We are facing a unique and troubling situation, to put it mildly.

We find ourselves on the eve of a $10.5M bond vote ($16M with 30 years' interest) for an extremely poorly planned project and a rushed project review, the DRB in effect being pressured to approve an incomplete plan, a bait and switch from a prior approved project for a private hotel and a smaller private garage, yet with many massive new implications, costs and unanswered questions remaining.

The City is now acting as promoter/developer vs. regulator; ... yet without the financial restraint, the time for due diligence and without the fiscal accountability that a private developer faces.

The unexplored risks and costs here will be shifted to taxpayers and to a lesser extent, the garage users, but not necessarily to the Hotel developer ramming this proposal through under a not-so-veiled threat of "If you don't cut lots of corners to buy me a garage, I'll take my Hampton Inn hotel and go home."

We have so far witnessed compromised review processes by the City Department of Public Works, the Technical Review Committee and even the Montpelier City Council, who seem to be more concerned with the hypothetical Ivy 'GreenWall,' the granite 'trim bands,' the proposed public art facade; all just more lipstick on a pig.

The City Council seems to be oblivious to the facts of the serious problems and flawed economics that will come only into focus and bear down on Montpelier taxpayers after these City Councillors have left office.

No contract yet being executed with the architect is but one tiny example. This has resulted in lack of access to needed public records including the alleged time deadline Hilton contract and the 3D models of the garage. To properly analyze the Visual impacts-REVIT models are required as a public record being work made for hire.

The lack of a completed and binding contract with Rabideau Architects also raises concerns as to the performance bonding and professional accountability and liability. Consequences of errors will accrue to whom if the renderings are found to be inaccurate? What legal remedies will be available to the City or the citizens? Our Montpelier cityscape views are priceless!

In response to a recent public records request, no minutes have been found to exist of the TRC meetings, wherein actions taken and decisions made are being relied upon at the DRB as reassurance that a number or significant problems have been adequately addressed, problems significant enough that the DRB should now be requiring that
complete evidence be put on the record of exactly how each of these technical issues will be addressed.

City officials are now even attempting to circumvent a thorough Act 250 review. This smacks of evasion of both professional and public scrutiny and is the un-kindest corner being cut from an accountability and due diligence perspective. This is almost exactly akin to Judge Kavanaugh pitiful dissembling when repeatedly asked by Senators if he would then welcome an expedited FBI investigation of the new charges made against him.

We now have a great need for extreme caution and diligence with the DRB in effect being required to be the adults in the room and potentially face down the City Council on the specifics of a poorly planned and potentially disastrous project permanently damaging the livability of our City (when combined with other projects' impacts)

There is a real need for independent professional verification of the perspective renderings which will simply be impossible absent obtaining copies of the computer generated 3D architectural models paid for and prepared for the City. Accountability must be a fundamental now and into the future!

Visualization tests using Helium Balloons floated on measured tethers at the proposed exact building heights both viewed and photographed from many locations and perspectives around the City and verified independently are necessary to be conducted prior to the granting of any permit. **This test should be immediately ordered by the DRB.**

Preserve, protect and expand the interconnection of walkways and preserve the walkability of the city. This is just one fundamental purposes and falls within the DRB's purview.

The Heney Trust Lot is even today an important promenade of sorts, all the way to the North Branch and the Winooski, and will increasingly be so as we reclaim more of our riverfront and focus on the irreplaceable views, community recreation, open space, arts and civic spaces.

Residents and visitors to our Farmers’ Market sometimes walk three and four persons abreast, some with strollers or pulling wagons, through the Market. Preserving this expansive access and extending this broad access to the Confluence of the Rivers simply cannot be accomplished with any narrow path around the back corner of a behemoth Dreadnaught garage, or with a steep or narrow wheelchair ramp up from the garage floor level eight feet up to a new Bike Path track crossing.

Nor can this pedestrian access be accomplished by requiring pedestrians, strollers and
bicyclists to enter into the garage, climb two flights of stairs or negotiate through traffic along two full lengths of the 215 foot structure and then exit heavy doors and cross a foot bridge.

In fact, the protection of Montpelier pedestrians' priority and prerogative and the walkability of the City will require that the planned garage elevator be relocated to the East end of the Garage closest to the North Branch as the most convenient entry where most City users would be entering and exiting on foot through the City's Heney Trust Lot.

