

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
NOVEMBER 20, 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; Peter Joslin, Gerald Bouchard, Paul Landler, Linda Radimer, Donna Stearns, Marty Illick.

ADMINISTRATION: Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator.

OTHERS: Scott Hardy, Chris von Trapp, Hayes Sogoloff, Bonnie Sogoloff, Marilyn Richardson, Patty Horsford, Gary Pittman, Dorothy Hill, Jeff Hill, Evan Metropoulos, Tim Hunt, Martha Hunt, and others.

AGENDA ITEMS:

7:15 PM PC-14-25 Scott Hardy: Final Minor Subdivision Application for a 3-Lot Planned Residential Development at 768 and 783 Mt. Philo Rd.

7:35 PM PC-14-26 Marilyn Richardson: Boundary Adjustment Application for properties at 2757 and 2789 Greenbush Rd.

8:05 PM PC-14-27 Tim and Martha Hunt: Sketch Plan Review for Site Plan / Conditional Use Application for Adaptive Reuse at 1046 Ethan Allen Highway (old Varney Farm).

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 addition: Deliberative Session

Consent Agenda: none.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MINTUES: November 6, 2014

MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to approve the Planning Commission minutes of November 6, 2014 as written, with the following edits:

- Page 3, line 106 – change the word “required” to read “requires”; line 126 – insert the word “at” between “looked” and “you”;
- Page 4, line 162 – after the word “explained” add “...pre and post development runoff would be the same...”;
- Page 5, line 206 – insert the word “much” between “how” and “greater”; line 223 – delete “steep slopes were a” and replace with “...near or in the core habitat would have...”;

- 46 • Page 7, line 302 - after “conform” add “with existing development
47 patterns...”; line 307 - change to read “From Spear’s Store she could see her
48 riding ring. The proposal would cut up...”.;
- 49 • Page 9, line 409 – change to read “..clarification that the east boundary line
50 would be west of the Holmes Brook tributary.”;
- 51 • Page 11, line 468 – replace the word “lower” with “Lot 2”.

52 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

53

54 **PC-14-25 SCOTT HARDY: FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FOR**
55 **A 3-LOT PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT 768 AND 783 MT.**

56 **PHILO RD.**

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

58

59 **STAFF NOTES**

60 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes.

61

62 **APPLICANT COMMENTS**

63 Mr. Hardy explained that in response to the Planning Commission comments from the
64 Sketch Plan review he moved the two house sites closer to the existing barn. The north
65 house site would sit behind the barn. The application was really for a 2-lot PRD
66 subdivision of the barn lot located on the east side of Mt Philo Road. The lot to the west
67 of the road was pre-existing with an existing house. A septic easement for Lots 2 and 3
68 was located on Lot 1 and the septic line would go under Mt Philo Road. The well shields
69 for Lots 2 and 3 were moved out of the easterly agricultural use areas, said Mr. Hardy.

70

71 **PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS**

72 Mr. Joslin stated that the well shield shouldn’t encroach on the neighboring Mansfield
73 property. Mr. Hardy said that the well shield area could be adjusted back onto the lot.

74

75 Mr. McDonald asked if a minimum of 5 acres of open space had been set aside and
76 designated on the site plan. Mr. Hardy said he didn’t think that the Sogoloff’s, who
77 purchased Lot 2 consisting of 115 acres from a previous subdivision, had an open space
78 agreement. He didn’t believe he needed to designate open space, said Mr. Hardy. Mr.
79 McDonald explained that the original subdivision of the 125 acre property had deferred
80 open space requirements. With the building envelopes on this particular parcel an open
81 space was required, said Mr. McDonald.

82

83 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

84 Ms. Sogoloff, abutting property owner, said that the all the acreage outside of their
85 building envelope was a ‘no-build’ zone. The bulk of their 115 acres was pasture, stated
86 Ms. Sogoloff.

87

88 Mr. Hardy expressed concern that designating open space would preclude someone from
89 having sheep, or animals. Mr. McDonald clarified that an open space agreement would
90 not impact an agricultural use of either of the lots.

91

92 Mr. Hardy said that since he applied to subdivide the barn lot the farmer has not used the
93 agricultural area of the lot.

94

95 In response to further questions by Mr. Hardy regarding open space requirements, Ms.
96 Illick read the previous subdivision application notes related to the deferred open space of
97 the 125 acre Lot 2 and 10 acre Lot 1 parcels.

