

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, November 13, 2024

3
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Buermann called the meeting to order at
5 6:05 PM.

6
7 ATTENDANCE:

8 Commission: Scholten, Marietta ; Demars, Howard ; Buermann, Robert ; Irwin, William ; Garrett,
9 Harold ; Neal Speer ; Julian Callan ; Yvon Dandurand ;

10
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12
13 Guests: Reice Banon (Emerald Visions, LLC), Ashley Bowen (Emerald Visions, LLC), Nick Smith (Emerald
14 Visions, LLC)

15
16 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

17 None.

18
19
20
21 **Minutes**

22 *B. Irwin motioned to approve the minutes of the October meeting. J. Callan seconded. The motion carried with*
23 *1 abstention.*

24
25 *Chair H. Garrett arrived at 6:11 PM due to a technical issue with Zoom.*

26
27 **Public Comment**

28 None.

29
30 **Project Reviews:**

31 **Act 250- Emerald Visions LLC**

32 *Project Details: As-built" construction of a ±2,400 square foot addition to a previously approved ±4,000 square*
33 *foot commercial building within a 5-lot commercial park at 969 U.S. Route 2 in Alburgh. The building addition*
34 *is to be used for cannabis cultivation and retail sales.*

35
36 E. Klofft reviewed the project site plan and draft project review sheet. The project will meet CBES standards
37 but will not provide bicycle/pedestrian standards and will not have EV chargers. The project will impact
38 wetlands, the applicant is in the process of applying for a wetlands permit. The project will include stormwater
39 infrastructure, E. Klofft noted that part of the email correspondence included with the application had stated a
40 previous swale was filled but it was not clear if that was being replaced. The project is located outside of the
41 sub-regional growth center, along a line of single-story commercial development that raises a potential
42 concern of strip development. The project is an addition to a current building and utilizes shared access on
43 Route 2, however it does add additional parking in the front of the building and does not provide
44 bicycle/pedestrian access. The project is located in a transitional area, the complete streets recommend
45 sidewalks when they can connect to the village sidewalk system.

1 B. Buermann asked how much of the project was constructed already. R. Banon stated that the foundation,
2 framing and parking lot improvements had already occurred. B. Buermann asked about the stormwater
3 improvements. R. Banon clarified that the swale which had been filled in was the small swale to the east of the
4 project and not the major swale in between the project and the hardware store to the west.

5
6 B. Irwin asked if the driveway access would continue to be shared. R. Banon stated that it would be and that
7 as part of the project they are updating the access to meet the B-71 standards. B. Irwin asked about the
8 shared maintenance plan. N. Smith stated that currently the neighboring property owner is plowing the
9 driveway, there is an agreement to split costs in the future if the property owner were to change.

10
11 B. Irwin asked about the plans for stormwater and the water retention pond. R. Banon explained that the
12 previous structure was not subject to the current stormwater rules, but that the new structure would be
13 because it was part of a common plan of improvement. Since water from one side of the existing roofline
14 cannot be separated from the stormwater from the new project, it will be included in the stormwater plan.
15 The stormwater treatment will be a gravel wetland that feeds into the existing swale.

16
17 B. Irwin asked about the security gate seen in the site plan. R. Banon stated that it was designed to prevent
18 access to the parking lot during non-business hours. B. Irwin asked if the project was a wholesale or retail
19 operation. N. Smith stated it was both, primarily a wholesale operation with a small retail store.

20
21 H. Garrett asked if the apron off Route 2 would be paved. R. Banon stated that it would be to the edge of the
22 ROW or 20 ft, whichever was less. H. Garrett asked about the expected traffic impacts. R. Banon stated VTrans
23 had reviewed and found 37 peak AM and 45 peak PM trips.

24
25 E. Klofft asked if the Committee had any questions or concerns about the land use impacts. B. Buermann
26 stated that the use was an expansion of the existing and that it would be more of a potential concern if it was
27 a new development on the adjacent subdivided lot. R. Banon stated that the original permit for the
28 development was 5 lots, and the lot has been subdivided although it does not show up on the parcel database.

29
30 H. Garrett asked if there would be access to the 5th subdivided parcel from the applicant's parcel. R. Banon
31 stated that there would be a ROW through the applicant's parcel to allow access from the 5th parcel from the
32 shared access.

33
34 B. Irwin stated that given the scale of the project, it did not make sense to make the applicant responsible for
35 the lack of bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. H. Garrett agreed. B. Irwin stated that while the project was not
36 ideal from the smart growth perspective of the Regional Plan, it was in conformance with the Plan.

37
38 *B. Irwin motioned to find that the project was in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of a substantial*
39 *regional impact. B. Buermann seconded. The motion carried.*

40
41
42
43 **Updates**

44 None.

45
46 **Commissioner Announcements**

1 None.

2

3 **Adjourn**

4 *M. Scholten motioned to adjourn. B. Buermann seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at*

5 *7:03 PM.*

DRAFT