

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

**TOWN OF CHARLOTTE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 5, 2015**

DRAFT

Minutes are subject to correction by the Charlotte Planning Commission. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the next Planning Commission meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff McDonald, Chair; Peter Joslin, Paul Landler, Gerald Bouchard, Linda Radimer, Marty Illick. **ABSENT:** Donna Stearns.

ADMINISTRATION: Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator.

OTHERS: Bill Root, Larry Stoneking, Tom Walsh, Gunnar McCain, George McCain, Ed Krasnow, Michael Krasnow, Sharon Richards, Douglas Weaver, Ed Cafferty, Larry Sommers, Joanne Dennee, P Darling, George Darling, Missy Kraus, Mel Huff, Roeluf Boumans, Scott Hardy, and others.

AGENDA ITEMS:

- **PC-15-02 Sketch Plan Review for KR Properties LLC for a 9 Lot Planned Residential Development off One Mile Road. (SE corner of intersection with Mount Philo Road)**
- **PC-15-04 Sketch Plan Review for Scott Hardy for a 2-lot Subdivision at 197 Mutton Hill Drive.**
- **Town Plan Responsiveness Summary**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McDonald, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVE REGULAR AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

The agenda was approved with the following additions:

- Schedule a Staff Meeting, date TBD

Documents to be signed:

- The Shays Mylar
- The Hudzick Forest Mgmt Plan.

Consent Agenda: none.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MINUTES: February 19, 2015

MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Ms. Radimer, to approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 19, 2015, as written.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Ms. Stearns), 2 abstentions (Mr. McDonald, Mr. Joslin); motion carried.

47

48 **PC-15-02 SKETCH PLAN REVIEW FOR KR PROPERTIES LLC FOR A 9-LOT**
49 **PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OFF ONE MILE ROAD. (SE corner**
50 **of intersection with Mount Philo Road)**

51 Peter Joslin said that he was an abutter to the subject property and recused himself.

52

53 Ed Krasnow, applicant, Gunnar McCain and George McCain, Jr., McCain Consulting
54 LLC, appeared on behalf of the application.

55

56 **STAFF NOTES**

57 Mr. McDonald reviewed Staff Notes.

58

59 **APPLICANT COMMENTS**

60 Mr. (Ed) Krasnow reviewed a history of the property purchased by several family
61 members and current efforts for estate planning purposes. The family had approached the
62 Charlotte Land Trust, the Vermont Land Trust and the State of Vermont regarding
63 conservation of the 88 acres without interest from the organizations or state. The current
64 plan for 9 lots fit the family goals. There was septic capacity for 17 lots, noted Mr.
65 Krasnow.

66

67 Mr. (Gunnar) McCain pointed out locations of the proposed building envelopes, open
68 space areas totaling 29 acres, shared and single access driveways, existing houses, and
69 two areas of septic capacity on the site map. The property was located in the 5 acre
70 zoning district, said Mr. McCain.

71

72 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

73 Mr. Stoneking, an abutter, asked where a tree line was located at the large meadow. Mr.
74 McCain pointed to the edge of the large meadow on the site map.

75

76 Mr. Stoneking asked if the family planned any further subdivision of the property. Mr.
77 McCain explained that no further subdivision of the property would happen as per a
78 written covenant, in perpetuity.

79

80 **PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS**

81 Mr. McDonald asked if the proposal triggered ACT 250 review. Mr. McCain replied no.
82 There were a total of 9 lots maximum, said Mr. McCain.

83

84 Mr. Landler asked for clarification of the open space related to the number of lots in the
85 proposed PRD. Mr. McCain stated that 37.5 acres of open space was defined and the
86 open space requirements have been met. The lots for the 3 existing homes would increase
87 to 12 acre, said Mr. McCain.

88

89 Mr. Stoneking asked if mobile trailers would be prohibited. Mr. McCain replied that
90 additional considerations regarding architectural control would happen as the plan
91 evolved.

92

93 Ms. Radimer reviewed that a large amount of animal movement from the State Park and
94 across the subject property as the woods were entered was noted during the February 21
95 site visit. Most of the animal activity occurred where the first house site was proposed.
96 There appeared to be wildlife corridors below the first existing house and below the steep
97 area. The evergreens east of the meadow as the topography went up hill grew close
98 together and that was a good sheltering area for animals. The additional new houses
99 proposed were up that hill. An impact study should be done for wildlife, said Ms.
100 Radimer. Mr. McCain said that it was recognized that there was wildlife in the area.
101 Three years ago the applicant approached the land trust organizations. Had this been an
102 extraordinary parcel one of the organizations would have been interested, said Mr.
103 McCain.

104
105 Mr. Stoneking stated that the Mount Philo State Park was one of the oldest in the state,
106 and expressed concern regarding impacts as development crept up the slopes of Mount
107 Philo.

108
109 Ms. McCrumb said that she had reached out to the state regarding the Almont property.
110 She would forward copies of the State Park management plan and a state interim plan for
111 the Allmon property to the applicant.

112
113 Mr. McCain explained that the applicant had asked to use an old farm road as an access
114 to minimize the number of driveways. The road could not be used, said Mr. McCain.

