

1 **Town of Charlotte**
2 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING**
3 **Meeting Conducted at Town Hall and via Teleconference**
4 **November 5, 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, Lydia Clemmons, Will Thompson, Ryan Augustine, Susie Williams.
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 Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, October 22, 2025
16 7:10 PM DRB 25-165-SK Clemmons Family Farm – sketch plan review – to retrofit the existing
17 barn into a visual and performing arts space at 2158 Greenbush Road
18 7:40 PM Review agenda for CCC/DRB/PC Joint Meeting
19 8:00 PM Review of DRB Rules of Procedure (continued)
20 8:15 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 7:00pm. No changes to the agenda.
25

26 **Public Comment:**

27 None.
28

29 **Review & Approve Meeting Minutes: draft DRB Minutes, October 22, 2025:**

30 **MOTION by Alexa Lewis; seconded by Gerald Bouchard, to approve the DRB meeting**
31 **minutes for October 22, 2025, as drafted. 4 ayes, motion carried.** Brandon Tieso had not yet arrived.
32

33 **DRB 25-165-SK Clemmons Family Farm – sketch plan review – to retrofit the existing barn into a**
34 **visual and performing arts space at 2158 Greenbush Road:**

35 Russell noted that a site visit occurred before the meeting.

36 Russell asked for introductions. Lydia Clemmons, Will Thompson, and Ryan Augustine
37 (engineer) provided their names.

38 Augustine opened the presentation by referencing a proposed parking area on the north side of
39 the barn which would hold 18 vehicles and 2 handicap accessible spots. On the southwest side, an
40 additional handicap accessible parking spot for lower-level entrance, a connecting sidewalk, and access
41 for the upper level. Augustine commented on site grading to ensure proper drainage and the installation
42 of a wastewater system.

43 Augustine elaborated on the proposed wastewater system. The new system would accommodate
44 the barn and replace the system for the two houses across the road. Russell asked if the existing septic
45 system had failed. Augustine said the rationale is to consolidate and modernize. Russell then listed the
46 conditions that allow for a septic system to cross a road under current Land Use Regulations (LURs).
47 Further, even if a condition is met, the Selectboard must also approve.

48 Augustine returned to proposed parking and said 11 additional turf spots have been identified
49 between the two houses across the road. Augustine concluded his presentation with brief mention of
50 proposed landscape screening between the parking lot and Greenbush Road. Russell said that LURs
51 outline the number of required parking spaces, and the benefit of slightly exceeding that number.

52 Russell questioned grading for the north side entrance. Augustine responded that all grading will
53 be ADA accessible.

54 Bouchard said he was concerned about sight visibility from the southside. Augustine responded
55 that the southside entrance is reserved for a single handicap accessible spot and will not see significant
56 traffic.

57 Russell asked if the driveway depicted on the northside was in existence. Augustine answered
58 that it is not. Russell then noted the need to obtain a Highway Access permit from the Selectboard.

59 Doug Paton spoke about his experience at the facility but couldn't recall parking conditions.
60 Clemmons responded that parking is currently located on the east side of the street on Greenbush Road.

61 Lewis asked if the barn is historic. Clemmons confirmed that it is. Lewis pointed out that
62 Clemmons could have applied for adaptive reuse and acknowledged that conditional use is less
63 restrictive. Lewis then asked Clemmons if the barn is on the State Register of Historic Places.
64 Clemmons responded that it is on the National Register and an official landmark on the African
65 American Heritage Trail.

66 Russell said the application will require conditional use and site plan review and asked which use
67 the application would fall under for conditional use review in the Rural District. Clemmons confirmed
68 the barn would be a cultural facility.

69 Lewis asked about the likelihood of loading and unloading, and if so, how that would be
70 handled. Clemmons said that a historic addition had been removed from the barn, this would be returned
71 and used for artists to load and unload on the lower level. Clemmons then referenced the proposed
72 warming kitchen and the possibility of a caterer loading and unloading. Clemmons said the thought for
73 the upper level is for performing arts.

74 Russell returned to required parking and outlined that 1 space is required for every 200 square
75 feet of floor area or 1 for every 4 seats when at capacity, whichever is greater. Parking is currently being
76 proposed at 33 spaces. To this, Clemmons said there would never be simultaneous events occurring in
77 the upper and lower levels. Russell asked if the expectation is to register and limit patrons. Clemmons
78 confirmed that this protocol is already in place, as non-profit, with mainly free events, there is nothing to
79 be gained by exceeding set limitations.

80 Tieso calculated a rough estimate of 8,000 square feet between the barn's two floors. Russell
81 asked if that calculation included the proposed addition. Tieso did not believe so. Lewis asked about the
82 maximum capacity being 70 and 33 parking spots being proposed. Specifically, would Clemmons
83 encourage carpooling. Clemmons confirmed this would be the approach. Lewis then asked about
84 overflow parking. Clemmons said 20 overflow parking spots have been identified.

85 Lewis asked about wetland delineations on mapping and asked for clarification on the various
86 depictions. Augustine clarified that the lawn is in the buffer but not in the wetlands.

87 Lewis questioned if any signage would be added. Clemmons said signage would be small and
88 discrete.

89 Russell asked if the facility is currently permitted by the town. Clemmons responded that current
90 events are small and free and no permitting has been obtained. Clemmons added that she had inquired
91 about the need for permitting in the past and was told that it was not necessary.

92 Tieso returned to usable space calculations as it pertains to parking. Tieso asked Clemmons if
93 any portion of the barn would be used for storage. Clemmons identified that some storage for audio
94 equipment might occur. Paton asked if a condition could be written prohibiting simultaneous events on
95 the two levels to address parking. Frank Tenney commented that parking must be sufficient for the
96 intended use and did not believe that a condition could be set to prohibit simultaneous use of both levels.

