

1 **ESSEX PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 **September 8, 2022**

3 **60 Colonel Page Road – Major Subdivision (Sketch)**

4 **Contents**

5 Applicant..... 2

6 Proposal..... 2

7 Background..... 2

8 I. Article II of the *Subdivision Regulations*: Subdivision Procedures..... 2

9 (A) SR Section 2.2: Classification..... 2

10 (B) SR Section 2.3: Review Process..... 3

11 II. Article IV of the *Subdivision Regulations*: Subdivision Standards..... 3

12 (A) SR Section 4.1: Standards Applicable to All Subdivisions..... 4

13 III. Article VI of the *Zoning Regulations*: Planned Unit Development..... 9

14 (A) ZR Section 6.4: General Standards Applicable to All Planned Unit Developments..... 10

15 (B) ZR Section 6.8: Planned Unit Development – Residential..... 12

16 IV. Article III of the *Subdivision Regulations*: Residential Phasing..... 13

17 V. Additional Findings by the Planning Commission..... 14

18 Conditions of Approval..... 14

19 List of Attachments..... 15

20 **Summary**

21 The applicant proposes a conventional 9-lot subdivision within the R1 and SRPO districts
 22 that somewhat meets the goals for scenic resource protection through use of building envelopes
 23 and intentional orientation of buildings. However, staff recommend significant layout changes,
 24 possibly requiring presentation of the project as a PUD, to reduce its visual and environmental
 25 impacts as well as cost of construction. Further detail is needed to determine whether some of the
 26 septic leach fields are located within a regulated floodplain / C2 district; if so, flood hazard
 27 review by the ZBA (as well as state and federal permits) and additional flood mitigation
 28 measures may be required. Public Works recommends contribution to the paving of Colonel
 29 Page Road and relocation of the proposed gravel wetland to improve stormwater management.

30 **Applicant**

31 Ken Heco
 32 83 Old Stage Road
 33 Essex, VT 05452

34 **Proposal**

35 The applicant proposes a conventional subdivision of a 37.06-acre parcel at 60 Colonel Page
 36 Road (Parcel ID 2-010-071-000) into nine new lots ranging from 2.1 acres to 8.6 acres along a
 37 new dead-end public road connecting to Colonel Page Road approximately 575 feet west of

38 Chapin Road. Each lot would accommodate a new single-unit dwelling with individual
39 driveways and on-site wells and septic systems (some of which may be located on shared land).
40 The parcel is located within the Low Density Residential (R1) zoning district, as well as the
41 Scenic Resource Preservation Overlay (SRPO) and Floodplain overlay (C2) districts. Except for
42 the multi-unit Alder Ridge condominiums to the south, neighboring uses are all large-lot single-
43 unit residences, as well as farms and forests.

44 **Background**

45 The parcel in question was part of a larger parcel conveyed from Bernice Bixby to Robert O. and
46 Marjorie P. Wilson on June 20, 1962 (as recorded in book 66 page 146 of the Town of Essex
47 Land Records).

48 The Wilsons conveyed a 1.12-acre parcel (currently addressed as 50 Colonel Page Road) to
49 Michael and Linda Wilson on March 5, 1980 (book 153 pages 69-71). Though this did not
50 receive an official subdivision approval from the Zoning Administrator as required under the
51 *Subdivision Regulations* effective at the time, it appears the new parcel complied with the *Zoning*
52 *Regulations* at the time.

53 Through a series of quit-claim deeds (book 333 page 246, and page 351 page 238), Robert O.
54 and Marjorie P. Wilson conveyed the remaining parcel to Robert P. Wilson on May 15, 1996,
55 who then conveyed it via warranty deed to Alan D. French Jr. on March 25, 2022 (book 1088
56 page 552).