Any misplaced priority to locate elevators on the West/Hotel end of the garage is an egregious affront to the stated purpose of a City Garage, making it most convenient for Montpelier business owners, restaurant customers and shoppers, and those doing business at City Hall, for example, to have convenient access and walk-ability from the proposed garage.

The added cost of any additional elevator to be located on the West end to primarily serve the Hotels' guest convenience and Capitol Plaza conference center should be borne entirely by the Hotel developer, and not by the City.

The walkway from the proposed main garage vehicle entrance adjacent the Hotel to then reach State Street is nothing less than wholly problematic. A pedestrian will immediately encounter a four way stop sign hazard where the Church lot parking, the City garage and the L shaped private road all meet. Presumably there will be crosswalks across the private road easement further impacting and impeding abundant vehicle traffic.

There is as of yet no sidewalk planned along the safer and less congested Christ Church side of the parking lot extending all the way to State Street. This results in all garage pedestrian traffic competing with the NSB pedestrian traffic, offices and ATM at an already congested sidewalk where no expansion of the sidewalk has even been discussed. Most will then need to also cross heavy vehicle traffic entering and exiting the private drive using the less than 30 foot curb cut onto State Street, with 30 feet being the minimum required under the zoning regulations for any such structure. Another corner cut.

**Traffic Impacts are the most significant problem and the Achilles Heel of this entire proposal.**

Thousands of cubic yards of dirt, asphalt and possibly toxic contaminated soil will need to be removed from the Capital Plaza lot and hauled away in order to recess the proposed garage down to the lower level of the Heney Trust Lot.

There has yet been no traffic impacts analysis whatsoever of the combined effects of these massive and potentially disastrous traffic impacts on Montpelier of three simultaneous
construction projects. Nor has there been any analysis of the impacts of displacement of the large number of existing metered and permit parking spaces in the Capitol Plaza lot and the Heney Trust Lot that are in constant use today yet will be temporarily or permanently eliminated by the construction.

The parking and traffic impacts of not only the dump trucks removing thousands of cubic yards of soil, but of all of the construction workers, food trucks, inspectors etc., required for building these three simultaneous projects at once have also not been analyzed at all.

A properly done traffic study must quantify not only the increased traffic load of the vehicles for all the related and adjacent projects and intersections, but also must including pedestrian safety impacts and proposed remediation strategies. [Oh, you mean this Pound of pot sir? Yes, officer, I'm invoking my new legal right to possess the one ounce limit, only I'm doing it sixteen times!]

The reckless and inadequate piecemeal approach done so far of estimating trip generation from incomplete plans for individual separate projects, then loosely combining these with an as of yet incomplete bus traffic study is a farce at best and simply cannot pass the straight face test for due diligence when considering approving the garage project. This complete Traffic Impacts Analysis should be immediately ordered by the DRB.

If we persist in avoiding these calculations altogether, we will then have also precluded one of the only possible remedies available, i.e. the 18 year old proposal for a vehicle bridge across the North Branch from Taylor Street to Main Street at Barre Street as envisioned in the Year 2000 Capitol District Master Plan. The currently proposed garage will be directly and permanently obstructing this possibly traffic solution.

Restrooms are still missing. Restrooms being located within and easily accessible at any $10M public building are also a no-brainer and are essential not only for those using the proposed garage but other City residents, pedestrians, bicyclists and visitors using the recreation path and the Confluence Park. Otherwise the new Garage corners will become a default bathroom.

If we can’t afford to take the time to plan this massively expensive and enduring City project properly, and to make sure the entire scope of the capital, operating and maintenance costs are factored in and equitably distributed, including contingencies, then we should not be doing it at all, especially at this extremely sensitive and problematic Riverfront location.