97 Rebecca Kaplan pointed out that the barn would have more than one use. Russell elaborated on Kaplan's
98 point, and said that for office space, parking requirements are 1 parking spot for every 300 square feet.
99 Lewis commented on language in the LURs that would allow parking requirements to be modified.

100 Thompson asked if existing parking across the road could be factored into parking requirements.
101 Russell said that it could be counted if included in the application. Lewis pointed out that a bicycle rack
102 is also needed. Tieso asked about a parking easement for the existing parking space if the intent is to
103 include in the application. Clemmons believed that one was already on-file. Russell asked about a path
104 from the barn to the existing parking spaces. Clemmons said there is a mowed path.

105 Russell pointed out that part of conditional use review is to ensure that the proposal fits the
106 character of the area and does not cause any undue adverse effects.

107 Paton asked if there is an intended emergency exit for the upper level, such as a stairway, to not
108 be solely reliant on an elevator.

109 Russell asked about proposed lighting. Clemmons said that nighttime events are not anticipated.

110 Lewis returned to Russell's previous point that wastewater crossing a road is only permitted
111 under certain circumstances. Russell read from LURs pertaining to this. This led to discussion that the
112 application would need to be reviewed against standards for Planned Residential Development (PRD).

113 Paton returned to parking. Paton pointed out that the parking spots, nearest to Greenbush Road,
114 on the north side are close to the road. Paton asked if there are any regulations that outline parking
115 proximity to roads. Russell said that the opening to the parking area is wide. Augustine pointed out that
116 it is not expected that patrons would be coming and going at the same time.

117 Russell asked if the parking areas would be gravel or paved. Augustine responded that parking
118 will be on reinforced turf. Russell asked if this was being done to avoid parking being counted as
119 impervious surface as it pertains to lot coverage. Lewis did not feel this was an issue either way given
120 the size of the lot. Russell pointed out that turf parking spaces will be difficult to decipher.

121 Tenney returned to Paton's question regarding parking proximity to the road. Tenney located in
122 the LURs where parking is prohibited in the front setback, unless there is no alternative location. Russell
123 said that the front setback in the Rural District is 50 feet.

124 Russell commented on the need to classify the application and approve any waivers. The first
125 potential waiver that was called into question was regarding the construction schedule. Lewis asked if
126 heavy equipment would be needed. Clemmons confirmed that heavy equipment would be used for the
127 addition to the barn, grading and septic. Russell suggested a narrative on construction plans. Russell said
128 the requirement for a shoreland management plan could be waived. Augustine asked how the absence of
129 any additional lighting should be addressed. Russell said in the narrative. Russell said traffic impact
130 could also be addressed in the narrative. Russell suggested that environmental impact is being addressed
131 through Act 250. Lewis suggested that visual impact could also be addressed in the narrative. Augustine
132 pointed out that the applicant did not intend to submit a storm water control plan; consensus to waive.

133 Russell returned to the application meeting the same requirements as a PRD and noted that PRDs
134 require two hearings, preliminary and final. Russell suggested that a legal opinion be obtained on
135 whether the application needs to be reviewed as a PRD.

136 **MOTION by Alexa Lewis; seconded by Brandon Tieso, to classify DRB 25-165-SK**
137 **Clemmons Family Farm as site plan and conditional use. 5 ayes, motion carried.**

138
139 **Review agenda for CCC/DRB/PC Joint Meeting:**

140 Tieso prepared a document based on the conservation of the October 22nd meeting that outlined
141 the closed application that would be presented. Paton suggested redacting names from any documents
142 presented. Russell said further clarification is needed around Planned Unit Development (PUD) and
143 PRD, which could be the focus of the exercise. Tenney commented on time constraints and questioned if
144 a mock staff report could be created instead of using a closed application.

145 Claudia Mucklow asked if the Charlotte Conservation Commission (CCC) should have an
146 agenda for the Joint Meeting or if the Development Review Board's exercise is intended to consume the
147 entire meeting. Russell said he intended to discuss this with the Planning Commission during their
148 November 6th meeting.

149 Discussion around whether Tieso's document should be distributed at the beginning of the
150 exercise. Kaplan pointed out that the document outlines the issues within the LURs. Consensus to
151 initially provide the application and staff report and have the Planning Commission truly engage in the
152 process.

153

154 **Review of DRB Rules of Procedure (continued):**

155 Tieso prepared and read a statement that he had drafted to address conflict of interest. Russell
156 spoke about a previous conflict of interest circumstance that predated the person making a public
157 comment before becoming an active board member. Tenney gave an example that would lead to
158 perception of conflict of interest, based on public statement.

159 Lewis suggested correcting that regular meetings occur on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the
160 month to read *unless adjusted and published*. Russell said an alternative is to note that the schedule is set
161 in December for the year ahead. Paton questioned special meetings. Lewis and Russell spoke to
162 examples of when special meetings have occurred in the past.

163 Lewis moved to interested persons, and the requirement for participation in the hearing for the
164 right to appeal a decision. Lewis noted that participation can be in writing prior to the hearing. Russell
165 said that participation in writing prior to the hearing is considered participation per the definition.
166 Through discussion, it was determined that participation should be formally documented in hearings.

167 Russell questioned protocol and whether dismissal of an application occurs.

168

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

170 Tabled due to time constraints.

171

172 **Adjourn:**

173 **MOTION by Alexa Lewis; seconded by Brandon Tieso, to adjourn the meeting. VOTE: 5**
174 **eyes, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:17pm.

175

176 Minutes respectfully submitted:

177 Nicole Burnell, Recording Secretary