

CITY OF BARRE, VERMONT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, June 4, 2026

Location: Council Chambers, City Hall, 6 N. Main Street, Barre VT

1. Call to Order:

Chair Sarah Helman called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

Roll Call:

Board Members Present:

- Sarah Helman, Chair, Ward II (In-Person)
- Chrysta Murray, Vice Chair Ward I (Video)
- Michelle Farnham, Ward I (Video)
- Jayme Bauer, Ward II (Video)
- Katrina Pelkey Ward III (In-Person)
- Colin Doolittle Ward III (In-Person)
- Philip Back, At Large (In-Person)
- Liz Turner, At-Large (In-Person)

Staff Present:

- Janet Shatney, Planning Director
- Robin L. Davis, Permit Administrator

Public Present: From presentations and Sign-in sheet In-person

- Brian Lane-Karnas P.E. representing applicant Good Samaritan Haven (GSH)
- Gregory Montgomery, Studio Architect for GSH
- Julie Bond, Executive Director for GSH
- Keith Goslant, audience for GSH
- Laurie Sabens, audience for GSH
- Reverend Earl Kooparkemp, audience for GSH
- Michael Ornitz, audience for GSH

2. Adjustments to Agenda: None

3. Visitors and Communication: None

4. Old Business:

a. Consideration February 5, 2026, Minutes:

Motion to approve was made by Katrina Pelkey and seconded by Liz Turner, motion **carried unanimously 8-0-0**. * Rescinded See c below.

b. Consideration February 5, 2026, Decision

Motion to approve decision for 0 Campbell parking lot, was made by Chrysta Murray and seconded by Jayme Bauer. The motion **carried unanimously -8-0-0**.

c. Clerical Error in minutes for February 5, 2026, noted by Liz Turner – wrong minutes were provided in the DRB Packet. Motion to rescind minutes previously approved motion was made by Liz Turner to rescind and seconded by Colin Doolittle, **motion carried unanimously 8-0-0**

d. Consideration for January 5, 2026, Final Decision with amendment to attendance:

Motion to approve made by Colin Doolittle and seconded by Jayme Bauer motion **carried unanimously 8-0-0**

5. New Business – Public Hearing:

DRB Application #Z26-000017

Applicant: Good Samaritan Haven, by and through Brian Lane-Karnas P.E.

Location: 24 Jefferson Street, MU-1 Zoning District, Conditional Use.

Request: Seeks conditional use for relocation of GSH to 24 Jefferson Street as a 24-Bed Emergency Shelter to be open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with a maximum stay of 90 Days.

Board Discussion: Summary of Board questions, clarifications, and discussion.

Applicant Testimony: B. Lane-Karnas, on behalf of GSH introduced himself as Civil Engineer for the project, Gregory Montgomery introduced himself as the Architect for the project and Julie Bond, identified herself as Executive Director of GSH. Chair Helman asked if they wish to continue with the hearing or postpone the hearing. It was agreed to move forward with the hearing.

Chair Helman read the brief overview of the matter before the board for the evening, asked if there was anything that needed to be read into record. R. Davis stated no.

Motion made to begin the hearing for 24 Jefferson Street application. L. Turner motioned to begin the hearing seconded by P. Back. **Carried Unanimously 8-0-0.** Hearing called to order at **6:12 P.M.**

Chair Helman reminded the audience to sign in if they had not already. Requested who was to speak about this application, and if there was anyone else here to speak to on this application. Chair Helman swore the representatives in.

The Oath was administered by S. Helman to B. Lane-Karnas, G. Montgomery, and J. Bond.

B. Lane-Karnas gave a brief presentation of the materials provided to the Board Members, including clarification of renovations of the property to accommodate the new usage of the property, including the new location being open 24 hours 7 days a week, with a maximum stay of 90 days, guests will not be required to leave during the day.

J. Bond Project is an innovative to ensure that the people GSH serve are away from a flood zone and make a commitment to serve the members of the community in times of need.

Floor was opened up for questions by the board members to B. Lane-Karnas.

- **Member K. Pelkey** – Praised the work done for the presentation was great. She referred to the picture provided on the Staff Report, about the exterior structure of the house, the porch on the 2nd floor leading down to the 1st floor, will that stairway be retained? B. Lane-

Karnas replied no it was being removed. With respect to egress, all the appropriate lengths and pathways will be up to code. K. Pelkey then asked if the 3rd floor balcony on the left side of the structure will it be retained? G. Montgomery replied no as the new building will be equipped with a sprinkler system forgoing the need of the balcony.

- **Member C. Doolittle asked** if it was the plan to close the existing shelter once the new shelter is complete. J. Bond states that once this is complete, the old shelter will be closed. The future maintenance of the old location is not tenable. It is the intention of changing the old location possibility into a park. B- Lane-Karnas clarified that the Seminary Street location is not part of this project. That would be a different application.
- **Member L. Turner** inquired about the impermeable surface increase, is there any efforts to offset some of the impermeable surface increase through landscaping B. Lane-Karnas attempted to share site plan with the members of the hearing with his computer. This was unsuccessful. B. Lane-Karnas then described the landscaping plan. There aren't any specific stormwater treatment practices on site because specifics due to the size of the project and not having an impact on the wider community outside the property. Some of the increases of the impermeable in the back where the sideway and smoke shelter is off set by the removal of the front walk up to the building at least 8-9 feet, and additional landscaping in the front of the building. The landscaping plan is really robust and will be mostly a passive stormwater treatment. It does balance out as much as possible the impervious condition and adding plants to the front.
- **Member L. Turner** inquired about the driveway; the modifications plan seems great, but does it trigger the modification provision in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) as the grade of the driveway is being adjusted, would those plans need to be presented to Department of Public Works (DPW)? B. Lane-Karnas, they are not proposing any changes to the width or length of the driveway, it is intended to change the grade to meet accessibility requirements, taking it from a steep slope to a easier access, does not believe it would have to be put to DPW.
- **Member L. Turner** inquired about the proposed smoking shelter, concerning the 4-foot set back requirements. B. Lane-Karnas states it meets the 4-foot setback requirements.
- **Member L. Turner** inquired about the agreement between Barre Elks Lodge (BEL) and GSH, regarding ongoing maintaining of the retaining wall and dumpsters. B. Lane-Karnas, is uncertain about what that agreement will look like at this time, as it has not been drafted, but to his mind, BEL has agreed to be represented for the zoning permit. How it works out, with a formal agreement or not, is less relevant to the zoning process.

