

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

**TOWN OF CHARLOTTE
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 3, 2014**

APPROVED

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 (arrived 7:07 p.m.); Gerald Bouchard, Paul Landler, Peter Joslin, Marty Illick. **ABSENT:** Donna Stearns, Linda Radimer.

ADMINISTRATION: Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator.

OTHERS: Clark Hinsdale III, Joanna Cummings, Andrea Grayson, Mark Keppel, Brandy Saxton, and others.

AGENDA ITEMS:

- **PC-14-13 Continuation Nordic Holsteins/Hinsdale Testamentary Trust Final Subdivision/Boundary Adjustment for properties located at 1824 Hinesburg Road and portion of adjacent Bean Farm.**
- **PC-14-10 Continuation of Sketch Plan Review for Andrea Grayson and Mark Keppel for a 2-lot subdivision Amendment at 322 Oak Hill Road.**
- **Town Plan Outreach Schedule w/Brandy Saxton of PlaceSense.**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Joslin, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

APPROVE REGULAR AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

Consent Agenda: none.

Mr. McDonald arrived and assumed the Chair at 7:08 p.m..

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MINTUES: May 15, June 5, 2014

MOTION by Mr. Bouchard, seconded by Ms. Illick, to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 15, 2014 as written, with the following edits:

- **Page 3, line 108: change the word “logging” to read “logged”;**
- **Page 3, lines 116 and 121: replace the “****” with the name “Ms. Radimer”, and globally change the word “prime” with “primary”;**
- **Page 4, line 134: correct the word “degregading” to “degrading”;**
- **Page 5, line 183: delete from “...in order...” to the end of the sentence.**

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 abstention (Mr. Landler); motion carried.

46 **MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to approve the Planning**
47 **Commission minutes of June 5, 2014 as written, with the following edits:**

- 48 • **Page 3, line 95: delete “dated 05/01/2014”, and rewrite to read: “...on the**
49 **adjoining Bean Farm, and an ecological assessment by Keith Thompson,**
50 **County Forester, on the subject property...”;** line 120: correct the name
51 **“Colvin”;**
52 • **Page 4, Line 148: insert the word “was” between the words “access” and**
53 **“an”;**

54 **VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 abstention (Mr. Joslin); motion carried.**
55

56 **PC-14-13 CONTINUATION: NORDIC HOLSTEINS/HINSDALE**
57 **TESTAMENTARY TRUST FINAL SUBDIVISION/BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT**
58 **FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 1824 HINESBURG ROAD AND PORTION**
59 **OF ADJACENT BEAN FARM.**

60 Clark Hinsdale III, Trustee, appeared on behalf of the application.
61

62 **STAFF NOTES**

63 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes.
64

65 **SITE VISIT:**

66 Four Planning Commission members, Ms. Radimer, Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Landler and Ms.
67 Illick, and Joanna Cummings, Conservation Commission member, conducted a site walk
68 of the subject property on Saturday June 28th. Mr. Bouchard said that he estimated that
69 there were 500 (sugar maple) taps versus the 1,200 reported by Mr. Hinsdale, although he
70 did not walk all the way to the north boundary. There was one 5 acre site he identified
71 that would keep a home out of the woods. Septic could be located off site for that 5 acres.
72 If development was concentrated around a big cul de sac a single well could feed all
73 those homes. The woods climbed in elevation steeper than the meadow and water flowing
74 from the woods would cause problems with foundations if a house was located in the
75 woods, said Mr. Bouchard.
76

77 Ms. Illick noted that the quality of the woods was rich and had not been cleared for
78 farming. They were not mature woods, but a smaller habitat patch. She envisioned a
79 development plan that would not encroach into the woods. Houses could be sited closer
80 to the fields, or just into the woods edge. There was a nice tree island for a privacy
81 aspect. An old stone wall that was in the scrubby edge of the forest could also be used as
82 a part of the housing edge if the scrubby area was cleared, said Ms. Illick.
83

84 Mr. Landler asked for clarification of a single housing site proposed on Lot 2. Mr.
85 Hinsdale replied that it was a previous plan proposed by a prospective buyer who had
86 backed out. The plan has merit that he has continued to consider. He would like to
87 continue the hearing for the purpose of exploring other options, said Mr. Hinsdale.
88

89 **APPLICANT COMMENTS**

90 Mr. Hinsdale submitted an alternate Final Plat by Stuart Morrow, dated March 2014,
91 which identified a home site at the edge of the woods where it was shady and had a view.

