Department of Planning and Zoning
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Telephone:(802) 865-7188
(802) 865-7195 (FAX)
(802) 865-7142 (TTY)

David White, AICP, Director
Ken Lerner, Assistant Director
Sandrine Thibault, AICP, Comprehensive Planner
Jay Appleton, GIS Manager
Scott Gustin, AICP, Senior Planner
Mary O'Neil, AICP, Senior Planner
Nic Anderson, Zoning Clerk
Elsie Tillotson, Department Secretary

TO: Development Review Board
FROM: Scott Gustin
DATE: May 7, 2013
RE: 12-1138PD Amendment; 70 Appletree Point Lane

Note: These are staff comments only; decisions on projects are made by the Development Review Board, which may approve, deny, table or modify any project. THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE MUST ATTEND THE MEETING.

Zone: WRL Ward: 4

Owner/Applicant: Staniford Farms, LLC

Request: Amend final plat approval. Relocate existing farmhouse, modify private drive, reduce number of new building lots, and delete construction of new homes.

Applicable Regulations:
Article 3 (Applications and Reviews), Article 4 (Maps & Districts), Article 5 (Citywide General Regulations), Article 6 (Development Criteria & Guidelines), Article 10 (Subdivision), and Article 11 (Planned Unit Development)

Background Information:
The applicant is requesting approval to amend an existing final plat approval for a 26-unit planned unit development (PUD) granted October 16, 2012. The requested amendment includes deletion of the new homes. Construction will be by individual property owners as they purchase the building lots. The total number of new building lots will decrease to 21 with 4 common land lots. A small cluster of homes at the north end of the development has been deleted in favor of a relatively large building lot for a new single family home. The private Appletree Point Lane will be modified, and the existing farmhouse will be relocated and placed on a new foundation. Some changes to the proposed farmhouse garage and breezeway are also included.

The Design Advisory Board reviewed the proposed amendment, particularly the relocation of the farmhouse, at their April 9, 2013 meeting and recommended approval with a 4-1 vote. The Board recommended that the farmhouse, in its existing location, should be properly documented using the applicable standards of the Historic American Building Survey and be submitted to the Department of Planning & Zoning prior to relocation.

Recommendation: **Amended final plat approval** as per, and subject to, the following findings and conditions.

I. Findings
Article 3: Applications and Reviews

Part 5, Conditional Use & Major Impact Review:
Sec. 3.5.6, Review Criteria
(a) Conditional Use Review Standards
1. The capacity of existing or planned community facilities;
The proposed development will be served by municipal water and sewer. Sufficient capacity is available as confirmed by the Department of Public Works. The amendment does not affect capacity in any way. **(Affirmative finding)**

2. The character of the area affected;
The proposed amendment does not significantly affect the development's relationship to the character of the surrounding area. Whereas previously the homes were all to be built as part of the subdivision, they will now simply be built one-by-one by individual homeowners. The overall layout and scope of the development remains largely the same, albeit with fewer new homes. **(Affirmative finding)**

3. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity;
Traffic impacts will remain essentially unchanged upon project completion. With the reduced number of building lots, there may be a small decrease in overall traffic impacts. **(Affirmative finding)**

4. Bylaws then in effect;
As conditioned, the project will be in compliance with all applicable bylaws. **(Affirmative finding)**

5. Utilization of renewable energy resources;
Conduit will be run in each of the homes so that they are solar ready if future owners opt for that choice. **(Affirmative finding)**

6. Cumulative impacts of the proposed use;
This criterion requires that cumulative impacts associated with residential development where it is permitted be deemed negligible. **(Affirmative finding)**

7. Functional family;
Occupancy of all of the dwelling units in this development will be subject to the functional family provisions. There is no request to exceed the limit of four unrelated adults in any of the homes. **(Affirmative finding)**