57 **I. Article II of the *Subdivision Regulations*: Subdivision Procedures**

58 The applicant has submitted the following plan:

- 59 • Drawing 1 of 1, “Subdivision Site Plan, Kenan Heco, Chapin & Colonel Page Roads,
60 Essex, VT,” prepared by JH Stuart Associates, dated 05/12/2022

61 **(A) SR Section 2.2: Classification**

62 The applicants have requested approval for a 9-lot subdivision, which falls under the
63 definition of “Major Subdivision” according to the *Town of Essex Outside the Village of*
64 *Essex Junction Official Subdivision Regulations* (SR). Minor subdivisions must receive
65 sketch, preliminary, and final approval.

66 **(B) SR Section 2.6: Sketch Plan Review**

67 As stated in SR Section 2.6(A), the purpose of sketch plan review is

68 *to explore the options for the overall subdivision concept and layout, including uses*
69 *and open spaces, in relation to the objectives of the Town Plan, the characteristics of*
70 *the site and characteristics of the surrounding area, and to determine that the*
71 *proposed subdivision appears consistent with the requirements of these Regulations*
72 *and the Town’s Zoning Regulations.*

73 The applicant has submitted a complete application for sketch plan review under SR
74 Section 2.6(B). Under SR Section 2.6(D), the Planning Commission must study the plan
75 to ensure that it conforms to the General Requirements in SR Article IV. Upon sketch
76 plan approval, the Planning Commission must also make a preliminary residential
77 phasing allocation review in accordance with SR Article III. Because the project will not
78 be developed in phases, and the remaining land would be included in an open space
79 agreement, a Master Plan is not required.

80 **II. Article IV of the Subdivision Regulations: Subdivision Standards**

81 The Planning Commission must evaluate any proposed subdivision according to the Subdivision
82 Standards in Article IV, and may require modification or phasing of the proposed subdivision in
83 light of findings relating to those standards.

84 **(A) SR Section 4.1: Standards Applicable to All Subdivisions**

85 Sketch plan applications are reviewed against the General Standards in Section 4.1. Not
86 all provisions of this section are reviewed here, as some are not relevant to this
87 development or are covered by other provisions of the *Zoning Regulations (ZR)* and/or
88 *Subdivision Regulations (SR)*.

89 **1. SR Standard 4.1(P): Conformance with the Essex Town Plan**

90 The proposal complies with the following goals and policies of the *Essex Town Plan*:

91 ***Specific Policy 2(S).14:*** *The provision of new housing in the community shall be*
92 *balanced with impacts on the environment and on public facilities and services.*

93 ***Specific Policy 3(S).4:*** *Critical wildlife habitat, including but not limited to deer*
94 *wintering areas, rare and/or endangered species habitat, local fisheries, and*
95 *identified travel corridors, shall be protected from in appropriate development and*
96 *land management activities.*

97 ***Goal 6a:*** *New development in floodplains, fluvial erosion hazard areas, and land*
98 *adjacent to streams, wetlands, and upland forests is avoided.*

99 Additional information and conditions may be needed to ensure the proposal
100 complies with the following policy:

101 ***Goal 7a:*** *The Town's significant natural, scenic, historic, and archaeological*
102 *resources are protected from development.*

103 ***General Policy 8:*** *To support large contiguous blocks and connectivity for wildlife,*
104 *agricultural and forest lands shall be protected from fragmentation by subdivisions.*

105

106 **2. SR Standard 4.1(G): Conformance with the *Zoning Regulations***

107 **(a) Table 2.4: Low Density Residential (R1) District Standards**

108 The parcel is located in the Low Density Residential (R1) district and must conform
109 to the dimensional requirements and development standards listed in Table 2.4 of the
110 *Town of Essex Outside the Village of Essex Junction Official Zoning Regulations*
111 (ZR), as well as Article III, General Standards, and any applicable provisions of
112 Article IV, Specific Standards.

113 **i. Purpose**

114 The project reflects the purpose of the R1 district in that it is low-density
115 residential development where lots are large enough to accommodate on-site
116 septic systems, but may connect to municipal water service.

117 **ii. Permitted and Conditional Uses**

118 Single-unit dwellings are permitted in this district. No conditional uses are
119 proposed.

120 **iii. District Dimensional Requirements**

121 The subdivision's layout conforms to Table 2.4(D), Dimensional
122 Requirements of the R1 district – all lots are at least 1 acre in area, providing
123 sufficient space for structures to be located outside setbacks, and each lot
124 would have sufficient frontage along a public road.