98

99 Mr. von Trapp said he thought that the open space standard was less than 10 percent of
100 the total land mass. Mr. Joslin explained that typically the standard was 50 percent of the
101 total land mass.

102

103 Mr. von Trapp asked if the standard applied to lots of 25 acres or more. Mr. McDonald
104 replied the lot was subdivided from a larger lot and the open space was deferred to a
105 future time. No development was identified for that lot and the open space was deferred,
106 clarified Mr. McDonald.

107

108 Mr. McDonald pointed out that now Mr. Hardy was proposing two 5 acre lots and he
109 must show building envelopes on the site plans.

110

111 Mr. Joslin suggested putting both houses closer together at either the south end or north
112 end of the barn and leaving the rest of the lots as open space. Mr. McDonald pointed out
113 that straddling the houses around the barn was more in keeping with a "farm stead" look.

114

115 Ms. Radimer asked if this would be the last subdivision of the entire parcel. Mr.
116 McDonald said that the barn lot could not be further subdivided.

117

118 Ms. Sogoloff asked if she could do a subdivision of their land along the Lime Kiln Road
119 since Mr. Hardy's subdivision was setting a precedent. Mr. McDonald replied yes.

120

121 Mr. Bouchard asked Mr. Hardy why he was applying for a PRD. Mr. Hardy replied that if
122 the septic lines were going under a town or state highway then a PRD was required.

123

124 Mr. Joslin suggested that the proposed house that was shown behind the barn should be
125 more in-line with the barn and closer to the road. A single driveway serving both the
126 barn house lots would be better than two driveways, said Mr. Joslin. Mr. Hardy said that
127 a shared driveway would impact the agricultural use around the barn. He placed the
128 house site behind the barn because of an existing shed, said Mr. Hardy.

129

130 Ms. Illick asked why the site plan maps were different. Only one curb cut showed on the
131 site map, said Ms. Illick. Mr. McDonald asked if Lot 2 had an existing curb cut. Mr.
132 Hardy replied no.

133

134 Mr. Joslin suggested having an agricultural access and one curb cut. Mr. Hardy said that
135 would result in right-of-way issues on the deed. Mr. McDonald pointed out that the
136 Selectboard had jurisdiction regarding curb cut approvals.

137

138 Mr. McDonald summarized that the applicant needed to do the following:

- 139 • Note a waiver for the barn side yard setback area.
- 140 • Consider clustering the two proposed homes.
- 141 • Consider one lot larger than the second lot.
- 142 • Draw building envelopes for Lots 2 and 3 on the site map.
- 143 • Draw up deed restrictions for a no build zone, or designate open space on the plat
- 144 for Lots 2 and 3.
- 145 • Draw well locations on the plat.
- 146 • A stream and Class II wetlands needed to be mapped and a 50' buffer identified.
- 147 • Coordinate the two site plan sheets information.

148

149 There was further discussion regarding an open space agreement in perpetuity versus
150 deed restrictions; if a deed restriction could be changed at some future time (Ms.
151 McCrumb said that it could be changed, and cited the Jason and Jensa Bushey
152 subdivision application approval that referenced open space in the decision and on the
153 plat); and a suggestion by Mr. Bouchard to remove an existing shed and site a house at
154 that location.

155

156 Ms. Illick said she did not support a deed restriction approach without legal advice.

157

158 Mr. McDonald read a letter from Clark Hinsdale Jr that opposed the proposed
159 subdivision.

160

161 Ms. Sogoloff said that siting a house behind a barn was a bad idea. If there were animals
162 then you are living with them if your house was built too close. The barn was a big
163 structure and having that as a view was not a good selling point, said Ms. Sogoloff.

164

165 Ms. Sogoloff asked what the plans for the barn were. At one time Mr. Hardy had talked
166 about turning the barn into a house, said Ms. Sogoloff. Mr. Hardy explained that he
167 explored the economics to convert the barn into living space, which was very expensive.