Stephen Whitaker
2018.11.05
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CITY OF MONTPELIER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Re: Application # Z-2018-0115 (subdivision)
Application #Z-2018-0116 (site plan amendment)
Application # Z-2018-0117 (major site plan)

PETITION BY TEN OR MORE PERSONS FOR INTERESTED PERSON STATUS UNDER 24 V.S.A. SECTION 4465

WHEREAS under 24 V.S.A. Section 4465(b)(4), "Any ten persons who may be any combination of voters or real property owners within a municipality listed in subdivision (2) of this subsection who, by signed petition to the appropriate municipal panel of a municipality, the plan or a bylaw of which is at issue in any appeal brought under this title, allege that any relief requested by a person under this title, if granted, will not be in accord with the policies, purposes, or terms of the plan or bylaw of that municipality. This petition to the appropriate municipal panel must designate one person to serve as the representative of the petitioners regarding all matters related to the appeal;"

WHEREAS on or about November 5, 2018, the Development Review Board, considered Application # Z=2018-0115, Application #Z-2018-0116, and Application # Z-2018-0117 related to the amendment to the Hampton Inn Hotel and Parking Garage, subdivision of property, and major site plan for a parking garage in downtown Montpelier (the Applications and Projects) for approval under the City of Montpelier’s “Master Plan: Montpelier, Vermont re-adopted with edits December 20, 2017” and “Zoning and Subdivision Regulations (adopted January 3, 2018)” (“Regulation”);

NOW THEREFORE the following persons hereby allege that they are a voter of the City of Montpelier, or a real property owner of property located in the City of Montpelier, who, by this signed petition to the Development Review Board, allege that the Applications and Projects, if approved, will not be in accord with the policies, purposes, or terms of the City of Montpelier, Plan, or the Regulation, and
that Dorothy Helling is hereby designated to serve as the representative of the petitioners regarding all matters related to the appeal. Laura Abbott is hereby designated to serve as back-up representative of the petitioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Dorothy (Dot) L. Helling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 East State Street, Montpelier, VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dothelling@gmail.com">dothelling@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>802-881-8832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/5/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Laura (Rose) Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Deerfield Dr, Montpelier, VT 05602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ridiculousrose@yahoo.com">ridiculousrose@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>845/901-6061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Abbott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. John Russell
[Legal Name - Printed]
107 State St., Montpelier, VT 05602
[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
[Email address]
jdr1973@myfaunprint.net
[Phone Number]
802-229-4842
[Signature and Date]
1/5/2018

4. Sandra Vitzthum
[Legal Name - Printed]
14 Louis Street, Montpelier, VT 05602
[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
vitzthum@sover.net
[Email address]
[Phone Number]
802-223-3844
[Signature and Date]
11/5/18

5. Andrea Stander
[Legal Name - Printed]
25 Liberty St. #3
[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
andrea.stander@gmail.com
[Email address]
802-522-3284
[Phone Number]
[Signature and Date]
11/5/18
6.
NATHANIEL FROMINGHAM
7 HILLCIDE AVENUE, MONTPELIER, UT 84032
[Email address]
NATHANMSKIE1GMAIL.COM
802 613 3525
[Signature and Date]

7.
Les Blomberg
20 Pleasant St
[Email address]
Les@NOISE.or
802 220 7078
[Signature and Date]

8.
Elizabeth Slayton
43 Terrace St.
[Email address]
eлизabethSlayton@gmail.com
229-0164
[Signature and Date]
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William J Kouchy
5 Deerfield Dr. Montpelier VT 05602
William.kouchy@gmail.com
802-661-0517
10/5/2018

Lisette Elise Paris
8 Cross Street
All Soul's Live @live.com
802.793.2621
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11. **Cara Barbero**  
[Legal Name - Printed]  
**210 Main St**  
[Address Property Owner][Address Voter]  
**cara.barbero@gmail.com**  
[Email address]  
**802.875.3558**  
[Phone Number]  
**Cara Barbero 11/5/18**  
[Signature and Date]

12. **Diana Baron**  
[Legal Name - Printed]  
**52 Estate St, Apt 9 Montpelier VT 05602**  
[Address Property Owner][Address Voter]  
**diana.baron@vt.gov**  
[Email address]  
**678.802.3053**  
[Phone Number]  
**Diana Baron 11/5/18**  
[Signature and Date]

13. **Jill Muhr**  
[Legal Name - Printed]  
**234 Main Street Montpelier VT 05602**  
[Address Property Owner][Address Voter]  
**jill.muhr@yahoo.com**  
[Email address]  
**802.477.2724**  
[Phone Number]  
**Jill A. Muhr 11.5.2018**  
[Signature and Date]
14. SARAH GRIFFIN
   [Legal Name - Printed]
   234 MAIN ST
   [Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
   sgriffin@coe.edu
   [Email address]
   471-2837
   [Phone Number]
   11/5/18
   [Signature and Date]

