

*William B. Niemi & Martha Niemi*  
*P.O.Box 126*  
*4691 Center Road*  
*Greensboro, VT 05841*

Nov.19, 2015

Development Review Board  
Town of Greensboro  
PO Box 119  
Greensboro, VT 05841

Dear Development Review Board

As an abutter, to the property at 2853 Hardwick Street Greensboro Vermont that was purchased by Greensboro Art Alliance and Residency, Mirror Theater and or Greensboro Performing Arts Center Trust and now wants to amend their original Conditional Use Permit and site plan per application # 2014-027B. Therefore, I request that either I or a family member be allowed to speak at the up coming Development Review Board Meeting on Nov.30, 2015 to express our concerns.

Sincerely



William B. Niemi

**Subject:** DBR Proceedings Mirror Theater  
**From:** Laurie Callahan (ldcallahan@comcast.net)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 18, 2015 6:26 AM

To Whom it may Concern,

I have signed a petition which will be presented at the Nov. 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. I cannot be present.

This project does not fit the characteristics of the neighborhood. It is too large and will negatively impact the community.

Sincerely,

Laurie Davis Callahan

**Subject:** Mirror theatre  
**From:** bearlady (bearlady@widomaker.com)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 3:26 PM

To the DRB:

As long time property owners in Greensboro, we are very much concerned with the proposed theatre currently under review. The population of Greensboro in the nine fall-winter-spring months of 600 to 700 does not warrant a theater designed to be open for business for twelve months in the year. Despite the quality of the productions presented, the demographics do not support this size a facility. It would be much more appropriate to have a tent in the summer months that could house a stage and seating capacity that would be appropriate for the added summer population and the weather conditions which would allow people from nearby communities to travel to Greensboro.

Our hope is that an appropriate modification will be part of your decision.

John B. and Lisa Landon Hewett

**Subject:** new theatre  
**From:** Norman Polston (madriverscience@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com; greensboro.theatre.information@aol.com; ClemMackenzie@aol.com;  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 12:08 PM

Dear board members.

A letter from Karen Newhouse made me aware of the new plans submitted by GPACT that seek to enlarge on the plans originally submitted. A small grassroots theater in Greensboro is a good idea - good for Greensboro, good for business. A larger theater built by eager developers that begins to overshadow bucolic Greensboro is not a good idea. I think the original plans that you approved are good enough. Do not change them.

Regards,

Norman Polston

The Miller's Thumb and 182 Craftsbury Road

**Mad River Science, LLC**

npolston@gmail.com

2736 Clay Road

Mckinleyville, CA 95519

707-616-3838

**Subject:** GAAR/GPACT  
**From:** Ronna Gray (grayronna@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2015 11:04 AM

---

Dear Zoning Board,

I am very concerned about the Mirror Theatre project. This project does not fit the characteristics of a rural community, is too large and growing larger, and will negatively impact the community. I have heard accounts of other small communities being negatively changed forever when projects were started that became bigger than anticipated. As a tax payer who is already paying exorbitant taxes, I am also concerned about how this non profit theatre will support itself in the long run without tax payer support. I am in favor of community theatre, but not on this scale.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Ronna R. Gray

Sent from my iPad

**Subject:** Greensboro Theater  
**From:** patricia smith (pkvsmith@hotmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2015 10:24 AM

---

Hello,

My name is Patricia Smith and I have been a summer resident my whole life. My family and ancestors have been summering in Greensboro for 105 years. For fourteen years I was a year round resident. I am writing to this board concerning the Greensboro theater.

While I love the arts, I do not think that a three story building that can be seen clear across the lake is needed for such a venture. Greensboro has always been an understated place, which makes it as wonderful as it is. I do not know why we actually need such a theater in Greensboro. I would much rather see the Highland Lodge be bought by new inn owners, or the Greensboro Garage bought by a mechanic team. These ventures are what Greensboro needs, not a three story building which will be an eye sore and which not not fit with the character of the town we all love.

