

CHARLOTTE PLANNING COMMISSION

Charlotte Town Office

PO Box 119

Charlotte, VT 05445

Phone: 802.425.3533

February 21, 2019

Linda Radimer
2012 Prindle Road
Charlotte, VT 05445

Re: Sketch Plan Review – Application Number PC-18-187-SK

Dear Ms. Radimer,

The purpose of this letter is to summarize the Sketch Plan Review for a proposed 2-Lot Subdivision of your 10.69 acre property located at 2012 Prindle Road within the Rural District (RUR) in the Town of Charlotte.

It is understood by the Planning Commission as displayed on the map within your application (see: <https://is.gd/IChnjB>) and discussions from the public meeting that you propose to subdivide your property into an approximate 3.3 acre lot (at the north end of the property) and a 7.4 acre lot comprising the remainder of the property.

Two site visits took place at the property. The first was on Saturday January 12, 2019 at approximately 9:00 AM attended by the applicant and Planning Commissioners David Kenyon and Gerald Bouchard. The second site visit to the property took place on Thursday January 17, 2019 at approximately 9:30 AM attended by the applicant, and Planning Commissioners Peter Joslin (Chair) and Marty Illick. The public meeting for the proposal was held that evening at 7:05 PM. In attendance were Commissioners: Peter Joslin (Chair), Charlie Pughe (Vice Chair), Gerald Bouchard, Mary Illick, Richard Eastman, and David Kenyon. Additional participants included the applicant Linda Radimer and the Town Planner.

The Planning Commission has classified your project as a "2-Lot Minor Subdivision/PRD" in accordance with **Sections 6.1(C)(1)** of the 2016 Charlotte Land Use Regulations (hereafter referred to as "the Regulations").

The Planning Commission is providing the following observations on your proposed application:

1. The following Areas of High Public Value (AHPV) were identified on the property:
 - a. Primary Agricultural Soils (Prime and Statewide - PAS): About 0.7 acres of Prime Agricultural soils exist on the northwestern corner of the property; with about 0.4 acres along the central eastern property boundary. About 0.6 acres of Statewide Agricultural souls exist on the northeastern corner; with about 1.5 acres on the

southeastern corner of the property (according to the *USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) GIS database*).

- b. Steep Slopes (>=15%): About 6 acres of 15-25% slope are identified along the south and the north of the parcel. About 2.4 acres of >25% slope have been identified at the center of the property.
 - c. Special Natural Areas: Lewis Creek exists about 750 feet to the south of the southern property boundary.
 - d. Surface Waters, Wetlands, and associated buffer areas: About 0.5 acre of wetland is estimated to exist along the northeastern portion of the parcel, according to the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation's *Vermont Significant Wetlands Inventory (VSWI)*. However, this would need to be field-checked by the Vermont DEC Wetlands Division Program.
 - e. Wildlife Habitat: Except for about 0.9 acres at the northwestern corner of the property, *Significant Forest Habitat* comprises all of the property (as identified within the GIS layers of the "*Charlotte Significant Wildlife Habitat Map and Database*"). About 1.6 acres of *Significant Linkage Habitat* has been identified along the northern portion of the property.
 - f. Water supply source protection areas (SPAs):
 - Ground water: N/A
 - Surface water: The entirety of parcel falls within the Champlain Water District – Zone 3 (System ID: VT0005092).
 - g. Scenic Views and Vistas: Prindle Road, abutting to the north of the property is classified as a "*Most Scenic Public Highway*" according to the Charlotte Town Plan.
2. When delineating the proposed boundary line for the new lots, the proposed survey for your forthcoming subdivision plat should indicate a minimum fifty foot (50') setback from any of the property boundaries for any of the current structures that exceed 250 square feet in area (according to **Table 2.5(E)** of **Section 2.3** of the Regulations, which address the dimensional standards for lots within the Rural Zoning district). Furthermore, **Section 3.6(B)(1)** of the Regulations covering Lot, Yard, and Setback Requirements state:
- "No lot shall be so reduced in area that it cannot meet area, yard, setback, frontage, coverage and other dimensional requirements for the district in which it is located, except as approved by the Planning Commission for a planned residential or planned unit development under Chapter VIII."*
3. The subdivision proposed includes two alternative parcel designs: **Alternative 1**: an L-shaped irregular lot, and; **Alternative 2**: a square-shaped regular lot. **Section 7.2(C)(5)** of the Regulations state the following:

“Irregularly shaped lots (e.g., with curves, jogs, doglegs; excessively rectilinear, etc.) shall not be created unless warranted by topography, surface waters, or to avoid the fragmentation of significant natural or cultural features.”

4. The Planning Commission considers **Alternative 2** as the preferable option to subdivide the property. However, according to the January 17, 2019 meeting minutes, the proposed lot would be about 3.3 acres, which is less than the 5-acre Rural Zoning district standard. This less-than conforming lot may only be approved as a Planned Residential Development (PRD), which would require fifty-percent (50%) of the existing property to be conserved.

5. **Section 8.1(B)** of the Regulations regard the purpose of the Planned Residential Development (PRD) as follows:

“PRD provisions are intended to allow clustering of residential development and innovative design to promote the most appropriate use of land and the preservation of Areas of High Public Value identified in Table 7.1;”

The less than 5-acre lot proposed in **Alternative 2** would cluster further development of the property. Furthermore, the resulting PRD-conserved portion of 5.345 acres of contiguous *Significant Forest Habitat* at the southern end of the property would be ideal for conservation. This delineated open space should be included on the proposed survey for your forthcoming subdivision application.

6. To further protect the *Significant Forest Habitat* of the property, it is recommended that building envelopes of approximately one-acre sized be created for both lots, which should also be included on your forthcoming survey. **Section 7.2(E)** of the Regulations state:

“All proposed lots intended for development shall include designated building envelopes within which all structures and parking areas shall be located, unless waived in accordance with Section 6.2. . . The Commission also may require the identification of specific building footprints if such information is needed to determine conformance with these regulations.”

7. There was a proposed replacement of the wastewater infrastructure indicated in your submitted Sketch Plan map. The status of the wastewater system indicated in the 2001 survey for your property is unclear (see: *Map Slide 126, Page 2*; “Property Plat of Barbara Horsford”). There is also a 1990 surveyed septic easement on your property (see: *Map Slide 76, Book 10, Page 7*; “Property of William C. & Barbara B. Horsford”) for the eastern adjoining property. Further, a concrete tile wellhead is depicted on the northeastern corner of a 1986 subdivision survey (see: *Map Slide 50, Volume 7, Page 8*; Property of “William C. & Barbara B. Horsford”) that is not indicated on the aforementioned surveys. For your forthcoming subdivision survey, all of the water supply and wastewater infrastructure should be updated and/or reference the previous surveys from 2001, 1990, and 1986.

8. Other issues may be considered during the review of your forthcoming Final Plan application. In accordance with **Section 6.3(D)** of the Regulations, this Sketch Plan Review is valid for six months.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Joslin', written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

Peter Joslin, Chair
Charlotte Planning Commission