

Village Center Zoning District Discussion:  
 Suggestions from the December 10, 2024 Listening Session:

	Suggestions:	Community Member:
1.	Increase the dimensions, especially the side setback	Cheryl Michaels, Tracy Martin
2.	Move Group Homes to the Conditional Use list	Cheryl Michaels
3.	Move Multi-Family Dwellings to the C.U. list	Cheryl Michaels
4.	Return Forestry to the Permitted Use List	Susanne Gann
5.	Keep Highway Mixed Use as it currently exists	Warren Hill Jr.
6.	Reduce the stated height limit	Cheryl Michaels
7.	Remove Hotel/Motel from the Conditional Uses	Susanne Gann
8.	Create a new category of "Inn" with a size restriction in the definition (Conditional Use)	Cheryl Michaels

Correlating email responses:

**5. Existing Highway Mixed Use**

Wed, Dec 11,  
2024, 2:34 PM

Kristen,

It would also seem that there are possible drawbacks to not including the north side of Route 16 in the HMU zoning. It might be worthwhile for the Planning Commission members to outline the positive and negative possibilities for comparison purposes. If the possibilities balance, then it would probably be best to leave the HMU zoning in place which reflects current, long standing reality.

Along the highway is a natural placement of businesses for accessibility both for people in the village as well as in Hardwick and surrounding towns. The boundaries of the Designated Village Center would seem to be a random outline that doesn't necessarily reflect best use.

For example D&L provides quite a bit of benefit to East Hardwick and surrounding citizens. Much more benefit than considering building a home on top of where large gas tanks have resided for quite some time. Similar arguments for Hill's Auto.

Mike Lance

**5. Existing Highway Mixed Use**

Wed, Dec 11,  
2024,  
10:37 AM

A question came to mind towards the end of the rather lengthy meeting yesterday that I decided not to raise, for fear of extending it further.

I wondered at the logic behind moving the North side of Rte. 16 out of Highway Mixed Use zoning and into Village Zoning. Current reality says that the entities occupying the North side remain at least as business/mixed use oriented as the South side. Demers, D&L, Hill Auto, and the old yellow school building all

seem more Mixed Use and less Village and in fact some operate businesses that are no longer Permitted in the Village zoning.

What is the intent of this move?

Thank you,  
Mike Lance

## **6. Reduce the stated height limit**

Cheryl Michaels

Sat, Dec 21,  
2024,  
6:06 PM

Dear Kristen and Dave,

I just want to follow-up on my observations about the 35 foot maximum height of buildings in the proposed by-laws for East Hardwick village.

As you know almost all of the existing homes in East Hardwick village were built between 1800 and 1850 in the Greek Revival Style (there were two federal style houses) and in the second period of growth, 1870 - 1900 building continued in the Greek Revival Style. According to the 1989 survey by the Division of Historic Preservation, the architecture of the village has specific significance because of the many Greek Revival residences and businesses that have survived. None of these buildings, including the old hotel and general store, are a full three stories high. The architectural heritage of the village was mentioned in our village center designation.

I believe that any new building, constructed to be three stories high, would be out of scale with the historic village and would be a detraction from the historic architecture.

Therefore, I would like to recommend that the new zoning by-laws define the maximum height of new construction as 30 feet and not more than 2.5 stories.

Since I can't climb on roofs and drop a knotted rope to measure the height of each building, I've been researching the height of typical antique structures. What I discovered is that a typical Greek Revival 1.5 story house from the 1800s would generally be around 20 feet tall at its highest point. In a 1.5 story design, the second story is usually a partial floor with knee walls and a lower ceiling height rather than a full second story. A standard two-story house is generally around 20-25 feet tall; however, this can vary depending on factors like roof pitch and ceiling height.

A typical 2.5 story home is usually around 25 to 30 feet tall at its highest point, with the added "half story" contributing to the overall height.

A full three-story building can also be constructed with a height of 27–30 feet, based on a single story height of 9 feet. This would obviously be a building with a flat or low pitched roof, and a box-like structure, and is why I think it is important to specify a maximum of 2.5 stories in addition to specifying the 30 feet maximum height. This would keep new construction within the current scope and style of the village.

Thanks for listening,  
Cheryl Michaels

**8. Create new “Inn” Category – follow-up from Cheryl:**

Fri, Jan 10,  
3:20 PM (3 days  
ago)

Cheryl Michaels  
to Kristen

Hi Kristen, I just remembered that in the listening meeting for the new district for East Hardwick, I mentioned a sizing definition for the hotel/motel category. My concern is that a B&B has a sizing definition, but there is nothing between that and a grand Hotel/Motel. What I was proposing was that we do not allow a Hotel/Motel in the new East Hardwick district, but instead create a new category which I will call an Inn. Inns would not be restricted to having the owner/manager live on the property like a B&B, but would be restricted in size, such as up-to 14 double rooms and with a kitchen and dining room allowed. Cheryl