8. Vehicular access points;
See Sec. 6.2.2 (i).

9. Signs;
(Not applicable)

10. Mitigation measures;
The proposed development will likely not generate offsite noise or glare substantial enough to require mitigation. **(Affirmative finding)**

11. Time limits for construction;

The applicant wishes to retain the approved 5-year build out for the project. As amended, the work associated with the development includes installation of all project infrastructure and relocation and renovation of the farmhouse. Within those 5 years, there are two phases: 1) finalize and file the subdivision plat in the city's land records, and 2) construct project infrastructure and farmhouse relocation and renovations. **(Affirmative finding as conditioned)**

12. Hours of operation and construction;
Hours of operation need not be specified for this residential development. Proposed days and hours of construction remain unchanged at Monday – Saturday, 7:00 AM – 6:00 PM.
(Affirmative finding)

13. Future enlargement or alterations;
In the event of future enlargement or alteration, permits would be required and reviewed under the regulations then in effect.

14. Performance standards;
Performance standards relating to outdoor lighting and erosion control are addressed under Article 5 of these findings.

15. Conditions and safeguards;
See conditions of approval.

Article 4: Maps & Districts
Sec. 4.4.5, Residential Districts:
(a) Purpose
(2) Waterfront Residential Low Density (WRL)
The subject property is located in the WRL zone. This zone is primarily intended for low density residential development in the form of single family homes and duplexes. Due to its close proximity to the lake, design review and stormwater management are particularly important considerations. The proposed development as amended remains consistent with the purpose of the WRL zone. **(Affirmative finding)**

(b) Dimensional Standards & Density
See Sec. 4.5.5, *Larger Lot Overlay District* for minimum lot size and density.

Lot coverage is limited to 35%. As amended, construction of individual homes will be left to the individual homeowners; however, as with the original approval, lot coverage will be calculated across the entire development (rather than on the small individual lots). The amended subdivision plat depicts building envelopes on each of the proposed building lots. Assuming a complete build-out on each lot, total lot coverage within the development would be 25.2%.

Within the PUD, only peripheral setbacks apply. As noted previously, the overall layout of the proposed development remains largely unchanged. The proposed building envelopes comply with all applicable peripheral setbacks.

No building heights are specified, as the new homes are no longer included in this amendment. The maximum building height in the WRL zone is 35'. **(Affirmative finding)**

(c) Permitted & Conditional Uses
The major PUD is subject to conditional use review in the WRL zone. Such review is addressed in these findings. **(Affirmative finding)**

(d) District Specific Regulations
1. Setbacks
No setback encroachments are sought.

2. Height
Not applicable in WRL.

3. Lot Coverage
Lot coverage is compliant as noted previously. **(Affirmative finding)**

4. Accessory Residential Structures and Uses
No home construction is included in this proposal. **(Not applicable)**

5. Residential Density
The proposed residential units are subject to the functional family provisions of the Comprehensive Development Ordinance. No request to exceed these limitations is included in this amendment. **(Affirmative finding)**

6. Uses
Not applicable.

7. Residential Development Bonuses
No development bonuses are being sought.

Sec. 4.5.4, Natural Resource Protection Overlay (NR) District
(d) District Specific Regulations: Wetland Conservation Zone
(6) Criteria for Review
The amendment entails no changes to onsite wetland impacts. As originally approved, the Conservation Board determined that there are no direct impacts to any mapped wetlands onsite and that buffer impacts are minor. They found that Home Owner Association (HOA) provisions for annual mowing in common areas within the buffer zones and for pond maintenance were acceptable. **(Affirmative finding)**

Sec. 4.5.5, Larger Lot Overlay District
(c) District Specific Regulations: RL Larger Lot Overlay
(1) Minimum Lot Size and Density
The minimum lot size for single family homes in this overlay district is 9,900 sf and 15,840sf for duplexes. Article 11, *Planned Unit Development*, allows flexibility in dimensional requirements (including lot sizes) and in residential densities. The proposed amendment includes fewer and larger proposed lots and remains acceptable. **(Affirmative finding)**

Article 5: Citywide General Regulations
Sec. 5.2.3, Lot Coverage Requirements
See Sec. 4.4.5 (b) above.