92 Mr. Hinsdale pointed to a tree row shaped in a “C” on the Morrow site plan, and 5
93 possible home sites with a small building lot at the “C”.

94

95 Mr. Hinsdale said that he would flag potential home sites. He didn’t want to sell the
96 woods. A question was if it was a waste to sell the existing mobile home 5 acre lot as is,
97 or to split the lot into two 2.5 acre lots, said Mr. Hinsdale.

98

99 PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

100 Mr. Bouchard asked if the stone wall that was seen on the site walk could be used in
101 some way. Mr. Hinsdale noted that there were several stone walls on the property.

102

103 In response to a suggestion by Ms. Illick to consider a PRD along the front of the
104 property, Mr. Hinsdale said that there problems with more density. The existing trailer on
105 the 5 acre lot could be moved further from the road to the back of the lot where there
106 were some 15”-16” oak and maple trees. The woods in that area go uphill and it would be
107 shady. There was an area just into the woods where it was level and the soils were good,
108 said Mr. Hinsdale.

109

110 Ms. Illick said that some home purchasers were seeking smaller lots and affordable
111 housing on a smaller scale. Mr. Hinsdale replied that was a proposal that would work
112 well on a 15 acre parcel located in the East Village.

113

114 Mr. Hinsdale stated that the trailer lot has an existing well and septic. There were two
115 places on the property that could be used for a community septic system – one was at the
116 old potato field where there was deep Stockbridge loam, said Mr. Hinsdale.

117

118 Mr. Landler asked if there were more than one home proposed for Lot 1. Mr. Hinsdale
119 reiterated that the sugar woods would remain with Lot 1, which was in Current Use. The
120 dotted line on the site map was an easement and the 71 acres were already conserved.
121 There was one home site proposed on Lot 1. The right-of-way was not conserved. He was
122 suggesting splitting the existing 5 acre Lot 2 into lots 2 and 3, explained Mr. Hinsdale.

123

124 Ms. Illick asked for clarification of the Bean Farm conservation easement that
125 encompassed both the north and south sides of the Hinesburg Road. Mr. Hinsdale
126 explained that he wanted to leave it as one easement, which would end up at either 81
127 or 100 acres. He did not want to subdivide the woods from the farm lot. Easements of this
128 type could only be split if there was an eligible agricultural reason to do so, said Mr.
129 Hinsdale.

130

131 Mr. Hinsdale reviewed language from the 2010 easement agreement. The structures on
132 the north side of the road were a ‘farmstead complex’, clarified Mr. Hinsdale.

133

134 Mr. Bouchard asked if the water well on Lot 2 could service 5 homes. Mr. Hinsdale
135 explained that the lot had a lot of water. A single house required at least 5 gpm of flow.
136 He would have an answer to that question at the next hearing. The maximum density
137 would be 3 home sites: for Lot 2 the 5 acres could be divided into two 2.5 acre lots, and

138 one home site on Lot 1 behind the “C” tree line. He would prepare a memo and a map
139 prior to the next hearing, said Mr. Hinsdale.

140

141 Ms. McCrumb said that if a building envelope was put behind the tree island versus into
142 the woods then the site map could be revised. Mr. Hinsdale replied that a building
143 envelope could be created to include the area around the tree island and at the “C” area
144 for a future idea.

145

146 Mr. Joslin suggested another site visit.

147

148 There was discussion regarding classification of the application. Ms. McCrumb read the
149 Sketch Plan Letter, dated 04/04/2014, related to the number of lots. Mr. Hinsdale said
150 that there were lots 2 and 3. There were four building envelope sites left on the un-
151 conserved land on Lot 1, pointed out Mr. Hinsdale.

152

153 **MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Mr. Landler, to continue the hearing for PC-**
154 **14-13, for Nordic Holsteins/Hinsdale Testamentary Trust Final**
155 **Subdivision/Boundary Adjustment for properties located at 1824 Hinesburg Road**
156 **and a portion of the adjacent Bean Farm to August 7, 2014, and a site visit at 5:45**
157 **p.m. August 7, 2014.**

158 **VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

159

160 **PC-14-10, CONTINUATION OF SKETCH PLAN REVIEW FOR ANDREA**
161 **GRAYSON AND MARK KEPPEL FOR A 2-LOT SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**
162 **AT 322 OAL HILL ROAD**

163 Andrea Grayson and Mark Keppel, owners, appeared on behalf of the application.

164

165 STAFF NOTES

166 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes.

