

1 **Town of Charlotte**
2 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING**
3 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**
4 **February 11, 2026**

5
6 *DRAFT – subject to approval by the Development Review Board*

7 **Development Review Board:** Charles Russell (Chair), Gerald Bouchard (Vice Chair), Alexa Lewis,
8 Doug Paton. Absent: Brandon Tieso.

9 **Staff:** Rebecca Kaplan, Zoning Administrator.

10 **OTHERS:** Taylor Harmeling, Cooper Hayes, Frank Tenney.

11
12 **Posted Agenda:**

13 7:00 PM Call to Order; changes to agenda (if any)
14 7:02 PM Public Comment (not pertaining to pending applications)
15 7:05 PM DRB-26-04-SDA Harmeling-Cooper (re-submitted) – public hearing - Subdivision
16 amendment to transfer 5.57 acres between lots of common ownership at 3702 Mount
17 Philo Road
18 7:15 PM Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, January 28, 2026
19 7:20 PM Review & Approve DRB Rules of Procedure
20 7:45 PM DRB suggested edits to the Land Use Regulations (continued)
21 9:00 PM Adjourn

22
23 **Call to Order/ changes to agenda:**

24 Chair, Charles Russell, called the meeting to order at 7:28pm due to technical issues. No changes
25 to the agenda.

26
27 **Public Comment:**

28 None.

29
30 **DRB-26-04-SDA Harmeling-Cooper (re-submitted) – public hearing - Subdivision amendment to**
31 **transfer 5.57 acres between lots of common ownership at 3702 Mount Philo Road:**

32 Russell explained why the application needed to be re-submitted due to a delay in submitting the
33 final plat. Russell swore in Taylor Harmeling and Cooper Hayes (MSK Attorneys).

34 Hayes commented that the application is the same as when it was approved last June. The delay
35 in submitting the final plat was because the applicant's lender struggled to understand the approach
36 taken by the applicant to create an easement.

37 Alexa Lewis recalled that an easement was given to Lot 12 to meet frontage requirement. Hayes
38 responded that Lewis's recollection was correct and added that there are an agreement and deed
39 allowing use of the driveway to access Lot 12. Harmeling noted that the easier approach would have
40 been to sell as is and give himself an easement, but his lender would not agree to this.

41 **MOTION by Gerald Bouchard; seconded by Alexa Lewis, to close DRB-26-04-SDA**
42 **Harmeling-Cooper. 4 ayes, 1 absent, motion carried.** Brandon Tieso was absent.

43
44 **Review of Draft Decision: DRB-26-04-SDA Harmeling-Cooper:**

45 Doug Paton said that Tieso's absence should be reflected in the document. Lewis commented
46 that the Decision should note submission of the final plat and receipt of the letter confirming that the
47 survey pins were set.

48 There was discussion amongst the Development Review Board (DRB) of how frontage
49 requirements were met and how this should be documented within the Decision.

50 **MOTION by Alexa Lewis; seconded by Gerald Bouchard, to approve the Decision for**
51 **DRB-26-04-SDA Harmeling-Cooper. 4 ayes, 1 absent, motion carried.**

52
53 **Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, January 28, 2026:**

54 **MOTION by Doug Paton; seconded by Gerald Bouchard, to approve the DRB meeting**
55 **minutes for January 28, 2026, as written. 4 ayes, 1 absent, motion carried.**

56
57 **Review & Approve DRB Rules of Procedure:**

58 Paton started the conversation with a suggestion under Section III: Definitions. Paton noted the
59 definitions for Conflict of Interest and Ex Parte Communication should be both singular and plural.
60 Paton also caught that there were several instances where the plural versions for these definitions were
61 not capitalized.

62 Lewis had a clarification under Section V: Alternate Members, letter A; it should read
63 ‘application review’ versus ‘application.’ Lewis moved to Section XI: Conflicts of Interest, letter C.
64 Lewis suggested that perceived Conflict of Interest be added to this. Russell asked Lewis to describe the
65 difference between perceived Conflicts of Interest and actual Conflicts of Interest. Paton commented
66 that perceived versus actual should be addressed in Section III: Definitions. Russell moved to Section
67 III: Definitions and reviewed letter D. Conflict of Interest, items 1-3. Consensus to add an item 4, to
68 reflect a situation where a DRB member could establish Interested Persons status. The conversation
69 returned to Section XI: Conflicts of Interest, letter A. Participation. Discussion of whether ‘shall not
70 participate’ should be replaced. Frank Tenney suggested that Conflicts of Interest that necessitate recusal
71 be listed.

72 Russell said that the Vermont League of Cities and Towns (VLCT) had offered training and
73 support. Russell suggested the VLCT could consult on the Rules of Procedure document, before the
74 DRB approves.

75
76 **DRB suggested edits to the Land Use Regulations (continued):**

77 Russell commented on the upcoming Joint Meeting between the DRB, Planning Commission,
78 and Charlotte Conservation Commission (CCC). Russell said that the Planning Commission has
79 designated an hour for the Joint Meeting. The CCC will present their suggested edits to Land Use
80 Regulations (LURs) to the Planning Commission, which will likely take the time that is available.
81 Russell proposed the DRB present their suggestions at the following Joint Meeting in May. Lewis
82 recalled previous discussion about the DRB’s suggested edits being presented to the Town Planner,
83 Lindsay Kahn. Paton asked if Kahn would come to a DRB before the Joint Meeting in May. Russell
84 suggested Rebecca Kaplan discuss this with Kahn.

85 The discussion of suggested edits began with Chapter II. Zoning District – Tables and the
86 proposal to add accessory structure setback dimensions in all districts where accessory structures are
87 allowed. Russell felt that this was covered under a concern flagged by the previous Zoning
88 Administrator under Chapter IX. Administration & Enforcement.

89 Russell moved to the next proposed edit in Chapter II. to clarify Listed Uses versus both
90 Permitted and Conditional Uses. Lewis spoke about the confusion in mixing uses and structures. In
91 response, Tenney explained how approved uses then require permitting. Russell referred to a chart used
92 in Underhill’s LURs that provides clarity.

93 The next proposed edit in Chapter II., delete references to Septic Setbacks. To this, Tenney
94 pointed out that there should be defined Setbacks to existing septic tanks.

95 Russell moved to the following proposed edit in Chapter II., request for definition of vegetated
96 buffer. Then the last proposed edit in the Chapter, the request for clarification on structures that are sited
97 in wooded areas or on edge of fields.
98

98

99 **Adjourn:**

100 **MOTION by Gerald Bouchard; seconded by Alexa Lewis, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE:**
101 **4 ayes, 1 absent, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:15pm.

102

103 Minutes respectfully submitted:

104 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary