

From: Ronda Moore

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 3:37 PM

Subject: Planning Commission meeting tonight regarding change in LUR (Old Lantern)

Planning Commission
Charlotte, Vermont

Dear Dean and members of the Planning Commission,

Due to the weather, I am unable to travel to Charlotte tonight to attend this very important meeting of the Planning Commission to discuss the proposed amendment to the Charlotte LUR permitting an existing facility as an "Allowed by Right" use within the WCV zoning district. I ask that this email become part of the record.

In sum, the amendment which will benefit only the Old Lantern and possibly the Clemmons Farm is overly broad, vague, and lacks any rational reason for inclusion in the LUR at least because the benefit to the Town is meager if it exists at all. I read the Planning Commissions report and I concur with most of the remarks but would like the Planning Commission to consider the following.

Over the last few decades the LUR have been amended and approved by the residents of the Town to be consistent with the Town Plan and to ensure thoughtful analysis and consideration of future development . Although I'm not always in agreement with the decisions of the Planning Commission, having such a commission to review each development or substantial improvement in the West Village to ensure that future development or substantial improvement meets the town's standards is critically important. The proposed amendment is so broad and so vague that the important role of the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board in regulating development with respect to the Old Lantern is essentially eviscerated.

According to the "Allowed by Right" provision, no permit is needed for anything. For example, the restaurant could be open at any time, the capacity for customers and the kitchen expanded, the parking lot enlarged, and the town resources utilized *ad libitum*. Recall the West Village is challenged, to say the least, with respect to water resources (see the Town of Charlotte hydrogeological map), septic capacity, traffic, and has no police force to rely on when an "entertainment facility" gets out-of-hand. The Old Lantern will have unfettered access to all these resources. And for those who say that there would be Site Plan and Conditional Use Review, then what does the Old Lantern gain from proposing this amendment other than to argue every time there is an improvement or any change in the present Old Lantern that they are "Allowed By Right". Litigation will abound.

The notion that the Lantern does or will have significant impact on the economy in Charlotte by providing jobs for Charlotters is just nonsense. There is no requirement that Charlotters are hired and persons benefitting from employment, likely part-time, may be residents of neighboring towns, not of Charlotte.

The Town needs to consider that there are a good many of us who reside and I mean "live" within earshot or are subjected to the noisy traffic or the beer cans on the front lawn every time the Old Lantern has an event. Also recall that the Old Lantern site was not designated as "commercial". This was likely not capricious but done for good reason when such designations were made.

I would prefer that the screws were tightened on the Old Lantern's activities rather than loosened. I believe that I am the only resident on Greenbush Road between the Lantern and the Four Corners that remembers when the Lantern opened. The activities of the Old Lantern today are *greatly expanded* from the warm weather only weekend activities I remember growing up. The residents have put up with this expansion with hardly a whimper. It is time now for the Planning Commission to maintain control over the objectives of the Old Lantern same as it does for every other issue under the purview of the commission.

Sincerely,
Ronda P. Moore
2922 Greenbush Road