Sincerely,

Patricia Smith

**Subject:** Greensboro Theatre  
**From:** Elizabeth Biancamano (emtbian@yahoo.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2015 2:17 PM

---

This does not look like something I would like to see in my town. In a word, it is grotesque! No possible way will this ever fit in our community. I am glad I do not know the morons who thought up such outlandish plans because it would embarrass me. Let us hope there are enough of us that we can make a change

Betty Biancamano  
Randolph Road

P.S. Since I drive through the four corners every day, please do not make me look at this "THING". Not easy to drive with your eyes shut.

**Subject:** New theater application  
**From:** Patricia Haslam (plhaslam@earthlink.net)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Cc:** greensboro.theatre.information@aol.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2015 10:10 AM

---

My husband and I do NOT object to having a theater group in town, but we staunchly disapprove of the size of the project and the style of the building as not fitting in with the rural character of the town and that neighborhood.

We are unable to attend the Nov. 30 meeting of the DRB to register our objections.

Thank you.

Peter M, Sr. and Patricia L. Haslam  
Stowe, VT and Greensboro summer residents

**Subject:** proposed theater project

**From:** Greg Kline (gmk105@gmail.com)

**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;

**Cc:** cpacsummer@aol.com; relevine@nutrition.umass.edu; greensboro.theatre.information@aol.com; gmk105@gmail.com;

**Date:** Wednesday, November 18, 2015 8:15 AM

Dear Greensboro Zoning Board, my wife and I have been renting the Bliss-Perry cottage on Breezy Ave from Connie Peterson for nearly 20 summers (2-3 weeks each summer) but we are not G'boro homeowners/residents. We have been attending and enjoying the summer theater events the past several years but are very concerned about the impact the newly proposed theater project would have on the character, charm and quality of life of G'boro. The current proposed theater scale seems out of proportion to the performing arts needs of a small rural town. Moreover, it is difficult to envision how a small town like G'boro could adequately absorb the inevitable increase in traffic and congestion. As non-homeowners we are aware that we have no voting rights on any town issues but, for what it's worth, thought we would send along our concerned voices for consideration as G'boro considers this project

Sincerely,  
Greg Kline & Robin Levine

THOMAS M. WOODWARD, JR.

P.O. BOX 191  
GREENSBORO, VT 05841

---

Kristen Leahy, Zoning Administrator  
Office of the Town Clerk  
Greensboro, Vermont 05841

November 23, 2015

Dear Ms Leahy,

We are writing to express our dismay at the recent changes in the Mirror Theater's plans concerning the amended conditional use application by the Greensboro Performing Arts Trust with regard to the following:

- The building is to be larger than first proposed
- The building is to be higher than first proposed
- There is a change in the size of the parking lot, to admit more vehicles
- There is an increase in seating (199 seats to 329)
- The total architecture is overwhelming in that the building with its restaurant is too large and completely out of character in any of Vermont's small towns (it would be far more suitable for Broadway in New York City – or at least, Burlington).

We are not against a theater in Greensboro, at all. In fact, I (Tom) acted in various plays in the 1940's which were performed in the old high school building. But this new, 10.5 million-dollar building proposal is a shock to the system. And it is going to deeply affect Greensboro.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Barbara Woodward

*Thomas M. Woodward, Jr.  
Barbara L. Woodward*

*add to email*

**Subject:** The Mirror Theater  
**From:** William Corbett (bevcobett@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 7:55 AM

---

Dear DB: We are summer residents of the lake's North End. We have concerns about The Mirror theater's building and site plan.

In our view the building is too big; there is too much parking and the lights, downward and on timers, will be too bright. We fear that unless the DRB limits The Mirror's grandiose production, a generous gift will disturb and diminish the serenity of the Greensboro we love.

If what is irreplaceable is damaged The Mirror will do Greensboro no favors.

Good luck with your deliberations.

William and Beverly Corbett and family

**Subject:** [DRB] Concern over theatre plans  
**From:** Henry Peck (peck.henry@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Sunday, November 29, 2015 10:46 PM

---

Dear Members of the Development Review Board,

I write out of concern regarding the proposed theatre construction in Greensboro. Unfortunately I am unable to attend the DRB meeting on Monday evening, but I hope you will take my views into account via email.

I am a summer resident in my late-twenties. For me, Greensboro is unusually precious. The inimitable lake, nature haven, dedicated community members and superb climate combine to create a very rare place.

