't vote because of his recusal.

PUBLIC HEARING Permit #13-9352 Town of Shaftsbury, Town Garage and infrastructure, to be located off North Road just east of existing landfill.

MSK presented the site plan for the project. The existing driveway will be widened and new drainage put in meeting VTAOT requirements for commercial and industrial use. The garage is 8700 sq. ft. The salt shed is 2400 sq. feet. The driveway and parking areas will be gravel.

A paved apron at the salt storage shed will have a negative slope (towards the shed) to minimize site contamination caused by salt run off.

Water and sewage disposal will be handled by a new well and on-site septic system. Oil collected from the trench drains in the garage storage bays will be separated before the water is introduced into the storm water drainage system.

The garage building has three different roof heights. Tom asked how the building heights were determined. MSK stated the height from grade to the ridge of the highest roof is 33'. The corresponding height of the salt storage shed is 29.5'. David Mance asked what was meant by median height. MSK responded this was the height from the median height of the roof to finished grade around the building. David asked for clarification because the mid-point was shown as 26.5' and 29.5' on the salt storage.

David Mance asked what the height of the garage was. MSK responded it was 33 feet with a grade difference of 20 feet around the building.

Maintaining tree growth along Airport Road won't be affected.

A Propane heating system will be used in the garage. This presents no air pollution issues. LED security lighting will be used. There will be a security gate to separate the garage from town dump.

David Mance asked what was the maximum grade of the road going to the town garage. MSK stated it was less than 10%. David questioned whether it should be less than 8%? MSK stated it is about 10%.

Chris P. expressed permitting concerns he had about the well. MSK stated this was discussed in 2010 with Dave Swift and all tests came back with acceptable results and no limit on potable

water use. If needed, a bubbler could be installed to improve the water quality to potable standards.

Chris Ponessi asked about slope of the bank behind the salt shed. MSK stated it was 3 to 1. West of the salt shed contour lines appear steeper, 1.5 to 1. Turf reinforcement of the bank is 1 to 1. David M. asked about slope ratios. MSK stated modified sloped areas will be confined within the property lines. David M. asked if trees will be replanted. MSK stated no landscaping plans have been developed.

Drainage discussion:

David M. asked what provisions for storm drainage had been made. MSK said they plan to use an infiltration basin but details of the design will not be determined until after the bond vote. Chris P. questioned whether room existed for pre-treatment of storm drainage and felt 100% pre-treatment was needed. Jay D. was unsure if this would be required.

There was discussion around various other permits needed.

The road is banked to drain into the hillside collecting through a turf-reinforced swale of 10%. There will be a culvert under the salt shed.

David M. asked about storm drainage at the salt shed. MSK responded the salt shed is open on three sides with internal walls to segregate materials. This will allow the town to receive bulk sand deliveries. (Currently, this isn't possible.) David M. presented the scenario of frozen ground and heavy rain and asked about a detention basin. MSK stated ground infiltration is expected to accommodate the vast majority of storm drainage.

Chris P. had concerns about water backing up into the salt shed. MSK stated the concrete retaining wall around the shed is 10ft tall and will divert drainage to the parking lot before it drains to the salt shed.

The Wetland area and culvert under the road need to be added to the site plan. The stream also needs to be shown on the site plan. Chris P. mentioned concerns about clearing the property and whether a buffer would be maintained between the Town parcel and the Weaver property.

End of Drainage discussion

David M. asked about the number of employees. Lon M. responded, six on road crew and one on the water department. MSK designed the septic system based on a total of 10 employees with some additional capacity for larger staffs in the future.

The site plan currently provides 10 parking spaces which include 6 for the highway department, the remainder being allocated for visitors and handicapped persons.

Chris P. mentioned the design isn't finished and can change. MSK has finished the basic site and building design but final documents for bidding are not complete. The final storm drainage

and waste water design are the components most likely to have significant changes and will be reviewed by the town prior to going out to bid.

David M. questioned the need for heated storage space in the garage. MSK noted the building will be heated in zones allowing for flexibility.