15. DANIEL COSTIN
   [Legal Name - Printed]
   26 PROSPECT ST
   [Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
   danielpatrick.costin@yahoo.com
   [Email address]
   802-279-9074
   [Phone Number]
   11/5/2018
   [Signature and Date]

16. Mollie Gribo
   [Legal Name - Printed]
   234 Main St
   [Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
   molliegribbin@gmail.com
   [Email address]
   802-522-4757
   [Phone Number]
   Mollie Gribo 11/5/18
   [Signature and Date]
17. A. David Gram

[Legal Name - Printed]
18 Cross St, Montpelier

[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
davidgram8@gmail.com

[Email address]
802-505-8895

[Phone Number]

11/5/2018

[Signature and Date]

18. Albert & Sabatini

[Legal Name - Printed]

[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
90 North St

[Email address]
asabatini56@gmail.com

[Phone Number]
802-793-1632

[Signature and Date]

19. Rebecca Davison

[Legal Name - Printed]
50 Liberty

[Address Property Owner]/[Address Voter]
drmtastudio@gmail.com

[Email address]
502-7000

[Phone Number]

[Signature and Date]
The following represent the concerns of the petitioners concerning Applications and Projects before the Development Review Board on Monday Nov. 5, 2018. These projects are related to the Hampton Inn amendment, the subdivision of land, and major project involving the proposed parking garage. They include Application # Z-2018-0115, Application #Z-2018-0116, and Application # Z-2018-0117.

There are concerns listed below in addition to the verbal comments made during the hearing.

1. A new lot needs 30’ of street frontage.

   3002 F Street Frontage. All lots shall front on a public or private street as specified in each zoning district and in accordance with the following:
   
   (1) An existing lot without the minimum required frontage on public or private street must have access to such a street over an easement or right-of-way approved by the Development Review Board that is not less than 20 feet wide for single and two family residential lots and 50 feet wide for all other lots.
   
   (2) Lots that front on more than one street shall only be required to meet minimum frontage requirements on one street except:
   
   (a) On lots in more than one zoning district the minimum frontage shall be maintained on at least one street in each district where the lot has frontage.
   
   (3) All new lots created under these regulations shall have the minimum frontage on a public or private street unless the Development Review Board:
   
   (a) Approves a lot with less frontage as part of a planned unit development in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 440; or
   
   (b) Reduces the frontage requirement to not less than 20 feet for irregularly shaped lots or lots accessed by a shared driveway.

3505 B Lot Dimensions. The applicant shall design the subdivision:

(1) So that all lots front on a street.

1.1. The lot needs 30 feet of frontage on a private or public street (not a driveway) which it does not have. Therefore, the lot does not meet this condition nor has the project gone through the PUD process.

2. Inadequate analysis of View Corridors

2201 D Development In the Design Control Overlay District. The Design Review Committee shall evaluate design review plans based on the following considerations:

(1) Preservation or reconstruction of the appropriate historic style if the proposed project is in the historic district or involves an historic structure;

(2) Harmony of exterior design with other properties in the district;

(3) Compatibility of proposed exterior materials with other properties in the district;

(4) Compatibility of the proposed landscaping with the district;

(5) Prevention of the use of incompatible designs, buildings, color schemes, or exterior materials;

(6) Location and appearance of all utilities;

(7) Recognition of and respect for view corridors and significant vistas including gateway views of the city and State House; and
3207 C Standards. Application required to meet this section shall meet the following:

(1) Architectural Standards
   (a) In districts with architectural standards, projects shall meet the standards required in that district.

(2) Form and Massing
   (a) Appear similar in mass and scale to structures typical of the neighborhood.
   (b) Match the building and roof forms that are typical of the neighborhood.
   (c) Avoid large box-like forms with continuous unrelieved surfaces by incorporating articulation to reduce buildings' perceived bulk.
   (d) Limit overall building size or designing buildings with features to break up building bulk such as changes in wall plane (instead of a long flat wall), changes in roof form and height, or major full-height recesses (typically at least 8 feet deep) along the length of the building that successfully break the building into smaller discrete masses.
   (e) Have window recesses, window trim, doorways, columns, overhangs and other architectural elements with depth adequate to create shadow and architectural relief.
   (f) Have facades that provide a pedestrian scale and orientation through overhangs, eaves, awnings, display windows and architectural ornamentation.

