



DRAFT MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
7 JULY 2026

The South Burlington Development Review Board held a regular meeting on Tuesday, 7 July 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium, City Hall, 180 Market Street, and via Go to Meeting interactive technology.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Q. Mann, Chair (elected during meeting); M. Behr, F. Kochman, J. Lesko, T. Lenski, C. Johnston

ALSO PRESENT: M. Keene, Development Review Planner; A. Levin, Planning Department; A. Wood, L. Yankowski, K. Luce, T. Bellavance, B. Currier, L. Thayer, J. Gregory, J. Bertolo, G. Allen, D Marshall, S. Kirshner, J. Hawkins, Bill, A. Cousins, P. Travers, S. Greenhalgh, M. Provost, S. Caflisch

1. Instructions on exiting the building in case of an emergency:

Ms. Mann provided instructions on emergency exit from the building.

2. Additions, deletions, or changes in order of agenda items:

Ms. Keene reminded members that since this is the first meeting of the new fiscal year, it is time to elect a slate of officers. She then opened the floor for nominations:

Mr. Johnston nominated Ms. Mann for Chair, Mr. Lenski for Vice Chair, and Ms. Lesko for Clerk.

There were no further nominations.

Ms. Lesko moved to approve the slate of officers as nominated. Ms. Mann seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

3. Comments and questions from the public not related to the Agenda:
No issues were raised.

4. Announcements:

Ms. Keene advised that at last night's City Council meeting, the Council voted to warn for public hearing amendments to the LDRs brought to them by the Planning Commission. This means that at this time both the existing LDRs and warned language are in effect, depending on the status of an application.

5. Continued Site Plan Application #PZ-SITE-2026-16 of Community Drive, LLC, to amend a previously approved plan for a 275,000 sf commercial and industrial building consisting of 232,233 sf of general commercial, 29,300 sf of consumer facing commercial, and 13,467 sf of child care facility. The amendment consists of a 12,735 sf expansion to be used as a general commercial, 530 Community Drive:

Ms. Mann noted there were some outstanding issues from the previous hearing.

Staff comments were addressed as follows:

#1. The applicant was asked to explain proposed changes regarding the increased height of the building and of the cooling tower. Mr. Gagnon said they are putting a CNC into the building which has resulted in a raised section of the roof. It does not raised the cooling tower. Both are still under the allowable 39 feet in height. The elevations were shown. Ms. Keene asked how much higher the building is now. Mr. Gagnon said 4 feet. He showed the area on the plan. Mr. Behr said he had no issues and felt the window change was an improvement. Members were OK with this.

#2. Regarding potential noise, the applicant showed a picture of a noise muffler that will be used. Mr. Lenski said it should work fine.

#3. Staff drew attention to comments from the City Arborist regarding surface area per tree. Ms. Thayer said they have been talking to him. They are asking that soil volume to a condition of approval. They will adjust if needed. It would be only a few inches. Members were OK with this.

#4. The applicant was asked to remove screening shown for the nitrogen tanks. Mr. Gagnon said they have done that.

Public comment was then solicited. There was no public comment.

Mr. Johnston then moved to close PZ-SITE-2026-16. Ms. Lesko seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

6. Site Plan Application #SP-26-018 of City of South Burlington to amend a previously approved plan for Red Rocks Park. The amendments consist of stormwater improvements, parking improvements, and slope stabilization measures, 4 Central Avenue:

Ms. Kirshner said there are 2 main project areas: the surface park area and the path. By the beach, the access road will be upgraded to improve erosion concern and protection of trees. The pipe will be covered with fieldstone.

Ms. Mann noted that the Board has a draft decision.

Public comment was then solicited and received as follows:

Ms. Yankowski said both projects are very much needed, particularly to address people walking on the road. She loved the proposed walkway and also noted that the beach is a continuing issue.

Mr. Johnston asked if the riprap will be above or below the water level. Ms. Kirshner said it will be below the flood plain. There is a letter indicating that there is no threat.