MSK reviewed internal drains/trench drains/oil interceptors. Washing of trucks will be done outside as they need to be clean before entering the garage. Tom H. asked what provisions for capturing oil had been provided. MSK stated an oil interceptor will be connected to the inside drains and direct this material in a 30 gallon container which will periodically be emptied. Flow from the trench drains is expected to be small and this liquid will be treated by an underground system before being released. MSK explained this is a self-contained system that has the oil treatment as part of the interceptor. If levels are above 50% a high level alarm will go off. The system has a fail-safe feature.

David M. asked if drainage provisions had been provided at the maintenance bay. MSK responded this was different from the other bays and no floor drain had been planned.

Lon M. asked MSK to explain what provisions for storage had been made. MSK pointed out the mezzanine would be used for this purpose. Lon M. talked about the state archive standards, which it was agreed this storage area would meet.

Chris P. asked about lighting. MSK said one or two poles will be provided. The access gate will be illuminated. Concern was raised that the fuel dispensing area have proper light and security cameras as there has been theft in this area in the past.

Chris P. asked about trash enclosures and dumpsters. MSK responded none are planned. Trash will be taken to the transfer station.

Chris P. asked about a double sector permit. MSK stated this will not be needed as the town is exempt as a municipality. No operational permit needed for smaller municipalities.

Dave M. asked about reviewing both Site Plan and Conditional Use requirements. Megan D. asked to go through both.

Conditional Use Review

MSK will comply with noise restrictions.

David M. stated all storm water drainage proposed is draining into the site. MSK agreed.

Landscaping – MSK stated nothing but grass has been planned at this time. The Airport Road woodland buffer will be preserved.

Exterior building materials were discussed: Asphalt shingle roof on main building, horizontal siding and concrete floors. Big barn look. Chris P. asked about an AFT permit. MSK said the

project was exempt from this requirement.

No explosion hazard except diesel fuel. An above ground (diesel) tank will be used and be protected by a roofed structure. (This roofed structure was not shown on the site plan.) David M. asked about propane. MSK said the tank would be underground and have a capacity of less than or equal to 1000 gallons.

Water resources – A drilled well will provide water for one bathroom and four slop sinks. Chris P. asked whether a letter from the fire department confirming “ability to serve” had been obtained, noting this was a requirement of the review. MSK replied this had not yet been done. Lon M. requested a similar letter from Bennington Rescue. Sanitary and solid waste will be disposed through a 200 gallon in ground system. The State permit for the waste water system is expected shortly.

David M. asked if the site had been cleared. MSK responded it had not. Dave asked what plans had been made to dispose of stumps and other debris. MSK said these would be dumped at Dailey’s facility. Trees go to whoever gets the job. David M. asked if taking stumps off site required a permit. MSK said these were going to an approved dump-site. David M. asked if Daily’s was an approved dump-site. MSK will verify this.

MSK stated any hazardous material will be trucked off site and mentioned that the oil/water disposal system will be permitted through ANR.

Chris P. asked about fuel tanks and storage of other liquids. MSK stated they have to apply for an NFPA13 building permit; can’t exceed flammable materials limits. MSK is unaware of what the town currently uses. Chris P. concerned about drainage in maintenance bay. MSK confirmed there is none. David M. asked about anything hazardous being stored inside. MSK said this is not an issue until allowed limits are reached and when this occurs material will be recycled or disposed off-site as permitted.

Storm drainage - MSK to follow up permit with ANR.

Visual Impacts - Power is coming from existing pole at water garage. Two new poles will be added which will blend into the existing tree line. From the last pole to the buildings utilities will be buried.

Energy Conservation - Energy efficient lights will be used and will comply with the New Vermont Energy commercial code. LED’s, T5’s, and T8’s will be used. MSK stated this will be a step above the commercial code.

David M. asked about generator use. MSK – town currently owns two and one will be used.

MSK will get a sign off from fire department, police and rescue squad. An intrusion alarm on the main building and lights on motion sensors will be provided. The alarm will be monitored off-site.

Chris P. asked about the public taking salt. Karen M. – a small amount will remain for sidewalks as well as the sidewalk plow.

Education and other municipal services – No impact expected.

Traffic - David M. asked about North Road truck traffic and whether or not the town will follow protocol and use Airport Road, minimizing turns onto RT 7A from North Road. MSK stated trucks will use Airport road. Lon M. wasn't sure of the driver routes and couldn't speak to the point. The DRB requested deliveries of salt and sand be made using Airport Road, and that dust be monitored and controlled.