168

169 **MOTION by Mr. Joslin, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to continue the hearing for**
170 **PC-14-25 Scott Hardy: Final Minor Subdivision Application for a 3-Lot Planned**
171 **Residential Development at 768 and 783 Mt. Philo Road to December 4, 2014, at**
172 **8:00 p.m.**

173 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

174

175 **PC-14-26 MARILYN RICHARDSON: BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT**
176 **APPLICATION FOR PROPERTIES AT 2757 AND 2789 GREENBUSH RD.**

177 Marilyn Richardson, owner, appeared on behalf of the application.

178

179 STAFF NOTES

180 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes.

181

182 APPLICANT COMMENTS

183 Ms. Richardson said that she lives at 2757 Greenbush Road and owns the apartment
184 building next door at 2789 Greenbush Road. The properties have been surveyed. She
185 would like to move the south side boundary line 25' further south to give the big house a
186 larger lot. There was an existing long narrow piece of land on the side and she would add
187 that to the big house lot. The two-apartment house was in the commercial zone and could
188 have a smaller lot. A 125 year-old maple tree at the corner would be added to the big
189 house lot so she could continue to take care of the tree, said Ms. Richardson.

190

191 **PLANNING COMMISSION**

192 Ms. Illick asked for the location of pipes. Ms. Richardson explained that the pipes were
193 all surveyed and marked on the site plan. The yellow apartment house parcel was odd
194 shaped. She bought it when it came up for sale. The Old Brick Store pump station, water
195 lines and well were on her 2757 Greenbush Road property.

196

197 Mr. Joslin asked if the Old Brick Store was on a shared well with Ms. Richardson. Ms.
198 Richardson explained that her well serviced the apartments, her house and the Farley
199 house. The Old Brick Store well and septic system went across her property and down to
200 the Horsford property, said Ms. Richardson.

201

202 Mr. McDonald asked if the big house lot would end up at 1.3 acres and the yellow house
203 would go from 0.66 acres to 0.27 acres. Ms. Richardson replied yes. The duplex yellow
204 house has been commercial for the last 35 years, said Ms. Richardson.

205

206 **MOTION by Ms. Radimer, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to close the hearing for PC-**
207 **14-26, Marilyn Richardson: Boundary Adjustment Application for properties at**
208 **2757 and 2789 Greenbush Road.**

209 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

210

211 **PC-14-27 TIM AND MARTHA HUNT: SKETCH PLAN REVIEW FOR SITE**
212 **PLAN / CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR ADAPTIVE REUSE AT 1046**
213 **ETHAN ALLEN HIGHWAY (OLD VARNEY FARM).**

214 Tim Hunt and Martha Hunt, owners, appeared on behalf of the application.

215

216 **STAFF NOTES**

217 Mr. McDonald reviewed staff notes. The applicant's Conditional Use application would
218 be reviewed by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The Planning Commission would
219 consider the Sketch Plan application, said Mr. McDonald.

220

221 **APPLICANT COMMENTS**

222 Mr. Hunt said that the Town Planner/Zoning Administrator had said to go through the
223 Sketch Plan review first. The plan was to convert the existing barn into an event space,
224 such as weddings, or community events. The vision was to create a self sustaining
225 property that would pay for the restoration/preservation of the historic barn. The barn was
226 a gateway to Charlotte. The property was a heavily regulated property with multiple
227 easements. An adaptive re-use of the barn was allowable. There were 5 acres of usable
228 agricultural land behind the barn. There would be no additions to the 220' barn.

229 Photographs and drawings by Studio Three from Bristol, VT, were submitted with the
230 application. The barn renovations would be to code. A stormwater permitting process has
231 been started to mitigate rain runoff from the 1-acre barn roof, said Mr. Hunt.

232

233 PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

234 Ms. Radimer asked for clarification regarding the barn face as shown in the drawings.

235 Mr. Hunt replied that it was the west facing gambrel barn side. He was removing a
236 section of the back where 90 percent of the roof was gone. The gambrel area was a later
237 addition and was not historic or worth saving, said Mr. Hunt.

238

239 Mr. Joslin asked for clarification of the proposed parking and driveway access. Mr. Hunt
240 explained that Jim Clancy was drafting a letter of intent regarding a proposed 24' wide
241 dual-lane access. The access met state requirements and VTrans had no issues, said Mr.
242 Hunt. Mr. Hunt pointed out a proposed car parking area on the site map.

243

244 Mr. Joslin said that the event proposal was for 150 seats. Where would excess cars park,
245 asked Mr. Joslin. Mr. Hunt said that a field could be used for excess parking, or people
246 could be bussed in from off site. He was not planning a 100 car lot. There was a flat
247 section where the house was that was nestled in the trees that could accommodate 38
248 cars, said Mr. Hunt.

