

**NORWICH DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES**

January 21, 2016

Tracy Hall Meeting Room

Members present: Carroll, Lawe, Ciccotelli, Dean

Members not present: Rotman, Stucker, Teeter

Alternates present: McCabe, Pitiger **Alternates not present:**

Clerk: Phil Dechert **Others:** Tim Rockwood

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, John Lawe, at 7:18 PM
2. **Agenda** – Approved
3. **Public Comments & Announcements** – None
4. **Minutes** – The following minutes were approved: 11-5-15 and 1-7-16
5. **Administrative Issues**
 - a. DRB welcomed Susan Pitiger as a new Alternate Member of the Board
 - b. Future Schedule & Agendas
 - i. February 4, 2016 - No hearing scheduled

6. Public Hearing:

#63BSUB15: Preliminary Plan Review of a Subdivision Application by Norah Lake and Chris Polashenski, Applicants and Anne Crewe, Landowner to divide Lot 05-086.000 into 3 lots of approximately 2.55 acres, 2.30 acres and 69.00 acres at 655 VT Route 132. Application was reviewed under the Norwich Subdivision Regulations.

The record in this case includes the following documents:

Submitted by Applicants

- A-1 Application #63BSUB15, dated 12/23/15
- A-2 Detailed drawing of existing buildings with proposed boundary setback, received 1-18-16
 - a. Option A – Proposed boundary line showing 2’ setback from existing accessory structure
 - b. Option B – Proposed boundary line showing zero foot setback from existing accessory structure

Submitted by Zoning Administrator

- ZA-1 Documents and Interested Parties list, dated 1-21-16
- ZA-2 Checklist for Development Envelopes, dated 1-20-16 (revised)
- ZA-3 Ortho Base (2011) Photo of Site Plan, dated 12-15
 - a. Site Plan of Proposed Lots 1, 2 and 3; and
 - b. Enlargement of Proposed Lots 1 and 2
- ZA-4 Density Calculation Sheet, dated 9-7-10
- ZA-5 Photos of Existing Buildings with Property Line, dated 1-19-16
- ZA-6 Waiver Request from Setbacks in accordance with Norwich Subdivision Regulations, Section 2.1(C), dated 1-20-16
- ZA-7 E-mail from Lyssa Papazian, Historic Preservation Consultant, re: historical significance of existing buildings on Property, dated 1-21-16

The Chair opened the Public Hearing at 7:31 PM

Site Visit Report: Dechert reported - 4:00 PM at 655 VT Route 132 on 1/21/16 – Present: Members: Lawe, Dean, Pitiger - Clerk: Dechert - Applicants: Tim Rockwood (Consultant – Surveyor) Public: None

The DRB looked at existing buildings on proposed Lots 1 and 2, the steep slope to the west of the developed area, and the close proximity of the existing small barn (“Corn Crib”) on Lot 1 and the existing house on Lot 2.

A **motion** was made by Lawe and seconded by Carroll to accept all of the Exhibits listed in Exhibit ZA-1 for the record. The motion passed 6-0.

Carroll stated that he is an abutter of other Property owned by Anne Crewe. Due to the distance from the property under review, members agreed there was no conflict of interest or appearance of a conflict of interest.

Tim Rockwood, a land surveyor representing the Applicants presented an overview of the planned subdivision. Two smaller lots will be created each with an existing house and accessory buildings. The balance of the land will be reserved for agriculture and forestry.

The Applicants are asking the Board to waive the required 10’ setback for the Corn Crib on Lot 1 from proposed property line dividing the two new lots. A waiver is also requested for the house on Lot 2 from the same property line. (See Exhibits A-2a and b) The purpose of the waiver is to accommodate the location of an existing historically significant Corn Crib on Lot 1 within the setback from the property line with Lot 2. The special circumstances are the pre-existing status of a group of historic buildings in close proximity to each other forming a farmstead and the need to separate the two houses onto separate lots. The Board discussed possible conditions limiting the use of the Corn Crib to cold storage of non-flammable materials and limiting any improvements except for maintenance. Easements may be needed to accommodate repair and maintenance of the buildings. A consensus of the Board thought Option “A” submitted by Applicants as ZA-3a seems most reasonable.

Plans do not include development envelopes for any of the lots. Lot 3 will not be developed. Lots 1 and 2 are small lots that are already developed. NSR Section 3.3(B) allows the board to waive the requirement for development envelopes in the case of small lots. NSR Table 2.2 Note #2 allows the Board, if the parcel is over 50 acres, to waive the requirement for a full survey of the large lot if the new smaller lots contain a total of less than 20% of the original lot. The two new lots total 4.85 acres.

The Clerk will check with fire chief to determine if any additional conditions are recommended for the building within the setbacks.

Dean moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Ciccotelli and was passed 6-0. The hearing closed at 8:30 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Phil Dechert, Clerk

APPROVED 3/17/16