To preserve and maintain the area, Greensboro has a robust land use policy. Proposed developments must be in keeping with the policy and consider the public interest. The revised plans for the theatre project have failed on both counts. These designs drastically exceed the initial description of theatre capacity, architectural aesthetic, building size, and light output. While the proposed expansion poses a serious threat to the Greensboro we all enjoy, the manner in which the plans have evolved (after DRB approval for a very different project) is insidious and raises questions about the integrity and interests of the developer.

Given that the commercial implications of the new application would violate our zoning policies, and the irrevocable alteration of the landscape and character of the area, I urge you to reject this application.

I am very grateful for your diligence in reviewing development applications and soliciting public input. Thank you for your consideration.

Your sincerely,  
Henry Peck

---

## Attachments

- signature.asc (842B)

*add to email*

**Subject:** Mirror Theatre  
**From:** Regina Wahlen (regina.wahlen@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzoneing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Sunday, November 29, 2015 6:02 PM

---

Please, do not let this theatre become any bigger than it already is planned to be. No higher roof, no larger parking lot, no additional seats.

It is already bigger and more out-of-place than it has a right to be for this small town.

Let us not make this a precedent for Greensboro.

We are not against theatre, or entertainment, or the arts; just not at this scale.

Regina Wahlen  
Benjamin Welch  
Greensboro, VT

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** GAAR/GPACT  
**From:** Timothy Breen (breener348@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 23, 2015 10:57 AM

Dear Kristen (if I may):

I want to add my voice to the growing number of people in Greensboro who believe that the dimensions and character of the Mirror Theater are totally inappropriate for our small community. Of course, the original plans have been approved. But now, without the kind of transparency that one expects with projects of this sort, the leaders of this enterprise announce their intention to expand their enterprise in ways--huge parking additions, for example--that suggest that the townspeople have never been fully or properly informed of the group's grand goals. It is time to demand openness about the theater, since once it has been constructed, it will be too late to complain that the Mirror does not mirror public opinion.

T.H. Breen

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** DRB meeting  
**From:** Sally Lonegren (slonegren@vmlink.net)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Saturday, November 21, 2015 1:42 PM

---

I don't agree that this petition is in Keeping with the character of this rare and special community. And I plan to be at the DRB meeting hoping to say a few things.

Thanks Kristen,  
Sally Lonegren

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** theatre project  
**From:** Vicky Sutton (vsutton1@verizon.net)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Saturday, November 21, 2015 9:09 AM

I will not be able to attend the November 30th meeting, but I want to express my concerns about the size and design of the proposed Mirror Theatre. I am especially concerned about design revisions that call for increasing rather than decreasing the size in any way. I would support a smaller structure more in keeping with the scale of Greensboro's population and existing architecture. I think the DRB should consider not just individual building specifications such as height and number of seats, but also the overall impact of the size of the building and its surrounding features such as parking and lighting. The building will exist all the time, not just when it is housing a theatre production.

Sincerely,  
Vicky Sutton  
542 Young Road  
Greensboro

Sent from my iPad

add to  
email  
list

**POND COTTAGE  
FRISTON, EASTBOURNE  
EAST SUSSEX BN20 0AL  
01323 422 422**

as from: **200 Miller Road  
Greensboro, Vermont 05841**

November 20, 2015

email: [charlespeck@supanet.com](mailto:charlespeck@supanet.com)

The Development Review Board

(Sean Thomas, Linda Romans, Nat Smith (Dep. Chair), Janet Travers (Clerk),  
Wayne Young, MacNeil, Jane Wodruff (Chair)  
Greensboro, Vermont 0581

Re: Greensboro Performing Arts Center Trust (a/k/a GAAR) application to build a  
theater; listed for hearing on November 30, 2015 before Development Review Board

#### Statement in Opposition

Dear members of the Development Review Board,

I love theater. Children and adults should experience more of it both as audiences and  
on stage. But I oppose the application which is before you on November 30.

I am a summer resident. The special qualities that have always attracted me to  
Greensboro are its gentle people, its peace and quiet, its dark nights, its attractive  
landscape and the refuge it provides from the hustle of the rest of the world.  
Greensboro zoning policies recognize and favor those qualities.