(3) Compatibility
   (a) Align building facades with the established setbacks on the block.
   (b) Locate the tallest portions of new buildings away from adjoining residential properties, in order to provide height transitions between taller and lower buildings, and to maximize light, air, and privacy for dwelling units.
   (c) Reduce the visual and shadow impact of upper stories on adjoining residential properties through means such as stepping back the upper floors from the stories below, tucking the top story inside a pitched roof, using pitched roofs with dormers, etc.

3507 B Standards. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed subdivision shall:

(1) Be compatible with or extend the city's traditional settlement pattern as a compact urban center.

(2) Not contribute to a pattern of strip development.

(3) Be compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

2.1. The Design Review Committee has been given inadequate analysis from significant vistas.

2.1.1. Approach view of the State House

2.1.2. Barre Street

2.1.3. Main Street near Barre Street

2.1.4. Main and Memorial Drive

2.1.5. Along Memorial Drive

2.1.6. Elm Street

2.2. There are insufficient renderings from the above locations. Finally, the City has refused to fly balloons to confirm roof heights.
3. Riparian Setback

2101 F Riverfront Standards. To promote redevelopment of the riverfront as an amenity and greenway corridor, land development within the water setback area:

(1) Shall meet the landscaping requirements of Section 3005.

(2) Are encouraged to provide public walkways, multi-use pathways, outdoor seating and similar public amenities along the river. An applicant may request a waiver to landscaping requirements for such amenities within the water setback upon demonstrating that the proposed design further the city's riverfront redevelopment goals.

Figure 2-01 Urban Center 1 Dimensional Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTS</th>
<th>SETBACKS</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>BUILDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot size: 3,000 sf min</td>
<td>Front: 0 ft min</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio: 4.0 max</td>
<td>Frontage build-out: 70% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage: 30 ft min</td>
<td>Side: 0 ft min</td>
<td>Height: 24 ft min, 60 ft max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage: 100% max</td>
<td>Rear: 0 ft min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water: 20 ft min or as per Note 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1 See Section 3002 for specific information and any exceptions regarding dimensional standards. Accessory structures may have reduced dimensional standards (see Section 3003 for specific details regarding accessory structures).

Note 2 Except in channelized sections of river where the setback will be 0 feet (see Section 3005 for specific information).

Section 3005. Riparian Areas

3005 A Purpose. The purpose of this section is to protect and enhance the overall quality, natural function, ecological health, scenic benefits, and recreation potential of the city's water resources by limiting or mitigating the impact of development within riparian areas.

3005 B Applicability. The provisions of this section apply to land within the water setback as established in the base district and as measured below.

3005 C Measuring Water Setbacks. Water setbacks shall be measured from top of bank of all surface waters mapped on the Montpelier Natural Resources Inventory Map.

3005 D Development in the Riparian Area. Except as outlined in Subsection 3005.E and Subsection 3005.F below, all development is prohibited in the riparian area.
(1) Except within Urban Center 1, Urban Center 2, Urban Center 3, and Riverfront Districts, applicants may request a waiver from the Development Review Board where this standard shall create an undue burden. The Development Review Board shall find that the proposal meets the requirements in Subsection 3005.G. Within the unchannelized portions of the Urban Center 1, Urban Center 2, and Urban Center 3 Districts and within the entire Riverfront District, the riparian buffer shall be 15 feet. Within the channelized portions of Urban Center 1, Urban Center 2, and Urban Center 3, there shall not be a buffer requirement.

3005.E Groundcover within Water Setbacks. Applicants shall establish or maintain a riparian buffer of natural woody vegetation from the top of bank a distance equal to or greater than half of the water setback for the applicable zoning district (i.e., a 50-foot water setback requires a 25-foot riparian buffer).

(1) The water setback area that is not part of the required riparian buffer may be covered with mowed lawns, patios, decks, walkways, or other impervious area provided impervious cover does not exceed 20% of the entire riparian area.

(2) The setback area that is not part of the required riparian buffer may be used for stormwater treatment and snow storage.

