

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, November 11, 2020

3 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. Chair A. LaRocque called the meeting to
4 order at 6:12 PM.

5
6 ATTENDANCE:

7 Commission: Garrett, Harold ; Speer, Neal ; Steen, Colleen ; Irwin, William ; Voegele, Albin ;
8 Buermann, Robert ; LaRocque, Alisha .

9
10 Staff: Bethany Remmers, Emily Klofft.

11 Guests: None

12
13 **Changes to Additions to the Agenda:**

14 B. Remmers requested to discuss an update on the Perrigo project under updates.

15
16 **Public Comment**

17 None.

18
19 **Minutes**

20
21 *W. Irwin motioned to approve the minutes of the October 2020 meeting. R. Buermann seconded. The motion
22 carried with one abstention.*

23
24 **Project Reviews**

25 **Act 250 – Peter Morse – St. Albans Mini Storage**

26 Project Details: The project is an extension to an existing self-storage facility located in St. Albans located in
27 the Franklin Park West industrial park. The applicant is proposing constructing four new storage buildings,
28 with attendant stormwater infrastructure upgrades. The project is located in a regional growth center, and
29 sidewalks are required under the Regional Plan Complete Streets policy. The applicant is not planning to
30 construct sidewalks, and requested the removal of a previous permit condition to construct sidewalks.

31 The Committee discussed the lack of proposed sidewalks. A. LaRocque stated that she believed sidewalks
32 were a requirement under the Town of St. Albans Development Regulations. H. Garrett asked who would be
33 responsible for maintaining sidewalks if they were constructed.

34
35 A. Voegele arrived at 6:21.

36
37 A. LaRocque asked A. Voegele if St. Albans Town required sidewalks. A. Voegele stated that the Town was
38 supportive of sidewalks, but did not require sidewalks in Franklin Park West.

39
40 Colleen Steen arrived at 6:23.

41
42 A. Voegele stated that there was a previous compromise that the Town had made to not require sidewalks in
43 the industrial park. The Committee discussed the conflict between the requirements of local zoning and the
44 requirements of the Northwest Regional Plan. A. Voegele stated that there had been a previous conversation
45 about sidewalks in Franklin Park West, and that there had been discussion of potentially painting a bike lane

1 on Franklin Park West Drive. W. Irwin suggested that one compromise could be requiring a bicycle lane on
2 Franklin Park West Drive and Village Drive to connect to the Missisquoi Valley Rail Trail. H. Garrett stated that
3 Franklin Park West Drive would not be wide enough for a bicycle lane.
4

5 B. Irwin suggests that given compromise given MVRT is there is to have there be a bike lane into Franklin Park
6 West and Village Drive, Harold thinks road is not wide enough for bicycle lane. The Committee discussed
7 whether sidewalks had been required for previous applicants in Franklin Park West and whether there was a
8 requirement to bond for future sidewalks.
9

10 E. Klofft reviewed the project review sheet. The Committee asked about stormwater improvements. E. Klofft
11 replied that the application stated new stormwater infrastructure would be added to connect to the existing
12 retention pond.
13

14 A. LaRocque stated that without sidewalks, the project cannot be in conformance with the Regional Plan given
15 the “shall” language in the Plan. If it was a bond that was required in other cases, then a similar bond should
16 be required for this case.
17

18 R. Buermann motioned that the project conforms to the regional plan so long as the original requirement for
19 sidewalks is not removed. W. Irwin second. The motion carried.
20

21 **Section 248a –Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless**

22 Project Overview: The project is a 130-foot Verizon cell phone tower located in Fairfax near Fairfax Village. The
23 project will be located on a 50-acre parcel which is owned by the Town of Fairfax. The proposed tower would
24 be 130 feet tall, and include 6 antennas and 6 remote radio heads that are each 72 inches by 11.8 inches.
25 Additionally, the project would include a 12-foot by 20-foot equipment shelter, a generator on a 10-foot by
26 12-foot concrete pad, and if propane is used, an 11-foot by 4-foot concrete pad and 500-gallon propane tank
27 will also be installed. The overall size of the compound is 50-foot by 50-foot. It will be surrounded by an 8-foot
28 tall fence with razor wire. The project will add 24,538 square feet of impervious surfaces.
29

30 The project would be located on the southeast portion of the parcel and be accessed by an existing access
31 road that is referred to as both a “woods road” and a trail in the application. Some areas of the access road
32 have a 13-14% slope. Power and cellular service lines will be run underground underneath the access road to
33 minimize visual impacts.
34