Ms. Lesko then moved to close SP-26-018. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

7. Site Plan Application #PZ-SITE-2026-011 of JB Development Group, LLC, dba Peregrine Design Build, for a new 5,040 sf footprint building on an existing undeveloped 3.05 acre lot, 65 Randall Street:

Mr. Marshall noted the previously approved 3-lot subdivision and said this is Lot 1D. Lot 1E remains undeveloped. He showed the plan.

The proposed building is for Peregrine Design. It uses existing infrastructure. Stormwater will be managed in accordance with State/City rules.

Ms. Bertolo, the owner, said this is a design/build firm which designs and builds homes. It has been a long-time dream to have their own space. The building will include area for tools, offices, conference room, kitchenette, and room for growth. Their pickups and trailers spend most of the time at building sites.

Mr. Marshall said the building will be 1-1/2 stories. He showed the elevations.

Mr. Allen said the office space capitalizes on the views to the east. He particularly noted the windows in this area. The building will have a shed roof which accents the entry. It will have graphite metal siding.

Mr. Kochman asked if vehicles come back at night. Ms. Bertolo said they do not. They either remain on the job site or go home with the driver. Mr. Allen said there has never been a need for them to be under a roof. Ms. Bertolo said the 2 garage door would allow for vehicles if needed.

Staff comments were then addressed as follows:

#1. Staff noted the front setback is 3 feet more generous than required. They suggested a potential conflict with the corridor could be addressed by having a smaller setback. Mr. Marshall said they want the building as close to Randall Street as possible and will move it forward 3 feet.

#2. The applicant was asked to enhance the orientation to the street. Mr. Behr said he liked the wood inserts and suggested there could be more of this, perhaps wrapping the porch around the corner of the building. Mr. Allen said with parking in the rear, it forces the non-main entry side to be the front of the building. Mr. Behr suggested something on the corner of the building like a patio or employee area that would make it "pop" and break up the scale. Ms. Keene noted that porch awnings are allowed to be up to 12-feet into the setback. Ms. Bertolo asked if landscaping would help. Members said it would. Ms. Keene noted there is a landscape requirement for the civic space.

#3. Regarding pedestrian orientation, the applicant was asked the purpose of the gravel path. Mr. Marshall said it created a better situation than the approved subdivision plans. Ms. Keene noted the DRB can modify conditions of a previous approval. She felt it was likely the creators of that decision did not want

to impact natural resources. Mr. Johnston asked who would use the path. Mr. Allen said it is not likely to be the general public. Mr. Marshall identified the wetland and river corridor and showed a potential “pinch point.” Ms. Keen noted the path dead ends and staff suggests guiding the path by having the lowest option until the adjoining lot develops and the path can be continued. Mr. Johnston showed where he would eliminate the path. Ms. Keene said she would like to review this to see if there is a middle ground. She said the possibilities are: keeping the path largely as it is, keeping the path with some improvements, replacing the path with an extended sidewalk, or having no path at all.

#4. Staff felt there is insufficient information regarding color, texture, detailing, etc. to evaluate whether the building is similar to or different from other buildings in the business park. Mr. Marshall showed pictures of existing buildings and noted there is a combination of peak and flat roofs. Mr. Allen felt the gabled building is more common to Vermont. He also noted the large feature glass windows which balance the commercial use. Mr. Behr was concerned with the solid color and felt detailing could help. Mr. Johnston asked if the business name will be on the building. Mr. Allen said ‘something subtle.” Mr. Kochman agreed with Mr. Behr. He also liked the windows. He suggested not using other buildings in the area as a standard.

#5 and #6: Regarding pedestrian connection, Mr. Marshall showed the sidewalk connection from Randall Street to the building. It starts as concrete and becomes gravel past the first door. Ms. Bertolo said she would prefer all gravel as it is more organic, and she felt the more natural materials the better. Mr. Johnston said white stone would help break up the black. Ms. Keene said staff would entertain gravel after one square of concrete for a transition.

