



Planning & Zoning Office
Town of Richmond P.O. Box 285
Richmond, VT 05477
(802) 434-2430
tmachia@richmondvt.gov
www.richmondvt.gov

**Town of Richmond
Development Review Board
December 13, 2024, at 7:00 PM
Minutes**

Members Present: David Sunshine (Chair), Roger Pedersen, Padraic Monks, Matt Parisi

Staff: Tyler Machia

Others Present: Michael Sipes, Jessica Sipes, Adam Miller, Diane LeClari, Bryan Currier, Siera Payn, Amanda Gardner, Curt Gardner, Liana Scheidman, Breck Knauft

Meeting opened: 7:05 PM

Item 1.

PRESUB2024-03

Matthew Parisi

Parcel ID#EM0112

Project Location: 114 East Main Street

- 1. Project Description:** The Applicants are seeking preliminary approval for a proposed 3 lot Residential Planned Unit Development. Lot 1 contains a preexisting duplex. Lot 2 contains a preexisting single-family home. Proposed lot 3 would be common land.

Minutes

- Chair David Sunshine opened the meeting and asked the members if anyone had a conflict of interest regarding this application.
- Matt Parisi disclosed that he had a conflict as he was a member of the board and recused himself at 7:05 PM to present his application.
- Parisi provided an overview of the project
 - He noted that the purpose of this Planned Unit Development (PUD) was to make it possible to separate ownership of the two existing residential structures on this lot.
- Sunshine asked if the HOA language had been created yet.
 - It was noted that it had been.
- Roger Pedersen asked whether anything had been done to address the ZA's recommendations in the staff notes.
 - Parisi noted that the parking area was screened with existing vegetation and a drywell had already been installed to deal with the storm water issues.

Motion to approve the application as presented by Roger Pederson, seconded by Padric Monks

Approved: Unanimously

Item 2.

Project Location: 60 Wolf Lane

1. **Project Description:** The Applicants, Jessica & Michael Sipes, are seeking to remove a restriction from the building envelope of lot 7 of the Wolf Lane Subdivision. This lots building envelope is currently restricted to agricultural uses only.

Minutes

- Parisi rejoined the board at 7:22
- Adam Miller, who was representing the sipes, provided an overview of the project
 - He went over some of the permitting history on this parcel.
 - He noted that is clients, the Sipes, have received mixed messages as to what restrictions exist on the building envelope for lot 7 of the original subdivision
 - He noted that the current building envelope has several structures in it
 - It was noted that both the original subdivision and the Environment Court Judgment order note that there was a restriction on the building envelope on lot 7 that noted the building envelope was restricted to agricultural uses only.
- The majority of the conversation on this proposal focused on this restriction and what it meant for future development on this site.
 - Many of the board members were unsure what the applicants were looking for.
 - Michael Sipes noted that a potential long term plan for this site was to eventually have a single family home in the building envelope for lot 7.
 - It was noted that the board cannot make decisions on a sketch plan application.
- Diane LeClair, an abutting property owner, raised concerns about further development on lot 7.
 - She was concerned that further development on lot 7 could exacerbate storm water problems they have been facing.
 - She noted that she had to spend 30k to repair erosion on her property.
 - It was noted that any future project would likely require a storm water plan.

Item 3.**Project Location: 90 East Main Street**

1. **Project Description:** The Applicants, Village View Condo Assoc, are looking to subdivide one lot off of their property.
- Matt Parisi disclosed that he had a potential conflict of interest with this project.
 - He noted that he was in conversation about purchasing this potential lot in the future.
 - He noted that he felt he could still participate in the proceedings as no decisions are made in a Sketch Plan review.
 - David Sunshine asked if any members of the board or the public had any objection to Parisi participating in the process.
 - No objections were raised.

- Liana Schneidman provided an overview of the project.
 - She noted that the Condo Association was interested in subdividing and selling off a lot.
 - She noted that they were in the very early stages of looking into subdividing this parcel.
 - It was noted that the applicants will need to provide a storm water plan for this project.

Item 4.

SKP2024-06

VYCC

Parcel ID#EM1949

Project Location: 1949 East Main Street

- 1. Project Description:** The Applicants, Vermont Youth Conservation Corps, are seeking an expansion of uses at their Richmond Campus. They are hoping to add a number of uses to the property, including housing for VYCC staff and participants, in order to offer more programming.

Minutes

- Bryan Currier and Breck Knauft provided an overview of the project.
 - They briefly went over the history of VYCC, noting the types of programming they offer as well as how they came to own the Richmond Campus.
 - Knauft noted that VYCC has outgrown its current footprint and needs to expand in order to enhance its offerings and provide more services to both the participants and the community.
- Currier went over the proposed upgrades to the campus which included the following
 - The construction of up to 6 seasonal bunk houses for program participants
 - A 16 bed four season bunk house for program participants
 - Improve the farm facilities so they can do a year-round food share program
 - Offer additional programming in the barn building.
- The proposed cabins and bunk houses were a major topic of conversation
 - The DRB had previously approved VYCC for an Educational Facility use which is supposed to be Certified by AOE. However, after conversation with AOE Knauft reported that AOE does not certify educational programs themselves.
 - Currier and Knauft argued that the bunk house and cabins could be considered part of the Educational Facility use.
 - However, it was unclear whether these buildings could be considered part of an educational facility.
- There was broad agreement that this project would require a PUD due to the number of principal structures on the lot.
- Pedersen noted that the board will have to determine what is included under this education use

Other Business

Public discussion of the Richmond Code of Ethics Parcel

- The board had a discussion on the Richmond Code of Ethics
- Most of the conversation was Focused on Ex Parte communication and how to avoid it.

Public discussion on DRB Rules and Procedures

- The Board discussed its rules and procedures as well as possible changes.
- The Board opted to not vote to approve the minutes at each meeting. The ZA will write and post minutes. If there are problems they can be corrected, and the corrections would be approved by the board.
- The board highlighted a few proposed changes that they would like to look into.
- The ZA will draft language changes and will bring it to the Board at their next meeting.

**Motion to have the ZA draft changes to the DRB rules and procedures for future board consideration. by Padric Monks, Seconded by Roger Pederson
Approved: Unanimously**

**Motion To Adjourn by David Sunshine, Seconded by Padric Monks
Approved: Unanimously**

Meeting Adjourned: 9:22 PM