The proposed theater and its associated buildings, parking and lighting is not a simple  
'next step' evolution from Miss Jean's summer plays, or their successors at the  
McIntyre Barn and subsequent venues leading up to the tent on the Village Green of  
recent years. Its design is assertive and out of keeping with local styles, its scale and  
massing are out of proportion to the site, its lighting is intrusive.

The reasons you should turn down this application are: first, the application is in  
almost total violation of Greensboro's land use policy; second, the public interest has  
not been properly taken into account; third, there may have been procedural  
irregularities in the consideration of this project which should cause you to step back  
and reconsider the validity of the proposal.

1. The application violates Greensboro's land use policy. The Greensboro Town Plan  
at page 13 sets forth land use goals: reserving rural undeveloped land, encouraging  
and centralising commercial growth in the two village districts, and keeping growth  
from driving up land values and taxes disproportionately. It is difficult to see how  
these goals are furthered by the theater application. Those goals are carried into the  
Greensboro Zoning Bylaw (the Bylaw) which guides the Design Review Board  
(DRB) when it considers applications.

**POND COTTAGE  
FRISTON, EASTBOURNE  
EAST SUSSEX BN20 0AL  
01323 422 422**

In the Bylaw, the theater site falls in the "Rural Lands District" which is governed by sec. 2.5 which, at subsection (A) defines this as rural land with residential uses, forestry, agriculture and "other small businesses which facilitate the local food economy as the present primary uses." Subsection (B) sets out Greensboro's Purpose for such Rural Lands: "to accommodate low density residential development while preserving open space, and to encourage Agribusiness and other small businesses which facilitate the local food economy as well as productive agricultural and forest resources...." This policy does not contemplate or invite commercial development which lacks an agricultural or forestry connection. No such connection is made in the current application, nor is any such connection found yet by the DRB.

Conditional uses, at sec 5.4, can, of course, include a Commercial Use but it "shall not result in an undue adverse effect on:...(2) The character of the area affected, as defined by the purpose or purposes of the zoning district within which the project is located and specifically stated policies and standards of the Town Plan." The DRB decision on September 17, 2014 should have said that the proposal could not be built in the land at Tolman's Corners. Instead, it ignored Greensboro's Rural Lands District policy and simply asserted--- on no appropriate evidence--- that the proposed theater, parking and lighting would have no adverse effect on its character. The application now before you seeks to exceed Greensboro's height limit and to erect a dozen outdoor lights on poles 20 feet high, along with additional LED lighting. These intrusions further contradict the existing modest policies Greensboro has in place to define and maintain rural areas. If granted, they will compound the error already made by the initial approval in 2014.

2. Worse, the Public Interest was not properly taken into account and will not be if this application is granted. While the matter was warned in 2014 and a meeting and decision resulted in September of that year, it is clear that this project is large enough to affect the entire town because of its addition to the Grand List. This is put forth as a charitable gift to the community. But that does not mean it is free of community costs or should be accepted without a vote of the Town. The only comparable DRB application in recent years has been that of Circus Smirkus who, in contrast to the present applicants, held several public meetings and engaged in extensive consultations and negotiations with affected members of the community to reach detailed agreement so that there was general acceptance of it before it was approved.

3. Procedural irregularities? Ultimately it is the DRB which must stand up for the substance of the public interest. The least that voters and taxpayers (resident and non-resident) can expect of it is a stout impartial defense of the planning policies which Greensboro has got. Applications must be tested robustly against those policies. Here, the DRB has so far simply given up all the policy protections afforded to a site in a Rural Land District and attempted to allow a large commercial non-agricultural/forestry development with parking, lighting and signage, all of which fly in the face of the town's policy. This is done without any compelling evidence of public necessity or benefit which would warrant a decision not authorized by those

**POND COTTAGE  
FRISTON, EASTBOURNE  
EAST SUSSEX BN20 0AL  
01323 422 422**

policies. To grant further requests for higher extensions to the building or more extensive lighting will compound these errors, and the application should be refused.

