

CHARLOTTE PLANNING COMMISSION

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION IN RE APPLICATION OF

**Taylor Harmeling
363 Colonel Williams Way
and
David and Dorothy Waller
150 Pease Mountain Road**

**Final Plan Application
For A
Subdivision Amendment
Application # PC-12-30**

Background

Taylor Harmeling owns a parcel with the address of 363 Colonel Williams Way. Mr. Harmeling has an option to buy from David and Dorothy Waller a parcel with the address of 150 Pease Mountain Road for the purpose of providing vehicular access to 363 Colonel Williams Way via an access on Mount Philo Road. In this decision, the parcel with the address of 363 Colonel Williams Way will be called "Parcel 1" and the parcel with the address of 150 Pease Mountain Road will be called "Parcel 2."

Parcel 1 was created in 1997 by a subdivision by Joanne Williams Bruska. The Planning Commission approved a Subdivision Modification on June 3, 1997 which changed Parcel 1 to its current form, with a condition that any future improvements, building permits, or subdivisions requires review by the Planning Commission.

Carl Moulton applied for a Subdivision Amendment to develop Parcel 1 in 2011 (PC-11-13). This application was denied, and Mr. Moulton appealed the denial to the Environmental Division of the Vermont Superior Court (Docket No. 176-12-11 Vtec). Mr. Harmeling has since purchased Parcel 1 and has attained status as the appellant in this docket. Both parties to the docket (Mr. Harmeling and the Town) have agreed to a temporary stay of the court's proceeding until a decision on the application in front of the Planning Commission is rendered.

Parcel 2 is Lot 12 of a subdivision by David and Dorothy Waller which appears to have been approved by the Planning Commission on September 28, 1982 and is subject to Land Use Permit 4C0519 (Act 250).

In addition to creating an access to Parcel 1 from Mount Philo Road, this application proposes the development of Parcel 1 with a single family dwelling and possible accessory structures. Sketch Plan Review was held on September 6 and October 4, 2012, and the Planning Commission conducted a site visit on September 29, 2012.

Application

Materials submitted with the application and additional materials submitted at the December 6th hearing are listed in Appendix A. Materials submitted for the February 7th hearing are listed in Appendix B.

Public Hearing

The Planning Commission held a public hearing for this application on December 6, 2012. The applicant was represented by Taylor Harmeling, Liam Murphy (attorney), David Marshall (engineer) and Kristen Watrous (wildlife biologist). No other parties were present at the hearing or submitted written comments prior to the hearing with regard to the application.

On its own motion made on January 3, 2013, the Planning Commission approved a motion to reopen the Final Plan hearing in order to obtain additional information about how the applicant plans to install utilities through an area with very steep slopes to the building site; the reopened hearing was warned and held on February 7, 2013. The applicant was represented by Taylor Harmeling, Liam Murphy and David Marshall. No other parties were present at the hearing or submitted written comments prior to the hearing with regard to the application.

Regulations in Effect

Town Plan, amended March, 2008

Land Use Regulations adopted March, 2010.

Recommended Standards for Developments and Homes adopted September, 1997

Findings

1. Parcel 1 is 34.55 acres and is located in the Rural District. There are no structures on the parcel.
2. Parcel 2 is 10.5 acres and is located in the Rural District. There are no structures on the parcel. It is approved as a building lot, though it does not have an approved wastewater permit or design.
3. Section 6.1(C)(4) of the Charlotte Land Use Regulations states: “Applications for Subdivision Amendments will be reviewed under the standards of Chapter VII.”

Applicable standards in Chapter VII of the Charlotte Land Use Regulations (“Regulations”) are reviewed below in Findings 4-50.

