

Zoning Board of Appeals  
May 21, 2020  
Egremont Village Inn/The Barn  
Special Permit Public hearing 5:03pm

Present: ZBA Chairman Elliott Snyder, Member Cathy Fracasse, Member Mark Holmes, and Nick Keene

Town Counsel ruled that the ZBA has jurisdiction over all pre-existing, non-conforming uses and changes.

Item three on the application has previously been approved

Egremont Village Inn (EVI) has asked to add the uses of retail and office space in the main inn and carriage house, to include a coffee shop in the restaurant area of the inn. No added signage, there would be advertising for the café. Cathy felt this was the existing use as a restaurant and Nick has maintained that status and licensing. Restaurant was previously opened to the public. Agree no special permit required for the café.

Cathy questioned concept of retail space - small shops, and office -

Nick upstairs would not be attractive to retail as it is not accessible. Path to mild long term financial stability while improving the property and community. Need to be flexible in order to survive. Asking to be trusted based on track record to wisely use these additional uses. Gravity of request for future of family, decimated by current situation.

Mark - retail on first floor - Nick no first floor spots for any other retail. Possibly in the Carriage house. Will use downstairs of Inn for private uses. Possible change for future. Will choose wisely in the future. Possible therapeutic, psychology, yarn shops. No longer rent rooms upstairs for stay - turn into private offices.

Cathy not about being a trusting person - not ZBA responsibility. Make sure that they types of things concern themselves with is traffic and parking. Professional offices are very low impact use. Retail space make sure all in agreement on any constraints. Hours, parking concerns in conjunction with the barn. Impacts rather than types of business. Protect neighborhood while giving Nick specific parameters with having an appropriate impact on the area. Use don't have negative impact on neighbors. Responsibility to make sure the uses don't.

Elliott - signage at road. Businesses that require signage at the road tend to attract more people than private uses that do not require signage. Professional offices such as dentists, doctors, etc would get a lot of traffic, but if offices are private, ie writers, planners than that is one thing that is not an issue. In terms of possible impacts there are offices that are problematical. Retail offices that wants to be noticed by traffic rather than change. No problem with private offices. Uses go with property. Obligated to define as clearly as can allowable uses, even given the fact that EVI has tremendous problems for a while with no way out of it. Love to give flexibility and trust but it is a matter of the responsibility to the bylaw. Make clear as best as can what allowing and hope it helps in business.

Non-retail not a problem, retail requiring signage is a problem.

Cathy - concern overly restraining - customers and patrons coming to the office is not a real

concern. Elliott disagrees that some, such as doctors, would attract more traffic. Parking required. Nick BOH rules over medical. Cathy not medical - architects, accountants, lawyers etc. Lower impact. Cathy happy to saying no medical offices. Low impact, professional offices. Professional offices other than medical.

Mark set up wouldn't lend it's self to medical - any other low impact office space.

Elliott - what about future changes?

Professional and private office, other than medical. Retail or not retail?

Carriage house retail?

Mark parking for retail store - designated parking for? Nick agrees parking would be addressed no problem with amount of parking. Hours not conflict with The Barn. List allowable uses not a good idea.

Selling services vs selling goods.

Private offices vs retail settings.

Signage with inspires traffic

Pre-existing, non-conforming is because properties lack setbacks and space. Creates the question of impacts.

Signage vs no-signage. Nick not interested if not able to have signage. Will not exceed current footage of signs, will give space to who rents.

Cathy - does not agree with no signage. Nick - no signage on the road.

Mark - retail would require signage.

Elliott - professional offices is different then those who want to sell from off road.

Cathy - the only question in her mind is the retail shops.

Elliott - appropriate and accessory use such as offices that do not require off street traffic, advance appointments.

Cathy coffee shop is not a change of use. He has that space already.

Professional offices vs retail.

Yarn, toy shop - selling products to people, walks ins has a different impact then a professional office.

Retail that requires some form of advertising.

Cathy - allow professional offices that do not require signage on the road. What do about retail stores?

Mark restrict retail to carriage house and offices to the Inn? Cathy doesn't feel a need to restrict professional offices - allow in either building. Could limit number of retail shops.

Professional offices, with the exception of medical service uses , and any other offices or uses that would engender a higher impact such as the kind of traffic and parking.

Balance flexibility with impact.

Agree on Professional offices. Question is retail shops - allow or not allow, if allow with what conditions. Can't be flexible with retail.

What is instead of retail shops - work space for light manufacturing. Is manufacturing forbidden. Craft outlet then or that is that a private office.

Cathy looking for details on the impact not the specific business. Limit customers, cars, etc.

Elliott: Any non-retail use is acceptable, uses that do not require roadside advertising.

Nick - remove, shelf both requests. Possibly re-address in the future. Stop adjudicating for the time being.

EVI is also asking to add outdoor retail/farmer markets/public assembly for parking lot, driveways and grounds.

Nick Keene withdrew his request and said he would bring forth a more detailed plan in the future. Thanks for time.

What happened and what is the ramification?. Pulled request, no action, he can bring a new permit application. He would need to withdraw without prejudice. Unanimous consent of the board can withdraw without prejudice.

Vote to withdraw motions 1 and 2 without prejudice. Allow to come back with a more specific set of conditions that will let him do what he needs to do and allows the board to be clear about what is allowed. Best case scenario. Validate with Jeremia. Hard to deal with COVID19 issues within the constraints of the bylaw.

Cathy move to allow withdrawal of items 1 and 2 without prejudice. Unanimous. Notify Mary who can validate with Jeremia.

Adjourn at 5:57pm.

Mary Brazie