

Fair Haven Planning Commission
Town of Fair Haven - August 6, 2025 - Regular Meeting

Commissioners Present: Deborah Laiacona - Vicechair, Ann Finley, Sam Lucci, Linda Sienkiewicz - clerk

Commissioners Absent: Robert Richards - Chair

Others Present: Phil Adams - Zoning Administrator, Jennifer Jackson - Minute-taker, Logan Solomon - RRPC, Craig Markcrow - current owner of application land, Eric Hier - realtor, Sally Redondo-Padilla - applicant

Agenda

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm by Vice Chair Laiacona. She stated she would be running the meeting today due to Chair Richards absence.

2. Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting:

Approval of Minutes: Regular meeting - July 16, 2025

Mr. Lucci motioned at 7:31 pm to accept the minutes of July 16th as written. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Finley. All were in favor and the motion passed.

3. New Business:

- a. **Sally E. Redondo-Padillo - Application #A2025-033 for a review of a proposed Home Occupation in a 25% portion of the principle building that will be converted from a Business Office use to a Single-Family Dwelling. The Home Occupation proposed involves sound therapy, massage therapy, child birthing classes, ministry related meetings and community garden, with a maximum number of 12 clients in group sessions. Property owner: Vermont Structural Slate Co., Inc.. Location: 3 Prospect Street. Fair Haven Tax Map number 24-52-48.**

Ms. Redondo-Padilla presented her application. She explained she has a background in small business. She's worked one on one services and in small groups. She is hoping to create calmness. She's also been working as a substitute teacher within the school district and hopes to continue doing such.

Mr. Lucci asked if she owns the adjacent lot as well. Mr. Mackcrow explained that he currently owns the property and the adjacent lot and filled out the application as the owner of the property. Mrs. Redondo-Padilla will purchase one of the parcels from him.

Mrs. Finley asked if Ms. Redondo-Padilla will be offering doula services. Ms. Redondo-Padilla explained she had been a doula in the past and was excited by Vermont's interest in doula services.

Mr. Lucci asked if two lots across the street from one another were considered adjoining. ZA Adams explained yea for the purposes of a zoning application.

Mrs. Sienkiewicz clarified that the application was for a change from business to residential. Ms. Redondo-Padilla stated yes. Mrs. Finley asked about where she was thinking

of having the community garden. Ms. Redondo-Padilla explained anywhere on the lot where there is space. ZA Adams explained there was lawn between the bridge and the building.

ZA Adams clarified with the Planning Commission that the plot's location was in the mixed river district, and converting to a single family home from a business location can be completed administratively. But the Home Occupancy Business cannot, that being the reason the application is brought before the PC.

Mrs. Laiacona asked about the normal considerations that the Planning Commission must consider, like signage and parking. Mr. Hier stated that he and ZA Adams had spoken and he was under the understanding that a sign is permitted as long as it is under 3ft², that no permit would be needed for signage. Mr. Markcrow explained that at the moment there is no sign, as it was involved in a car accident, but there had been a sign by the entrance door. Mr. Hier stated if Ms. Redondo-Padilla preferred the sign could go on the building but not to exceed 3ft².

Mrs. Finley asked about parking. Mr. Hier stated there is a diagram of parking in the application. He stated that as the building is an old mill there is plenty of parking already available. Mr. Markcrow explained that there is parking for 7 or 8 people at the office.

Mr. Lucci asked, as there are two units on the property are they both for consideration. It was answered in the negative. Mr. Hier explained that the front house was the house being converted. Mrs. Redondo-Padilla stated that the kitchen needs appliances and to be brought up to standards. Mr. Lucci asked if she would be living there. Mrs. Redondo-Padilla stated she would. She liked the location because she said it wasn't in a neighborhood and her sound therapy practices shouldn't bother any neighbors there.

Mrs. Laiacona clarified with ZA Adams if a Home Occupancy needed to be considered for a site plan review. He stated it would need to be considered. Mrs. Laiacona stated she didn't believe the application needed a site plan review. Mr. Lucci asked for an explanation of what a site plan review would entail. ZA Adams gave a description. Mrs. Finley was in agreement that she believed the application did not need a site plan review. Mr. Lucci asked if in the future another business was to come along do they need to consider the ramification of changing from commercial to business with this application. ZA Adams stated no as the change between the two can be completed administratively. Ms. Redondo-Padilla made the choice to live in this area and it being a mixed river district gives her the ability to do that. Another owner can make another choice and it could change again.