Sections 7.2 and 7.3—General Standards & District Standards

4. The following are areas of high public value (as listed in Table 7.1 of the Charlotte Land Use Regulation) located on, in close proximity to, or associated with **Parcel 1**:
 - A. Steep slopes: two areas on the westerly and southerly facing slopes have existing grades of at least 25%, as indicated in plans submitted by the applicant on October 6. Additional portions of the southerly and westerly facing slopes have existing grades of at least 15%, as indicated in GIS data provided by the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission.
 - B. Wildlife habitat: much of the parcel is depicted as forested wildlife habitat on

- Map 6 in the Town Plan. Additionally, the previous application by Moulton (PC-11-13) included a study by Morse and Morse Forestry and Wildlife Consultants and Northern Stewards, LC which indicated the easterly portion of the parcel may have productive bat habitat, and other portions of the parcel hosts forested and supporting wildlife habitat. The current application included written and oral testimony from Kristen Watrous regarding existing and potential bat habitat specifically as it relates to the proposed driveway from Mount Philo Road.
- C. Scenic views and vistas: the western facing portion of the parcel contributes to a ridgeline that is prominently visible from roads to the west and southwest that are labeled as “most scenic roads” on Map 13 in the Town Plan.
- D. Conserved land on adjacent parcels: the applicant’s parcel adjoins a parcel owned by the Town and leased to the University of Vermont via a long-term lease. The University uses the parcel for wildlife research, education and public recreation. The parcel is identified on Map 18 in the Town Plan as Pease Mountain Natural Area.
5. Considering the resources on and adjacent to Parcel 1, the Planning Commission finds that all of the areas of high public value associated with the parcel are important. All are resources that strongly characterize the property and its vicinity, and are features that the Planning Commission feels are important to protect as it considers the proposed subdivision amendment.
6. The following are areas of high public value (as listed in Table 7.1 of the Charlotte Land Use Regulation) located on, in close proximity to, or associated with **Parcel 2**:
- A. Primary agricultural soils: much of the easterly portion of the parcel has statewide soils (from NRCS).
- B. Wildlife habitat: the westerly portion of the parcel is depicted as forested habitat on Map 6 in the Town Plan. Additionally, the application included written and oral testimony from Kristen Watrous regarding existing and potential bat habitat as it relates to the proposed driveway from Mount Philo Road.
- C. Scenic views and vistas: Mount Philo Road is depicted as a “most scenic road” on Map 13 in the Town Plan where it runs adjacent to Parcel 2.
- D. Conserved land on adjacent parcels: the parcel adjoins a parcel owned by the Town and leased to the University of Vermont via a long-term lease. The university uses the parcel for wildlife research, education and public recreation. The parcel is identified on Map 18 in the Town Plan as Pease Mountain Natural Area.
7. Considering the areas of high public value on and adjacent to Parcel 2, the Planning Commission finds that wildlife habitat is the most important area of high public value associated with the parcel. The scenic characteristic of Mount Philo Road is a secondarily important area of high public value. These are the resources that most strongly characterize the property and its vicinity, and are features that the Planning Commission feels are important to protect as it considers the proposed subdivision amendment.
8. Although bedrock and surficial aquifer recharge areas are not included in the list of areas of high public value (Table 7.1) in the Regulations, both parcels are within an area depicted as having a higher recharge potential for bedrock aquifers and a moderate recharge potential for surficial aquifers in maps created for the groundwater study by Agency of Natural Resources & Vermont Geological Survey. The aquifer recharge areas