Sec. 5.2.4, Buildable Area Calculation
The proposed amendment has no effect on the buildable area calculation. Density is calculated based on 12.27 acres. At 4.4 units per acre maximum, up to 54 units could be permitted. The 21 proposed units are compliant. **(Affirmative finding)**

Sec. 5.2.5, Setbacks
See Sec. 4.4.5 (b) above.

Sec. 5.2.6, Building Height Limits
See Sec. 4.4.5 (d) above.

Sec. 5.2.7, Density and Intensity of Development Calculations
See Sec. 4.5.5 above.

Sec. 5.4.8, Historic Buildings and Sites
(b) Standards and Guidelines

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*
   The farmhouse has always been used as a single family residence and will continue to be used as such. The proposed renovations to the farmhouse remain largely unchanged from the previous approval except for its relocation. **(Affirmative finding)**

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
   The historic character of the farmhouse will be retained and preserved. Existing building materials, including the wooden clapboard siding and slate roofing, will be repaired or replaced in kind as needed. The existing foundation and basement are in poor condition and in need of substantial work or replacement. Insofar as replacement of the foundation in the existing location is acceptable under these criteria, relocation onto a new foundation some 200' to the east within the same overall development context is also acceptable. The Design Advisory Board noted that the farm is gone, and subdivision approval has been granted. The relocated farmhouse will remain on lands originally associated with the farm and will continue to relate to the original tree-lined private road used for access. **(Affirmative finding)**

3. *Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*
   The proposed amendment entails no changes affected by this criterion. No conjectural alterations are proposed. There is no attempt to fabricate faux historic elements. **(Affirmative finding)**

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*
   Removal of the northern addition has already been approved. No additional demolition is proposed. **(Affirmative finding)**

5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
   All of the farmhouse's significant materials, features, and finishes will be retained. **(Affirmative finding)**

6. *Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials recognizing that new technologies may provide an appropriate alternative in order to adapt to ever changing conditions and provide for an efficient contemporary use. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
   Historically significant features will be repaired in kind. Where replacement is proposed, the replacement features (i.e. windows) will match the originals. **(Affirmative finding)**

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.*
   (Not applicable)

8. *Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.*
   There are no known archeological resources on the property. **(Affirmative finding)**

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
   Except for its relocation, little is changing about the proposed renovations to the farmhouse. The previously proposed breezeway will now be enclosed and shorter. It continues to provide a connection between the home and the garage while leaving the essential form and integrity of the farmhouse building intact. The garage design is somewhat different from the previous approval; however, it remains clearly subordinate to, and separate from, the farmhouse. **(Affirmative finding)**

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
    See #9 above.

Sec. 5.5.1, Nuisance Regulations
Nothing in the proposal appears to constitute a nuisance under this criterion. **(Affirmative finding)**

Sec. 5.5.2, Outdoor Lighting
Outdoor lighting along the new public road remains unchanged and acceptable. Lighting for the new homes will be included in individual permit applications for each home. **(Affirmative finding)**

Sec. 5.5.3, Stormwater and Erosion Control

Stormwater infrastructure remains essentially unchanged as do erosion control measures. Post-construction stormwater management remains the responsibility of the homeowners association as originally approved. Individual home construction must adhere to the erosion control measures included in this project approval. **(Affirmative finding as conditioned)**

Article 6: Development Review Standards:
Part 1, Land Division Design Standards
(a) Protection of important natural features
The amended subdivision plan depicts generally the same layout as previously approved, albeit with fewer and somewhat larger building lots. The new lots continue to be placed along the new roads within the development. They remain out of the wetlands onsite. The wetlands will be contained within common open space areas for the project. **(Affirmative finding)**

