



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2024 @ 6:00 PM
RUTLAND CITY HALL, ALDERMEN'S CHAMBERS

ATTENDANCE

DRB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mike McClallen, Chair
Jim Pell
Steve Wilk
Al Paul

Whitney Standefer (58 Ives Ave, Landowner)
David Nelson (152 Bellevue)
Carol Hignite (62 Ives Ave)
Susan Ahearn (61 Ives Ave)
Michael Ahearn (61 Ives Ave)

STAFF PRESENT:

Andrew Strniste, Zoning Administrator
Luke Alexander, Asst. Zoning Administrator

74 ALLEN STREET HEARING:

Mark Desmery (74 Allen St,
Landowner/Applicant)
Eugene Rakow (24 Wales Street)
Lynn Harasty (237 Hawley Ln)

58 IVES AVENUE HEARING:

Trevor Smith (58 Ives Ave,
Applicant/Landowner)

-
- Members of the Rutland City Development Review Board and the public 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 – SITE PLAN REVIEW (58 IVES AVENUE)

6:02 PM

APPLICANT: TREVOR SMITH

LANDOWNER: TREVOR SMITH AND WHITNEY STANDEFER

ZONING DISTRICT: SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (SFR)

-
- [6:02] Chair M. McClallen called the hearing to order and provided an overview of the hearing procedures. The subject of the evening's hearing related to the construction of an 8 ft. x 27 ft. front porch, attached to the west front side of the single-family dwelling. Chair M. McClallen swore in all those who were in attendance wishing to provide testimony during the evening's public hearing. The applicant and landowner, Trevor Smith, was before the Board to present the application.
- [6:03] Applicant T. Smith explained that he was proposing to construct an 8 ft. x 27 ft. front porch with a hip roof onto the front of the house. He informed the Board that the width of the house is 33 feet and that the porch would not extend further in width than the already existing structure. T. Smith explained that the existing structure (the single-family dwelling) is approximately 30 feet from the sidewalk along Ives Ave, and the proposed porch would

decrease the distance to approximately 22 feet. He informed the Board that other houses along Ives Ave average about 20-25 feet away from the sidewalk, and that his proposed front porch would not be egregiously closer than other development in the neighborhood. T. Smith opined that the proposed front porch would fit in aesthetically with his existing house, as well as other development in the neighborhood.

- [6:07] Board Member S. Wilk opined that the application seemed straight-forward and inquired about the proposed lighting relating to the front porch.

Applicant T. Smith advised that the proposed lighting would be less obstructive than the existing lighting on the house. He informed the Board that he plans to install an overhead light, most likely a ceiling fan. T. Smith advised that an existing light post towards the front of the house may be removed as part of the project, further reducing the amount of light being emitted.

A picture of the existing house, and an example of a similar front porch, were submitted in the record as Attachments 6 and 7 and shown to the Board and public.

- [6:07] Board Member S. Wilk inquired about the distance of the edge of the steps to the edge of the sidewalk.

Applicant T. Smith advised that the total length of the steps would be approximately 22 inches beyond the porch and approximately 21 feet from the edge of the sidewalk.

- [6:10] Chair M. McClallen inquired about the north side setback – depicted in Attachment 4. He asked for clarification of the distance of the existing structure to the north side property line in comparison to the distance of the proposed front porch to the north side property line.

Applicant T. Smith advised that the porch would be set inward approximately three feet from the existing building line of the house.

Chair M. McClallen sought clarification from Applicant T. Smith that the north side setback from the front corner of the existing house is approximately 6 feet, and the setback of the proposed front porch would be approximately 9 feet.

Chair M. McClallen confirmed that the proposed lighting for the front porch would be a reduction from the existing lighting on the front of the house. He inquired if the proposed front porch would block sight lines when attempting to access the road from the driveway of the Applicant's property or the neighboring properties.

Applicant T. Smith advised that the proposed porch would not impede or obstruct sight lines when accessing Ives Avenue.

Chair M. McClallen inquired about the landscaping proposed as a part of the project and if it would impede sightlines when accessing Ives Avenue.

Applicant T. Smith advised that any landscaping installed would be small and would not extend higher than the proposed porch, thus not impeding the sight lines when accessing Ives Avenue.

- [6:13] Chair M. McClallen opened the hearing to public comment.

Michael Ahearn (61 Ives Ave) expressed support for the project as proposed.

David Nelson (152 Bellevue Ave) opined about his experience by having a front porch and his perceived benefits and the impact on fostering interactions between neighbors.