Looking at the on-line record, I see a letter dated June 1, 2014 from the Fire District signed, evidently, by Nat Smith which granted permission to Sabra Jones of GAAR to connect the theater to the town water mains. Presumably this is the same Nat Smith who as a member of the DRB voted to approve the theater's application fourteen weeks later on September 17, 2014. Did the first decision in any way predispose him to the second? The record does not say.

In the applicant's curb cut decision of the DRB on March 19, 2015, members MacNeil and Sean Thomson recused themselves on grounds of conflict of interest. What were those interests? Did they also exist when the two recusants voted for the application six months earlier on September 17, 2014? The record does not say.

I am extremely grateful for the unpaid and unthanked hard work of citizens of Greensboro sitting on the DRB. My questions, and concerns----and, indeed, my conclusions----are not intended as personal criticisms of their actions or decisions to date. But we have, thank goodness, the rule of law in Greensboro. I am asking, with the greatest respect, that the members of the DRB look again at this project and first consider if anything in the procedure to date requires reconsideration of prior decisions. Second, compare it with our law--our zoning policies for commercial development in a rural district-- and ask themselves if it is truly in the public interest here to depart from those policies. I hope the DRB will then be confident enough to turn this application down and grant such other relief as may be necessary.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Charles R. Peck

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** Concerns and Questions about Theatre Project  
**From:** Alan Bascom (bascom.a14@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Cc:** greensboro.theatre.information@aol.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 23, 2015 3:25 PM

Dear Board Members:

I understand that a hearing on November 30 will address open questions and changing specifications for the Theatre development project at 4-Corners. As a life-long summer resident of Greensboro, I am concerned about the scale of the eventual improvements. The capacities that will be in place seem to be a moving target, which will hopefully be clarified at the hearing. The building performance capacity, size/height and parking spaces sound very large scale for Greensboro. Traffic congestion alone would be a huge concern.

I look forward to an informative session on the 30<sup>th</sup> since I would like to continue to support the project but under reasonable size parameters.

Alan Bascom

Blockhouse Hill

*add to email list*

**Subject:** [No Subject]  
**From:** Frank Emanuel (Frank@relaxinmaui.net)  
**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 3:23 PM

**Please put a stop to this Mirror Theater explosive growth. Most of us do not want Greensboro to become another Lake George (NY) Village! Jane and Frank Emanuel**



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** re: theater  
**From:** Lise Armstrong (eaabcl1957@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Saturday, November 28, 2015 9:33 PM

---

**To the DRB:**

After reviewing the design and walking the property, I am very against the amended design of the proposed theatre. Some people are describing it as a "round barn". It is not a round barn. The round part is not visible on the exterior. The "cupola" that has been added to the design is called "a collar" as described by the attorney of the project. I also googled cupolas on round barns in Vermont and those cupolas are not even close to what has been proposed on the theater. If the architects had designed a round barn, it would fit into the aesthetics of the town of Greensboro and the Northeast Kingdom. The current proposed design is not one that belongs here. It is my opinion that Ms. Jones, et. al. are taking advantage of the generosity of Mr. Brown. The design is getting bigger and bigger and if approved, will only end up as a white elephant. I feel the new design should be denied and go back to the smaller building. It is better to have a small building and sold out shows than to have a bigger building and a lot of empty seats.

Thank you.

Lise Armstrong

*add to email  
list*

**Subject:** Theater Design  
**From:** Liza F. Carter (liza@saltwind.net)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Saturday, November 28, 2015 3:35 PM

---

Hello,

I am writing to ask that you scale back the size of the theater, not increase it. Located right at the entrance to the Village, it already is going to dominate the landscape and it wildly out of keeping with the character of the region. If they wanted to build such a large structure, they should have picked a location where it wasn't going to be so visible.

Please help maintain the character of the neighborhood and vote no to any increase in size.

Regards,

Liza Carter  
North Shore Road.

Liza F. Carter  
Moving with the Seasons: Portrait of a Mongolian Family  
[www.lizacarterart.com](http://www.lizacarterart.com)

*add to email  
list.*

**Subject:** Mirror Theater development/November 30 DRB hearing  
**From:** Sara Dillon (saradillon238@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Friday, November 27, 2015 2:17 PM

Greetings--

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed development of a massive theater at the edge of the town of Greensboro. I will be in attendance at the hearing on the amended application scheduled for this Monday, November 30, 2015.