(b) Block size and arrangement
No new blocks are proposed. The interior roads, including one new public road, will connect to the city's public street system. **(Affirmative finding)**

(c) Arrangement of Lots
As with the previous approval, newly created lots are regular in shape, except for undeveloped open space parcels. While many of the new lots along the new public road remain relatively small, the overall density of the development will be less than that of surrounding development. **(Affirmative finding)**

(d) Connectivity of streets within the city street grid
The amended project does not affect proposed street connectivity in any way. **(Affirmative finding)**

(e) Connectivity of sidewalks, trails, and natural systems
No changes to sidewalk connectivity within the development and to the existing public sidewalk system are included in the amended project plans. **(Affirmative finding)**

Part 2, Site Plan Design Standards
Sec. 6.2.2, Review Standards
(a) Protection of important natural features
The amended project plans entail no new impacts to onsite natural features including ponds, wetlands, wooded areas, and the existing row of mature Locust Trees along Appletree Point Lane. **(Affirmative finding)**

(b) Topographical alterations
No significant topographic changes are included in the amendment. **(Affirmative finding)**

(c) Protection of important public views
There are no important public views from or through the property. **(Affirmative finding)**

(d) Protection of important cultural resources
The site has no known archaeological resources. **(Affirmative finding)**

(e) Supporting the use of alternative energy

(Not applicable) (No new building construction is included.)

(f) Brownfield sites
The property is not included on the Vermont DEC's Hazardous Sites List. **(Affirmative finding)**

(g) Provide for nature's events
Stormwater management measures will be installed as originally approved.

There is ample room onsite for seasonal snow storage. **(Affirmative finding)**

(h) Building location and orientation
While the construction of new homes has been deleted from the subdivision proposal, the amended plans depict building envelopes on each new building lot. These envelopes will provide for consistent spacing and orientation of new homes within the development. **(Affirmative finding)**

(i) Vehicular access
All of the new building lots will be served by private driveways. Vehicular access changes from the previous approval only insofar as the number and spacing of new building lots changes in the amendment. **(Affirmative finding)**

(j) Pedestrian access
As previously approved, new public sidewalks will serve the new subdivision. The public sidewalk runs continuously across driveways as required. When they are built, each new home will be required to have a front walkway connecting to the public sidewalk. **(Affirmative finding)**

(k) Accessibility for the handicapped
Public sidewalk ramps will be handicap accessible as required. **(Affirmative finding)**

(l) Parking and circulation
Onsite circulation remains essentially unchanged. Parking will be provided with individual homes as they are constructed under separate permits. **(Affirmative finding)**

(m) Landscaping and fences
As previously approved, new street trees will be planted along the new public road. These trees have been reviewed and approved by the City Arborist. Other landscaping consists of a variety of trees, shrubs, and ground cover. Landscaping will be installed in common open space areas. Construction of individual homes will include landscaping plans.

Split rail cedar fencing will be installed along sections of 50' wetland buffer in the rear yards of affected properties. The fencing will provide an on-the-ground demarcation of the buffer zone. **(Affirmative finding)**

(n) Public plazas and open space
Common lands and amenities remain essentially unchanged except that a small gazebo has been added to the green space at the end of the reconfigured Appletree Point Lane. **(Affirmative finding)**

(o) Outdoor lighting

See Sec. 5.5.2.

(p) Integrate infrastructure into the design
No changes to project infrastructure are included in the amendment. Actual construction associated with the amendment is limited to infrastructure elements such as the road, sidewalks, utility lines, etc., and the farmhouse renovation and relocation. **(Affirmative finding)**

Part 3, Architectural Design Standards
Sec. 6.3.2, Review Standards
Not applicable (No new home construction is included.)

Article 10: Subdivision
See Articles 3, 4, 5, and 6 of these findings.