#7. Regarding the site amenity (e.g., paver patio), Ms. Mann noted that seating must be the main feature, and this is not met. Ms. Bertolo said they would want furniture that could be moved as built-in seating is a challenge. Ms. Lesko suggested permanent seating on the outside and more flexible space on the inside of the area.

#8. Ms. Quinn noted landscaping is also needed in the amenity. Mr. Marshall said that has been sent to the landscape designer.

#9. Regarding the wetland delineation, Mr. Marshall noted they are within the 5-year period of the existing delineation.

#10. Regarding the river corridor and grading of the path within the river corridor, Ms. Keene said there can be no development within the corridor. She showed a plan and noted a “pinch point” which may require a retaining wall. Mr. Marshall said they will look at that.

#11. The applicant was asked if the gravel path would be publicly owned. Mr. Marshall said it will not.

#12. Staff noted the need to identify the material and height of the dumpster enclosure. Ms. Bertolo said they are not sure they will use a dumpster.

#13. The applicant was asked to meet the required 40% solar ready requirement. Mr. Marshall said the roof would not preclude that opportunity. He also noted that a ground option would provide 100%. It will be one or the other, if there is flexibility. Ms. Keene noted applicants usually provide less, “the blob approach,” which is OK.

#14. Regarding EV charging, the applicant was asked how many would be provided. Those need to be EV ready, not only EV capable.. Mr. Marshall said they will do the calculation and provide the location.

#15. Regarding space for truck movement, staff asked about removing 12 feet of excess pavement. Mr. Marshall showed the plan regarding truck turning movements and stressed the need to have enough space to get vehicles in and out of the overhead doors, especially with a building extension. Mr. Allen said they need to get supplies delivered and get the fire truck in there. Mr. Marshall added that there are many unknowns, and the engineer asked for flexibility. This is what they came up with.

#16. Regarding landscaping and parking, staff asked how realistic it is that the snow storage area will be used and whether plantings should be moved further back. Mr. Marshall said they wouldn’t be pushing snow toward the trees (there is also a guard rail there). He was comfortable with the location of the trees and felt there are other areas for snow storage. Ms. Quinn thought what is there is reasonable. Members agreed.

#17. Regarding the variety of landscaping species, Mr. Marshall said they will give this issue to the landscaping person. It was noted that the City Arborist feels the city is “over-mapled.”

#18. Previously addressed.

#19. The applicant was asked to review the remainder of the landscaping standards for compliance.

#20. The applicant was asked to comply with stormwater comments. Mr. Marshall said that their concern has nothing to do with this lot. There is a question of who is responsible. The stream no longer goes to the culvert, and water now goes in front of Booska Movers. Each lot has its own response. When they asked if they could rebuild the ditch, the State said “no.” Ms. Mann said the Board appreciates the unique situation and hopes there can be an agreement.

#21. Staff questioned whether there is sufficient landscaping around utility cabinets. Mr. Marshall said the subdivision approval showed utilities did not require landscaping. Ms. Keene asked if they are existing. Mr. Marshall said they are.

Mr. Kochman said it is unclear to him whether the developer has a vested interest in the previous approvals. Ms. Keene said she predicted the answer will depend on what the previous decision was. She thought there was a technical answer: you don’t dig around utility cabinets for plantings.

Ms. Mann noted the application will be continued as there is still the issue of the gravel path. Ms. Keene said the Board will discuss this and provide a decision.

Public comment was solicited. There was no public comment.

Mr. Lesko then moved to continue PZ-SITE—2026-011 to 4 August 2026. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

8. Site Plan Application #PZ-PRELIM-2026-4 of North East Agricultural Trust to subdivide an existing 5.5 acre lot, developed with a single family home, into 2 lots of 2.0 acres (Lot 3) and 3.5 acres (Lot 4) with lot 3 containing the existing single-family home, 1730 Spear Street:

Mr. Currier said the project is a 2-lot subdivision that will put the single-family home on its own lot. Access is from the right-of-way on Lot 1. They would continue the right-of-way through to the rear of Lot 4. There is no intention to build at this time.

