



131 Church Street Suite 200 Burlington, VT
05401 Office: 802.862.0098 | www.
segroup.com

TO: Melissa Manka, Taylor Newton
FROM: Tom Hand
CC: All Attendees
DATE: October 27, 2021, Revised October 29, 2021
RE: Westford- Pigeon Property Site Plan | Oct. 27 Steering Committee Meeting

PLEASE CONTACT THE AUTHOR IMMEDIATELY IF THERE ARE ANY DISCREPANCIES IN THE CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT.

Attendees

<i>Name, Title</i>	<i>Organization</i>
Melissa Manka	Town of Westford – Town Planner
Taylor Newton	Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
Daniel Albrecht	Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
David Mullin	Green Mountain Habitat for Humanity
Chris Haggerty	Button Professional Land Surveyors (BPLS)
Stephen Diglio	KAS Consulting
Steve Libby	Vermont River Conservancy (VRC)
Mark Letorney	Westford Planning Commission
Tom Hand	SE Group
Mark Kane	SE Group
Jake Ferreira	SE Group

Discussion

1. Survey Update

- a. Boundaries of the site are an on-going issue - Current eastern / riverfront boundary is questionable -- Limit along commons to south is also questionable
- b. Research component is the driver of the schedule on this - land records back to 1820 to ascertain where property lines are.
- c. Big Question - are the existing records valid when the historic boundary evidence is no longer there? Historic deeds point to corners of structures that are no longer existing. Not sure we will find definitive boundaries for 1705 parcel and surrounding abutters.
- d. Feel confident in Western and Northern Boundaries - Not so sure about Eastern Boundary @ hotel – Used to be grist mill, a factory, and a little road for river access
- e. Historical confusion to width of rt 128 - VTRANS took over a 3 rod right of way not a 5 rod right of way.
- f. **So what do we do** -- interview abutters to see if they have further information or survey work, feel out their opinions -- Next Step: should make some sort of boundary agreement with abutters and move on -- do the same for the southern boundary at commons

2. Related Projects

- a. Stormwater Scoping Study – Hoyle, Tanner are looking at stormwater throughout the commons

coming from public roads and properties, as well as culvert under VT Rt 128 – they are also "looking at highway," funded by the state...

- i. Culvert is low point of commons and will most likely remain
- ii. Adjustments in the common will end up adjusting height of culvert
- iii. Collection of stormwater along edge of 128 is needed but minimal
- iv. Agreed that both projects would benefit from some filling of the ravine, cleaning up culvert, and erosion control in ravine

b. PAH/Contamination and Ravine

- i. Area around the ravine is fill - hard to find the end of the contamination. Ravine has higher contamination than surrounding area.
- ii. LE Environmental will need to do another study to define area of contamination in ravine.
- iii. Work that is done in this area will have to take into consideration what type of contamination mitigation... cap? keep vegetation and cordon off area? Need further conversation on best practices for all projects.
- iv. Who will carry the cleanup efforts for consultants is of further discussion as well.
- v. Geotechnical issues resulting from fill and differential settlement will have big impact on how development on the parcel will be supported. Could mean a decent amount of soil will need to be removed, cleanup or not, stabilization of the ravine will need to be done either way. Potential option to preload site with big pile of dirt and let settlement happen up front.
- vi. Storm water impacts - will need to address runoff from contamination as ravine work happens. Cleaning up the culvert will help with treatment, but will need to address how much water is being treated as runoff from commons and 1705 parcel runoff enters ravine. Wood debris dam could be used to create check dams without using heavy equipment. Also could use energy dissipater at end of culvert, concrete or natural.

c. Town Wastewater –

- i. Oct. 19th Community Waste Water meeting - +/- 100 participants
- ii. minority of people did not want development
- iii. Roughly 80% of respondents are interested in connecting to service area.
- iv. Doing outreach for both projects at the same time is challenging with people averse to development.
- v. Form based code would ensure that the property is developed in a way that fits the historic character of the area.

d. Pigeon House Appraisal - select board will be signing off on appraisal this week and by mid-December we should have an appraisal for 1705.

e. Town of office renovations - Library building will stay separate and town offices will be renovated in place

- i. driveway through buildings is a survey issue - in 1980s a right-of-way appeared in the landowners deed and it is now unclear who owns the drive way in-between the library and town office

3. Development Options Review

a. Path to River –

- i. Would be good to be able to compare an 8% path to 5% path. Would be interested in seeing an elevated walkway that could go through the wetland buffer?

- ii. Giving purpose to the path – If the path does need to be windy and long could we give it more purpose, eg, Johnson > arboretum for pathway -- Community garden? –
 - iii. Steve libby thinks the width of path is ok, has also done the 8% path and it works OK but thinks it is a great goal to keep full access to the river edge with a 5% path if possible -- maybe there is a scheme with a straight path/ accessible path combo - longer path can be seen as a health amenity
 - iv. Northern property of site may not be able to house contaminated soil if we wanted to use mounds to cap contaminated soils
- b. Concept 1
- i. If path could start at town office lot that would give recreational people the idea to park there instead of in the commercial lot.
 - ii. May just want to show on-street parking on one option -people may think it is to urban - - currently overflow parking is along common road - could just show path across commons
 - iii. Should have two specific accessible parking spots for the path - Drop off spot?
- c. Concept 2
- i. Generally positive feedback, may need more parking
- d. Concept 3
- i. Could be a carriage court as well - maybe 6 units as opposed to 10
 - ii. Fire access is questionable
 - iii. 10 units may be too much for wastewater and town perception
 - iv. If you lose the back building that could alleviate the parking and stormwater issues, love the character of the courtyards
 - v. Good concept as a discussion point - shows potential of the site within the code
 - vi. Footprint for replacement of town offices is a bit small in all options
 - vii. Might be to suburban - not sure if it is keeping in context with the village
 - viii. Showing this much development may have negative impact on Wastewater vote by scaring people
 - ix. Reality is that for this to work we need to fill ravine and slide building 4 forward

Responsibilities List

- 4. Responsibilities
 - a. SE Group to collect individual comments and revise concepts as needed.

Next Meeting

- 5. Tuesday Nov. 9th - Public Meeting via Public Access / Live Stream / In-Person