- are a very important resource on both parcels, and warrant consideration and protection.
9. The application proposes two building envelopes on Parcel 1, one for the proposed dwelling and one for an accessory structure. Both are depicted on the Overall Site Plan (drawing C1) and Site Plan (drawing C3) by Civil Engineering Associates, Inc. The building envelope for the dwelling is .45 acres and is located on the southwest slope of the knoll just below the highest point of the parcel. The building envelope for the accessory structure is 1.71 acres and is located between the knoll and the parcels northerly boundary line.
 10. As depicted on the site plans submitted with the application, neither building envelope includes areas with a natural slope greater than 25%.
 11. Both building envelopes are located within forested wildlife habitat as it is depicted in Map 6 of the Town Plan. However, in her written and oral testimony in PC-11-13, Susan Morse (with Allan Thompson) indicated that the most important wildlife habitat on Parcel 1 is to the east of the knoll, although she also said that creating a pond on the western portion of the parcel would improve the habitat in that area.
 12. Testimony by Kristen Watrous submitted with the application and provided at the hearing focused on bat habitat as it relates to the proposed driveway from Mount Philo Road. In summary, Ms. Watrous' opinion is that the proposed driveway will not impact bat habitat. Ms. Watrous also made recommendations with regard to improving potential bat habitat.
 13. Information regarding wildlife habitat on Parcel 2 other than bat habitat was not provided with the application.
 14. The Overall Site Plan (Drawing C1) submitted with the application depicts a Proposed Conservation Area of 18.66 acres.
 15. At the hearing on December 6, 2012, Liam Murphy said that the applicant would be willing to enter into an Open Space Agreement with the Town. At the hearing on February 7, 2013, the applicant stated he proposes to implement the wildlife management by Susan Morse and Allan Thomas that was included in the application PC-11-13.
 16. An access/driveway was constructed by the previous owner up the westerly portion of Parcel 1, leading from the easterly end of Colonel Williams Way to the proposed building site. This route runs through areas with natural slopes exceeding 25%. Though a post-construction zoning permit was issued for this access, the access was not approved by the Planning Commission as required by the June 3, 1997 decision approving Subdivision Modification.
 17. The current application proposes to create a new access/driveway from Mount Philo Road over Parcel 2. The application has addressed likely bedrock and surficial aquifer recharge areas in its design of the driveway by building the driveway up from the existing grade rather than cutting or blasting into the bedrock, and directing run-off away from bedrock fissures.
 18. At the hearing on December 6th, David Marshall stated that the most suitable route for bringing utilities (power, telephone and cable) to the development site would be via the existing westerly driveway from Colonel Williams Way. Mr. Marshall also stated that power would be primary electrical service from the existing distribution line to a new transformer, which would be owned and maintained by Green Mountain Power ("GMP"). Mr. Marshall stated further that GMP would require year-round access to the primary electrical service. This would mean that the existing westerly driveway from Colonel Williams Way, which runs through areas 25% or greater slopes, would be maintained as

- a year-round maintenance drive.
19. At the hearing on February 7th, David Marshall provided testimony and revised site plans indicating a new MTC (cabinet) could be located at the westerly end of the existing driveway in an area that has less than 25% natural slope, and a new transformer could be located at the easterly end of the existing driveway which also has less than 25% natural slope, thereby eliminating the need to maintain a maintenance drive for primary electrical service on the portion of the existing driveway located on the steep slopes.
 20. The applicant stated at the hearing that he is proposing to restore vegetation on the steep portion of the westerly access, and the site plan indicates water bars will be installed to correct erosion that has occurred and is continuing to occur on the drive.
 21. The Planning Commission notes that Section 3.14 (B) of the Regulations states “Development is specifically prohibited on slopes equal to or in excess of 25%”, and that (in Section 10.2 of the Regulations) the definition of Land Development includes “installation of infrastructure or improvements including but not limited to roads, utilities, drainage, wastewater or water.”
 22. The Planning Commission notes that, whereas the proposed utility lines run through an area with a natural slope of 25%, the potential adverse impacts of developing on a slope, i.e. erosion and stormwater run-off, will be (adequately) mitigated by the proposed re-vegetation and installation of water bars. Additionally, bringing utilities to the building site from Mount Philo Road would have more deleterious impacts due to the presence of aquifer recharge areas along that route.

Conclusion 1: The siting of the proposed building envelopes, driveway and utility lines sufficiently minimizes impacts on the prioritized areas of high public value, and adverse impacts from the building envelopes, driveway and utilities will be mitigated via the proposed Conservation/Open Space Area, wildlife management techniques, and re-vegetation and water bar installation.

Section 7.4—Compatibility with Agricultural Operations

23. The project is not adjacent to any agricultural operations, with the exception of a small maple sugaring operation on the adjacent parcel to the west.
24. The project will not impact the maple sugaring operation on the adjacent parcel.

Conclusion 2: The project will not have an impact on any agricultural operations.

