

FAYSTON DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2019
Unapproved

Attending DRB Members: Shane Mullen (Chair), Lindsay Browning (Vice-Chair), Mike Quenneville, Ky Koitzsch, and Pete Ludlow; ZA: John Weir; Public: Tim Harris, David Frothingham

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m.

Chair Mullen opened the hearing for application #3506 (parcel ID #03-095.002, located at 2186 Center Fayston Road, Fayston). Applicants Jane O'Donnell and Andrew Baer requested approval under Article 7 of the Fayston Land Use Regulations for a minor subdivision of 31.24 acres into two lots of 27.24 acres and 4 acres. This application was reviewed at a public hearing held on December 11, 2018, and approved on January 31, 2019. Pursuant to the conditions of approval for application #3506, applicants were required to file a mylar of the approved plat within 180 days of the approval date, or risk the approval becoming null and void. Applicant failed to file the requisite mylar within 180 days, filing the mylar one day late – on the 181st day. This hearing is to ratify prior decision and sign the mylar of the approved plat.

David Frothingham provided a quick summary of the application and the plat as approved by the Board in January. Since the application was approved in January, the project has gone through Act 250 review as well as review by Fish & Wildlife. All permits are in order.

There be no questions, Mike moved to close the hearing and Ky seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Chair Mullen opened the hearing for application #3545 (parcel ID #11-085.001, located at 626 Mt. Ellen Road, Fayston). Applicant Green Mountain Valley School (GMVS) requests conditional use approval under Section 2.4, Table 2.3 (C) (28) of the Fayston Land Use Regulations to replace and lengthen GMVS T-Bar lift on Mt. Ellen. Project components include: removal of the existing 50-year old surface (poma) lift including associated towers, terminals and infrastructure and installation of a new fixed-grip T-Bar surface lift, towers, top and bottom terminals and associated infrastructure. The project includes limited tree removal to re-establish the ski trail edges and provide for appropriate clearance for the ski lift components as well as grading typically associated with the construction of the lift components. The top and bottom terminals will be relocated along the same line as the existing lift.

Tim Harris presented the application. Tim noted that currently there is an existing poma lift, more than 50 years old. The State tramway association wished that GMVS/Sugarbush retire the poma lift, not to mention parts for the antiquated lift are difficult to find. There is also an existing T-bar lift. The project proposes to remove the poma lift and extend the top terminal of the T-Bar lift about 400 feet uphill, and the bottom terminal about 1,300 feet downhill. One objective is for the skiers to be able to load on the base area as opposed to taking two different

lifts to the top of the race hill. In addition, lengthening the T-Bar lift uphill will provide better access to the beginning of the race hill. These improvements will also enhance the ski race training venue and skier safety while improving access to terrain for all skiers.

There will be approximately 0.2 acres of disturbance, mainly attributed to the terminal bases and the tower bases. There are 16 towers proposed and two terminal bases. The bases of the towers are 6 feet x 7 feet. The bases for the top and bottom terminals are 9 feet x 16 feet.

Tim added there would be typical erosion control procedures in place, water bar improvements on the trail, silt fencing, wattle-type features at each tower, and revegetation. Applicant has applied for both an Act 250 permit as well as a Stormwater permit under the low-risk criteria.

Tim noted that there was the State refers to as an intermittent tributary near the proposed new lift. In reality, this a water bar put in when the Inverness lift towers were constructed. Applicant has been working with engineers, Arrowwood Environmental and Fish & Wildlife to come up with a riparian buffer plan for least disturbance. The State's main concern is an area within the buffer zone in which the project proposes to cut down 11 trees. The State proposed abandoning a failed culvert within the tributary and improve the conditions on top of that culvert instead. The goal would be to bring back as much of this area to its original state as possible. There would be some excavation in order to rebuild the stream bottom. There is an area of existing ski terrain that the applicant proposes to restore in hopes to offset the tree cutting below.

Ky asked why the State was concerned with the tree removal, specifically whether it had anything to do with the amount and flow of water. Tim stated in the negative. Tim believes it has to do with the canopy and provision of shade.

Tim added that another issue was where the lift line runs over the stream. The project proposes to put half culverts over the stream in the section where the lift runs over so that snow can be groomed over it for skiing in the winter. The culverts would be removed in mid-May and placed back in mid-October.

There will be some excavation on the edge of the buffer for the towers. Shane asked about the details of the towers. Tim stated that the tower bases were 6 feet x 7 feet. The top and bottom terminals are roughly 10 feet x 18 feet. Shane asked how deep the foundations will be dug into the ground. Tim responded below frost line, about 4-5 feet.

Shane asked about the erosion control details, specifically the stone lined ditch details. Shane did not see any notes on the callouts. Tim responded that he believes this is because the project proposes water bars and wattles in lieu of the stone lined ditching. Tim will follow up. With regard to the erosion control blankets, Shane noticed that the narrative calls for double-netted straw with plastic netting. Shane stated that the State of Vermont requires use of two natural fiber nettings of processed natural yarn, or basically jute net to hold the straw together (S150 BN).

Shane asked whether there would need to be roads put in for construction. Tim stated that the plan is to use the existing roads on site. Applicants prefer to avoid as much disturbance as possible. Much of the cement will be airlifted to the location and dropped into place. Between

the existing roads and the airlifts, the need for additional roads to access the location is alleviated. Ky asked whether stone would need to be put in underneath. Tim believes some stone will be necessary although that won't be known until digging.

Shane asked about buttoning up after stabilization, and whether 7 days or 14 days is the period. Tim stated that he had the winter conditions put in just in case. Tim stated that 14 days more realistic.

Shane asked about the tower layout and whether it embodies the ideal location. Shane noted that the second tower up near station 600 is on pretty steep slopes. Tim stated that the proposal is really a worst case scenario. Tim is hoping the towers can be spread out somewhat, farther up and down. Shane noted that if the one pile on can be moved about 20 feet uphill, the structure would be outside the stream buffer. Tim stated that there are other pieces that factor into the placement. Specifically, the towers have to be at a certain height for purposes of safety to the skiers below.

Shane asked about specific erosion control measures in the area that disturbs the stream buffer. Tim referred to the specifications on the detail, which notes silt fencing. Otherwise no other detail was provided. Shane asked whether Tim would be amenable to added erosion protection in the buffer area, such as a wattle. Tim stated that he would accept any recommendations or conditions that may help.

Lindsay moved to close the hearing and Pete seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.