



April 6th, 2026

Members Present: Tom Deck (President), Scott Swinarton, Jim Lewis, Scott Swinarton, Nina Mooney

Others Present: Donald Brodie (Village Clerk), Sarah McClintock (Treasurer), Curan VanDerWielen (Village Manager), Terry Findeisen (Zoning Administrator), Rich Heilemann (Planning Commission Chair)

Call to Order: 4:31 PM by Deck.

1. Approval of the Agenda

VanDerWielen proposed an addition to the agenda to review and vote on the adoption of the state's updated roads and bridges standards.

Motion: To approve the agenda, with added new business of discussing the adoption of the updated Vermont roads and bridges standards.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

2. Approval of the Draft Minutes

Motion: To approved of the draft minutes for the regular March meeting, as submitted.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Lewis.

Motion approved, unanimously.

3. Review and Possible Vote on the Draft Aircraft Take-Off and Landing Facilities Ordinance

Deck introduced the topic of discussion and asked VanDerWielen to introduce the draft to the Board. VanDerWielen presented the draft aircraft take-off ordinance, noting that it had been designed to address several concerns raised over the past couple of years regarding the safety and noise pollution of landing aircraft -particularly helicopters- within Manchester Village. Although infrequent, the ordinance comprehensively addressed not only helicopters but other fixed wing aircraft and unmanned aircraft, such as drones. He also noted that a key part of the process was designing the regulation as an ordinance, as opposed to a zoning regulation, both for flexibility in design and enforcement, as regulating the placement and design of helipads and other aircraft landing facilities was complex.

Heilemann added that the version presented lacked a revision the Commission had adopted in its most recent meeting to Section 3.4. VanDerWielen asked Heilemann if it would be more helpful to treat the presentation then as an introduction and to delay a vote on the matter until a corrected issue had been distributed Heilemann agreed and added that the Commission was looking for further input from the Trustees about its content. Heilemann then provided an



synopsis of the content of the ordinance, noting the prohibitions and exceptions found within. Also noted was the designed power of the Trustees to permit specific landings in tandem with special events, should the appropriate need arise. VanDerWielen recalled a permitted event from the year previous where a VTOL aircraft was to be presented as part of a show at the Orvis Green, although the event never ran.

Brodie asked Heilemann how commercial real estate activities were defined in relation to the permitted uses of drones. Heilemann and Findeisen both responded, clarifying that the use of drones for photography and video capture in civil engineering and construction was a common and low-impact use the Commission agreed was appropriate to allow. Brodie agreed they were appropriate uses, but asked about a case where someone might fly up from the city to show a property, and whether that would qualify as an acceptable commercial real estate activity. Swinarton then asked how helicopter landings were regulated at the Orvis Green in previous years. VanDerWielen responded that outside of the FAA federal flight regulations, the landings were not regulated by a local source. A short discussion on those landings and the origin of the ordinance ensued.

Deck asked how the ordinance interacted with FAA regulations. VanDerWielen responded that FAA regulations would almost always supersede any local regulation of air traffic, but that municipalities were allowed to regulate the placement of grounded aircraft and where aircraft could land and take off from in the contexts of public safety, land use, and noise pollution. The municipality could not regulate flights overhead, regular activities at an airport, or any number of items the FAA specifically regulates, at least without taking additional steps or fitting in to specific cases, which the Village was not pursuing. Mooney asked about pre-existing landing areas which might fall into the ordinance's purview. Heilemann responded that the Commission could not identify any, but that the ordinance addressed that possibility by required pre-existing sites to lose their pre-existing exemption once they cease operations. The only possible example raised by the Commission was the Orvis Green, but for which an exemption might be difficult to seek as there existed no permanent landing infrastructure. Heilemann saw the possible extension of an argument that any field could be used as a helipad to be too broad to be acceptable.