167

168 APPLICANT COMMENTS

169 Ms. Grayson reviewed that new photographs had been submitted and a revised site
170 drawing. The new proposal included the following points:

171

- 172 • The lower contiguous forest would be left alone.
- 173 • The existing house and 5 acres would be separated out.
- 174 • The existing cabin would keep the remaining 29 acres.
- 175 • Two micro-houses would be built on the ledge behind the cabin.
- 176 • A 2 acre open area could be used for a solar array, or a garden.
- 177 • There were two lots currently divided into a 10 acre lot and a 24 acre lot.
- 178 • The 2 bedroom camp has an approved septic that has been tested and could serve
179 4 bedrooms.
- 180 • A single well could serve the camp and 2 micro-houses.

180

181 PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

182 Ms. McCrumb clarified that the state septic rules required a minimum of 2 bedrooms per
183 house, not 1 bedroom. A 6 bedroom mound system would be needed, said Ms.
184 McCrumb.

185
186 Ms. Grayson asked if two 1-bedroom rental micro-homes were possible versus
187 subdividing the lot. Ms. McCrumb asked if the rentals would be seasonal, or year round.
188 If they were seasonal then it would be a camp ground. As accessory dwellings you could
189 have one accessory and one residential dwelling, said Ms. McCrumb. Mr. McDonald
190 suggested converting the existing camp into a house and adding one accessory dwelling.

191
192 Ms. Grayson asked if she built more than one accessory dwelling, would the Town Plan
193 language need to be amended.

194
195 Ms. McCrumb said she was suggesting subdividing a lot and a community shared system.
196 Ms. Grayson replied that she could do one 29 acre lot and do the rest the next year. Ms.
197 McCrumb suggested subdividing the existing house and five acres and a 29 acre lot now.
198 Ms. Grayson said that a 29 acre lot could be put into Current Use and managed as a wood
199 lot.

200
201 There was further discussion regarding accessory dwellings related to Section 4.2, page
202 37, of the Land Use regulations; an accessory dwelling requirement that the main house
203 had to be owner occupied ; and that an accessory dwelling had to be less than 30 percent
204 of the main house floor space, or 1,000 square feet.

205
206 Mr. Landler asked if the driveway grade was an issue related to a subdivision
207 amendment. Mr. Keppel said that he spoke with Chris Davis, Fire and Rescue. Jim Olson
208 had previously split off 9.96 acres for the cabin. The roadway was 16' wide. If additional
209 dwellings were added then he would widen it further, said Mr. Keppel.

210
211 Ms. Grayson asked if she could submit a plan for 2 one-half acre lots with a shared
212 driveway. Mr. McDonald replied yes; as one application.

213
214 Ms. McCrumb read a Sketch Plan letter regarding the application, and noted that the
215 sketch plan review had been continued. A full waste water design was not needed at this
216 time, said Ms. McCrumb.

217
218 There was further discussion regarding options to draft one application as either one 5
219 acre lot/existing house, create 2 one-half acre lots, or continue the hearing. Ms. Grayson
220 stated she would separate the 5 acres with the existing house now, and wait on the rest.

221
222 Mr. Landler pointed out that the regulations say that every new lot needs a building
223 envelope identified on it. Ms. McCrumb replied that each lot already has a structure on
224 it. Mr. McDonald said that the two lots already have setbacks. If the cabin was torn down
225 then a building envelope could be located anywhere on the lot.

226

227 **MOTION by Mr. Landler, seconded by Mr. Joslin, to classify PC-14-10, Sketch**
228 **Plan for Andrea Grayson and Mark Keppel, as a Subdivision Amendment.**
229 **VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

230

231 **TOWN PLAN OUTREACH SCHEDULE W/ BRANDY SAXTON OF**
232 **PLACESENSE**

233 The Planning Commission welcomed Brandy Saxton, PlaceSense, at 8:23 p.m. There was
234 discussion regarding a Town Plan schedule for outreach.

235

236 **ADJOURNMENT**

237 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

238

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

240