

**Town of Danville, Development Review Board**  
**Permit 2025-29, Waiver Hearing**

**Applicant:** Rural Edge Housing and Community Development, for Danville Senior Citizens Housing

**Site:** TH114-003.001, 98 Grandview Avenue, Danville VT 05828

**Zoning District:** Village Residential

**Project Description:** The project involves the renovation and expansion of the existing building on the property, reconfiguration of the existing parking area, and improved pedestrian access. The building expansion involves reconstructing the middle of the existing building into a new, two-story section and expanding the footprint of this area to the south. The project will increase the number of units from ten to sixteen.

**Warning:** 02 May 2025 (Caledonia Record).

**Hearing Date:** 18 June 2025.

**Development Review Board Members Present:** Mickey Bullock, Brian Henderson (Chair), Terry Hoffer, Bob Magro, Bruce Palmer, Larry Rossi, Wes Standish.

**Development Review Board Members Absent:** Craig Morris,

**Interested Parties Present:** Jess Gasik (Project Architect), Laura Gogue, Brian Lane-Karnas (Project Engineer), Louise Legendre, Ken Linsley, Dennis Marquise (Zoning Administrator), Rebecca Masure, Lindsey Mitchell, Audrey Phelps, Betty Remiqu, Patrick Shattuck(Applicant),

**Correspondence from Interested Parties:** None

**Disclosure of Conflict of Interest:** None by board.

**Disclosure of *Ex Parté* Communication:** None by board.

**Applicable Bylaws:**

This application requires a review by the DRB under the following section of the Danville Bylaws:

Sec 304, page 17. Waivers

Sec 414, page 27, Affordable Housing

Sec 512, page 39, Village Residential

Sec 603, page 68, Non-conforming Structures

**Findings of Fact:**

Sec 304.2 B, Waivers, and Sec 305.2 B, Variances:

***Must not approve** a waiver to allow a prohibited use, **an increase in residential density**, or the subdivision of a lot that does not conform to the applicable provisions of these regulations.*

Sec 414.1, Affordable Housing:

*An affordable Housing development as defined in Article 2 served by municipal water and sewer is permitted to exceed residential density limitations by 40%. Such developments may also exceed maximum building height by one story. The density bonus will be rounded up to the nearest whole number of units.*

The density **bonus** is calculated on the number of units, not the square feet of the lot. This is a **bonus** calculation, **not a reduction** in required square feet per unit. The bylaw text is identical to Act 181, Sec. 52. 24 V.S.A. § 4412-13

#### Sec 512, Village Residential

*Multi-Unit Residential Density: 8,500 sq. ft. of lot area per dwelling unit*

*Maximum Building Footprint. The total combined footprint for all principal buildings on a single lot in this district shall not exceed 4,000 square feet.*

*In no case shall the total at-grade impervious area on a single lot (including but not limited to parking, loading areas, walkways, and patios, but excluding building roofs) exceed 2,500 square feet.*

With a lot size of 1.85 acres, the applicant would be permitted 9.48 units, rounding up to 10. Ten units would be entitled to a 40% bonus, for a net of 14 units. A waiver or variance is not permitted to increase residential density above this number of units.

The proposed impervious area is 8449 SF (which incorrectly does not include buildings), exceeding the 2500 SF permitted in the bylaw. The existing impervious area is 12,244 SF. This is a reduction in non-conformity.

#### Sec 603.1, Non-Conforming Structures:

*A non-conforming structure (outside of Flood Hazard Areas) may be continued indefinitely and may be expanded without limitation provided the expansion is in accordance with any applicable requirements of this bylaw.*

***Does not increase the degree of non-conformance and meets the requirements regarding expansion of a non-conforming use.***

The proposed building footprint is 8,990 SF, exceeding the 4000 SF permitted in the bylaw. The existing non-conforming structure has a footprint of 6,558 SF.

### Summary of Discussion:

Patrick Shattuck from Rural Edge explained the history of the project. Rural Edge was approached by the residents to assume ownership and management of the senior housing. They proposed upgrading the property to meet the design and material requirements for current senior housing, along with increasing the residential capacity. There is currently a waitlist for residents of 30 people, with an approximate turnover of four years. Their plan is to rehab and expand the building while not displacing any residents. It was noted that this project is not “subsidized housing”, although there will be different levels of affordability.

Brian Lane-Karnas, PE, explained the project and the site plan. The center of the existing building would be expanded to the south and have another story added. This would add six additional units, along with a first floor common area and “SASH” office for resident services. There will be no elevator. He further reviewed the wetlands portion, stormwater issues and landscaping, responding to several questions from the board. Landscaping will be limited to allow for snow removal and storage. A fenced dumpster area will be provided at the west end of the building.

Jess Gasek, project architect, further explained the project details. The existing units would be rehabbed to include new kitchens and baths. Eight of the existing units will retain laundry hookups, while the rest of the units will have a common laundry facility. The average one-bedroom unit will be 500-700 SF. One proposed unit will be two-story. The newly installed heat pumps will be retained for the existing units. The project will be “solar ready” as required by code, but panels are likely not included in the budget.

**Decision and Conditions:**

The board was in agreement that this is a well-designed and nicely presented project. There is certainly a desperate need to increase housing stock in our area. While the board would like to support this project, there are several constraints in the Danville Bylaws that do not permit our approval.

Larry Rossi motioned to deny the application as submitted based on residential density and footprint. Bob Magro seconded the motion. With all in favor, the motion stands.

The Board would welcome a revised application with 14 permissible units, per Sec 414.1, and with a reduced footprint, for reconsideration.

**Signed:**

*Brian Henderson*

Brian Henderson, Chair, Danville Development Review Board

**Date of Decision:** 18 June 2025

**Final Appeal Date:** 18 July 2025

**NOTICE:**

This decision may be appealed to the Vermont Environmental Court by an interested person who participated in the proceedings (in person or in writing) before the Development Review Board. Such appeal must be made within 30 days of the date of this decision, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. #4471 and Rule 5(b) of the Vermont Rules for Environmental Court Proceedings.