Brodie asked if the Commission had considered authorizing the enforcement agent to issue tickets, adding that he believed a certified letter after the fact to be less effective. A short discussion on the matter ensued. It was noted that the process to gain the authority to issue tickets required entering an agreement with the state Judicial Bureau, but that Village had not approached the subject with any real seriousness. It was agreed that VanDerWielen would research the possibility and determine its feasibility for future enforcement action. Heilemann also added that he believed the ordinance could be partially self-enforcing, as it was unlikely local commercial entities would actively seek to flaunt the rules once put in place. Mooney expressed doubt about the ordinance's effectiveness, specifically that she believed it unlikely that helicopter operators and passengers would know about or look for local ordinances before making the trip. VanDerWielen agreed, but stated that the Village needed some tool to address the matter and that even if it couldn't prevent cases outright, it could at least allow the Village to



react and to pre-empt certain known cases by notifying Orvis of the ordinance's passage. Heilemann added that it would pre-empt any cases of private helipad development in Village, should a wealthy homeowner look to develop one in the future.

Deck expressed his and what he believed to be the Board's approval of how the ordinance to be drafted and encouraged the Commission to continue considering the matter. It was resolved to table further discussion on the ordinance until a future time when the final draft could be presented to the Board.

4. Monthly Reports

a. Road Commissioner

Lewis opened his report by discussing the design of the parking expansion and sidewalk improvement project being prepared in front of the Equinox Junior Shops. Lewis noted that he had visited the site with Alan Mowrey (Village Road Foreman). While the project was currently scoped for two additional parking spots they were considering creating a third, and Mowrey had already scoped out most of the stormwater, curbing, and sidewalk improvements being made. Lewis added that the cost of the sidewalk work would make up the bulk of the project. VanDerWielen clarified that it would be ~\$75,000 for the sidewalk work of the \$95,000 project budget.

b. Tree Warden

Lewis noted that he would like to come to a decision on the holiday tree for the Winter, asking whether the Board wanted a temporary tree as it had planted last year or a permanent tree. McClintock and Mooney stated that they believed the temporary tree used recently had appeared small from the road. Deck added that a key reason in using the small tree was the amount of work incumbent on Mowrey to decorate a larger tree. Lewis then asked if the holiday tree would significantly impact the budget for the next year. VanDerWielen responded that the bloc of monies for tree projects had not been defined in terms of use yet, but that it could easily be integrated into the budget.

Motion: To plant a permanent holiday tree for the 2026-27 season.

Motion made by Mooney. Motion seconded by Lewis.

Motion approved, unanimously.

Lewis also discussed the proposed placement of two new dogwood trees in front of the Equinox Junior shops once the sidewalk work had been completed, adding that he believed they should be planted in May. Lewis asked the Board if they preferred a pink or white flowering dogwood. A short discussion ensued with no action taken.

Deck asked if a meeting with a local resident was forthcoming about replacing a streetscape tree taken down earlier in the year. VanDerWielen responded that he was in the process of scheduling said meeting, but that it had been left open what the placement



and size of the replacement trees should be. It was resolved to have VanDerWielen follow up on the matter.

c. Village Manager

VanDerWielen provided a brief update on recent work conducted by Village administration. Of note was a significant volume of work to position Village for the close of FY25, work to finalize the draft budget for FY26, a package of security and content updates to the Village website, and tracking/ongoing conversations about legislative matters at the state level. Of particular concern was keeping an eye on state reforms for the Act 250 process, transportation funding, and option taxes available to municipalities. A short discussion ensued regarding the Vermont legislative session. VanDerWielen also provided an update on recent DLL licensing activity and the timing of issuing the annual reports.

d. Zoning Administrator

Findeisen provided a brief update on the work conducted by the Village zoning office, starting with continuing work by the Planning Commission to come to an agreement with AT&T on the siting of a utility pole extension, which was still being negotiated. A short discussion ensued regarding the history and current status of that discussion. Of note were right-of-way and district restrictions which had guided the current proposal of siting the utility extension on a pole on lower West Union Street. Heilemann added that issues of effectiveness and height still needed to be addressed. Deck thanked the Commission for its time on the matter and encouraged further deliberations on the matter.

