

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, March 12, 2025

3
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Buermann called the meeting to order at
5 6:02 PM.

6
7 ATTENDANCE:

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

10
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12
13 Guests: Jeff Olesky (Route 2A, LLC- Steve Pomarico), Alicia Feiler (Malone 72 Swanton Road Properties, LLC)

14
15
16 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

17 B. Buermann noted that Harold Garrett had not been re-appointed as a Regional Commissioner by the Town
18 of Swanton, and therefore there is currently no chair for the Committee. He requested the Committee
19 approve him as acting chair for the meeting.

20
21 *Y. Dandurand motioned that B. Buermann should serve as acting chair for the meeting. B. Irwin seconded. The*
22 *motion carried.*

23
24 E. Klofft thanked B. Buermann for serving as acting chair for the meeting so the Committee can meet and
25 noted that Commissioners interested in serving as chair should contact Catherine Dimitruk.

26
27 E. Klofft noted a request from Jeff Olesky to be moved up the agenda as he had another meeting at 7 PM. The
28 Committee agreed to hear the Act 250-Route 2A, LLC Steve Pomarico project first on the agenda.

29
30
31 **Public Comment**

32 None.

33
34 **Project Reviews:**

35
36 **Act 250- Route 2A, LLC Steve Pomarico**

37 *Project Details:* Residential 5-lot subdivision with four new housing units.

38
39 E. Klofft reviewed the project location, site plan and draft project review sheet. The project is a rural
40 subdivision with lots of 1-3 acres off a shared access on VT 78. The project will have wetlands impact and
41 require a wetlands permit. Agricultural soils mitigation is required. There were no concerns on the school
42 impact questionnaire. While not specifically built as affordable housing, the estimated value of the new
43 housing units is \$250,000 to \$275,000. There is no walking or biking infrastructure, but the project is located in
44 a rural area.

1 Y. Dandurand asked to clarify where the access road is. J. Olesky stated that it was a single shared access off of
2 VT 78 and that they had received a permit from VTrans. B. Buermann asked if they had received their wetlands
3 permit. J. Olesky stated that they had. He clarified that for the agricultural soils, they had to replace previous
4 on-site mitigation with off-site mitigation.

5
6 H. Demars noted that the abutting property owner was listed as owned by “Vermont Pavilion” and asked if it
7 was state-owned land and if there was a park there. E. Klofft confirmed that it was owned by the State as the
8 Mud Creek Wildlife Management Area, but that there are no recreational facilities.

9
10 H. Demars asked if there were any water quality issues with the wells. J. Olesky stated that they had a State
11 Water and Wastewater permit which met the isolation distances required. H. Demars asked if there was a
12 deed covenant for upkeep of the shared septic, water and access road. J. Olesky stated that the current owner
13 is a design-build contractor, there will be an HOA for the shared infrastructure.

14
15 H. Demars noted the application stated their were no signs and looked to clarify if there would be a private
16 road sign for emergency purposes. J. Olesky stated that the lack of signs referred to the fact that there would
17 not be any sign denoting the subdivision, but that there would be any required private road sign. H. Demars
18 asked if any archeological mitigation was required. J. Olesky stated that the project had been cleared of any
19 potential archeological impact during the archaeological phase 1 assessment.

20
21 *H. Demars motioned to find the project in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of substantial regional*
22 *impact. B. Irwin seconded the motion.*

23
24 H. Demars asked how realistic the proposed cost of the homes was and noted that they would be affordable if
25 priced around that price range. J. Olesky stated that there are many factors that could affect final price but
26 that it was the owner’s intention to price them around this range.

27
28 J. Callan asked if there were any concerns about traffic safety with the project located on VT 78. J. Olesky
29 stated that they had received a VTrans 1111 permit and that this section of VT 78 was relatively flat and
30 straight with good sightlines.

31
32 *The motion carried.*

33
34 **Act 250- Malone 75 Swanton Road Properties, LLC**

35 *Project Details:* Subdivision of parcel and construction of a 2,450 square foot coffeeshop with drive thru.

36
37 E. Klofft reviewed the project site plan and draft project review sheet. The Committee reviewed the project in
38 January and had questions about the traffic impact, the right-turn in lane and its potential impacts on the
39 mixed-use path, and the stormwater. The traffic study was delayed due to an initial confusion on the size of
40 the project, it is now complete and VTrans submitted a comment letter. E. Klofft reviewed the traffic study and
41 Vtrans comment letter. The traffic study found that the queue for the drive-through would not exceed 200 ft,
42 with 400 ft available. In regard to the right-turn in lane, the study found that given the angle of the right-turn
43 in lane, the multi-use path would need to be outside of the Route 7 ROW in order to meet the entrance at a
44 safer right-angle. VTrans comment letter supported the right-turn in lane in part to reduce potential
45 intersection queuing on Route 7 after the planned road diet in 2029 which would remove a lane on Route 7. E.