125 **iv. PUD Requirements**

126 The proposal is not for a Planned Unit Development (PUD). However,
127 modification of the project to align with the PUD provisions in Article VI of
128 the Zoning Regulations could substantially improve the project's conformance
129 to the SRPO district, and may significantly reduce the cost of development.

130 **(b) Table 2.19: Floodplain (C2) District Standards**

131 A portion of the parcel is located within the Floodplain (C2) overlay district. Any
132 development within this area must conform to ZR Table 2.19 and ZR Section 5.8,
133 in addition to the requirements of the underlying zoning district.

134 Without preliminary engineering data, it is unclear if the project reflects the
135 purpose of the C2 district by designing development to minimize impacts to
136 public safety and finances from flooding in designated flood hazard areas,
137 ensuring the Town remains eligible for federal flood insurance and disaster
138 recovery / hazard mitigation funding. Though the proposal does not include any
139 primary structures to be located within the floodplain overlay area of the parcel;

140 however, several septic leach fields and a stormwater retention pond would be
141 located within it. This is further addressed in Finding I(A)(4).

142 **(c) Table 2.20: Scenic Resource Preservation Overlay (SRPO) District**
143 **Standards**

144 Finally, the parcel is entirely within the Scenic Resource Preservation Overlay
145 (SRPO) District, and must conform to the provisions of ZR Table 2.20.

146 **i. Purpose, Applicability, General Provisions, and Review Process**

147 The purpose of the SRPO is to avert or minimize the adverse impacts of
148 development on the Town’s identified scenic resources, viewsheds, and
149 roadscape corridors through site planning and design. These provisions only
150 apply within the mapped SRPO overlay area, and include both requirements
151 and guidance for development applications. In addition to review procedures
152 identified in ZR Section 5.2 and SR Section 2.4, proposals also must include
153 building envelopes and typical building elevations (which may be provided at
154 preliminary review) and analysis of the project’s conformance to ZR Table
155 2.20 and *Views to the Mountains: a Scenic Protection Manual* (“the Manual”).

156 **ii. Identified Scenic Resources**

157 The entirety of Colonel Page Road and sections of Chapin Road adjacent to
158 the project are noted as moderately to significantly scenic in the Manual,
159 which does not identify specific viewpoint to the ridge of the Green
160 Mountains. However, the application narrative notes that a narrow view of
161 Camel’s Hump, as well as other peaks in the foothills such as Saxon Hill,
162 Burnt Rock Mountain, Robbins Mountain, and Molly Stark Mountain, are
163 visible from Colonel Page Road roughly where the proposed internal road
164 would be located. The Manual also notes the presence of historic homes,
165 orchards, and farm fields on these roads contributes to their scenic character.
166 Protection strategies include maintaining open land in the foreground
167 (including preventing vegetation overgrowth), clustering homes, and locating
168 them on the edges of tree lines or at foothills with shared driveways.

169 **iii. Conformance to SRPO Standards**

170 The project somewhat complies, and somewhat conflicts with the purpose of
171 the SRPO and protection strategies, since it only somewhat minimizes impacts
172 of development on identified scenic resources. Though the lots are larger than
173 the minimum lot area for the R1 district (1 acre), the proposed building
174 envelopes are approximately 1 acre, with most of the remaining land included
175 in open space (which is typically used in PUDs rather than conventional
176 subdivisions) or otherwise restricted as wetland or riparian / floodplain area.

177 The application narrative notes that buildings would be oriented to reduce the
178 visual impact along the view to Camel’s Hump.

