

Town of Underhill
Development Review Board Minutes
Chairperson Scott Tobin

August 30, 2010

Board Members Present:

Charles Van Winkle, Vice Chair
Will Towle
Matt Chapek
Penny Miller
Peter Seybolt

Also Present:

Kari Papelbon, Zoning Administrator

6:30 PM: Vice Chairperson Charles Van Winkle called the continued Goplen sketch plan meeting to order.

Applicant Present:

Brent Goplen
20 Lower English Settlement Rd.
Underhill, VT 05489

Consultant Present:

Gunner McCain
McCain Consulting, Inc.
93 South Main St., Ste. 1
Waterbury, VT 05676

Others Present:

Scott Tobin (recused)
6 Orchard Rd.
Underhill, VT 05489

Anne Jobin-Picard
13 Lower English Settlement Rd.
Underhill, VT 05489

Larry and Nancy Plouffe
7 Romar Dr.
Underhill, VT 05489

Brian Wells
11 Romar Dr.
Underhill, VT 05489

5 others

Identifier:	Contents:
ZA-1	Materials from the sketch plan meeting held July 19, 2010
ZA-2	A copy of the completed Subdivision Checklist: Sketch Plan;
ZA-3	A copy of the letter from neighbor Andrea Phillips (dated 8-30-10)

- Vice Chairperson Van Winkle began the meeting by explaining the procedure for sketch plan review.
- Gunner McCain, consultant for Brent Goplen, provided an overview of the proposed 5-lot planned residential development (PRD). The plan is to split the parcel into five lots, all to be accessed via a private road off of the existing driveway. The smallest lot is about 3.5 acres and the largest is about 7.5 acres. No common land, but undeveloped land will be identified. The road will exceed 10% in a few areas, and Gunner has been discussing the road with Harry Schoppman at the Underhill-Jericho Fire Department (UJFD). Chief Randy Clark has indicated that he would like to see the road as close to 10% as possible. The first ~400 feet will be 12%, the next ~500 feet will be 10%, the next ~300 feet will be 13%, and the remainder will be flat. Mr. McCain will try to bring the grades down, but to get a road at 10% would create excessive earth disturbance and curves.
- Board Member Peter Seybolt asked what the total acreage of the parcel was, to which Mr. McCain stated it was about 28 acres.
- Board Member Will Towle asked what the radius of the curve in the proposed road measured, to which Mr. McCain responded it was about 75 feet. Board Member Towle stated that it appeared to cross steep topo lines and asked how such would be accomplished. He also asked if there were other roads on the property. Mr. McCain stated that there were existing woods roads on the property, and the curve is at a little over 10% grade. The cuts and fills are at close to the existing grade. Board Member Seybolt stated that it looked like a straight road without the proposed curve would not be as steep. Mr. McCain stated that doing so would be steeper.
- Vice Chair Van Winkle stated that part of the PRD requirements was to determine whether the proposed project met density and layout regulations. Road frontage and lot size waiver requests are anticipated. He then asked to see a conventional subdivision layout, which Mr. McCain provided and a discussion of such, particularly frontage, ensued.
- Board Member Seybolt asked what the rationale was for requesting a PRD if a conventional layout could be designed. Mr. McCain responded that a PRD allows for more usable lots without being segmented by the development road.

- Board Member Seybolt asked if there wasn't any open space. Mr. McCain stated that there is open space—woods and meadow. Board Member Seybolt asked if there was common land, to which Mr. McCain responded there was not. He then explained that all septic systems will be conventional.
- Vice Chairperson Van Winkle asked for clarification on the flag depictions. Mr. McCain stated that they were marking various things in the field. There is a wet area on the northern part of the property that will probably be delineated as wetland.
- Board Member Will Towle asked if there would be proposed culverts to address potential runoff. Mr. McCain stated that while the design has not been finalized, there would be culverts, and that a State Stormwater Permit would be needed. Board Member Seybolt asked where the Phillips' spring was on the map. Mr. McCain responded that it was south of the map depictions, and that no water sources would be affected by the proposed development. Board Member Penny Miller asked if the removal of trees on the site would exacerbate runoff. Mr. McCain stated that their removal would affect runoff somewhat, but not significantly, and such would be addressed in stormwater management plans.
- Vice Chair Van Winkle asked if ZA Kari Papelbon had any comments. She stated that part of the PRD requirements was to designate protected open space, and that this should be clearly delineated on the preliminary plans. Other issues would be addressed at the preliminary hearing.
- Vice Chairperson Van Winkle asked for public comment.
- Anne Jobin-Picard, 13 Lower English Settlement Road, asked whether a PRD allows for common land. Vice Chair Van Winkle explained the PRD requirements. Mrs. Jobin-Picard then asked if all percolation testing had been completed, to which Mr. McCain replied that it had. Mrs. Jobin-Picard asked if Lot 1 could be viewed from the road, to which Mr. McCain replied that it would. Mrs. Jobin-Picard stated her concerns for the proposed houses being visible, for the preservation of trees and habitat, the road, and drainage.
- Larry Plouffe, 7 Romar Drive, stated his concerns for runoff from the proposed development, and provided his experience with drainage issues.
- Scott Tobin, 6 Orchard Road, stated that an old farm drainage ditch exists that flows into his backyard and he would be concerned for the addition of water to that ditch. Mr. Tobin also stated his concerns for clearing and aesthetics would be raised at the preliminary hearing.
- Gunner McCain stated that he understood the neighbors' concerns and that he will prepare preliminary plans to address them.

- Mrs. Jobin-Picard asked if the development would be phased, to which Mr. McCain stated that the proposal did not include phasing.
- Board Member Seybolt asked about the letter from neighbor Andrea Phillips. Mr. McCain stated that he had a copy of the letter and would propose some buffers where appropriate.
- Board Member Matt Chapek asked about the direction of cutting for views. Mr. McCain stated that generally the views would be to the southwest.
- Brian Wells, 11 Romar Drive, stated that he had the same concerns Mr. Plouffe. He also had concerns for drainage, runoff, and mentioned that culvert maintenance and ditching were lacking in the area. Mr. McCain stated that the development plans would not fix current conditions, but the conditions would not be worsened by the development. The majority of the water would be running southerly of Romar Drive based on contours, but there would be stormwater management plans to address such issues.
- Nancy Plouffe, 7 Romar Drive, stated that all of the houses built behind her house made the drainage issue worse because it used to be swampy and now the water has nowhere to go. She added that she feels the development will cause the same issues.
- Mrs. Jobin-Picard asked about the incline of the driveway. Vice Chair Van Winkle explained that the UJFD would have to provide a letter detailing their capacity to service the new development.

7:21 PM: Vice Chairperson Charles Van Winkle asked if the Board felt they had enough information to make a decision on the application. The Board stated that they had enough information to proceed. Board Member Peter Seybolt made a motion, seconded by Board Member Will Towle, to enter a closed deliberative session. The motion was passed by all Board Members present.

8:30 PM: By consensus, the DRB moved into open session. All Board Members present asked ZA Papelbon to provide a letter to the Applicant indicating their acceptance of the sketch plan application, with the following areas of concern to be addressed in the preliminary plans:

1. drainage
2. advantage to the town for allowing a PRD
3. the location and grade of the proposed road
4. aesthetics
5. suitability for development.

The DRB discussed the proposed unified bylaw.

9:30 PM: Meeting adjourned.

These minutes of the 8-30-10 meeting of the DRB were accepted

This _____ day of _____, 2010.

Vice Chairperson Charles Van Winkle

These minutes are subject to correction by the Underhill Developmental Review Board. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the DRB.