



Town of Georgia

47 Town Common Road North. • St. Albans, VT 05478

• Phone: 802-524-3524 • Fax: 802-524-3543 • website: townofgeorgia.com

Georgia DRB

7:00 PM Tuesday October 18, 2022

Board Members present: Suzanna Brown, Greg Drew, Gilles Rainville, Jr., Lisa Faure, Jamie Comstock, James Powell

Board Members not present: Glenn Sjoblom

Staff Present: Emily Johnson – Zoning Administrator, Mary Stanley – Minute Taker

Other's Present: Jenn Desautels (Trudell Consulting Engineers) Levi Lilly, Keenan Cota, Dan Coolbeth, Lake Champlain Access T.V.

Present by Zoom: Monika Ingalls (Trudell Consulting Engineers)

1. DRB Chair, S. Brown calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., and swears everyone in.
2. Additions, deletions, or changes in order of agenda items – None
3. Public Hearings:
 - a. Consideration and possible approval of request to reconsider Site Plan application #SP-001-22 filed by Levi Lilly, for Lot 5, Morin Ave, Georgia, VT.
 - b. If the foregoing reconsideration request is approved, reopened hearing on Site Plan application #SP-001-22 filed Levi Lilly, for Lot 5, Morin Ave, Georgia, VT.
 - c. Reopened hearing on Conditional Use Application #CU-001-22 filed Levi Lilly, for Lot 5, Morin Ave, Georgia, VT.

Suzanna Brown recuses herself from this hearing and James Powell reads the request to reconsider the Site Plan Application aloud:

- E. Johnson states that the Board needs to vote to reconsider the site plan.
- G. Drew makes a motion to vote, the vote is seconded, by G. Rainville, all are in favor.

Mr. Lilly explains that originally, he viewed the 2 pieces separately.

- 1) Site Plan.
- 2) Conditional Use

Mr. Lilly apologizes for the lack of information when he met with the Board previously. He believed the Site Plan was separate of the Conditional Use. He hopes we can clear some of that up tonight.

One condition on the site plan approval was the carbon filtration for odor control in the facility. He would like to see that on the conditional use side as it's the use of the building that's dictating the need for the odor removal, not the structure itself.

Secondly, Mr. Lilly is asking to remove cannabis from the site plan approval. The plan currently is to occupy the building with his cannabis company but the investment in that property and in that building is the warehouse.

The warehouse is a tangible asset that is separate from the cannabis business that might be sold off, or owners could take it in a different direction that wouldn't involve cannabis. Mr. Lilly would rather keep the site plan side around the site plan and not the conditional use side.

Third ask, it's a budget project, developing only a portion of the plaza. He is asking for all paving requirements to be waived. He'd rather the road and the parking lot be gravel.

J. Powell says the business use (smell) was already set. He is confused. Mr. Lilly clarifies that the odor control was a condition on the Site Plan. Mr. Lilly would like it switched to the conditional use instead of the site plan approval(#8). G. Rainville asks if there's mention of it on the conditional use, and Mr. Lilly says he believes it's just on the Site Plan.

G. Drew states he believes that's reasonable. Mentioning cannabis in there could create a problem with real estate in the future and there's nothing cannabis tied to the building. If it's permitted use, he could have those things in the building, but if it's conditional use Mr. Lilly would still have to come before the Board.

E. Johnson mentions that the parking lot was mentioned because it was noted on the site plan. Mr. Lilly would like to make that decision but not have it as a requirement. J. Powell points out that there are 2 other lots that are using that road, and would benefit from the road being paved.

Cars and vans will use the road more than big trucks.

Questions from the conditional use side:

Rhize Cannabis Co. is the name of the business. Rhize Cannabis Co. is planning on occupying 100% of the building.

Rhize Cannabis Co. have pre-approval from the State for Tier 2 cultivation and Tier 2 Manufacturing.

Rhize Cannabis Co. can have a maximum of 14 employees in the building, but more likely 5-8 employees.

Indoor cultivation – indoor growing with artificial grow lights

The size of the canopy dictates the difference in Tiers

Tier 1 1000

Tier 2 2500 sq ft of canopy. (Bldg is 10,000 feet)

Tier 3 5000 sq ft of canopy

Tier 4 10,000 sq ft of canopy

Tier 5 15,000 sq ft of canopy

Manufacturing there are 3 tiers

Tier 1 has a revenue cap which is \$10,000 annually (meant to be for small home business') simple manufacturing practices for extraction of different compounds. You can only use water and heat, and you can have a commercial kitchen if you want to do edibles.

Tier 2 (which is what Rhize Cannabis Co. would like to do) uses the same extraction methods, but there is no cap on size or revenue The size they want to do. Pre-approval simple extraction process.

Tier 3 is extraction involving more dangerous compounds, like butane and propane for example.

Mr. Lilly explains the differences between the Tier's and extraction methods and products produced. Simple vs. more dangerous process. Mr. Lilly explains that the extraction method that Rhize Cannabis Co. uses is ice water to physically remove a portion of the plant that has cannabinoids resins and compounds in it.

The end result is the consistency of play-doh, more of a liquid than a solid. There are factors that influence the consistency.

Using that extracting method, you are extracting the active ingredient from the plant material.