179 The open space area includes approximately 9.5 acres (45%) of the 21 acres of
180 open hayfield; however, that means meaning that 11.5 acres (55%) would be
181 occupied by building lots and the proposed new road. Though the entirety of
182 these building lots would not be intensely developed, placement of structures
183 and conversion to yard space would substantially change the appearance of
184 the field, particularly as the foreground to the view of Camel’s Hump from the
185 proposed new road, which are the primary scenic elements on this parcel. In
186 addition, the proposed building envelopes on the plans indicate that structures
187 would far exceed the minimum required setbacks for the R1 zone under
188 conventional standards, much less the reduced setbacks allowed for PUDs.

189 It is recommended that the proposed homes be clustered much more closely to
190 the northern side of the parcel and the lots / building envelopes be reduced in
191 area to reflect the minimum conventional setbacks for the R1 district (or better
192 yet, the reduced setbacks allowed for PUDs). This would reduce the
193 proportion of the view taken up by developed areas, and has the added benefit
194 of reducing the impervious area associated with the proposed road.

195 Additionally or alternatively, the applicant should consider siting all the
196 proposed homes on the west side of the field along the treeline, which would
197 reduce their visual prominence and leave more contiguous open space. This
198 could be achieved through smaller lots for detached single-unit dwellings
199 (possibly in a PUD) or through use of duplexes. Finally, the use of shared
200 driveways along the boundaries of lots, rather than individual driveways for
201 each dwelling, is also recommended.

202 **3. SR Standards 4.1(B), 4.1(H), and 4.1(M): Natural and Scenic Features**

203 The property contains several natural and scenic features that should be preserved or
204 avoided during development.

205 The plans show an area of Class II wetland in the southwestern corner of the property,
206 associated with the Alder Brook river corridor. These areas, as well as the wooded
207 areas along the adjacent slope, are also noted as “Highest Priority Surface Waters and
208 Riparian Areas” on Vermont’s BioFinder map. According to the Vermont
209 Conservation Design (VCD) Report¹, surface waters and riparian areas provide vital
210 habitat for water-dependent species as well as a means of travel for other species, in
211 addition to ecosystem services like flood resilience and improved water quality.
212 VCD’s goal for “highest priority” areas is to avoid permanent fragmentation from

¹ Sorenson, E. & Zaino, R. (2018). *Vermont Conservation Design*. Vermont Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved 12 Feb., 2021 from [https://anr.vermont.gov/sites/anr/files/maps/biofinder/Vermont Conservation Design - Summary Report - February 2018.pdf](https://anr.vermont.gov/sites/anr/files/maps/biofinder/Vermont%20Conservation%20Design%20-%20Summary%20Report%20-%20February%202018.pdf)

213 development (limited development on the margins may not have adverse effects) and
214 maintain ecological functions that vegetative cover and hydrologic regimes provide.

215 Though the project entirely avoids impacts to the Alder Brook river corridor and
216 associated Class II wetlands, the initial construction of the leach fields for Lots 1-5
217 and the stormwater detention pond would impact the riparian habitat areas. Post-
218 construction operational impacts would be lesser due to the infrequent human
219 presence and the ability for vegetation to regrow somewhat; however, the applicant
220 should explore alternative locations for stormwater (including Public Works'
221 suggestion to treat stormwater in the center of the cul-de-sac) and attempt to locate
222 leach fields on edges of the riparian area where possible.

223 **4. SR Standard 4.1(C): Flood Safety**

224 As noted in Finding I(A)(2)(b), the plans indicate that six of the proposed septic leach
225 fields, as well as the stormwater detention pond, are located within an area mapped by
226 the Federal Emergency Management Agency as a Zone A Special Flood Hazard
227 Area, which has a 1-percent annual chance of inundation (though flood elevations are
228 not mapped for this location). The effectiveness of a stormwater detention pond
229 within a floodplain is questionable; as noted by Public Works, it is recommended that
230 the stormwater system be relocated to the center of the proposed cul-de-sac.