Staff comments were addressed as follows:

#1. Staff asked to require the applicant to revise the computation of building area, noting that the Class 3 wetland and buffer count toward the buildable area. Mr. Currier said that increases the buildable area from 2.6 acres to 2.9 acres.

#2. Staff noted there is potential for 16 lots and recommends the applicant continue connectivity to Lot 3. Mr. Currier said they do that.

#3. Regarding civic spaces, staff said the concept is satisfactory. Members were OK with there being a condition when there is development.

#4. Staff noted the civic space should have frontage on the pedestrian access. The applicant was OK with this.

#5. Regarding minimum residential density, the applicant was asked to show an area for stormwater practices and the shared use drive as a road with a temporary turnaround. Mr. Currier said they are OK with that.

#6. The applicant was asked to show exceptional features of the wooded area. The arborist should review this. Mr. Bellevance said their primary goal is to preserve the property. It was farmed until 1980-90. There are no big trees on the property. He noted 6 apple, 4 maple and some willows. They could look more at Lot 4 when/if it is developed.

#7. Any trees of 20" caliper, specimen trees, etc. should be identified when there is development. Mr. Bellevance said 1730 is mostly things that have just grown up. Ms. Keene said the location of the road could be determined by any valuable trees. Mr. Bellevance said they will look to see if there is anything in the document Ethan Tapper gave them. Mr. Currier said if the City Arborist says there is anything valuable, they can slide things a bit.

#8. Staff indicated that the Board should discuss whether to include a condition at final plat that the first application for development be accompanied by an updated wetland delineation. It was noted the current delineation expires in August. Staff feels not much has changed. Members were OK with that.

#9. Regarding the Class 3 wetland being incorporated into Lot 4, the applicant was asked to show a delineation at the time of development in addition to the subdivision plat. Mr. Currier said they are OK with that.

#10. It was noted that the civic space is adjacent to the wetland. Staff said the Board should include a preference for co-locating civic space with a resource area. The Board and applicant were OK with this.

#11. Regarding the street grid the applicant was asked to provide an easement of Lot 4 having access to South Pointe Drive as part of the Final Plat application. Mr. Currier said the easement would be from Mr. Bellevance to Mr. Bellevance.

#12. Regarding the requirement for mixed housing types, there is a question as to whether Lots 3 and 4 together could meet the requirement or whether each lot should meet it separately. Members felt each lot should meet the requirement.

#13. The applicant was asked to show which direction services (e.g., electric, gas) are coming from. Mr. Currier said Spear Street, North Jefferson, etc.

#14. Regarding renewable facilities, staff said the applicant can include one or more of these.

#15. The applicant was asked to manage inclusionary zoning requirements on Lots 1 through 4 as part of final plat. The applicant was OK with this. Ms. Keene said if Habitat is doing 12 units, this is OK. If Habitat doesn't happen, there should still be a plan. Mr. Currier asked if this could be a condition of approval. Ms. Keene said it doesn't meet the test. If there is development within 5 years, they are aggregated. Mr. Currier noted the extra legal work involved.

Public comment was then solicited. There was no public comment.

Ms. Lesko then moved to close PZ-PRELIM-2026-4. Mr. Behr seconded. Motion passed 6-0.

9. Minutes of 16 June 2026:

Mr. Johnston asked to add mention that the Board recognized Dawn Philibert on her last meeting as a member/chair of the DRB.

Ms. Lesko then moved to approve the Minutes of 16 June as amended. Mr. Behr seconded. The motion passed 6-0.

10. Other Business:

No other business was brought forth.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned by common consent at 9:42 p.m.

These minutes were approved by common consent on _____.