1 Klofft reviewed the complete streets policy for Growth Areas, which includes “accesses to the roadway shall
2 be minimized”.

3
4 B. Buermann asked why the proposed sidewalk along Franklin Park West did not extend to the edge of the
5 property. A. Feiler stated that it was not extended as there is a planned subdivision and future development
6 on that portion of the property. B. Irwin stated that it would be good to have that sidewalk gap addresses
7 sooner rather than later, as there may be demand for pedestrian trips from the adjacent car dealership.
8

9 B. Buermann noted that the traffic study suggests that the shared use path would need to be beyond the
10 Route 7 ROW and asked if the applicant would be willing to allow the shared use path on the property. A.
11 Feiler stated that the applicant would be willing to work with the Town on a solution, depending on the exact
12 proposed location. B. Buermann asked if the applicant was concerned that the entrance could be used by
13 vehicles to cut through onto Franklin Park West. A. Feiler stated that the driveway was not designed for
14 through use, current traffic is mainly tractor trailers which would not cut-through. E. Klofft noted that there
15 was housing located on Franklin Park West and that the Town is planning for additional housing in this area.
16

17 The Committee reviewed the definition of substantial regional impact.

18
19 *B. Irwin motioned to find the project in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of a substantial regional*
20 *impact. H. Demars seconded.*

21
22 B. Buermann asked if the project would be tied into the larger Franklin Park West stormwater system. A. Feiler
23 stated that there was a separate stormwater treatment on site via a gravel wetland.
24

25 E. Klofft recommended that the Committee include conditions to their approval that would address the
26 concerns around the multi-use path and sidewalk. Specifically, a condition to require the extension of the
27 sidewalk when the subdivided portion of the property is developed and a condition to require that the
28 applicant coordinate with the Town of St. Albans to allow development of the multi-use path beyond the right
29 of way if needed.
30

31 *B. Irwin amended his motion to find the project in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of a substantial*
32 *regional impact to include two conditions relative to coordination of the sidewalk development and ensuring*
33 *adequate right of way for the multi-use path: 1) That the applicant develop an extension of the proposed*
34 *sidewalk along Franklin Park West to the property line of the current unsubdivided parcel at the time which*
35 *development is proposed on that portion of the parcel and 2) That the applicant work with the Town of St.*
36 *Albans to ensure future right of way for the multi-use path on the applicant’s property if needed. H. Demars*
37 *accepted the amendment. The motion carried.*
38

39 **Act 250- Bernard Martel Berkshire Barn & Gardens LLC**

40 *Project Details:* Conversion of the upper level of an existing post & beam horse barn and improvements to
41 surrounding lands for use as a seasonal (May-October) wedding and events venue at an existing small farm
42 with up to fourteen (14) total events per year.
43

44 E. Klofft noted that the Committee had found the project in conformance with the Regional Plan but had been
45 interested in understanding the impacts of these projects on the rural landscape, including sound, traffic and
46 hygiene when running water is not provided. E. Klofft noted that an abutter of the project had raised some of

1 those concerns: including concerns about the sound study, potential traffic issues and emergency services.
2 The applicant responded, including letters from emergency services that they are able to serve the proposed
3 project.
4

5 B. Buermann stated that he did not feel the new information changed the decision of conformance with the
6 Regional Plan. H. Demars stated it was good that the applicant had addressed the emergency services
7 concerns.
8

9 **Staff Reviews**

10 E. Klofft reviewed three staff review projects: Section 248a-T-Mobile/248a-at 116 Fox Hill Road/Alburgh,
11 Section 248a- T-Mobile/248a- at 245 Church Street in Enosburg Falls and Enosburg, Section 248a- T-Mobile
12 Northeast, LLC (Georgia). All three projects are additions of equipment to existing telecommunications towers
13 with no increase in height above ground level. The Enosburgh project is located inside an existing church
14 tower. The Committee reviewed imagery of the additions and requested that this be included in future
15 meeting materials. There were no concerns with the projects.
16

17 **Minutes**

18 H. Demars noted that he was listed as absent on the January minutes but should have been listed as present.
19

20 *H. Demars motioned to approve the minutes of the January meeting with corrections. J. Callan seconded. The*
21 *motion carried.*
22

23 **Updates**

24 E. Klofft provided a brief update on the Howrigan wind project.
25

26 **Commissioner Announcements**

27 None.
28

29 **Adjourn**

30 *H. Demars motioned to adjourn. B. Irwin seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at 7:17 PM.*