



Village of Manchester, Vermont

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Development Review Board Held February 1st, 2023 at 10:00am

Members Present: Chair Craig Powers, Donald Brodie, Orland Campbell, Dana McCloskey, Jack Morris

Member(s) Absent: Gordon McClellan, Renee Waller

Others Present: Zoning Administrative Officer Curan VanDerWielen, Nanette Forti, Cheyanne Pugliese, [Representative Agent for 23-01]

The meeting was held both in person at the Village Offices and via Zoom.

Chair Craig Powers called the meeting to order at 10:02am.

Applications:

22-54 Nanette Forti, owner of 212 Taconic Avenue. The application regarded the replacement of the slate roof of the main structure with that of a refurbished structure and asphalt shingling. It was noted that the replacement of the roof had become necessary due to a persistent ceiling leak within the main structure. The Design Advisory Committee (DAC) had already chosen to defer judgment on the application directly to the Development Review Board (DRB) in December of 2022.

Chair Powers began by introducing the application, noting that Forti was present as representative of the applicant, Richard Forti. Powers then opened the floor for Forti to begin her presentation. Forti presented the application, noting the material and dimension of the sub-decking to be employed, the three (3) week timeline of the project as to begin in Spring, and the dark-grey color of the asphalt shingles to be used. Forti also noted the projected cost of the project as \$35,470.00. A short discussion then ensued among Forti and members of the Board about the recent rise in material costs. Powers then asked why no DAC recommendation had been attached to the application packet. Curan VanDerWielen responded that the DAC had chosen to defer their power to recommend directly to the DRB in this case, as they had believed the project minor and logical enough to not require a formal review on their part.

Powers then asked if the members of the Board had any questions about the application. Donald Brodie commented that the cost of the project sounded correct based on his knowledge of other local projects. Orland Campbell commented that while he had hoped a slate roof could be preserved on the main structure, he understood the prohibitive cost of the notion and further complimented the applicant on their thorough maintenance of the property. No other questions were raised. Powers commented that he believed the asphalt shingling would be consistent with adjoining and other nearby properties.

23-01

Campbell motioned to approve the zoning permit application without conditions. Dana McCloskey seconded the motion. The DRB then unanimously voted to approve zoning permit application 22-54.

Cheyenne Pugliese and [additional representative for 23-01], representative agents for the owners of 3738 and 3746 Main Street. The application regarded the installation of a temporary fence wrap with graphics on the safety fencing which had recently been erected on the perimeter of the property while the main structure was demolished. The DAC had reviewed the zoning permit application the week prior and had recommended the permit with several recommendations, including removing all advertising content from graphics, preparing alternative color schemes, preparing sample photographs, and preparing a sketch of the wrap's placement.

Powers introduced the permit application, however, he noted the absence of the applicant and any representative agents for the application. VanDerWielen offered to introduce the permit application by utilizing the facts and materials already submitted with the application. Powers accepted this, and VanDerWielen presented the application. VanDerWielen noted the intent expressed in the DAC meeting the week before, the DAC recommendations made, and the materials presented with the application.

Campbell commented that he believed the content of the graphics on the fence wrap constituted a billboard, which were prohibited in the state of Vermont. Campbell also noted that allowing a fence wrap might encourage future projects to utilize them, a trend he cautioned against. Jack Morris stated that he had observed a small sign with a similar graphic on it already attached to the safety fencing on the property, adding that he would likely vote against the fence wrap as presented given that the idea was too similar to that of an advertisement or billboard. VanDerWielen responded that he had been in contact with the property owners concerning the small sign previously posted, and that it had since been removed. Brodie commented that he would likely vote against it. McCloskey commented that she believed while the wrap itself was logical, the graphics were troublesome. Powers commented that he was torn, believing similarly to McCloskey in the utility of the wrap but perhaps not the graphics as presented.

Brodie motioned to deny the zoning permit application and Campbell seconded the motion. The DRB then unanimously denied the zoning permit application.

A short discussion then ensued concerning the application and whether a wrap could qualify as a billboard under the existing Village sign regulations. At this point in time, however, Cheyenne Pugliese and an additional representative agent arrived at the meeting to present. Powers informed the applicant of the vote to deny the application, however, the applicant requested that they be given a chance to present their materials themselves. Powers asked Campbell if it were possible to re-vote on the matter following a second presentation. Campbell stated that they could nullify the vote if the DRB wished to. VanDerWielen stated that the Board should vote on the matter before proceeding.

Campbell then motioned to nullify the previous vote to deny zoning permit application 23-01, with Brodie seconding the motion. The DRB then unanimously voted to nullify their previous vote on the matter

Powers then opened the floor to the applicants to present their application. The applicants then presented several color options and a physical sample of the material, itself somewhat transparent and not as opaque as shown on the sample imagery. The applicants also presented the graphics not as an advertisement, but as information for passersby regarding the development itself. Powers asked about the timeline of the temporary fence wrap, to which the applicants stated that it was intended to be come down with the fence, likely after the foundation of the new structure had been poured or when framing began. Either of these scenarios placed this within the Springtime, although the applicants emphasized their openness to discussion on the matter. A short discussion then ensued regarding this timeline.

Campbell and Morris both commented on the size of the wrap, noting the six (6) square feet maximum size set for signs of all types within the Business-1 (B-1) zoning district. The applicants asked if maintaining a six (6) square foot graphic rather than limiting the size of the wrap itself would be appropriate. VanDerWielen responded that either interpretation was likely acceptable. Campbell clarified that he had meant the graphic and not the wrap itself. McCloskey, Brodie, and Powers agreed with Campbell's assessment that the graphics would have to be limited in size to six (6) square feet.

Brodie asked whether a timeline be built into the permit as a condition. Powers responded that he believed a verbal agreement with the applicant to remove the wrap with the fencing as new construction began in the Spring, would suffice given the fluidness of the project's overall timetable.

Powers then motioned to approve the zoning permit application with two conditions: (1) that only the concept are and the "Monarch on Main" text remain in a maximum six (6) square foot graphic and only on one panel of the wrap; and (2) that a dark color be used for the final product. Campbell seconded Powers motion. The DRB then unanimously approved zoning permit application 23-01 with the two conditions as set by Powers.

VanDer Wielen made an announcement regarding an upcoming meeting for the following day between the Planning Commission (PC) and the DRB for the purpose of reviewing proposed amendments to the Village Zoning Bylaws.

**Other
Business:**

Powers then asked VanDerWielen for an update on several items from the Planning Commission, namely that of the formation of the Village Energy Plan and Energy Committee. A short discussion then ensued regarding the status of these endeavors, the jurisdictional boundaries between the Vermont Public Utility Commission (PUC) and municipalities, and ongoing discussions within the PC regarding the creation of an Energy Committee. There being no further business before the Board, Powers closed the meeting at 11:00am. The next regular meeting of the Development Review Board will be held on March 1st, 2023, at 10:00am.

Respectfully Submitted,
Curan VanDerWielen, Zoning Administrative Officer