Article 11: Planned Unit Development
Sec. 11.1.6, Approval Requirements
(a) Lot coverage requirements of the district shall be met
Lot coverage is compliant at 25.2%. The coverage limit is 35%. **(Affirmative finding)**

(b) The minimum setbacks required for the district shall be met
As noted previously, setbacks are compliant. **(Affirmative finding)**

(c) The minimum parcel size shall be met if the project is located in a RL or RL-W district
The two acre minimum lot size requirement for the PUD has been met. **(Affirmative finding)**

(d) The project shall be subject to design review and site plan review of Article 3, Part 4
See Article 3 above.

(e) The project shall meet the requirements of Article 10 for subdivision review
See Article 10 above.

(f) All other dimensional, density, and use requirements of the underlying zoning district shall be met as calculated across the entire property
Applicable dimensional requirements have been met. The single family homes are permitted in the WRL zone. **(Affirmative finding)**

(g) Open space or common land shall be assured and maintained in accordance with the conditions as prescribed by the DRB
Common open space lands will be held and maintained by the Home Owners' Association. **(Affirmative finding)**

(h) The development plan shall specify reasonable periods within which development of each phase of the planned unit development may be started and shall be completed. Deviation from the required amount of usable open space per dwelling unit may be allowed provided such deviation shall be provided for in other sections of the planned unit development.
See Sec. 3.5.6 (a) 11.

(i) The intent as defined in Sec. 11.1.1 is met in a way not detrimental to the city's interests

Sec. 11.1.1, Intent

(a) Promote the most appropriate use of land through flexibility of design and development of land;

The proposed use of land remains unchanged from the original approval. The residential use is appropriate for this property. Site constraints, primarily wetlands and ponds, preclude the proposed number of units in a traditional subdivision meeting standard dimensional requirements. The PUD process enables flexibility in dimensional requirements that allow for the proposed development. **(Affirmative finding)**

(b) Facilitate the adequate and economical provision of streets and utilities;

Multiple residences will be served by shared streets and utilities within the development. **(Affirmative finding)**

(c) Preserve the natural and scenic qualities of open space;

Open space will remain, and much of it will contain protected natural features like the ponds and wetlands. **(Affirmative finding)**

(d) Provide for a variety of housing types;

As amended, the proposed development will consist entirely of single family homes. However, as they will be individually permitted and constructed, a variety of building types and styles are anticipated. **(Affirmative finding)**

(e) Provide a method of development for existing parcels which because of physical, topographical, or geological conditions could not otherwise be developed; and,

As noted in (a) above, extensive wetlands and ponds preclude development on much of the property. Placing homes on smaller lots as proposed preserves these natural features and allows for a moderately scaled development. **(Affirmative finding)**

(f) Achieve a high level of design qualities and amenities.

The Design Advisory Board found the project design compliant with the standards of Article 6. Amenities include individual parcels, common open space lands, gazebo, and associated infrastructure, access to significant natural areas and to the public bike path. **(Affirmative finding)**

(j) The proposed development shall be consistent with the Municipal Development Plan

See Sec. 3.5.6 (b) 10.

II. Conditions of Approval

1. Within 180 days of the date of final approval, the subdivision plat mylar, with all applicable endorsement signatures, shall be filed with the City Clerk per Sec. 10.1.11 of the Comprehensive Development Ordinance. Failure to do so shall render void the final plat approval.
2. Except as specifically changed in this amendment, all conditions of zoning permit 12-1138PD approved October 16, 2012 shall remain in effect.
3. This approval includes a 5-year built out in two phases. Phase 1 includes finalizing and filing the subdivision plat in the city's land records (per condition 1). Phase 2 includes all infrastructure construction and relocation/renovation of the farmhouse.

4. Erosion control measures included in the original October 16, 2012 approval shall apply to all construction included in this development (infrastructure and individual home construction).
5. Future building of structures on any of the lots shall require individual zoning and associated construction permits. Impact fees will be assessed based on the square footage of each new house.
6. Standard permit conditions 1 -15.