(3) The applicant may apply for a waiver to remove woody vegetation from part of the riparian buffer to allow for the development of water access and the development of water-dependent uses.
   (a) Applicants shall submit waiver requests to the Conservation Commission for written comments before the Development Review Board shall review the request.
   (b) In addition to the requirements of Subsection 3005.F, the applicant shall demonstrate that the amount of woody vegetation proposed to be removed shall be minimized, that the location is not critical habitat, and that erosion and other environmental hazards are mitigated. The Development Review Board may require replacement of an equal amount of buffer in the water setback area.

A water-dependent structure or use means a structure or use that requires access to the water or a location adjacent to, extending over or extending into the water as a necessary component of its purpose or function.

3005.F Non-Conforming Development within the Riparian Buffer. Non-conforming development within the riparian buffer shall be regulated as follows:

(1) A non-conforming building or developed site may be used for any purpose allowed in the zoning district.

(2) Where an applicant proposes to expand a non-conforming structure or non-conforming site in the riparian area, a waiver shall be required in accordance with Paragraph 3005.D(1).

(3) When a proposal requiring major site plan approval occurs on a lot with a non-conforming riparian area, the applicant shall bring the riparian area into conformance to the maximum extent feasible.

(a) Maximum extent feasible shall be interpreted to mean that buffer material shall be planted and maintained, impervious cover shall be removed to meet maximum coverage, and similar non-conformities removed but that encroaching structures.
especially primary structures shall not be required to be removed.

(4) On previously developed residential lots, natural woody vegetation shall not have to be re-established on areas within the riparian setback maintained as lawns or gardens. Non-conforming lawn or garden areas within the riparian buffer shall not be expanded except in accordance with this section. Landowners are encouraged to replace non-conforming lawn or garden areas with natural woody vegetation, which can provide multiple benefits including bank stabilization, filtration of runoff and wildlife habitat.

(5) Demolished non-conforming structures within the Urban Center 1, Urban Center 2, Urban Center 3 and Riverfront Districts may rebuild on the previous footprint provided application to rebuild is made within 12 months of demolition.

3.05.G Waiver Review Criteria. When reviewing proposed development within the riparian area, the Development Review Board shall find that either Paragraph (1) or (2) below is met:

(1) All of the following:
   (a) The proposed land development cannot reasonably be accommodated on any portion of the lot outside the riparian area;
   (b) The proposed land development shall not have new or greater (as compared to existing conditions) adverse impact on the natural functions of the surface water and land within the riparian area; and
   (c) The proposed land development shall be the minimum necessary to accommodate a reasonable use of the property.

(2) The proposed land development is a water dependent use such as a boat or fishing access or a public access for swimming.

3.1. There has been an incomplete analysis of riparian setbacks. Moreover, there has been an incomplete analysis of how the setbacks meet the state definition of river corridor. Finally, there is no evidence that the fluvial erosion hazard zone and the broader definition of river corridor were analyzed.

4. The presented future phase of a canopy with solar panels on top deck represents a significant substantial change that affects views and aesthetics and needs to be addressed now and not segmented.

4.1. The proposed solar panels are a significant and material change that necessitates a complete reopening of the hearings. The addition of solar panels materially affects the substantive analysis under the review criteria. The solar panels constitute a major addition to the projects height, bulk, visibility, and overall impact on the surrounding area. The Board is obligated to undertake a comprehensive and cumulative review of the propose development and attendant impacts. Without a complete, comprehensive and cumulative review, the Board will impermissibly review the proposed pieces of this project without conducting the legally mandated analysis of all impacts under all applicable standards.

5. The State Storm Water Permit and requirements should be part of the application because they will likely overlap with the Riparian Setbacks. The Permit does not yet exist, and therefore cannot be considered.
6. Pedestrian Safety and Street Design

Section 3506. Design and Layout of Necessary Improvements

3506 A Streets. Applicants shall design and construct all new streets within a subdivision in accordance with this subsection.

3506 A Streets. Applicants shall design and construct all new streets within a subdivision in accordance with this subsection.

(1) General. Applicants shall design and construct all new streets within a subdivision to:

(a) Safely accommodate all users (including vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic).

(b) Provide adequate access and suitable turnarounds, when applicable, for emergency and service vehicles.