Lon asked to mention the improvement of entrance to North Road. MSK noted this will be widened to 47ft and comply with VTRANS standards. When cars are lined up for the dump, trucks will still be able to go by.

Chris P. asked if a new gate for the transfer station is part of the project? MSK – no. MSK stated the Town Garage entrance will have an automatic gate.

David M. asked about total trips per day? MSK expects 6-12 round trips during summer months and 12-24 during the winter. Megan D. asked if all the trucks left at once or staggered. Lon M. said all leave at once. Their returns are staggered. Winter return trips will be staggered based on the length of plowing routes. No conflicts with transfer station traffic on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays are expected.

Chris P. asked about signage at the entrance to directing people to transfer station. MSK should schedule appt. with Terry to review. Lon M. suggested an intercom. MSK added there may be a card swipe or key pad used. MSK will look at upgrading signage and directional signs at the transfer station. Sign permits will be needed.

Site Development Plan Review

The application and site plan need to be completed.

Chris P. asked distances be darkened to be more easily read.

David M. requested many details be added. A copy of the tax map was not submitted. Site map was sent in but the DRB didn't have it.

David M. asked about the buildings and widened entry being roughly staked? MSK – no. David M. requested this be done to Legacy's drive way on the North Road. The trailers can be waved but the driveways and culvert need to be included.

A list of abutting property owners was provided.

Chris P. requested new signage at entrance.
Landscaping/Green Space – none proposed.

Easements/Encumbrances – none.

Chris P. wants to review cut sheets on poles after design phase.

State Permits – To be obtained after design/permitting process is complete. Have no permits at this time.

Need letters from Town services – fire, police, emergency, school.

Ended the site plan review. The board had no additional comments.

Public Comments

Phyllis Porio commented on conditions placed on past developments have precluded trucks from using North Road unless servicing residents on that road. She noted the bridge at the bottom of North Road is very narrow and would not allow two trucks to pass simultaneously. She also noted in the past the DRB had requested a letter from the school stating proposed development would not pose a safety hazard to school buses.

Landscaping – It was suggested to add landscaping to reduce headlight glare and minimize noise on North Road. Lon asked the DRB to tailor its conditions regarding safety and landscaping to what is appropriate for highway commercial use.

Chris P. agrees to conditions that circulation doesn't add heavy traffic to North Road. He also noted State permits are needed prior to DRB approval.

Lon M. spoke to the role of the DRB in reviewing Town projects. He will have town counsel comment. He noted the role of the DRB is not to "approve or reject." Dave M. stated his understanding was the DRB was to review Town applications as it would any other. Lon M. thought the role of the DRB was to comment but can't grant or deny the permit.

Lon M. asked Phyllis P. if she was an abutting neighbor. She isn't but wanted to share her previous observations with the board. David P. explained interested party status but added the Open Meeting law also allows comment from the public.

David M. asked that the definition of mean vs. median height be clarified by MSK. What are the ceiling heights?

Chris P. moved to recess the hearing as more information is needed. He suggested preliminary site plan approval, with final approval pending receipt of additional information requested. There was no second to this motion.

MSK questioned why review was being done before state approvals were obtained.

Lon M. asked for general feedback from the board.

- ⌚ David M. had concerns with the shed circulation on the east side.

The following are needed:

- ⌚ Cut sheets for light fixtures and utility poles
- ⌚ Spec's for signage
- ⌚ Stipulations for truck traffic on North Road
- ⌚ Storm water UIC Permit details
- ⌚ Letters from Fire Department and Bennington Rescue
- ⌚ More screening/landscaping
- ⌚ Add limits of wetland to site plan

Chris P. moved to recess the hearing to April 3, 2013 pending feedback from the town attorney regarding the role of DRB, and to grant preliminary site plan approval with conditions as noted above. Motion was seconded by Dave M. Board voted 5 – 0 in favor of the motion. MSK noted they may or may not have all State permits by April 3.

Margy B. – wondered about a specific date for next meeting. MSK- after bond vote.

Other Business

None

Megan D. agreed to do the minutes in Sandra's absence. Megan asked about finding of fact. David M. agreed to do Hale Mountain. Chris P. will complete town garage decision when necessary.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 8:45.