Staniford Farms
Appletree Point
Burlington, Vermont

PUD Project Phasing

Single Zoning Permit

Phase	Reference Parcel
1	Overall PUD - Plat of Survey, Proposed Boundary Adjustments & Subdivision Plan (26 housing lots + 4 HOA lots)
2	Staniford Farms Road - New Public Street
2	Appletree Point Lane - Relocated Private Road
2	Site Infrastructure (utilities, street plantings, storm water pond, etc.)

Note 1 **Individual Zoning Permits to be issued for each housing lot**

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

Staniford Farms
Appletree Point
Burlington, Vermont

Development Program Summary

LOT #	TYPE	CURRENT OWNER	TYPE	# UNITS
Staniford Farms HOA				
1	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
2	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
3	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
4	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
5	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
6	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
7	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
8	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
9	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
10	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
11	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
12	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
13	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
14	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
15	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
16	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
17	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
18	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
19	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
Total housing units (all single-family) in Staniford Farms HOA				**19**
Appletree Point Farm HOA				
20	relocated Farmhouse	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
21	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
22	new	Staniford Farms, LLC	single-family	1
23	existing residence	Seleen/Terhune	single-family	1
24	existing residence	Secker-Walker	single-family	1
25	existing residence	Schwartz	single-family	1
26	existing residence	Townsend/Lauber	single-family	1
Total housing units in Appletree Point Lane HOA				**7**
Total Number of Housing Units in Entire PUD				**26**
Less: Relocated Farmhouse	Lot 20	Staniford Farms, LLC		(1)
Less: Existing Residence	Lot 23	Seleen/Terhune		(1)
Less: Existing Residence	Lot 24	Secker-Walker		(1)
Less: Existing Residence	Lot 25	Schwartz		(1)
Less: Existing Residence	Lot 26	Townsend/Lauber		(1)
Total Number of New Housing Units in Entire PUD				**21**

Staniford Farms, LLC
P.O. Box 1335, Burlington, VT 05402
802-861-3000 fax 802-861-3003

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

March 27, 2013

Scott Gustin, AICP
Senior Planner
Department of Planning & Zoning
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401

Re: Staniford Farms, 70 Appletree Point Lane
Final Plat Amendment to Findings of Fact - 12-1138PD

Dear Scott,

Enclosed please find the following materials for you use in connection with my request to amend my Final Plat approval for the above referenced property:

- Zoning Permit Applications (5)
- Application Fee - $150.00
- Development Program Summary
- PUD Project Phasing
- Plan Set (Civil, Landscaping & Architectural). The Architectural plans only depict the Farmhouse on Lot 20
- Digital Plan Set
- Blue Brick Preservation - report on the relocation of the Farmhouse
- existing conditions pictures of the Farmhouse basement

Proposed Changes

In general, we are removing the new homes from the plans and seeking approval for a subdivision only, plus the relocation of the historic Farmhouse to (new) Lot 20. All of the previously approved infrastructure improvements (streets, utilities, plantings, retention pond, etc.) will remain essentially the same. Individual lot buyers will secure zoning permits for the homes they desire to construct on their respective parcels. The plans reflect minor modifications to the boundary line adjustments with my neighbors. At full build-out, the PUD will have a total of 26 single-family homes.

The overall project is summarized, as follows:

- 21 new (vacant) single-family house lots
- the relocation of the Farmhouse to new Lot 20
- 4 existing neighbor homes
- 4 HOA parcels

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

Lot Coverage

As currently approved (i.e. including the houses depicted on each and every lot), the overall lot coverage is 13.6%.

For the purposes of calculating lot coverage in the amended plan, I propose that we divide the PUD into two components, as follows:

- Component A - to include new lots 1 - 19, plus the 4 HOA lots, plus the new public ROW
- Component B - to include Lots 23, 24, 25 & 26 (i.e. the existing neighbors), as their boundaries are herein adjusted.