35 R. Buermann noted that the proposed lease was only for a 100-foot by 100-foot area, but that the tower is
36 130 feet tall, which would mean the lease is less than the potential fall zone. W. Irwin asked if the Town had a
37 plan for use of the rest of parcel to understand if this use would prohibit other uses. B. Remmers stated that
38 she was unsure what the future plans were for the rest of the parcel, but that the Town Selectboard signed
39 the initial lease and the Planning Commission had also discussed the project.
40

41 W. Irwin asked if the applicant would allow for co-location with other carriers on the tower. B. Remmers
42 stated that it was not discussed in the application, but the applicant did state that they could not provide
43 equivalent service by co-locating on an existing tower.
44

45 The Committee had a discussion about community response to the project. There has been some limited
46 pushback locally.

1
2 A. Voegelé asked what level of service (3G, 4G or 5G) the tower could provide.
3

4 B. Remmers reviewed the project review sheet. The project could meet the goal of developing infrastructure
5 to maintain and improve service, but the applicants have not yet detailed what areas will receive service that
6 haven't previously, or will receive improved service. The applicant did note that the project was sited on the
7 parcel to be as least obtrusive as possible, but have not provided information on alternate sites considered or
8 done visual analysis of where the tower will be visible from. A LaRocque asked if the applicants had conducted
9 a balloon test. B. Remmers stated that they had not but that the Committee could ask for one.
10

11 B. Remmers stated that in terms of natural resources, since the access road is pre-existing and skirting the
12 eastern boundary, it will not create additional forest fragmentation. The applicant did not provide
13 information on stormwater mitigation for the gravel road. W. Irwin asked if the project is within a habitat
14 block. B. Remmers stated that the parcel is within a 253-acre ANR-mapped habitat block and does have prime
15 agricultural soils. A. LaRocque requested that the applicant provide more information on how the parcel was
16 selected, and what their plan was for limiting natural resource impacts.
17

18 B. Remmers reviewed the list of questions the Committee asked of a similar project in Grand Isle. A. LaRocque
19 stated that she thought they were suitable for this project as well.
20

21 H. Garrett requested that the applicant provide information on the make-up of trees and whether the area
22 had softwood trees which are important for deer habitat. A. LaRocque asked if the equipment produce any
23 noise. W. Irwin stated that typically the only noise is a small computer hum, but that if power was lost the
24 back-up generator would create noise.
25

26 Questions the Committee had for the applicant:

- 27 • What is the drop zone for the tower? Is the 100-foot by 100-foot lease large enough to cover the entire
28 drop zone for a 130-foot tower?
- 29 • Will the applicant allow other service providers to co-locate on the tower?
- 30 • What level of service (3G, 4G or 5G) will the tower provide?
- 31 • What areas will be served that have not ben previously, or will have improved service as a result of this
32 tower?
- 33 • What will be the visual impacts of the project? Can the applicant conduct a balloon test and visual
34 impact analysis?
- 35 • What steps will be taken to mitigate stormwater impacts, especially along the access road?
- 36 • How was this location selected? What other alternate locations were considered?
- 37 • Are the trees on the project site hardwood or softwood?
- 38 • What noise is expected to be generated by the project? What level of noise will occur when the
39 generator is running?
40

41 Updates

42 B. Remmers provided an update on the proposed expansion of the Perrigo facility in Georgia. There was a
43 meeting between various state groups, local Perrigo representatives, Perrigo's engineering firm and
44 executives from Perrigo. Perrigo is planning to complete an even larger upgrade than previously proposed,
45 likely to exceed 300 million dollars. The project has been relocated to the east of the parcel. It is expected that

1 this will reduce the project's visual impacts, but building massing and viewshed analysis has not been
2 conducted yet.

3
4 The Committee discussed the potential visual impacts. A. LaRocque stated that she still had questions around
5 stormwater and disposal of whey. B. Remmers stated that she would invite Perrigo to the December 9th
6 meeting of Project Review.

7
8 **Other Business**

9 The Committee discussed the meeting time for the December meeting, given that the Board of Commissioners
10 meeting may be scheduled on the same evening. The Committee agreed to meet at 5:30 PM if the Board of
11 Commissioners meeting was scheduled for the 9th of December.

12
13 **Adjourn**

14 *A. LaRocque motioned to adjourn. W. Irwin seconded. The Committee adjourned at 7:24 PM.*

DRAFT