My opposition is based on the size, scale and non-contextual design of this proposed theater. A development of this size would be considered large even in Boston. It is most certainly not in keeping with the agricultural lands district of Greensboro, nor is it in keeping with the architecture or character of this special and beloved town. It is inconceivable that a building of this massive size is required for the purposes of community theater. What it will be used for, and by whom, is still very unclear, as the size goes far beyond the requirements of possible uses mentioned to date.

Many of us had no idea when the original application was up for review last year that anything this large was being proposed. Last summer, we were utterly shocked to learn that the theater building would be more than 25,000 square feet. The latest proposal appears to be even larger, of a scale to overwhelm the unique landscape of Greensboro.

There are so many things wrong with this development, it would require a longer letter to describe them all. It is my hope to contribute more extensive remarks before the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

Sara Dillon  
238 Craftsbury Road  
Greensboro, Vermont

*add to  
email list.*

**Subject:** The Mirror Theatre Project  
**From:** DAVID LAMBERT (lambertda@msn.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 9:26 AM

The Mirror Theatre project does not fit the characteristics of the neighborhood. It is too large and will negatively impact the community.

Thank you.

Mollie Lambert  
Spahr Road  
Breezy Avenue

**Subject:** Greensboro VT Greensboro Arts Alliance Theater Project Comments to the Development Review Board  
**From:** Patrick Hewes (patrickhewes1@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 5:09 PM

Dear Members of the Town of Greensboro Development Review Board,

Regarding the Amended Site Plan Application and Site Plan Review, on tonight's agenda, I wish to comment on the application as it relates to the Town's Master Plan, and to the pitfalls of considering major new land use projects without depending upon a flexible but intentional comprehensive planning attitude.

It is critical that the Town pursue sound planning principles for all long-term, comprehensive planning, as well as for short-term, or current planning projects themselves.

In that regard, it is my professional opinion that the significant controversy, opposition, debate, and community interest in the project is a result of the Town's Master Plan not being upheld and depended upon as the starting point of all planning and development projects within the Town.

The Town's Master Plan is the vessel of the community's vision for its future; in a well-executed Master Plan, it would represent the community's consensus for its future, and would promote and accommodate future development in sufficient detail to enable development, but with enough flexibility to allow development to respond to market forces and the unknowns of site conditions.

While the Development Review Board's planning role in reviewing proposed projects and through its procedural purview is wide enough to allow the unknowns of future projects to be considered and reviewed, there is no doubt in any reasonable person's mind that the proposed theater represents a major future change in the Town. It represents the largest development project in its history; It is a significant cultural tourism land use; it sets the stage for a future for the community that includes significant visitation and employment, as well as an increase in the use of water, power, and other natural resources. For these reasons, It is important for the Development Review Board to do everything it can in its defined powers to cause the application to be paused in order for there to be time and opportunity for significant updating of the Town's Master Plan to countenance such a significant land use in the community.

Once the Town's Master Plan successfully captures the Town's consensus for a future to include some form of this proposed land use, the Town of course would need to examine and amend its zoning code to implement the Town's Master Plan.

For the Development Review Board to do anything less is to adopt an reactive posture, and to shirk its highest duty - to oversee how the community's long-term future will unfold, as reflected by the community choices.

To restate in plain terms, the Board must look to the Town's Master Plan's silence on such a significant proposed land use to freeze its deliberations on the specifics of the project, until there is community consensus on what it wants to be, in the future.

Patrick Hewes, AICP

**Subject:** Fwd: The theater  
**From:** Town Of Greensboro (greensborovt@yahoo.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzoning@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 9:44 PM

---

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Patricia LeBlanc <cowspigsandmore@gmail.com>  
**Date:** November 30, 2015 at 2:37:20 PM EST  
**To:** greensborovt@yahoo.com  
**Subject: The theater**

I do not own land in Greensboro, but we farm lots of land and own a good section of the street from the theater. It seems what was a good idea, i.e. a wooden tent small theater is being pushed into something that is making the area a laughing stock. The proposed model does not fit with the area, nor does the size with the economics. This would be bigger than the Stowe theater which is known for its money woes. Though there appears to be money to maintain it later how can that be guaranteed. Better to stick to the original small size. This would be taller than our silos

I spend a lot of time in GREENSBORO popular spots. Willeys the library etc. It seems like people are afraid to speak about common sense as being labeled anti arts or progress.