115
116 Mr. (Michael) Krasnow explained a history of the old pasture land noting that much of
117 the land had been pasture when they purchased. The hayed fields would continue to be
118 hayed, said Mr. Krasnow.

119
120 Mr. Bouchard asked for clarification of the proposed driveways. Mr. McCain pointed out
121 existing curb cuts and an old farm road to the large meadow on the site map. A single
122 family driveway would access a proposed 'estate-style' house on a private 2.4 acre
123 building envelope at the edge of the large meadow for a total lot of 37 acres. A shared
124 driveway would access two of the homes, said Mr. McCain.

125
126 Mr. Joslin, One Mile Road resident, said that the Town tried to minimize the number of
127 curb cuts. The eastern side two lots and two other lots have access through Half Mile
128 Road. In terms of the southern end lots, would the applicant consider moving further to
129 the west, or closer to One Mile Road where development has occurred along the road.
130 Two curb cuts could be eliminated. The area closest to Mt Philo State Park was a
131 sensitive area, said Mr. Joslin.

132
133 Ms. Radimer suggested that the area near One Mile Road would be a more logical
134 location and fewer impacts if homes were clustered versus put in the southwest area
135 where there was wildlife activity.

136
137 Ms. McCrumb said that the brook and wetlands on the property needed to be mapped.
138

139 Mr. Walsh, One Mile Road neighbor, spoke in support of the plan. However, he had
140 concerns regarding the following:

- 141 • wildlife habitat and wildlife access to the State Park – how to minimize impacts,
- 142 • a proposed private driveway to the large meadow lot versus a shared driveway,
143 and
- 144 • water supplies for the new homes.

145

146 Mr. McCain explained that the proposal called for drilled wells to serve the homes as
147 either shared wells or individual wells.

148

149 Mr. Root, One Half Mile Road resident, stated that he has walked the land with
150 permission for the last 40 years. There were deer runs, deer beds and wildlife mobility
151 throughout the property. Could there be a trail easement, asked Mr. Root.

152

153 Mr. Root explained water issues and concerns in the area, and pointed out wet areas and a
154 possible natural spring on the site map. Ms. McCrumb said that drainage areas should be
155 mapped for the record.

156

157 Ms. McCrumb said that Ben Pualwan and Don Aiken, neighbors, had asked to be
158 recognized as Interested Parties, for the record.

159

160 Ms. Illick suggested a spring time site visit in order to view vegetation, core forest values
161 and regional connectivity in terms of the proposed PRD. Clustering the homes should be
162 considered, said Ms. Illick.

163

164 Mr. (Ed) Krasnow said that the goal was to balance the family estate planning against
165 Town and animal needs, which was hard to do. The 10 acres around the existing houses
166 was 'settled' and the animals moved around and near the houses all the time. He had an
167 owl, deer, and coyotes next to his house now. The plan was to have high value homes
168 where there were lake and mountain views. The family approached the Mt Edge group to
169 seek use of an access off their road, which was rejected. He understood their concerns
170 regarding road wear and tear when there were 16 teens living there versus the 2 cars per
171 day now, said Mr. Krasnow.

172

173 Mr. McDonald explained the Sketch Plan process for a major subdivision application.
174 The Planning Commission would be interested in reviewing the state's State Park
175 management plan in relation to wildlife sensitivity along the State Park boundary. Any
176 access off Mt Philo Road was a concern due to high traffic volumes, stated Mr.
177 McDonald.

178

179 Larry Stoneking asked if the Planning Commission would support conserving the land if
180 possible. Mr. McDonald explained that it was not a role that the Planning Commission
181 was directly involved with, but the commission did encourage it.

182

183 Ms. Illick reviewed two ways to conserve land: through the purchase of development
184 rights via the Charlotte Land Trust or Vermont Land Trust, and open space agreements.

185 As a member of the Charlotte Land Trust, she was not aware of any contact regarding the
186 parcel, said Ms. Illick. Mr. (Ed) Krasnow said that two members had come to his house,
187 but they did not express interest in the parcel.

188

189 Mr. Sommers, Mt Edge Road resident, asked to be notified of future application reviews.
190 He was concerned regarding the proposed lots with scenic vistas, which were located in
191 more sensitive areas. He would be in favor of 12 clustered homes verses 9 larger lots to
192 keep homes away from the more sensitive areas, said Mr. Sommers.

193

194 Mr. (Ed) Krasnow reiterated that the goal was to have 3 higher priced homes with the
195 lake and mountain vistas. The family tried to be considerate of neighbors by not putting
196 all the homes along One Mile Road. The proposal would locate 2 houses on the east, 2
197 homes below his existing home, which would blend in with the existing houses, and
198 clustering the remaining homes, said Mr. Krasnow.

199

200 Ms. Darling, Mt Edge Road resident, asked for clarification of tree cutting parameters.
201 Mr. (Ed) Krasnow said the septic areas and areas around the proposed houses would need
202 to be cleared. Mr. McCain would do some of that planning as the application moves
203 forward. Some of the homes would be seen from Mt Edge Road, said Mr. Krasnow. Mr.
204 (Michael) Krasnow said that this was the exact area that the family had proposed
205 conserving. The land trusts were not interested. We could plan to have the least visual
206 impacts, said Mr. Krasnow.