231 More importantly, although the underlying soils provide excellent drainage for septic
232 systems, flooding would cause backups in residential septic systems and possibly
233 permanent damage to the leach fields. It is recommended that the applicant conduct
234 detailed elevation mapping to assess the actual risk of flooding as part of the
235 preliminary engineering submittal. If it is determined that the infrastructure is located
236 outside the Zone A Special Flood Hazard Area, no further review is required;
237 otherwise, the proposal may require review by the Zoning Board of Adjustment under
238 ZR Section 5.8, including Sections 5.8(H)(4) and (5) which requires that on-site
239 sewage systems be designed to minimize or eliminate infiltration of flood waters into
240 the systems, as well as discharges from the systems into flood waters.

241 **5. SR Standard 4.1(N): Clustering of Lots**

242 The proposed lots meet the required depth-to-width ratio under SR Section 4.4(B)(5).
243 However, the lots and building envelopes are relatively large and occupy a majority
244 of the open hayfield, which conflicts with the provisions of the Scenic Resource
245 Preservation Overlay (SRPO) District; this is addressed further in Finding II(A)(2)(b).

246 **6. SR Standards 4.1(D), 4.1(F), and 4.1(I): Access and Street Planning Standards**

247 The proposed subdivision provides sufficient access to dwellings via individual
248 private driveways connected to a Class 3 minor gravel road (Brigham Hill Lane). As
249 the development numbers fewer than 50 dwelling units, a second permanent
250 connection meeting the standard for a public road is not required.

251 In a memorandum dated August 30, 2022, Public Works staff stated:

- 252 a) *The applicant's engineer shall indicate on the plans where snow removal is*
253 *proposed to be stored.*
- 254 b) *As per Section 220 of the Town's Specifications, all projects involving any new*
255 *curb cuts require a completed study indicating any impacts to traffic. The*
256 *applicant shall be required to submit a traffic study to Public Works.*
- 257 c) *The proposed road shall conform to the Town of Essex Standard Specifications*
258 *for Construction. Per section 502 of the Town's Specifications, the road shall*
259 *meet a minimum length requirement of 900 ft. to the center of the cul-de-sac and*
260 *the cul-de-sac shall meet a minimum outside diameter of 100 ft.*
- 261 d) *The applicant plans to pave the proposed road connecting to Col. Page Road.*
262 *Public Works is of the opinion that in order to maintain the continuity of Town*
263 *road operations, such as plowing, the section of Col. Page from Chapin Road to*
264 *the proposed road should also be paved.*

265 In follow-up discussions with Public Works, a road impact fee charged to the
266 applicant may be used to ensure equitable contribution to future paving of the 600-
267 foot section of Colonel Page Road between Chapin Road and the project's new road
268 entrance.

269 In an e-mail dated August 15, 2022 the Fire Chief stated:

270 *The general idea and layout of this proposed development is agreeable, there is*
271 *one important element to this project. It will be served by drilled water wells and*
272 *is not on the town hydrant system for water supply. Even though this application*
273 *mentions building a paved road to town specifications, the Fire Department and*
274 *Public Works will need to work closely with the Applicant to ensure that the road*
275 *width and turning radius at the dead-end is sufficient to turn trucks around. Any*
276 *fires in this development will require the use of fire tanker shuttles and will*
277 *require several trucks making trips in/out to supply the engines. As always, we'll*
278 *also want to have input on the name of the street once the options are created.*

279 **7. SR Standard 4.1(E) and 4.1(L): Pedestrian and Recreation Facilities**

280 The sketch plan indicates a proposed multi-use public trail would be located along the
281 edge of the river corridor boundary on the southwest corner of the parcel, aligning
282 with Town Plan maps 5, 6, 7, and 9 which depict proposed networks for horseback,
283 cross-country ski, footpath, and snowmobile trails, respectively. If permitted under
284 state rivers and wetlands rules, this trail would be captured in a 15-foot-wide
285 easement to the Town pursuant to SR Section 4.7(B). Since the path does not connect
286 to any other existing trail sections, recreation impact fees would be levied towards the
287 cost of future path construction as noted in an e-mail from the Parks & Recreation
288 Director dated August 15, 2022.

289

290 **8. SR Standard 4.1(L): Parking**

291 It appears that each lot would have adequate space to accommodate the required
292 amount of parking under ZR Section 3.9(B).

