



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023 @ 6:00 PM
RUTLAND CITY HALL, ALDERMEN'S CHAMBERS

ATTENDANCE

DRB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael McClallen, Chair
Stephanie Lorentz
Al Paul
Jim Pell

Matty Hauke, Landowner/Applicant
Heather Hauke, Landowner/Applicant
Susan Alfonso (275 Dorr Drive)
Ron Henderson (220 Mussey Street)
Diane Henderson (220 Mussey Street)

STAFF PRESENT:

Andrew Strniste, Zoning Administrator

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

None

212-214 MUSSEY STREET:

* Denotes that the attendee joined via Go-to-Meeting

-
- Members of the Rutland City Development Review Board convened in the Aldermen's Chambers at Rutland City Hall @ 52 Washington Street around 5:55 PM.
 - No general public was in attendance to provide public comment before the evening's hearings.

PUBLIC HEARING – CONDITIONAL USE REVIEW (212-214 MUSSEY STREET)

6:03 PM

APPLICANT: INTRINSIC PROPERTY SERVICES

LANDOWNER: INTRINSIC PROPERTY SERVICES

ZONING DISTRICT: MIXED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT 1 (MR-1)

[6:03] Chair M. McClallen called the continued hearing to order and provided an overview of the hearing procedures. He then reminded everyone why the Board originally continued the hearing and advised that the Applicant was to create a site plan that the Department of Public Works approved of. The Board and Applicants agreed that the original hearing addressed a lot of the concerns relating to the other matters of the application and that the evening's continued hearing would relate to the proposed parking lot.

[6:05] Applicant Matty Hauke informed the Board that after much deliberation, an agreement was reached where a maximum 45 ft. x 60 ft. parking area between the buildings at 212 & 214 Mussey Street, accessed by a 12 ft. driveway from Mussey Street, would be constructed. The parking lot could potentially be smaller than the proposed 45 ft. x 60 ft. dimensions and is expected to serve at least 13 vehicles. Board Member Lorentz asked if the 12 ft. curb-cut width was wide enough for the vehicles; the Applicants responded that they wished for the curb-cut width to be larger; however, the proposed 12 ft. would suffice. Board Member

Lorentz then inquired about the ability to return the greenspace back to its original state; the Applicants informed they were in agreement with DPW – the greenspace would be restored. Board Member Paul sought clarification relating to the parking lot area and the number of vehicles to be parked. The Applicants informed the Board that the parking lot would be setback 23 ft. from Mussey Street itself. The Applicants did admit to having cut down trees; however, this work was in conformance with the regulations. Board Member Lorentz clarified that potential changes to the application once approved would require them to come back to the Development Review Board. Staff Member Strniste provided clarification relating to the Department of Public Work's concerns over the course of the application process.

- [6:13] Chair M. McClallen inquired about potential buffering strategies between the right-of-way and the parking lot. Applicant Matty Hauke asked what the parameters are relating to installing landscaping were; the City's regulations do not have requirements. Then Applicant M. Hauke provided an overview of his experience and frustration with the application process, informing the Board that he had to revise the application five or six times and had difficulty understanding what the written requirements were. The Applicants agreed to install landscaping between the Mussey Street right-of-way and the parking lot, potentially planting lilac trees, as well as informed the Board that returning the greenspace to its original condition before May 15, 2023 was doable. Chair M. McClallen confirmed that the parking lot would contain 14 spaces in the parking lot. Applicant M. Hauke explained that he still has the ability to park five or six more vehicles on his property at 217 Mussey Street. He then confirmed that at a minimum, the parking would be large enough to park at least six to eight vehicles. He wanted to propose a parking lot as large as possible and make it smaller if need be. Chair M. McClallen noted that no other modifications were being made since the original application, and that storage is still proposed; however, the parking area is largely just for trucks and employee cars. Board Member Lorentz confirmed that the Applicants are still proposing to construct a 6 ft. high vinyl fence along the property line with 218 Mussey Street.
- [6:18] Susan Alfonso, who co-owns 218 Mussey Street asked clarification questions relating to how far the parking lot would be setback from the City's Mussey Street right-of-way, as well as the proposed landscaping between the parking lot and right-of-way. In response to Susan Alfonso's questions, Applicant M. Hauke advised that he could not definitively state what will be parked on the pad; nevertheless, vehicles are to be parked in the parking lot between 212 & 214 Mussey Street or at 217 Mussey Street. Applicant H. Hauke advised that they wanted to create the parking area for the ability to park more vehicles, and reiterated that the parking lot could potentially be smaller than what is proposed.
- [6:23] Susan Alfonso then expressed her concern about summer operations, and then asked clarification questions about the application, specifically about what would be approved should the Board grant approval. She then inquired about the non-permanent structure mentioned during the first hearing and its dimensions. Applicant M. Hauke advised that the structure would likely be 15 ft. by 20 ft. carport. Staff Member Strniste confirmed that the carport would conform with the requirements of the Mixed Residential District 1 zoning district, as well as distinguished between primary structures and accessory structures. Applicant M. Hauke informed the Board that he would like to use the carport for storing equipment to ensure they are out of the elements.
- [6:28] Abutting Neighbor, Ron Henderson, opined that the Applicants should not need an access permit for one of the curb-cuts since it was always existing. Applicant M. Hauke agreed and stated that that was one of the topics of discussion with the Department of Public Works.

[6:29] The Board had no other questions, nor did the Applicant provide additional testimony. Chair M. McClallen adjourned the hearing and provided an overview of the process going forward.

OTHER BUSINESS

6:30 PM

[6:30] The Board entered into closed deliberation to discuss the evening's hearing.

[6:43] The Board discussed the upcoming agenda on March 15, 2023 and then adjourned the evening's meeting at 6:45 PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Andrew Strniste, Planning & Zoning Administrator