249

250 Mr. McDonald asked if the existing vegetation was preserved when the house was
251 moved. Mr. Hunt replied that almost 100 percent of the trees and bushes were saved.
252 Some weedy cedar trees were cut down, but the silver maple and ash trees along the front
253 were saved. Green Mountain Power did cut a tree in order to install a power pole, and
254 VTrans removed some trees along the front, said Mr. Hunt.

255

256 Mr. McDonald asked if a horse trailer access to the Park was an issue. Mr. Hunt said that
257 there was a parking area for horse trailers to the north of the lot. The same access and
258 curb cut off Route 7 would be used as proposed by the Vermont Land Trust. A northern
259 path from that parking area would go to the Park, said Mr. Hunt.

260

261 Ms. Radimer asked if the plan was to put a gambrel roof on the south side of the barn as
262 well. Mr. Hunt pointed to barn features on colored aerial photographs, and said that the
263 plan was replace the existing metal siding with wood siding on the south side.

264

265 Mr. McDonald asked if the well at the old house site would be used. Mr. Hunt explained
266 that the existing well was unserviceable. A new well would be drilled at the new house
267 site, and a secondary well on the north side of the barn for barn use.

268

269 Mr. McDonald asked for an update on septic.

270

271 PUBLIC COMMENTS

272 Mr. Metropolitous, abutting neighbor, stated that neighbors were not being notified
273 regarding plans for the property. For example, the north side entrance access. When he
274 developed his property the Town made him give up 10 acres along the front to preserve

275 the views. He did not want to look at a parking lot, or events. Bussing in people was a
276 bad idea. Route 7 was a dangerous road. There were accidents there every month. He had
277 submitted photographs during Sketch Plan that demonstrated how dangerous it was, said
278 Mr. Metropolous.

279
280 Mr. Metropolous expressed concern regarding noise, fights, and vandalism that occurred
281 during events. His daughter works at the Old Lantern where those things happen. There
282 was no way to control 125 people. He supported the Hunt's plan to move the old house
283 and improve the property. This plan was out of context for the rural area. The Town
284 should not allow a commercial banquet hall at the property, stated Mr. Metropolous.

285
286 Mr. McDonald reviewed that abutting land owners were notified of the Sketch Plan
287 application. Ms. Hill said that she was not notified. Ms. McCrumb said that Ms. Hill was
288 not an abutting land owner.

289
290 Mr. McDonald explained the process of the Sketch Plan review. The Hunt's were
291 bringing a new idea and site plans before the Planning Commission. A Conditional Use
292 application has to appear before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. This was the first of a
293 three-step process, clarified Mr. McDonald.

294
295 Mr. Metropolous said that he called Mr. Hunt. Mr. Hunt said that he would plant
296 screening. There were too many issues, such as security, noise, lighting, landscaping, etc.
297 The topography of the area where the septic would be located was very steep. He was
298 concerned that there would be septic seepage onto his lot. He has lived on his property 30
299 years and did not bother anyone. His peace would be disrupted and his wife was very
300 upset, said Mr. Metropolous.

301
302 Ms. Hill, Snowdrift Lane, said her property was to the south of the Hunt's lot. She was
303 familiar with the lot since she grew up there. She was supportive of moving the house.
304 However, Route 7 was dangerous and busy with many serious accidents and having
305 people pulling in and out at that location for events was not a good idea. Spot zoning in a
306 highly preserved and restricted area was not a good idea. She was upset with the barn
307 renovations. The historic slate roofing and historic date have been torn off. The slate and
308 date were not being replaced. The barn was being hacked up, stated Ms. Hill.

309
310 Mr. Joslin asked if the proposed septic was within 200' of Mr. Metropolous' property.
311 Mr. Metropolous pointed out his house on a 20 acre lot and his daughter's house on the
312 site map. Mr. Metropolous said that the Hunt's septic was proposed on top of a 40-50
313 percent slope, which was 50' from his lot line.

314
315 Mr. Hunt explained that the existing septic near the old house site had been flowing back
316 into the house. He has a 10 acre septic easement on the Town Park land that came with
317 the property, said Mr. Hunt. Ms. McCrumb clarified that a 10 acre floating septic
318 easement was located on Town land.

