

1 **Town of Charlotte**
2 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING**
3 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**
4 **November 19, 2025**

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, Brandon Tieso.

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

10 **OTHERS:** Frank Tenney, Claudia Mucklow, Peter Post.

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 7:03 PM Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, November 5, 2025
16 7:05 PM DRB-25-158 SDA Post – public hearing - Subdivision Amendment to change the
17 location of the building envelope at 1706 Carpenter Road
18 7:30 PM Deliberations on closed applications (if any)
19 7:40 PM Review of CCC/DRB/PC November 12 Joint Meeting
20 8:00 PM Discussion on 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 7:01pm. Russell added sketch letter review
25 for DRB 25-165-SK Clemmons Family Farm, to the agenda.

26
27 **Public Comment:**

28 None.

29
30 **Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, November 5, 2025:**

31 **MOTION by Alexa Lewis; seconded by Brandon Tieso, to approve the DRB meeting**
32 **minutes for November 5, 2025, as amended. 5 ayes, motion carried.**

33
34 **DRB-25-158 SDA Post – public hearing - Subdivision Amendment to change the location of the**
35 **building envelope at 1706 Carpenter Road:**

36 Russell swore in Peter Post. Russell asked if any Development Review Board (DRB) member
37 had any conflicts of interest or ex parte communications to disclose; none noted. Russell commented
38 that a site visit had occurred before the hearing.

39 Russell questioned if the driveway to the west had been built. Post responded that no driveway to
40 the west has been built. Post went on to explain that the curb cut to the west was established as part of
41 the original subdivision for residential access. The driveway in Post's proposed subdivision amendment
42 would be accessible through the existing agricultural entrance. The curb cut to the west would then
43 become the agricultural access.

44 Gerald Bouchard asked about the proposed location for the well. Post confirmed that the well
45 would be in proximity to the proposed building envelope. Russell pointed out that water is under the
46 purview of the state.

47 Lewis redirected the conversation back to the proposed driveway which is currently used for
48 agricultural purposes. Post said that the curb cut would have to be brought up to residential standards.
49 Lewis asked about Selectboard approval to do so. Rebecca Kaplan said that Post's Highway Access
50 Permit was on the agenda for the upcoming Selectboard meeting.

51 Tieso questioned whether the DRB should address that more than half of the proposed building
52 envelope is depicted within 100 feet of the septic isolation zone. Frank Tenney noted that the isolation
53 zone pertains to maintaining distance between water and septic.

54 Tenney asked about the rationale behind the original building envelope. Post spoke about
55 reduced installation costs for the driveway and utilities with the proposed building envelope. Tenney
56 clarified that he was asking if the original building envelope was established for any reason. Post said it
57 was his preference, which has changed over time. Regarding preferential relocation, Russell read the
58 conditions from the original subdivision to determine if there was anything that would prevent changing
59 the location. Character of the area was referenced in the original conditions; consensus that the proposed
60 building envelope would still fit.

61 **MOTION by Gerald Bouchard; seconded by Doug Paton, to close DRB-25-158 SDA. 5**
62 **ayes, motion carried.**

63

64 **Deliberations on closed applications (if any):**

65

66 **DRB-25-158 SDA Post:**

67 Russell commented on the need to obtain amended water, wastewater and highway access
68 permits. Bouchard questioned if the suggestion should be made for screening with trees in the front of
69 the proposed building envelope. Tenney pointed out that screening was not discussed during the hearing.
70 Russell agreed that it could have been discussed during the hearing, along with aesthetics such as house
71 color, but it was not. Lewis proposed a suggestion that the applicant consider that Carpenter Road is
72 scenic and encourage landscaping and aesthetics that are fitting with the surrounding area. Bouchard
73 noted that the final plat would need to be presented for review.

74

75 **DRB 25-165-SK Clemmons Family Farm – sketch letter review:**

76 Russell questioned if the application could be considered a Planned Residential Development
77 (PRD) given it includes more than residential. Lewis questioned if classifying as a PRD is necessary. In
78 response, Russell referred to the proposed septic running across the road, and because of this, the
79 necessity of meeting PRD standards. To this, Russell said PRD standards would be for residential uses
80 only.

81 Russell suggested an alternative to meeting PRD standards, that would allow the septic to run
82 across the road, a variance. Russell felt that a variance could potentially come into play to allow
83 reasonable use of the parcel. The five criteria to receive a variance would also need to be analyzed and
84 met. Paton recalled that the Selectboard would also need to approve and asked Tenney to speak to that
85 process. Tenney spoke about the process. Tenney said he is more stuck on reasonable use. In his view,
86 the applicant would be increasing their use.

87 Tieso recalled that the applicant presented that the proposed septic was to modernize, not to
88 replace a failed system. Bouchard pointed out that they are being proactive in replacement. Lewis agreed
89 but noted that being proactive cannot be used as rationale to cross the road.