If you assume that each and every new lot (1 - 22) in Component A is built out to the full extent of the building envelopes depicted on the plan (which is only theoretically possible), the overall lot coverage in the PUD would be only 32.5%. Of course, it's not possible to build out each and every lot to the full extent of the prescribed building envelopes, so the resulting overall lot coverage is more likely to in the range of 20%.

Therefore, as a condition of approval, I propose that when each individual lot owner (i.e. lots 1 - 22) comes in to apply for a zoning permit for his/her lot, that the lot coverage need not be calculated, as Component A can never reach the maximum allowable under the CDO.

For Component B, I propose that those 4 lots (23, 24, 25 & 26) remain subject to the lot coverage limits prescribed in the CDO (i.e. 35%).

Staniford Farmhouse - relocation

The amended plans depict the relocation of the Farmhouse to new Lot 20, where it will be appropriately restored. A new 2-car garage will be added, connected to the Farmhouse by a 10'x12 breezeway. The garage and breezeway are designed to be subordinate to and set back from the Farmhouse.

I have made every attempt to sell the Farmhouse in its present location and in its present condition. The consistent response I have received is that given the condition of the old stone foundation, and significant structural issues, it is not economically feasible to restore the house in place.

In addition to being prohibitively expensive to repair the foundation and correct the structural deficiencies, the current basement does not meet the building code for height clearance; cannot be brought into compliance with the City's energy codes; and is wet and moldy, which condition cannot be rectified (see interior pictures attached).

The house has been vacant for several years, has no heating system and has experienced repeated winter freeze-ups. Even though I have diligently protected and secured it since I purchased it in December 2009, it continues to deteriorate.

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

There are no specific standards in the CDO by which to determine whether an historic house should be relocated, other than a statement that relocation is preferred over demolition. Reciting language from the "demolition" section of the CDO, the Farmhouse is certainly at risk by remaining in its current location; it cannot be used in a manner that is "economically beneficial"; and there is no economically feasible strategy that can be employed to rehab it in place.

In fact, I am meeting the letter and intent of the same section of the CDO, which states its purpose as: "To discourage the demolition of a historic building, and allow full consideration of alternates to demolition, including rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, resale, or relocation".

By proposing to move the Farmhouse by a mere 200 feet, I am accomplishing the following:

- no demolition
- rehabilitation
- resale
- relocation

In addition, although the Farmhouse is on the Vermont State Register of Historic Places, it is likely no longer eligible for listing on the National Registry. According to a report prepared by Blue Brick Preservation, (attached), the relocation that I propose is not only appropriate, it is in compliance with the National Park Service's Management Policies.

I do not believe it is fair nor reasonable to expect me to privately underwrite the restoration of a deteriorated historic structure; however, I am fully committed to saving the Farmhouse and willing to relocate it nearby and see that it is properly restored and honored.

For the record, it is the precisely the relocation of the Farmhouse, and the resulting creation of two salable building lots in its place, that enables me to undertake the restoration of the Farmhouse in the first place.

My application and the amended plans, as submitted, reflect the following:

Final Plat (12-1138PD) Conditions of Approval - no change, except as amended herein

Compliance with the Conservation Board's Recommendations - no change

Construction Schedule - the site infrastructure improvements will be completed in a single phase. The homes will be constructed on the individual lots pursuant to market demand.

Erosion Control - no change

Fire Marshall Approval - no change

Inclusionary Housing - no longer applicable

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

Staniford Farms Homeowners Association, Inc. (19 house lots + 3 HOA parcels)

- Lots 1 - 19 are new single-family lots
- HOA Lots A, B & C – are common land for the benefit of the homes fronting on Staniford Farms Road

Appletree Point Farm Homeowners Association, Inc. (7 house lots + 1 HOA parcel)

- Lots 20 is a new single-family lot upon which the Farmhouse will be relocated
- Lots 21 & 22 are new single-family lots
- Lots 23, 24 & 25 are existing single-family lots
- HOA Lot A – is common land for the benefit of the homes fronting on (relocated)m Appletree Point Lane

Lot 26 (existing home), which fronts on Appletree Point Road, will not be a member of either Homeowners Association

Relocation of Appletree Point Lane - no change

Underground Utility Services - no change

Article 10.1.8 (d) Review Criteria

The project, as proposed, conforms to all City plans and regulations and will not place an undue burden on municipal services or infrastructure. There are significant natural areas on the project site, all of which are being preserved. With a proposed density of only 1.19 units per acre (26 units/21.84 acres) and a maximum overall lot coverage well below the allowable limits, the proposed project represents a very low intensity of development, as compared to the surrounding built environment.

Gazebo - added on Appletree Point Farm HOA Lot A

Traffic - The total number of housing units has been further reduced from Final Plat, so the original Traffic Report, dated May 2011, remains valid.

Sincerely Yours,

Eric Farrell

Eric F. Farrell
Sole Member

Attachments

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

PO Box 3074, Burlington, VT 05408 802-999-1634 www.bluebrickpreservation.com

PROPOSED RELOCATION OF HISTORIC STANIFORD FARM HOUSE

Blue Brick Preservation was asked to evaluate the effect of relocating the former Woodbury-Wick House (now commonly referred to as the Staniford Farm House) approximately 200' to the east of its present location. Entered onto the Vermont State Register of Historic Places as the Hilton Wick Property in 1993, it was once part of an extensive (300+ acres) farm. The site has a rich and documented history and what remained of the property in 2008 (less than 3 acres) was determined to be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C – for the architectural merits of the dwelling and its associations with noted Vermont architect Louis Sheldon Newton. Eligibility under Criterion A for its associations with the development of agriculture in Vermont was deemed tenuous since much of the pastoral context had been lost.

Remaining elements of the property were documented in 2010: the prominent entry portico, which was in danger of collapse, along with several outbuildings which were also in poor condition and being considered for removal. Due to a number of environmental and other factors, the house now requires extensive structural, foundation and utility repairs in order to make it livable. It appears that making it compliant with relevant life safety and energy codes is infeasible, even impossible. The property owner has had a number of parties interested in purchasing and renovating the home in its present location, but estimates for this work have been exceptionally high and discouraging to prospective buyers. *In situ* foundation repairs in particular are reportedly cost prohibitive, making relocation a more economically feasible alternative for the property owner - who has articulated a commitment to retaining the historic house rather than removing it from the site entirely.

Part of the proposed residential redevelopment of the area includes relocation and reorientation of the main block of the historic dwelling. Currently it faces southeast. Historically, it fronted a road that is no longer extant. The current proposal aims to reorient the house so that it faces west-southwest, where that it can overlook a small green that is part of the new development. The existing garage and connecting wing of the building will be removed and a new garage erected at the new location.

Relocation and reorientation of a historic structure can be problematic, as these are measures which can erode its integrity. National Park Service policy on the relocation of a historic structure that is of "less than national significance" is such that it may be moved if it "cannot practically be preserved on its present site" and if "every effort will be made to re-establish its historic orientation, immediate setting and general relationship to its environment." (National Park Service Management Policies, Chapter 5 - 5.3.5.4.5, 2006). In this case, the proposal aims to mitigate adverse effects by: relocating the structure a short distance from its original location; orienting the dwelling in such a manner that it articulates a prominent and logical relationship to surrounding buildings and landscape features; retaining historic design elements and exterior materials; restoring an earlier porch design; and locating a new, compatible garage on a secondary elevation away from the approach road. Although the location and

orientation of the building will change, its immediate setting and environment will largely be reestablished – thus complying with NPS policy. In light of a lack of prospective buyers willing to rehabilitate the property in its present form and location, relocation is a preferable and appropriate alternative to demolition.

Liisa Reimann

Liisa Reimann
Principal
March 22, 2013

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING

RECEIVED
MAR 2 7 2013
DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING & ZONING