Findeisen then provided an update on the status of Short-Term Rental (STR) registrations, noting that she had sent out a large batch of notices for registration the week previous and that about half of the known 26 STR operators had already been registered ahead of the annual deadline. Findeisen added that she intended to continue pursuing registrants and would have a more wholesome number to provide for planning purposes after the annual deadline had passed. Findeisen also noted that she was working in close concert with the state fire marshal's office on the matter.

e. Treasurer & Tax Collector

McClintock presented the financial reports, starting by noting the healthy position of the balance sheet with \$1,274,936 in assets and ~\$73,000 in liabilities. McClintock then reviewed the revenue report and noted that 99.27% of tax revenue billed had been collected this year and that intergovernmental revenues were on track. She then presented the expenditure reporting, noting that Winter Maintenance categories and the accounting category was over budget, but that both could now be mitigated entering the new fiscal year due to reduced load on both. VanDerWielen added that accounting work would be pro-rated moving forward, with additional hourly expenses incurred on a case-by-case basis, which would likely flatten the accounting expenses in the next fiscal year. Heavy equipment spending was also over budget, as was employee healthcare expenses,



which VanDerWielen clarified was a result of temporarily extending health care coverage for a former employee. Deck asked VanDerWielen about the quality of NEMRC's assistance in accounting work. VanDerWielen responded that Village had successfully reduced the amount of work it had had to conduct with NEMRC due to Kylie Allen's assistance.

f. Clerk

Brodie noted no updates with the Clerk's office aside from a volume of DLL permitting over the previous month.

5. Review of Pending Itinerant Vendor Permit Applications

Deck introduced the topic of discussion and opened it to VanDerWielen to present. VanDerWielen presented a permit application for Fresh Mountain Bowls to be placed in front of the Orvis Outlet Shop, noting that it was a renewal with no changes in information relative to the year previous. VanDerWielen added that no complaints or violations from the previous year had been received and recommended its approval.

Motion: To approve of Itinerant Vendor Application I-26-01, as presented.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

6. Review of Pending Vermont Liquor License Applications

VanDerWielen noted that five DLL liquor license applications were up for review including four first class licenses (Curate Café, Crooked Ram, Silver Fork, and Mari's Ecuadorian) and one second class license (Crooked Ram). VanDerWielen noted that all applications were considered complete except for the Crooked Ram's, for which the license fee had not yet been paid. He recommended approving all, including the Ram's, with the condition that the latter be issued on receipt of payment.

Motion: To approve all license applications as presented, with conditions as described.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Mooney.

Motion approved, unanimously.

7. Review of Draft Tri-Party Agreement Concerning the Courthouse

Deck introduced the topic of discussion and asked for comments and questions on the draft document. He asked VanDerWielen if the Village's attorney had looked at the draft. VanDerWielen responded that the attorney had and provided comments which had been addressed in the interim with the current draft. VanDerWielen noted that the principal note of concern from Village's perspective was the continued use of the current office space in the building, which he felt had been adequately addressed both in discussion with the attorney and with members of NCC. A short conversation about the agreement ensued.



Motion: To approve the tri-party agreement, as presented.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

8. Review and Adoption of Updated Vermont Roads and Bridges Standards

VanDerWielen introduced the item, noting that the Village needed to re-approve the standards as a basis to engage in VTRANS permitting and grants work moving forward. The changes this year largely revolved around standards for culverts and miscellaneous stormwater infrastructure, and would have relatively low impact on the regular business of the Village.

Motion: To adopt the 2026 Vermont Roads and Bridges Standards.

Motion made by Mooney. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

9. Public Comments

No public comments were raised.

Old Business:

A short discussion on lettering the marble rock ensued, with no action taken. It was agreed that Deck and Mooney would follow up on leads for design and implementation.

New Business:

No new business was discussed.

Adjournment: 5:26 PM.

Motion: To adjourn.

Motion made by Deck. Motion seconded by Lewis.

Motion approved, unanimously.

The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be held at 4:30 PM on Monday, May 4th, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Curan VanDerWielen, Village Manager