90 The five criteria to be granted a variance were then reviewed. Russell circled back to his
91 reasonable use thought, he said that reasonable use includes septic. Lewis questioned if there might be
92 an alternative location that does not require running across the road. Bouchard said there might be
93 potential, where parking is being proposed.

94 Tieso redirected the conversation back to why the application cannot be considered against PRD
95 standards and recapped that it is because of mixed use. To this, Russell pointed out that Planned Urban

96 Development (PUD) is not listed as a rationale for running a septic system across the road, and even if it
97 was, PUDs are not permitted in the Rural District.

98 Consensus that the idea of retrofitting the existing barn would be a great use of the historic site.
99 Bouchard suggested this may be a case where the DRB exercises discretion.

100 Tieso asked how the application warrants variance consideration. In response, Russell spoke
101 about previously granted variances and returned to criteria.

102 Tieso questioned if porta-potties might be an alternative. To this, Lewis spoke about the intent
103 for artists to also use the facility.

104 Russell suggested review of the remainder of the sketch letter, and then returning to the septic
105 discussion. Lewis pointed out that under Section 2.4 (E) Dimensional Standards there should be note of
106 proposed parking in the front setback. Also under Dimensional Standards, Russell questioned if the
107 existing small barn would be used under the proposed new use. If so, then it would need to be included
108 in the site plan review. Lewis noted the need to reference overflow parking adjacent to the property in
109 Section 3.11.

110 Russell asked DRB members that had attended events on the property where the events were held. Event
111 location on the map was pointed out. This led to discussion of the property hosting artists in residence.
112 Russell then asked if there might be simultaneous events between the barn and the house. Tieso asked
113 how the applicant presented to Act 250. Kaplan responded as one 10.82 parcel. Lewis referenced
114 applications waivers from Section 5.5 and noted that the only items waived were shoreland and
115 stormwater management plans, all other items were to be part of the application's narrative.

116 Russell returned to the septic issue and asked about comfortability with potentially granting a
117 variance. Russell restated his point that any reasonable use on the east side of the parcel would require
118 septic. Tieso said that he does not feel the application meets criteria to be granted a variance. Russell
119 asked which of the five variance criteria Tieso felt had not been met. Lewis suggested that the Planning
120 Commission be asked to update Section 3.16 and add proposed updates to the March Town Meeting
121 Day ballot. Russell asked if it is reasonable to limit the applicant to use the 10.82-acre parcel without
122 wastewater. Tieso pointed out that there is nothing supporting the idea that running the septic across the
123 road is truly necessary and there is no existing septic on the east side to begin with. Paton asked if the
124 suggestion could be made to find a septic location on the east side. Russell said it would be possible to
125 notify the applicant that running septic across the road would require a variance. Paton added to that,
126 and Selectboard approval. Lewis brought up the potential for adaptive reuse, which was discussed and
127 determined would not be beneficial.

128

129 **Review of CCC/DRB/PC November 12 Joint Meeting:**

130 Tieso said that he did not feel that any member of the Planning Commission or Conservation
131 Commission seemed as concerned as the DRB with the applicability of LURs. Tenney commented on
132 the difficulty an applicant faces in utilizing LURs, down to determining which district they reside in.
133 Tenney suggested that Kaplan should prepare a presentation on steps taken by the Zoning Administrator,
134 when an application is received, to create a staff report for the DRB. Russell said it's difficult to
135 appreciate the complexity of navigating LURs without repeated exposure. To this point, Tenney said the
136 application exercise could be repeated at each Joint Meeting. Lewis agreed and suggested one issue a
137 session. Claudia Mucklow pointed out that new Planning Commission members are completely
138 unfamiliar with LURs and have not even read them. In response to Mucklow's comment, Lewis noted
139 that the DRB should be able to provide input when LURs are being updated by the Planning
140 Commission. Tenney proposed that DRB feedback should flow through town staff. Russell disagreed
141 and pointed out that the Town Planner is new to the position. This might be possible in the future.
142 Russell said that the DRB should be able to engage with the Planning Commission. Lewis agreed with
143 Tenney's suggestion for use of staff. Bouchard disagreed and felt use of staff allows for suggestions to
144 morph.

145
146 **Discussion on Suggested Edits to the Land Use Regulations (continued):**

147 Russell said he has been reviewing Underhill's LURs. Underhill corrected similar issues that
148 Charlotte encounters. Russell suggested a thorough review of Underhill's LURs to outline corrections
149 to be made to Charlotte's LURs. Lewis proposed that all DRB members review Underhill's LURs in
150 preparation for the next meeting.

151
152 **Adjourn:**

153 **MOTION by Brandon Tieso; seconded by Gerald Bouchard, to adjourn the meeting.**

154 **VOTE: 5 ayes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:17pm.

155
156 Minutes respectfully submitted:

157 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary