

46 Chair Clymer asked if the clearing on the site followed the previously approved clearing limits of
47 the subdivision. T. Hand confirmed that it has.

48
49 Chair Clymer asked if there is anything else proposed. T. Hand responded that the amended
50 clearing limit is all that is proposed. He anticipates that a home will be built in the near future.

51
52 Chair Clymer asked how much of the property is located within the RHOD. T. Hand stated that
53 approximately 5% of the property is within the RHOD.

54
55 Chair Clymer went through the standards.

56
57 Sarah MacDonald also requested that the applicant put in a standpipe, and asked if there are
58 engineering requirements for ponds. Chair Clymer responded that all ponds have to be engineered.

59
60 C. Walton made the motion to direct staff to draft findings of fact and conclusions of law in support
61 of Project #7128 for the DRB's consideration. The motion was seconded by M. Diender and
62 approved 5-1 (P. Roberts opposed).

63
64 **Project #: 7018 (Cont. from 11/1/22; 1/17/23; 3/7/23)**

65 **Owner: David Bailey**

66 **Tax Parcel #: 03-077.000**

67 **Location: 2878 Waterbury Road**

68 **Project: Change of Use from single-family dwelling to office; nonconforming use review**

69 **Zoning: RR2**

70
71 The application has been withdrawn.

72
73 **Project #: 7057 (Cont. from 2/21/23)**

74 **Owner: Louise H Sparks & David Schwartz**

75 **Tax Parcel #: 06-039.000**

76 **Location: 2438 Mountain Road**

77 **Project: Partial review of double setback waiver criteria for a Planned Residential**
78 **Development (PRD)**

79 **Zoning: UMR**

80
81 C. Walton was recused and left the meeting.

82
83 Chair Clymer swore in Tyler Mumley, Kyle Gambone, Dave Gambone, Bond Worthington, Cynthia
84 Silvey and Damian Liddiard.

85
86 T. Mumley provided a summary of the project. The applicants seek a double setback waiver for the
87 north and east sides of the property for future multi-family development. The applicant will return
88 to the DRB after proper warning is made for the development itself, but for now understands that
89 the board will address the setback waiver request at this hearing.

90
91 S. McShane commented that the board could address the partial review, which contains the double
92 setback waiver request. All other aspects of the proposed development need to be adequately
93 warned and reviewed at a future DRB meeting – likely the June 20th meeting.

94

95 T. Mumley continued with a general overview of the overall project, just to give the DRB a sense of
96 all that is proposed. The proposed building designs, driveway and parking designs, landscape
97 designs, stormwater control designs, and clearing limits, etc. were presented.
98

99 C. Silvey provided an overview of the landscape design and clearing limits of the future
100 development. The DRB questioned the visibility of the proposed structures from Mountain Road. C.
101 Silvey provided feedback that given the topography and treelines between the property and
102 Mountain Road, even with existing trees removed for views, the proposed development would still
103 be difficult to see from Mountain Road.
104

105 Chair Clymer asked to hear from the architect.
106

107 B. Worthington (architect) provided an overview of the proposed buildings, including elevation
108 drawings, floor and roof plans, etc.
109

110 P. Roberts questioned the height calculation method – noting that the proposed building looks too
111 tall. T. Mumley responded that given the slope of the property, and the driveway, the buildings may
112 look tall, but they still meet the maximum height limitation.
113

114 T. Mumley went over what they have provided to address the setback waiver criteria – noting in
115 general that the site is well hidden with existing and proposed vegetation, and elevation. The intent
116 of the plan is to reuse much of the area that had previously been developed. By getting the 50-ft
117 reduction, we're able to use more of that area, because that's where the driveway and house were.
118

119 T. Mumley went on to address the third criteria pertaining to the characteristics of the area, further
120 emphasizing that the development would be difficult to see from Mountain Road and neighboring
121 properties. He noted that given the size of the development, they won't have to go through full
122 State stormwater permitting – they'll be under a half-acre total. But they'll be installing stormwater
123 controls accordingly.
124

125 S. McShane confirmed that this hearing is to consider just the PRD setback waiver request, and that
126 continued review would consist of the conditional use criteria and applicable criteria under the
127 subdivision and PRD regulations.
128

129 M. Diender made the motion to recess the hearing to June 20, 2023, with a site visit immediately
130 preceding the regular DRB meeting. The motion was seconded by M. Black and unanimously
131 approved.
132

133 **Other Business:**
134

135 None.
136

137 **Approval of Minutes:**
138

139 A motion to approve meeting minutes from May 2, 2023, was made by C. Walton and seconded by
140 M. Black. Motion passed 7-0.
141

142 At 6:05pm the meeting was adjourned.
143

144 Respectfully Submitted,

145 Ryan Morrison
146 Deputy Zoning Administrator