[6:24] Carol Hignite (62 Ives Ave) opined that the proposed front porch did not match the aesthetics of the neighborhood due to the porch having a greater width. She informed the Board that the measurement from her porch to the sidewalk was approximately 26 feet and 6 inches.

Applicant T. Smith referenced laser measurements he had taken of surrounding porches in the neighborhood and submitted them into the record as Attachment 8. He explained that the measurements between the sidewalk and other development in the neighborhood were similar to the front porch he was proposing, and that the development on Litchfield Avenue, one street over, were notably closer to the road.

C. Hignite expressed concern that the view down Ives Avenue would be altered, and that she was unsure of the distance the proposed front porch would extend from the house.

Chair M. McClallen advised that the proposed front porch would extend 8 feet from the existing house, as stated in the application.

C. Hignite asked the applicant if the property line markers were still in place. Applicant T. Smith confirmed that they were.

[6:24] The Board and the public 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.

PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW (74 ALLEN STREET)

6:27 PM

APPLICANT: MARK DESMERY

LANDOWNER: MARK AND KATHLEEN DESMERY

ZONING DISTRICT: PLANNED OFFICE PARK DISTRICT (POP)

[6:27] Chair M. McClallen called the hearing to order and provided an overview of the hearing procedures. The subject of the evening's hearing related to the construction of a 20 ft. x 64 ft. single-family dwelling, with a two-car garage attached to the front of the house. Chair M. McClallen swore in all those who were in attendance wishing to provide testimony during the evening's public hearing. The applicant and landowner, Mark Desmery, was before the Board to present the application.

[6:29] Applicant Mark Desmery informed the Board that he is seeking to construct a 20 ft. x 64 ft. single-family dwelling, with a garage attached to the front of the house. He explained that the 20 ft. side setbacks required by the zoning district, as well as a minimum building width of 20 ft. made developing the lot difficult, as the lot itself was only 52 ft. wide. He advised that many options were explored when designing the proposed single-family dwelling. M. Desmery admitted that with such a narrow lot, some trees on the sides of the property might not survive the excavation process for the foundation; however, any trees that don't survive, would be replaced with sufficient buffering to maintain his abutting neighbors' privacy.

[6:29] Board Member S. Wilk clarified that the Applicant was requesting a dimensional waiver request and not a variance. He opined that the plans for the single-family dwelling looked nice and advised that he did not have any further questions regarding the application.

Board Member A. Paul inquired about the number of people who would occupy the home. Applicant M. Desmery informed the Board that he and his wife would occupy the two-bedroom, two bathroom, single-family dwelling.

Board Member S. Wilk confirmed that the property was located in the Planned Office Park (POP) zoning district.

Board Member J. Pell opined that the proposed development would be a big improvement to the previous abandoned mobile home on the lot.

Board Member S. Wilk inquired if the building would have any special circumstances that would interfere with the property lines.

Applicant M. Desmery advised that the proposed development would be sleek, with no bump outs. He informed the Board that a minimal extension of the roof over the door could be possible.

Board member S. Wilk confirmed that there were no lot size requirements for the number of bedrooms and bathrooms.

[6:34] Chair M. McClallen referenced Attachment 5 and inquired about the driveway location.

Applicant M. Desmery advised that the driveway would retain the same curb cut; however, would be altered towards the garage in order to provide ingress and egress.

Chair M. McClallen inquired about the single-family dwelling's exterior lighting proposed.

Applicant M. Desmery informed the Board that the exterior lighting would be motion activated, low intensity LED lights, pointed downward. He advised that the lighting would be the minimum amount to safely access the property.

Chair M. McClallen clarified with the Applicant that a Sewer and Water Allocation was likely required from the Department of Public Works. He opened the hearing to public comment.

[6:37] Lynn Harasty (72 Allen St) expressed her concern relating to water run-off and flooding on her property.

Applicant M. Desmery advised that he will attempt to disturb the property as little as possible, and that water assumably would drain between the properties or into the street.

Chair M. McClallen inquired if the property had existing drainage problems.

L. Harasty advised that it did not.

[6:39] Eugene Rakow (24 Wales St) informed the Board that based on his experience the property has had previous drainage problems; nevertheless, he was in support of the project.

[6:41] The Board and the public 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

6:41 PM

[6:42] The Board entered into closed deliberation to discuss the evening's hearing.

[6:50] The Board adjourned the evening's meeting.

Respectfully Submitted by Luke Alexander, Assistant Zoning Administrator