(c) Provide efficient access to property and avoid congestion on existing streets.

(d) Logically extend and improve the connectivity of the city's existing street network.

(e) Fit into the landscape and follow the natural terrain to the greatest extent feasible.

(f) Provide for livable neighborhoods and attractive streetscapes.

(g) Not be excessively wide, in order to calm traffic and minimize impervious surface.

(2) Topography and Arrangement. New streets shall be:

(a) Designed to relate appropriately to the pre-existing topography and provide adequate drainage.

(b) Graded and laid out to conform as closely as possible to the pre-existing topography.

(c) Integrated into the city's existing street network to the maximum extent feasible.

(d) Extended to the boundary lines of the parcel(s) being subdivided to facilitate the coordinated development of adjacent undeveloped land unless prevented by topography or other physical conditions.

(e) Designed to discourage through and high-speed traffic.

(f) Designed to minimize the amount of impervious surface necessary to provide convenient and safe access to property.
(g) Designed to minimize the number of stream crossings.

(h) Oriented to create lots that facilitate passive solar design to the maximum extent feasible.

(i) Designed to terminate with views of prominent buildings or open spaces to the maximum extent feasible.

(3) Connectivity. Discontinuous street systems are inefficient and cause undue congestion, while a well-connected street system disperses traffic efficiently and improves walkability. Accordingly, cul-de-sac or dead-end streets are prohibited except that the Development Review Board may approve cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets if one of the following applies:

(a) As stubs to permit future expansion. The Development Review Board may require construction of street stubs or condition approval on a future agreement to extend streets when adjacent property is developed.

(b) Where topography or other physical conditions make construction of through streets impossible or undesirable.

(c) To serve not more than 5 lots.

(4) Access Management. Applicants shall implement proper access management techniques that follow VTrans’ Access Management Program Guidelines in the design of new streets.

(5) Access Points. A subdivision with more than 10 lots or 40 dwelling units shall have at least two access points from public streets. The Development Review Board may waive or modify this requirement as recommended by the Technical Review Committee for sites with physical conditions that make provision of a second access impractical. The Development Review Board may allow the secondary access to be limited to emergency access. The Development Review Board may require a secondary or emergency access for smaller subdivisions or developments when deemed necessary to protect public safety.

(6) Design Standards and Construction Specifications. Applicants shall:

(a) Design new streets to the VTrans A-76 Standards for Town and Development Roads except as otherwise specified in this section; and

(b) Construct new streets in accordance with the city’s Public Works Specifications.

(7) Design Speed. Applicants shall design new roads for a speed of 30 miles per hour or less.

(8) Width. Applicants shall design new roads in accordance with the following unless otherwise approved by the Development Review Board to respond to site-specific physical conditions or anticipated traffic flows:

(a) For streets with a traffic volume of less than 100 trips per day on average, lane widths shall be at least 8 feet and not more than 9 feet.

(b) For streets with a traffic volume of 100 trips per day or more on average, lane widths shall be at least 9 feet and not more than 10 feet with 2-foot shoulders on both sides.

(c) For streets intended to accommodate on-street parking, a parking lane at least 7 feet and not more than 9 feet wide may be located on one or both sides.

(d) For alleys intended to provide access to rear parking or service areas for lots that front on another street, a total paved width of at least 10 feet and not more than 18 feet.
(9) **Intersections.** New streets shall be:

(a) Laid out to intersect as close to 90 degrees as physically possible. They shall not intersect at less than 75 degrees or more than 105 degrees.

(b) Designed with directly opposed intersections whenever feasible. If not directly opposed, the centerline offset of street intersections shall be at least 150 feet.

(c) Designed with an intersection approach that does not exceed a 3% grade for a distance of 20 feet as measured from the edge of the right-of-way of the intersecting street.

(d) Designed with a curb radius at the intersection that does not exceed 30 feet as measured from the edge of the traveled way. Applicants are strongly encouraged to use the smallest curb radius that can safely accommodate anticipated vehicular traffic to minimize conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. The Development Review Board may allow a larger curb radius to respond to site-specific physical conditions or uses with heavy truck traffic.

(14) **Street Trees.** The applicant shall plant trees along new streets in accordance with Subsection 3203.F of these regulations.