There will be a packaging facility on site. Everything that Rhize Cannabis Co. produces will be packaged for retail sale, but it will be sold wholesaler to a retailer.

Manufacturing and cultivation meet the Towns regulations for light industrial, as does the cultivation process.

Theoretically, what is the likelihood that in 5 years the business has grown, and you'd like to move to Tier 3 cultivation? Mr. Levi has no interest in Tier 3 cultivation. The only way they could step up would be to grow on racks, but there's no interest in doing that, and no plans to expand the building.

Discussion is had about the use of the processing, packaging, growing spaces. Tier 2 level. Will there be other product processed, or just Rhize Cannabis Co.'s grow. Mr. Levi says there's a chance that they might collaborate and do some packaging/processing, contract manufacturing. The production level is still at a cap, as well as employees.

There will be multiple cultivation rooms, ongoing cycle that's staggered. Possible 5-6 harvests per year. Everything is grown from seeds. Genetics of Cannabis is discussed as well as grafting and cloning plants.

Security regs – video surveillance, locked doors, cannabis id card is necessary. Only people with a state card have access to the building unless they are visitor. Visitors must be 21, must sign in and signed out. J. Comstock asks about who to call if there's a break-in. Police, Fire, Ambulance, and the Cannabis Control Board.

Rhize Cannabis Co. will not be having a second tenant.

There is a Traffic Report from the original subdivision that accounted for 125 trips per day. Mr. Lilly says he believes it will be 25-50 trips per day.

Odor Control - Carbon filtration is simple, and effective. There is not a regular ventilation process, it's all done manually, and It's regulated.

Signage is not proposed.

Wastewater produced is very low. Rhize Cannabis Co. tries to re-use 90-95% of the water that they put into the system. There are ways to offset wastewater usage.

- collect the condensation and reuse it directly.
- Re-use runoff from the plants as well with filtration. There will not be a lot of wastewaters injected into the waste-water system.
- The Septic is in use by one property. The whole system is 1,000 gal overall.

Plant waste will be ground up, and composted. There are ways to accelerate the process, using worms or other organisms to go back to soil. Ideally it would be in containers, once ground up. Discussion is had about the growing process that will used.

Motion to end the hearing was made by J. Comstock, and seconded by G. Drew, all were in favor.

- d. Final Plat Amendment (FA-001-22) Keenan Cota is proposing to dissolve the boundary lines of an approved subdivision at 236 Red Barn Hill Rd, in the AR-3 zoning district, and revert the parcel back to the original parent parcel boundaries. Prior Planning Commission approval was received for a final plat amendment (PC-003-20) but the required mylar was not filed in time.**

S. Brown reads the Final Plat Amendment to be discussed aloud.

E. Johnson offers to start the conversation; this is more of an office paperwork error. Mr. Cota did receive permission from the Planning Commission to dissolve that PUD back in 2020 but a final mylar

was not recorded in time, therefore, the approval expired. Mr. Cota is not proposing anything different, he's just looking to file that mylar.

Currently, Mr. Cota does not wish to build the duplex.

S. Brown asks for clarification on existing structures shown on the map. Mr. Cota confirms there's a barn near the bridge, and the tarp garage is no longer there.

There is a stream with a 50' buffer. The barn crosses that. The duplex plan would move him away from the buffer, if he decides to do that.

S. Brown asks for a motion to end the hearing. J. Powell makes the motion, G. Drew seconds, All in favor.

e. Preliminary Plat Review (PL-001-22) Dan Coolbeth is proposing a 3-lot subdivision at 211 Mills Rd (Lot 3) located in the L-1 zoning district.

S. Brown reads the 3-lot preliminary plat review for a 4-lot subdivision aloud.

This is deemed a major subdivision decision by Town of Georgia.

- Emily has spoken to Chief Baker about the driveway access angles (The DRB had mentioned moving/adjusting the driveway angles) and where parcel 7 could still come off that shared driveway. S. Brown pointed out that in doing this, the need to cross wetlands would be eliminated.
- The entrance for fire trucks would be much easier to navigate, eliminating the need from having to do an easement.

Ms. J. Dezotelle offers additional information for those that are in attendance and may not be familiar with the project. Ms. Dezotelle gives a history of past interactions with the Board, and where the project stands today.

S. Brown pointed out that there are still references to the old road "going to be seeded". It will all be seeded says D. Coolbeth. The upper portion is all done, in fact 2/3 done.

There will be a walking access to the camp, no road.

There's another cabin on a different lot, and it's been sold.

They will get all the permits that are needed.

With the change of the driveway, everyone will have their own driveways including E911 signs

Lot 7 the driveway will go out directly to the road.

Emily and James discuss on the map the adjustment to the driveway.

J. Desautels states that she has been working with Chief Baker to build out the hammerhead a bit, and it's already reflected on their side of things.

In addition to what was there, there's a shared storm water feature between lot 6 & 7

Lot 5 impervious was not there. The previous area was just increased for lot 3. Discussion was had about lots and HOA's.

The lots are all spoken for by local residents.

Motion to close the hearing, G. Drew, seconded by G. Rainville, All in favor.

4.

Review & approval of the October 4, 2022 meeting minutes.

G. Rainville, made the motion to accept the minutes with the changes, Greg seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Motion made to go into deliberative at 8:04 pm by G. Rainville, seconded by J. Powell.