Section 7.5—Facilities, Services & Utilities

25. The project consists of one single family dwelling and therefore does not trigger the requirement for a fire pond and dry hydrant.
26. Plans submitted with the application indicate the driveway is proposed to have a grade of up to 10%.
27. The Recommended Standards for Developments and Homes indicate that the maximum grade for a driveway should be 8%.
28. The Planning Commission has allowed driveways with grades greater than 8% (up to 10%) but only with a condition requiring sprinklering of all living areas and a direct-to-station fire alarm.
29. The application does not include information regarding proposed outdoor lighting, except a sheet indicating the following potential condition: “Only down-shielded incandescent

exterior lights with wattage no greater than 75 watts shall be installed, maintained and replaced as necessary. All lighting shall be kept to the minimum practical necessary for the use intended and shall be substantially screened so as to provide minimum visibility from off of the Property.”

30. Outdoor lighting on Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 has the potential to be visible from scenic public roads and private properties.

Conclusion 3: The project will not create an unreasonable burden on existing or planned municipal or educational facilities or services and does not trigger the requirement for providing a fire pond and dry hydrant.

Conclusion 4: A condition requiring sprinklering of all living spaces and direct-to-station fire alarm is appropriate.

Conclusion 5: Restrictions on outdoor lighting is appropriate, due to the visibility of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 from scenic public roads and private properties.

Section 7.6—Water Supply

31. There is no known shortage of suitable groundwater in the vicinity of Parcel 1.
32. The project will need a Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Permit.

Conclusion 6: It is likely that a water supply could be developed to serve Parcel 1 without adversely impacting existing water supplies in the vicinity.

Section 7.7—Sewage Disposal

33. A design for a wastewater disposal system was submitted and approved by the Town in 2006. The approval has since expired.
34. The project will need a Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Permit.

Conclusion 7: The parcel appears to have sufficient wastewater disposal capacity for the proposed development. A Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Permit is needed, and appears to be obtainable.

Section 7.8—Stormwater Management & Erosion Control

35. The project is likely to impact steep slopes—i.e. slopes between 15%-25%.
36. The project appears to trigger coverage under the State of Vermont Construction General Permit 3-9020 due to construction activity that will disturb one acre or more.
37. The application includes a sheet with details and specifications for the control of stormwater and erosion resulting from construction of the project.
38. In evaluating possible routes of the driveway from the edge of the woods on Parcel 1 to the development site, the Planning Commission noted that the northerly route appeared to have less likelihood than the southerly route of producing erosion and run-off that could affect adjoining properties to the south, as occurred when the site-work was performed by the previous owner. The application proposes the northerly driveway route.

39. Development is not proposed near surface water or other sensitive areas.
40. In approving the Highway Access Permit, the Selectboard required that the easternmost 30 feet of the driveway must have a -2% grade from Mount Philo Road. This will reduce the potential for run-off entering onto Mount Philo Road.

Conclusion 8: Erosion and stormwater run-off are not likely to create impacts beyond the immediate development site.

Section 7.9—Landscaping and Screening

41. The application indicates that the driveway has been laid out to preserve larger trees in order to maintain the tree canopy and potential bat roosting trees on both parcels. The proposed forest management plan does include some removal of vegetation; but this is for the purpose of improving wildlife habitat, particularly bat habitat.
42. The development site is not adjacent to surface waters, but there are steep slopes in the vicinity of the proposed development site. In these areas, maintaining existing vegetation will help to prevent construction-related erosion and as well as post-construction stormwater run-off.
43. The proposed development site will likely be visible from public roads and private properties to the west. The applicant has proposed conditions related to building height and color, window reflectivity, driveway color and outdoor lighting that will sufficiently address prospective adverse impacts, making vegetative screening unnecessary.

Conclusion 9: The project will not have a significant impact on existing vegetation if it is constructed as proposed.

Conclusion 10: With conditions as offered in the application, the project will not have impacts that necessitate vegetative screening.

Section 7.10—Roads, Driveways & Pedestrian Access

44. Due to its low density, the proposed subdivision amendment will not create a significant increase in traffic on public roads in the vicinity of the project over what currently exists.
45. The applicant has obtained a Highway Access Permit from the Selectboard (HAP-12-06), with conditions.