293 **9. SR Standard 4.1(R): Landscaping and Screening**

294 The landscaping objectives for single- and two-unit structures on individual lots in
295 residential districts includes provision of a street tree for every 50 feet of frontage
296 along public and private roads, except where they would interfere with important
297 scenic resources within the Scenic Resource Preservation Overlay District. Given that
298 substantial changes are recommended to the subdivision's layout to preserve scenic
299 qualities, landscaping analysis will be deferred to preliminary review.

300 **10. SR Standard 4.1(K): Public Safety**

301 The Police Chief did not provide any comments or concerns with this proposal.

302 **11. SR Standard 4.1(J): Utilities**

303 Though sketch plan applications need not include detailed engineering information,
304 the plan indicates that private well and septic systems will be used instead of public
305 water and sewer, though a 30-foot utility easement between Lots 5 and 6 is reserved
306 for possible future connections. In a memorandum dated August 30, 2022, Public
307 Works staff stated:

308 *Each lot will be served by a drilled well and an individual wastewater system. The*
309 *applicant will be required to receive State approval for these systems. Copies of*
310 *all State permits and associated documentation shall be submitted to Public*
311 *Works.*

312 Electric service to the new lots would be provided by overhead distribution lines
313 maintained by Green Mountain Power which run along Chapin and Colonel Page
314 Roads; telecommunications would use these existing overhead lines as well, but all
315 new services within the parcel must be underground. The parcel lies outside the
316 Vermont Gas service area; it is recommended that the homes utilize low-carbon and
317 energy efficient heating systems.

318 The project narrative states that stormwater from the proposed public road would be
319 directed through ditching and underground pipes to a gravel wetland and detention
320 pond located in the southwest corner of the property, meeting the requirements for
321 water quality and up to 100-year storms. In their August 30, 2022 memorandum
322 Public Works staff stated:

323 *a) The amount of impervious surface was not indicated on the plans. The applicant*
324 *shall verify whether they will be required to obtain a State Stormwater Permit. If*
325 *the impervious surface is greater than a half-acre, the applicant will be required*
326 *to obtain a State Permit.*

327 b) *There should be some stormwater treatment in the center of the cul-de-sac. The*
328 *Town is currently making efforts to retrofit oversized cul-de-sacs by removing the*
329 *center pavement and installing stormwater treatment practices to reduce*
330 *phosphorus in accordance with the Lake Champlain Total Maximum Daily Load.*
331 *Is it possible to treat the stormwater within road right-of-way instead of directing*
332 *it to the gravel wetland? It is understood that this may not be feasible but may be*
333 *worth investigating.*

334 c) *The applicant's engineer only provided a location for possible treatment.*
335 *Additional design information will be required to provide a thorough staff review.*
336 *Public Works will provide further comment at future reviews of this project.*

337 Community Development staff estimates that the current road design would result in
338 approximately 0.596 acres of impervious surface, which would require a state
339 stormwater operating permit. It is noted that if the subdivision were more clustered,
340 the length of the roadway and impervious area could be reduced, eliminating the need
341 for a state permit and allowing for a smaller treatment area. If presented as a PUD
342 with a road less than 300 feet in length, the road could remain private and would
343 allow for oversight and maintenance by the homeowners' association, not the Town.

344 **12. SR Standard 4.1(S): Over-Sized Improvements and Future Expansion**

345 The proposal includes an open space area that would restrict future development of
346 the parcel; however, it also reserves a 30-foot-wide utility easement, which may
347 include possible future connection of municipal water. It is noted that the revised,
348 more clustered layout recommended by staff would allow for additional development
349 of the site, though this would be inconsistent with the provisions of the SRPO and is
350 not recommended at time.

351 **13. SR Standard 4.1(O) and 4.1(T): Municipal Services and Impact Fees**

352 The new homes will be subject to recreation impact fees, and a road impact fee for
353 maintenance and/or improvement of Colonel Page Road may be assessed.