- **Member P. Back** inquired regarding the smoking shelter, as the setback is 8 feet from the main building. B. Lane-Karnas replied, it is not 8 feet from the building; it is not possible to have the 4 feet from a property line and 8 feet from the building, it is just too small.
- **Member P. Back** inquired about the fence, how will the fence effect the drainage into the adjacent lot if at all. B. Lane-Karnas replied they do not expect to have any impact on drainage; it is intended to maintain the existing drainage patterns. The lot is so small, the 12-foot set back from the rear property line crosses through the new sidewalk in the back, it's very tight and the best we can do for this project is to maintain the current drainage patterns.
- **Member P. Back** inquired concerning the removal of the walkway at the front of the building including the steps, does this mean the new entrance will be the driveway. B. Lane Karnas confirmed that the driveway would be for delivery and loading, not used as a driveway. It will be access to guests and staff will enter the building from that area; this location is controlled.
- **Member P. Back** inquired regarding DPW approval for any part of this. B. Lane Karnas stated there is no work in the right-of-way. The only thing not in the DRB Packet is the sprinkler system, as DPW will have to approve a new water connection for the sprinkler system. DPW would need to issue water and sewage allocations, it is not unusual or trigger any concerns for DPW
- **Member J. Bauer** stated her questions about egress were answered, and her questions with the MOU with BEL have also been answered. The final question has to do with ongoing landscaping, making sure everything looks nice between the 2 properties. B. Lane-Karnas, replied he was unsure what she meant about the 2 properties. He went on to describe the ongoing landscaping that is proposed, and it does meet all requirements of the zoning regulations. J. Bauer's final question was in regard to signage. B. Lane-Karnas replied that this would be done under a separation application with the city.
- **Member C. Murray** stated that all her questions were answered.
- **Member M. Farnham** inquired about 24-bed is an increase from the current facility. J. Bond stated she believed that the original permitting for the shelter was in the 20's and may be higher than 24. The number of beds were reduced during the COVID era and now they are looking to increase the capacity, but not outside the size of the original shelter.
- **Applicant B. Lane-Karnas** mentioned an item he wanted to address which was the request for reduction in minimum parking spaces. He also wanted to address the Staff Recommendations contained in the staff report. With respect to the agreement between

GSH and BEL it is requested that this not be part of the approval, since there is no agreement at this time. With respect to the lighting, this fully meets the requirements under UDO, and it is requested to omit the “residential in scale” from the staff's recommendations.

6. Public Comment: None

With no further input from the Board, or the public, Chair S. Helman stated the Board would enter into a deliberative session at the closing of the hearing. Chair S. Helman also noted the Board would return from a deliberative session to issue its decision. Applicants may contact the Permit Administrator on the following day for the outcome if a decision is rendered promptly, and a written decision will be issued within 2 weeks.

Motion by P. Back and seconded by C. Doolittle to end the hearing and enter into a deliberative session at 6:38 P.M. **Motion passed unanimously 8-0-0.**

7. Deliberative Session:

Motion by C. Doolittle to begin a deliberative session, seconded by L. Turner, inviting the Planning Director and Permit Administrator to remain. **Motion passed unanimously 8-0-0.**

Motion by K. Pelkey to close the deliberative session, seconded by C. Doolittle at 7:00 P.M. **Motion passed unanimously 8-0-0.**

8. Deliberative Session closed Meeting reopened for voting on motion of application 7:01 P.M.

L. Turner made motion to grant approval of the application with following conditions:

1. Submission of the Final Site Plan with ADA access, new walkway and driveway reconstruction and retaining wall details.
2. Any signage requests will be submitted under separation application for zoning permit approval
3. Waiver of the off-street parking requirements as requested in the application.
4. If the final agreement with regards to the retaining wall changes the design of the site plan, the new design must be submitted to DRB for approval.
5. Any immaterial or non-substantive modifications to the approved plans may be authorized by the Zoning Administrator.

Motion seconded by P. Back. **Motion passed unanimously 8-0-0**

9. Round Table: With respect to schedule DRB Meeting for July 2, 2026, this was brought up by Chair S. Helman as it is a popular holiday weekend. Who would be available to attend that meeting? S. Helman advised there were 2 applications for the next DRB Session.

A Special Meeting Date of July 13, 2026, which all members of the DRB Board stated they were available except for C. Doolittle as this was his last DRB meeting since his term was complete.

10. Adjournment:

Motion by J. Bauer to adjourn meeting, seconded by C. Murray. The meeting closed at 7:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin L Davis, Permit Administrator

DRAFT