Conclusion 11: The project is unlikely to create unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe traffic conditions.

Section 7.11—Common Facilities, Common Land, & Land to be Conserved; and Section 7.12—Legal Requirements

46. No common land is proposed.
47. The application proposes that 18.66 acres are to be put under an Open Space Agreement with the Town.
48. The proposed Open Space Area covers most of the resources on the parcel that are the prioritized for protection—i.e. wildlife habitat and steep slopes.

49. As stated above, the applicant stated at the hearing on February 7th that he proposes to implement the wildlife management plan by Susan Morse and Allan Thomas that was submitted with PC-11-13.
50. A right-of-way easement over Parcel 2 to reach Parcel 1 will not be needed as long as the same party owns both parcels.

Conclusion 12: A standard Open Space Agreement appears to be appropriate, subject to the review and approval of the Selectboard and Town Attorney. The Open Space Agreement should reference the wildlife management plan by Susan Morse and Allan Thomas.

Conclusion 13: A right-of-way easement is not needed at this time.

Decision

Based on these Findings, the Planning Commission approves the Final Plan Application for the proposed Subdivision Amendment with the following condition:

1. Overall Site Plan Drawing C1 will be revised to provide dimensions of the proposed Conservation/Open Space Area.
2. Site Plan Drawing C2 will be revised to change the slope at the easterly end of the driveway to -2%.
3. Site Plan Drawing C3 will be revised to provide dimensions on both building envelopes.
4. One digital copy (pdf) and a mylar (18" x 24") of each of Drawings C1, C2 and C3, as amended by Conditions #1, #2 and #3 above, respectively, will be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and signature (of the mylars) within 160 days. The applicant will record the signed mylars in the Charlotte Land Records within 180 days.
5. Prior to the submission of the mylars in accordance with Condition #4 above, the applicant will complete the following steps:
 - A. Obtain an amendment to Land Use Permit 4C0519 (i.e. "Act 250") or provide documentation from the District Environmental Commission that such an amendment is not required.
 - B. Obtain a Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Permit for Parcel 1.
 - C. Execute an Open Space Agreement (with a reference added to the forest management plan Morse and Morse Forestry and Wildlife Consultants and Northern Stewards, LC) and record it in the Charlotte Land Records (with the mylars) after review and approval by the Selectboard and Town Attorney.
6. Prior to the submission of an application for a zoning permit for any structures, the corners of the building envelope will be staked.
7. During construction of any structures within the primary building envelope, vegetation will not be removed down-slope of the building envelope.
8. The application for a Certificate of Occupancy for the dwelling on Parcel 1 will include a letter from an appropriated licensed engineer certifying that construction of the driveway complies with the approved site plans, and the existing westerly driveway that is not adjacent to primary electrical service has been reclaimed with topsoil, seed, fertilizer, mulch and waterbars as indicated in Drawing Number C1.0A, titled "Overall Site Plan Option 1, East Access Power on Existing Drive".
9. The primary dwelling and any accessory dwellings or living space on Parcel 1 will have a

- 13-D sprinkler system, a central station monitored fire alarm, smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors. Prior to the submission of a Zoning Permit for a dwelling, the applicant will submit a sprinkler system design to the Fire Department for review and approval; the design will be able to maintain an acceptable flow rate for residential fire loads for all occupied spaces, including the basement, for a minimum of 20 minutes.
10. No outdoor lighting shall be used on Parcel 2.
 11. On Parcel 1, no pole-mounted light fixture will be taller than 8' off the ground, and no new building-mounted light fixture will be taller than 15' off the ground. Fixtures will be shielded to direct light downward, and will not result in lighting levels that are uncharacteristic of the adjacent properties. Wattage will be no greater than 75 watts or the equivalent. All lighting shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the intended use and it shall be substantially screened so as to provide minimum visibility from off of the parcel.
 12. No building or structure on Parcel 1 shall be higher than the existing highest point of land on the parcel.
 13. The exterior materials of all buildings, including roofs, shall use materials of "earth tone" color, defined as those colors that draw from a palette of browns, tans, greys, and greens. The colors and finishes shall be muted and flat in an emulation of the natural colors found in soil, vegetation and rocks. It is the intent of this condition that the color scheme of the exterior materials of the buildings blend with the surrounding landscape during most of the year.
 14. All windows on buildings shall be anti-glare or non-reflective.
 15. All new utility lines will be underground.
 16. The new driveway and parking area will be surfaced with non-white crushed stone.
 17. The access on Mount Philo Road approved herein serving Parcel 1 shall be shared with any development on Parcel 2 unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission and Selectboard.