Something the size that it has been changed to does not seem to fit this area. The promise of 60 jobs even for the short eight week busy season does not seem to have facts to it. Who says these jobs won't be filled by people from away like a lot of the theater spots seem to be?

Don't be pushed into something too big and not in keeping for the area. My encouragement to the board. There is a lot of support for common sense.. Patti LeBlanc Hazen Monument Farm

**Subject:** Armstrong statement to DRB  
**From:** CHRISTINE ARMSTRONG (cfa1152@gmail.com)  
**To:** greensborovtzing@yahoo.com;  
**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 11:00 PM

---

Thank you, Kristen, for ccing this to the members of the DRB. I was told I spoke too quickly! Please also be sure they have a copy of the WW permit.

It was sort of like when I have to leave a message on an answering machine. My brain seizes....

All the best,

Christine

This is not a referendum about theater. We're not trying to stop this thing from happening. Let that go.

It is a referendum about a building--its current proposed use and potential future uses, and its effect on our town. The traffic, the light, the noise, the impact on our community services, our safety.

The applicant is asking us to reconsider and approve only changes in the lighting, the height, and to add an additional building. But if those were the only questions, then why did they change the entrance, the orientation, the site, entire footprint, the siding, the windows, increase the sf by 18% plus move and expand the storage from inside to outside, adding another 10% to the footprint? If it's just the height, why change everything? And then return with exactly the same height issue as was denied before?

Because it's a whole new and different project. It can't just be the roof.

We now see the rear of the building at the street scape. The orientation has flipped. How did it become other than the small building, rustic, intimate, tucked in the tree line as was originally advertised even before any permit was applied for?

The Applicant wrote in spring of 2015 in one of the Act 250 application documents that the theater would house an audience of 100, perhaps occasionally 160, with 50 shows in July and August and 50 over the course of the other 10 months of the year.

This is in stark contrast with the fact that the Fire Safety Permit application proposed the occupancy load to be 528 people; the ancillary building at 4 people.

This is in stark contrast with the waste water permit in which there are so many fixed and folding theater seats (329) that they limit the activities that can happen on the site. It is all conditional. No theater camps on performance days. No performances on theater camp days. The restaurant can seat 25 unless it's a special event where there can be 25 added seats. The permit states that the flows must be regulated, thus the activities are mutually exclusive. Occupancy is restricted.

The applicant needs to fortify the data relating to traffic and parking. It is inadequate and inaccurate must be corrected with accurate data analysis.

There needs to be a photometric plan regarding the lighting. This light issue is profoundly important to every person in Greensboro. For example, the light poles are not required by anyone to be 20 feet high. Why are they so tall? Shorten them.

The developer has not demonstrated understanding of the conditions and the requirements of the Town and the State of Vt. The developer is charging along with building at his own risk. He has no permit to do it. Ask that he declares his intentions, clearly, so the DRB can rule on them.

I have produced a draft document of the discrepancies and inaccuracies. There have been so many changes, with so many outstanding decisions based on wildly varying statements, that the applicant needs to return with a declaration of what they are really going to do, to submit the facts, so the DRB can honestly, as the agents for our community, weigh in on them. And so that we, as community members, can be accurately informed in a timely and transparent manner, and weigh in too.

I hope that by open debate and respectful discussion we can arrive at a better result.

**Subject:** town theatre

**From:** K N (karinnew@aol.com)

**To:** greensborovt zoning@yahoo.com;

**Date:** Monday, November 30, 2015 11:18 PM

While we support the GAAR and the theatre that has been in town for almost 10 years now, we are not in support of the size and style building that is being built. It is too large and very out of character for Greensboro, Vermont.  
Sincerely - Karin & Arthur (Rusty) Newhouse