207

208 Mr. Landler said he first thought that the land next to the State Park should be left open.
209 However, well designed homes next to the State Park would be attractive to residents.
210 Development was already happening next to the State Park; lots 8, 7, and 6 were a
211 continuation of existing development along the east side, pointed out Mr. Landler.

212

213 Mr. McDonald summarized that the Planning Commission would like a second site visit
214 in the spring, state information regarding a State Park management plan needed to be
215 reviewed, and he suggested continuing the Sketch Plan review related to proposed home
216 locations, water issues and drainage. As the application review continued then studies
217 could be requested, said Mr. McDonald.

218

219 **MOTION by Mr. Landler, seconded by Ms. Illick, to continue PC-15-02, Sketch**
220 **Plan Review for KR Properties LLC, for a 9-lot Planned Residential Development**
221 **off One Mile Road to April 16, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. and to schedule a site visit for**
222 **Saturday, April 11, 2015, at 9:00 a.m.**

223

VOTE: 5 ayes, 1 absent (Ms. Stearns), 1 recused (Mr. Joslin); motion carried.

224

225 Mr. Joslin rejoined the Planning Commission.

226

227 **PC-15-04 SKETCH PLAN REVIEW FOR SCOTT HARDY FOR A 2-LOT**
228 **SUBDIVISION AT 197 MUTTON HILL DRIVE.**

229

Scott Hardy, owner, appeared on behalf of the application.

230

231 STAFF NOTES

232 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes. A site visit was conducted on February 21, 2015, at
233 10:11 a.m.

234

235 APPLICANT COMMENTS

236 Mr. Hardy reviewed the following:

- 237 • There was an existing 10 acre parcel that would be subdivided into two 5 acre
238 lots.
- 239 • He would use two curb cuts off an existing driveway to the 2 lots.
- 240 • Neighbors were concerned regarding a steep portion of the existing driveway. He
241 planned to chip out the steep area on the driveway to a lesser degree of slope as
242 shown as a 'hatched' marking on the site map.
- 243 • He intends to build his personal house on Lot 2.
- 244 • There was an existing 60' right-of-way.
- 245 • There were 5 existing houses on the existing private ROW. There was an informal
246 home owners association that shared snow plowing and trash removal costs.
- 247 • The proposed houses would be located in line with the existing houses.

248

249 PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

250 Ms. McCrumb said that Mutton Hill Road was a private road, with ledge outcrops. At the
251 proposed house site the slope was more gradual, said Ms. McCrumb.

252

253 Ms. Radimer said that there was wildlife movement noted during the site visit.

254

255 Mr. McDonald said that the private road agreement language should be cleaned up. Mr.
256 Hardy pointed out to where a portion of Mutton Hill Road was paved and was a town
257 road. The road turned to a private gravel road past Small's house, said Mr. Hardy.

258

259 Mr. Landler asked if the proposed house would be the 6th house on the private road. Mr.
260 Hardy replied yes. Mr. Landler asked if the number of houses would trigger road
261 improvements as per the Town road standards.

262

263 Mr. Joslin read regulations regarding road standards for a 6 lot, or more development,
264 which required a minimum width of 18' with 2' shoulders.

265

266 In response to commission questions, Mr. Hardy said that he would adjust the slope of
267 the existing road and his two lots would have separate access. Mr. Hardy pointed out the
268 location of an existing well and two septic areas on the site map.

269

270 Ms. Illick suggested minimizing the building envelope sizes to reduce the impacts to the
271 State and Town Habitat blocks. Was there a way to bring the proposed house closer to the
272 road and away from the habitat blocks, asked Ms. Illick. Ms. McCrumb said that the
273 proposed house location was fine, however the proposed 1 acre building envelope could
274 be one-half acre.

275

276 Mr. McDonald said that the proposal was 'in-fill' development, which the Town was
277 encouraging. The commission could ask for a one-half acre building envelope set closer
278 to the road, said Mr. McDonald. Mr. Hardy stated he sited the house up on the hill to
279 catch a morning sun.

280

281 **MOTION by Ms. Radimer, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to classify PC-15-04, Sketch**
282 **Plan Review for Scott Hardy for a 2-lot Subdivision at 197 Mutton Hill Road as a**
283 **Minor Subdivision.**

284 **VOTE: 6 ayes, 1 absent (Ms. Stearns); motion carried.**

285

286 Ms. McCrumb noted that two of the Mutton Hill Road neighbors had attended the
287 February 21, 2015 site visit, and Mr. Ferrara had contacted the Town for Interested Party
288 status.

289

290 **TOWN PLAN RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY**

291 The Commission agreed to table this item given time constraints and staff illness.

292

293 **ADJOURNMENT**

294 **MOTION by Mr. Landler, seconded by Ms. Radimer, to adjourn the meeting.**

295 **VOTE: 6 ayes, 1 absent (Ms. Stearns); motion carried.**

296

297 The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

298

299 Minutes respectfully submitted, Kathlyn L. Furr, Recording Secretary.

300

301