Mrs. Sienkiewicz asked about parking. Mr. Hier stated the lot was quite a ways from the intersection and wasn't a challenge to get into. Mr. Markcrow stated that up until 1995, 35 people worked in that location. Mrs. Sienkiewicz asked how many people were expected to be in a session at a time. Ms. Redondo-Padilla stated not more than 12 people per session, but in the walk through with the fire marshal she was told no more than 20 people at a time.

Mrs. Finley **motioned to exempt the application from site plan review.** The motion was seconded by Mr. Lucci. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Mrs. Redondo-Padilla asked a clarifying parking question, where can the business owner park according to the bylaws as she is concerned about winter snow and parking far away from her home. ZA Adams stated that a single family home needs one parking space per dwelling on the side or rear yard. Mr. Hier stated there are two spaces for employees in the back. ZA stated that the parking should follow the bylaws.

Mrs. Sienkiewicz motioned to accept the application as written with no conditions at 7:53 pm. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Finley. All were in favor and the motion passed. Mrs. Redondo-Padilla thanked the PC and left at 7:54 PM.

b. Review work on components required for Fair Haven to qualify for a Downtown Designation.

Downtown Designation Application Packet

(https://outside.vermont.gov/agency/ACCD/ACCD_Web_Docs/CD/CPR/State-Designation-Programs/CPR-DT-Application-Guidelines.pdf)

Mrs. Laiacona moved the PC on to the discussion for Downtown Designation.

Mr. Solomon stated he brought a map of the businesses in the downtown area he would like the PC to look at and correct as needed. The map is both a good exercise and a required part of the application. The map ultimately needs pictures of all the businesses in town and a description of why the building is significant to the downtown heritage. He stated that he found a 1980 National Historic District application that might help with some of the map building. Mr. Lucci suggested they extend the downtown area to include the St. Mary's school as the location is a good one for a future business. Mr. Solomon thought that would be a good idea to consider. Mr. Solomon explained that the map can be revisited in the future as businesses change. The PC reviewed and corrected the map as needed.

Mr. Solomon explained that the historical district regulations should be customized to each community. They should explain what is significant to the community. The report that needs to be created needs to explain all this. The report can be used to build regulations or to reference. He suggested that the PC get together with the historical society or other people in the community and walk around the area in question and talk about the buildings, why they are important or not and how the bylaws should be amended or not to keep the historical district historical. Mrs. Laiacona asked for clarification on exactly what type of document the PC is being asked to produce. Mr. Solomon explained that they are being asked to create a report with statutes that lives on a website and is referenced in the bylaws of the Town. That they are being asked to create regulations based on the historical significance to the town.

Mr. Solomon clarified himself by stating they are creating a zoning amendment with the historic district that needs to articulate the historical significance of the buildings in the district. The report they create inventories the buildings. He stated the language they drafted before was too broad for the State Historical partners, and that it left out the significance to the community of each building. Mrs. Laiacona asked, the PC needs to create a report that explains our buildings? Mr. Solomon explained that yes they need to create a report, but that it does not need to be part of the regulations. Mrs. Laiacona asked if the 1980's report could be a starting point. Mr. Solomon was in agreement. Mrs. Sienkiewicz asked if the Historical Buildings of Rutland County could also be referenced. Mr. Solomon stated he would send over the 30 page document he had without pictures of the buildings to help get the PC started, but he emphasized the tall task the PC has of creating this report and why taking the walking tour with interested parties is so helpful. The PC needs to be purposeful with their creation of this report. He stated that non-contributing structures can be looked at as well and explained why they are non-historically contributing structures.

Mr. Solomon asked if there were any town owned properties that had developmental projects in the near future. Hardwick included in their application an explanation of what they would be doing in the future with their town owned parcels. He was curious if Fair Haven wanted to include that information or not. Mr. Lucci asked what the disadvantage to that is. Mr. Solomon explained that town owned land is accessible to all - if it's not developed it needs to be a park. Mr. Lucci explained there are parcels outside of the DT area that are considered for various projects.

Mrs. Laiacona stated that in the next meeting a walking tour should be scheduled.

4. Other Business:

- a. Review of Mail: None
- b. Public Comment: None

5. Adjournment:

Mrs. Sienkiewicz **motioned to adjourn at 8:58 pm.** ZA Adams asked that the PC let him know if the walking tour will be part of the regular meeting or if a special meeting was needed. Mrs. Laiacona stated that the next meeting should begin at 7:00pm requiring a special meeting notice. Mrs. Finley seconded the adjournment motion. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 9:02pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jennifer Jackson, Minute-taker

The Next Commission Meeting will be held on August 20, 2025 at 7:00pm