319

320 Ms. Hill stated that she would like to have the same septic easement that the Varney farm
321 has. Ms. McCrumb reviewed that when the Varney farm lot was separated from the Town
322 Park land there was an agreement that was approved.

323

324 Ms. Hill expressed concern that public property was being used for private septic. Mr.
325 Hunt explained that when the Vermont Cheese Factory was exploring the purchase of the
326 Varney farm lot the 10 acre septic volume was granted.

327

328 Ms. Hill said that there were many uses for a dairy barn. To say that the agricultural use
329 would be turned into a commercial use isn't right, said Ms. Hill.

330

331 Mr. McDonald read overlay standards acceptable to the Vermont Land Trust and the
332 Preservation Trust. Ms. McCrumb said that Mr. Hunt has had conversations with the
333 Vermont Land Trust. Mr. Hunt said that every one has been supportive of the proposed
334 adaptive reuse of the barn. There would be no interior walls added in the barn, said Mr.
335 Hunt.

336

337 Ms. Illick asked for clarification of a landscaping, or screening plan. Mr. Hunt replied
338 that Mr. Metropoulos had asked for cedar trees on the north side of the lot. He would
339 plant more trees. There were things that could be done for crowd control. He was not
340 allowed to bring things outside the farm complex. For example, tents would not be
341 erected outside of the barn area. A cross-rail fence could be put up to keep people in the
342 right area, said Mr. Hunt.

343

344 Ms. McCrumb said that tents were an issue. Why a tent was needed when there was a
345 barn, asked Ms. McCrumb. Ms. McCrumb said that the Planning Commission should
346 keep a tent area in mind, if one was allowed at all.

347

348 Mr. Hunt said that he didn't need a 'big top' tent. He meant a canopy in the southwest
349 corner area of the barn, said Mr. Hunt.

350

351 Ms. McCrumb said that a canopy was the type of specificity that was needed on the
352 plans. Mr. Hunt said that a canopy wouldn't be permanent.

353

354 Mr. Joslin asked if the existing driveway was 14' to 16' wide, and if a 24' wide driveway
355 was necessary. Mr. Hunt replied that the current driveway was for residential use and
356 handles the tractors. He was in the process of putting in a Letter of Intent regarding a
357 dual-lane driveway, said Mr. Hunt.

358

359 Ms. Illick asked if lighting was planned. Mr. Hunt replied that his architect had sent
360 Town details. Mr. McDonald said a lighting plan was not needed at the Sketch Plan level.
361 Landscaping, lighting, access impacts and safety would be issues later on. A plan for 150,
362 seats 50 parking spaces, and the event activity was a commercialization activity in the
363 Route 7 in rural area, said Mr. McDonald.

364

365 Mr. Hunt said that he was not planning an excessive event use. A restriction was that he
366 was required to have an agricultural function, pointed out Mr. Hunt. Mr. Joslin asked
367 what percentage would be agricultural versus commercial use. Mr. Hunt said that the 5
368 acres could be used for agriculture. The 5 acres were currently hayed full time. He was
369 exploring growing pumpkins, or cut flowers. Something would grow 100 percent of the
370 time on the 5 acres, stated Mr. Hunt.

371

372 Mr. McDonald reiterated that adaptive re-use was outside of the Planning Commission
373 review. Mr. Hunt explained that there would be a prep kitchen. The Vermont Land Trust
374 said that a sink could be on a farm, and an oven could be removed at any time. The
375 concept was not to be commercial kitchen, stressed Mr. Hunt.

376

377 Mr. Joslin asked how the commercial use would break down. What number of parking
378 spaces were needed for what level of events; was parking allowed in terms of the
379 restriction on the view shed; could parking go behind the barn out of Route 7 view shed,
380 asked Mr. Joslin. Mr. Hunt replied that the Vermont Land Trust wouldn't approve of
381 parking on the protected soils. Behind the barn going west were the desirable soils. The
382 soils along Route 7 in the front were not desirable soils. Having parking in front was
383 better, said Mr. Hunt.

384

385 Ms. Radimer asked what the scale of the operation would be regarding parking spaces.
386 Mr. Hunt said that there was a parking plan.

387

388 Mr. Metropoulos asked where the details of the plan were. How can 150 people be
389 bussed in, stated Mr. Metropoulos.

