

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 12, 2020

The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. Chair A. LaRocque called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Commission: Garrett, Harold ☒; Speer, Neal ☐; Steen, Colleen ☒; Charron, Claude ☐; Irwin, William ☒; Voegelé, Albin ☐; Buermann, Robert ☒; LaRocque, Alisha ☒.

Staff: Bethany Remmers

Guests: None.

Changes to Additions to the Agenda:

None.

Public Comment

None.

Minutes

A. Larocque noted that the meeting adjourned at 6:59 PM, not 7:59 PM as the minutes stated.

B. Irwin motioned to approve the minutes of the July 2020 meeting with corrections. H. Garrett seconded. The motion carried with abstentions.

Project Reviews

Act 250 – Perrigo Nutritionals Expansion

Project Details: Perrigo Nutritionals is in the concept plan phase for a large-scale expansion to their existing powdered infant formula manufacturing facility in Georgia, Vermont. The proposed project includes a new dryer facility housed in a 150 ft tall building, replacing the existing wet processor in a 50 ft tall building, a new warehouse space, a possible second dryer and other related improvements.

Representatives for Perrigo Nutritionals presented at the July Project Review Committee meeting to seek input on the project, specifically feedback in regards to the Act 250 Criteria 8: Act 250 Criteria 8: Aesthetics, Scenic and Natural Beauty. At the August meeting, the Committee discussed the documents presented in July and additional documents provided by the applicant after that meeting.

The Project Review Committee reviewed the goals and policies of the Regional Plan pertaining to aesthetics and then had a conversation about the potential visual impacts of the project. The Committee reviewed the building and view models provided by the applicant and agreed there would be a substantial visual impact from the project. However, Committee members also noted that the project is located in an industrial park and the goal is to use this parcel for industrial uses. Committee members also observed the visual impacts from the nearby wind turbines on Georgia Mountain. After reviewing the “View Corridors” documents, the Committee concluded the “all white cube” approach is too visually obtrusive. The Committee would like the applicant to continue to refine the “Gray Graduated Panels” treatment and to pursue the least visually obtrusive building treatment as possible. The Committee also questioned if the applicant has a decommissioning plan if the site was abandoned and the factory was not being used for an extended period of

time. The Committee requested to know when a “balloon test” would be done and how many houses/parcels would be able to see the proposed buildings.

In addition to aesthetics, the Committee had questions or wanted additional information on the following topics:

- Provide clarification of the stormwater plan. How is stormwater currently treated and how will the treatment plan change? How much stormwater is currently discharged? After construction will all stormwater be treated onsite and how? What could be the impacts to the nearby ravine and Deer Brook?
- Provide clarification of water withdrawals from Arrowhead Mountain Lake. What is the current permitted allocation? How much of the current allocation is the applicant using now? How much of the allocation will the applicant be using after all four phases are constructed?
- Provide clarification on whey disposal. How is whey currently disposed and how will that change after construction? What is the Vermont Whey Pollution Abatement Authority noted on the plans? What is the purpose of the 30’ water easement to the Vermont Whey Pollution Abatement Authority noted on the plans and is there an existing pipe within that easement?
- Provide more information on the traffic impacts of the project during and after construction. How many more trucks will be using Skunk Hollow Road during construction? Are there existing limits on daily truck trips for other industrial businesses along that corridor?
- Will the new buildings require an aviation beacon?

Act 250 – Sandy Birch Road, LLC, 14-Lot Subdivision, Georgia, VT

Project Details: The application is for a 14-lot subdivision on Sandy Birch Road including 12 lots for single family residences, 1 lot of commonly held open space and 1 lot comprised of 34 acres to be retained by Sandy Birch Road, LLC and not to be developed at this time.

The Committee reviewed how the project addressed the goals and policies of the Regional Plan. The Committee discussed the mitigation of agricultural soils, the two lots set aside for more affordable housing, potential impacts to the Class 2 wetlands. The Committee was concerned that the proposed project does not include sidewalks or walking paths within the development. It also does not provide a sidewalk or path to the commonly-held open space (Lot-13); access to that space is only possible by leaving the development and accessing from Lot-14 along an unimproved ROW. The Committee also recommended there be a comprehensive stormwater master plan for the site and a future build-out projection for the remaining 34 acres on Lot-14.

H. Garrett motioned to find that the project as currently designed was not in conformance with the Regional Plan. C. Steen seconded. The motion carried.

Updates

None.

Other Business

None.

Adjourn

B. Buermann motioned to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 8:15 PM.