(15) **Street Lights.** The applicant:

(a) Should provide streetlights only as necessary for safety and security.

(b) Should consider locating streetlights at intersections, crosswalks and high-traffic areas.

(c) Shall meet the requirements of Section 3204.

3506 B **Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.** The applicant shall integrate pedestrian and bicycle access into the design of the subdivision in accordance with the following:

1. **Sidewalks.** Except within the Rural District, applicants shall install sidewalks along both sides of new streets. The Development Review Board may allow a sidewalk to be constructed on only one side of a street if the density of the subdivision or development shall be less than 4 dwelling units per acre. Sidewalks shall be at least 5 feet wide and constructed of concrete or a similar material with equivalent durability in accordance with city Public Works Specifications.

6.1. There will be a significant increase in daily trips to and from the site. This equates to significantly more than 100 trips per day through each of the proposed street entrances. As a result, both the State St. entrance and the Taylor St. entrance should be designed as streets.

6.1.1. Parking along the street must be parallel to the roadway.

6.1.2. Five foot minimum sidewalks must be on both sides of the street.

6.1.3. Bike lanes should be provided; the City has stated that this will be an access to the bike path.

6.1.4. The four-way intersection at the garage entry must meet at one point or be offset a minimum 150 ft.

6.1.5. The raised bike path and long alley to the west of the parking garage both create unsafe pedestrian paths.

7. **Loading Areas**

3011 F **Loading Areas.** An applicant for a use that will regularly receive deliveries or generate shipments by truck shall demonstrate that there will be adequate off-street space for loading and unloading without interfering with traffic circulation, access and parking.
3011 H  **Dimensional Standards.** Off-street parking and loading areas shall conform to the following:

1. **Parking Spaces.** Off-street parking spaces shall not be less than 8½ feet wide by 18 feet deep, except for compact car spaces approved by the Development Review Board. Each space shall be accessible from a driveway or access aisle except for:

   a. Stacked spaces within a driveway serving not more than 4 dwelling units; or
   b. Tandem parking [a double-depth parking space with one vehicle parking the other in] for residential or employee parking.

2. **Access Aisles.** The access aisles within a parking lot or structure shall be not less than 20 feet wide except that one-way aisles serving angled parking spaces may be designed in accordance with accepted engineering standards.

3. **Loading Areas.** Loading areas shall conform to the following minimum standards:

   a. Off-street loading areas for single-unit trucks shall have an overhead clearance of at least 10 feet and shall be not less than 10 feet wide and 20 feet long, exclusive of access and maneuvering area.
   b. Off-street truck loading areas for trailer trucks shall have an overhead clearance of at least 14 feet and shall be not less than 12 feet wide and 50 feet long, exclusive of access and maneuvering area.

7.1. The revised plans do not appear to show adequate loading areas for the Capital Plaza and Hampton Inn services and utilities that do not interfere with traffic circulation, access, and parking.

8. **Traffic Study**

3504 B  **Traffic Impact Study.** A traffic impact study prepared by a qualified professional in accordance with VTrans' traffic impact study policy shall be included in an application for any proposed subdivision that is expected to generate 75 or more new trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour on Class 1 roads, and 50 or more new trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours on Class 2 and 3 roads. The Development Review Board may require any applicant to submit a professionally prepared traffic impact study as deemed necessary to determine compliance with this section, particularly if traffic is anticipated to impact an intersection with a level of service of E or F.

8.1. The traffic study does not include Capitol Plaza Conference Center event traffic levels.

8.2. Peak flow analysis is inadequate.

8.3. The traffic study is insufficient and has false conclusions.

9. **Cities Ability to Provide Services**

3502 A  The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed subdivision shall not cause a disproportionate or unreasonable burden on the city's ability to provide community facilities and utilities including:

1. Local schools.
2. Police, fire protection and ambulance services.
3. Street infrastructure and maintenance.
4. Parks and recreation facilities.
5. Water supply, sewage disposal and stormwater systems and infrastructure.

9.1. Updated comments from the police and fire departments about their ability to provide services have not be made since modifications to the proposal have been made.

10. **Wayfinding Requirements are vague + incomplete**

10.1. No renderings provided.

10.2. No revised landscaping or architectural features.

10.3. No partnerships established to provide for state St. and other locations owned by others besides applicants.