354 **III. Article III of the Subdivision Regulations: Residential Phasing**

355 Any proposed development that contains dwelling units and requires Subdivision Approval is
356 subject to Article III, Residential Development Phasing. The goal of residential phasing is to
357 maintain an annual population growth rate set forth in the *2016 Town Plan* of between 184 and
358 226, aiming for the midpoint of the range at 205. Population growth is allocated to new
359 developments through Estimated Population Equivalents (EPEs), essentially equivalent to the
360 number of bedrooms in new dwelling units (5-bedroom units are counted as 4.5 EPEs).

361 Any single project outside the sewer core is allowed to add 5 dwelling units per calendar year.
362 The Planning Commission must act on a preliminary phasing request when a proposed
363 development obtains sketch plan approval. Final allotment is granted if the development secures
364 Final Plan approval.

365 The proposed project lies outside the sewer core area and would add a total of 9 dwelling units,
366 each with 4 bedrooms, resulting in a total of 36 EPEs, likely in years 2023 and 2024. Currently,
367 there are 41 EPEs available for allocation outside the sewer core in 2023 and 2024, so it appears
368 there will be sufficient allocation available for 5 units (20 EPEs) in 2023 and 4 units (16 EPEs)
369 in 2024. Assuming other projects currently under review are approved as planned, there would
370 be 122 total EPEs (21 of which are available outside the sewer core) remaining in 2023, and 137
371 total EPEs (25 outside the sewer core) remaining in 2024. A summary of the running phasing
372 tabulation is attached.

373 **IV. Additional Findings by the Planning Commission**

374 •

375 **Conditions of Approval**

- 376 1. All construction shall be in conformance with the plans listed above as may have been
377 amended by the Planning Commission and subject to other conditions and approvals.
- 378 2. All conditions from previous approvals shall continue to apply except as amended herein.
- 379 3. In addition to the requirements of Section 2.7 of the *Subdivision Regulations*, Table 2.20 of
380 the *Zoning Regulations*, and Section 212.0 of the *Standard Specifications for Construction*,
381 the Preliminary Plan submission shall include the following elements:
 - 382 a) Specific engineering analysis of the extent of the FEMA Zone A special flood hazard
383 area as it relates to the proposed leach fields and stormwater treatment facilities, pursuant
384 to applicable local, state, and federal floodplain regulations;
 - 385 b) Building envelopes and typical building elevations for the proposed structures;
 - 386 c) Turning movement analysis for the proposed public road using a WB-50 truck or
387 approved equivalent by the Fire Department;
 - 388 d) If feasible, relocation of stormwater treatment facilities to the center of the cul-de-sac as
389 recommended by Public Works;
- 390 4. An electronic copy of the plans as may have been revised shall be submitted to the E911
391 coordinator in .PDF file format. Another copy shall be submitted in geodatabase or shapefile
392 in Vermont State Plane Meters, NAD83 (NSRS or most current); alternatively, coordinated
393 CAD data – Vermont State Plane Coordinates, US Survey Feet, Grid Zone 4400, NAD 83
394 (2011) epoch 2010.0, NAVD 88 (geoid12b); alternatively, paper showing three (3) values of
395 State Plane Coordinates.
- 396 5. The applicants shall be approved for a preliminary phasing schedule of 5 dwelling units with
397 20 EPEs in 2023 and 4 dwelling units with 16 EPEs in 2024.

60 Colonel Page Road
Major Subdivision (Sketch)
September 8, 2022

398 6. By acceptance of the conditions of this approval without appeal, the applicants confirm and
399 agree for themselves and all assigns and successors in interest that the conditions of this
400 approval shall run with the land and the land uses herein permitted, and would be binding
401 upon and enforceable against the applicants and all assigns and successors in interest.

402 **List of Attachments**

- 403 • Project Narrative, “Kenan Heco, 60 Colonel Page Road,” prepared by John Stuart, JH
404 Stuart Associates.
- 405 • Residential Phasing Record, dated 09/08/2022

406
407 cc: John Stuart, JH Stuart Associates, john@jhstuartassociates.com
408

409 G:\PC\REPORTS\Colonel Page Road 60 Sketch 20220908.docx