390

391 Ms. Radimer said the plan seems to be a smaller scale parking area. The review would go
392 through the ZBA, said Ms. Radimer. Mr. Hunt replied yes. The Town regulations were
393 clear regarding the number of parking spaces, said Mr. Hunt.

394

395 Mr. McDonald pointed out that on the application Mr. Hunt was seeking parking for 50
396 cars when 38 spaces were required. Mr. Hunt said he was OK with 38 spaces.

397

398 Ms. McCrumb asked how many parking spaces could fit in front of the barn. Mr. Hunt
399 replied roughly 40.

400

401 Ms. McCrumb asked for more details regarding a parking plan, which appeared to be
402 closer to the road. Also, the screening was better up by Route 7, said Ms. McCrumb. Mr.
403 Hunt explained that there would be a gravel lot for most of the parking area and an area
404 with a gravel base and grass on top.

405

406 Ms. Illick suggested screening the parking from the barn structure with natural plantings
407 around the barn.

408

409 Mr. Joslin expressed concern that cars would be parked close to Route 7 in the view shed.
410 Were soils delineated on the site map, asked Mr. Joslin. Mr. Hunt explained that a dashed

411 line on the site map was a building envelope and noted the location of protected soils.
412 Elevations went up as you looked west. There was a solid wall of trees from the street
413 view heading south on Route 7 and going north as well. More cedars could be planted,
414 suggested Mr. Hunt.

415
416 Mr. McDonald suggested placing parking spaces in and around the existing trees in front.

417
418 In response to questions regarding hours of operation, Mr. Hunt said that the tourist
419 wedding season was May to mid-October on weekends. He was not planning a full-time
420 year-round, or Monday–Sunday venture. The Vermont Land Trust would not support
421 that. He would follow the Town Park hours, said Mr. Hunt. Ms. Illick said the Park hours
422 were from sunrise to sunset.

423
424 Mr. Metropoulos said that the Old Lantern contracted wedding that were to end at 9:00
425 p.m. His daughter frequently works to 1:00 p.m. The Old Lantern events can get out of
426 control. Events required a commercial oven, dishwasher and other equipment. This was a
427 commercialization of a beautiful rural area, stated Mr. Metropoulos.

428
429 Ms. Hill asked how many times has the Town approved a commercial business in the
430 rural district of a historical property. Mr. McCrumb replied this application was an
431 adaptive reuse of a historic barn. He has to meet Vermont Land Trust and Preservation
432 Trust parameters, said Ms. McCrumb. Mr. McDonald said that Zoe's Tack Shop was the
433 closest application. The Berry Farm tea shop was not a good comparison, said Mr.
434 McDonald.

435
436 **MOTION by Mr. Joslin, seconded by Ms. Radimer, to classify PC-14-27, Tim and**
437 **Martha Hunt: Sketch Plan Review for Site Plan/Conditional Use Application for**
438 **Adaptive Reuse at 1046 Ethan Allen Highway (old Varney Farm) as a Site Plan**
439 **Review.**

440 **DISCUSSION:**

441 **Mr. McDonald reviewed that the Zoning Board would review the Conditional Use**
442 **application. The Selectboard usually would approve curb cuts, but there was**
443 **nothing to review, pointed out Mr. McDonald.**

444
445 **Ms. Hill asked if the there were two road cuts, or one. Ms. McCrumb replied one,**
446 **which needed to be widen.**

447
448 **Mr. McDonald asked if the horse trailer access required review. Ms. McCrumb said**
449 **it wouldn't have a separate access.**

450 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

451
452 Ms. McCrumb said that Ms. Hill would be added to the notification list as an interested
453 party.

454
455 **DELIBERATIVE SESSION**

456 **MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Mr. Joslin, to enter Deliberative Session.**

457 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

458

459 The Planning Commission entered Deliberative Session at 9:16 p.m.

460

461 **MOTION by Ms. Illick, seconded by Mr. Bouchard, to exit Deliberative Session and**
462 **adjourn the regular meeting**

463 **VOTE: 5 ayes, 2 absent (Ms. Stearns, Mr. Landler); motion carried.**

464

465 The Planning Commission adjourned Deliberative Session at 10:00 p.m.

466

467 **ADJOURNMENT**

468 The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

469

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

471