Additional Conditions: All plats, plans, drawings, documents, testimony, evidence and conditions submitted in association with the application or at the hearing and used as the basis for the Decision to grant permit shall be binding on the applicant, and his/her/its successors, heirs and assigns. Projects shall be completed in accordance with such approved plans and conditions. Any deviation from the approved plans shall constitute a violation of permit and be subject to enforcement action by the Town.

This decision may be appealed to the Vermont Environmental Court by the applicant or an interested person who participated in the proceeding. Such appeal must be taken within 30 days of the date of the 4th signature below, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. Section 4471 and Rule 5(b) of the Vermont Rules for Environmental Court Proceedings.

Members Present at the Public Hearing on December 6, 2012: Jeff McDonald, Jim Donovan, Linda Radimer, Ellie Russell, Paul Landler and Gerald Bouchard.

Members Present at the Public Hearing on February 7, 2013: Jeff McDonald, Jim Donovan, Linda Radimer, Ellie Russell, Paul Landler and Gerald Bouchard.

Vote of Members after Deliberations:

The following is the vote for or against this Findings of Fact and Decision as written:

- 1. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 2. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 3. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 4. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 5. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 6. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____
- 7. Signed:_____ For / Against Date Signed:_____

APPENDIX A

The following items were submitted with the application or at the December 6th hearing:

- 1. An application form for a Subdivision Amendment.
- 2. The fee submitted with the application was \$450; a subsequent payment was made of \$150.
- 3. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan, Drawing Number C1” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
- 4. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Site Plan, Drawing Number C2” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
- 5. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Site Plan, Drawing Number C3” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
- 6. A sheet by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Site Details, Drawing Number C4” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
- 7. A sheet by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Low Risk EPSC Details and Specifications, Drawing Number R” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
- 8. A memo sent via e-mail from Kristen Watrous of Stantec Consulting to Taylor Harmeling dated November 16, 2012 re: “Indiana bat habitat assessment in Charlotte, Vermont,” with a curricula vitae for Ms. Watrous.
- 9. A letter from David S. Marshall, P.E. of Civil Engineering Associates, Inc. to Tom Mansfield dated November 15, 2012 re: “Harmeling Stormwater Management Plan.”
- 10. A memo (no addressee, undated and unsigned) stating “The Applicant is willing to impose accept the following Permit Conditions or to impose them on the property as Covenants,” will several conditions/restrictions (a) through (e) following.
- 11. Responses to staff notes were submitted at the hearing on December 6th.

APPENDIX B

The following items were submitted in association with the hearing on February 7th:

1. A letter from Liam Murphy to Thomas Mansfield dated January 30, 2013 regarding “Re-opened Hearing on Revised Access to Harmeling Property”
2. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 1, East Access Power On Existing Drive, Drawing Number C1.0” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
3. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 1, East Access Power On Existing Drive, Drawing Number C1.0A” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
4. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 2, East Access Power On Existing Drive, Drawing Number C1.1” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
5. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 3, East Access Drive, East Power Route, Drawing Number C1.2” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
6. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 3, Drawing Number C2” dated October, 2012, no revisions.
7. A plan by Civil Engineering Associates, LLC entitled “Taylor Harmeling, Proposed Driveway Improvements, Colonel Williams Way, Charlotte, Vermont, Overall Site Plan Option 3, Drawing Number C3” dated October, 2012, no revisions.