

Category 1 examples:

Correction: Shelburne (sole held). Corrected the reference to a property survey in Schedule A. Also corrected language in Schedule B.

Exclusion Reconfiguration: Highgate (co-held with VHCB and VAAF). Redesigned exclusion to place more agricultural land into conservation and to secure a farm road access to a back field.

Easement Add-on and Language Upgrade: Troy (co-held). VHCB funded the conservation of an additional 33.5 acres. New easement with modern language replaced the previous easement.

Category 2 Examples:

Exchange new/revised rights for Option To Purchase At Agricultural Value (OPAV): Swanton (co-held). Allowed for the subdivision into two farm units (a cropland parcel and a sugarbush parcel) and relocated an unexercised FLH to the sugarbush parcel. Placed an OPAV on the cropland parcel.

Allow for Road/ROW realignment: New Haven (sole-held) Allow for change in access. Exchange 2.3 acres of conserved land for 2.3 acres of unconserved land, including a special treatment area.

Allow for Road realignment: Charlotte (co-held). Allowed for relocation of small portion of Higbee Road over conserved land to create a safer intersection with Route 7.

Category 3 Examples:

Exchange new rights for addition land conservation: Swanton (co-held). Added a standard Farm Labor Housing (FLH) right to the farm in exchange for the conservation of an additional 31 acres of sugarbush. Also upgraded language for approvable structures, added the Rural Enterprise clause, and expanded the Farmstead Complex.

Exchange location of a house right to an improved location for guest house right: Woodstock (sole held) Retired a prime building site on good agricultural land in exchange for allowing a guest house to be located on marginal land.

Addition of Option to Purchase At Agricultural Value and Farm Labor House Right: Orwell (co-held). Added OPAV and sole-discretion Farm Labor House right. Also expanded the Farmstead Complex, and added Special Treatment Areas.

Denied Examples (requested by landowner but not allowed):

Land Swap of Insufficient Conservation Value. The landowner proposed to release 100 acres of conserved mixed agricultural and forest land in exchange for the conservation of 80 acres of agricultural land. The swap was considered out-of-scale with the easement holders' policies and the resource exchange was determined to be neither enhancing to the public benefit nor satisfying of the private benefit test.

Request to Separate Labor Housing with No Conservation Exchange: The landowner wanted to subdivide an existing dwelling on a small lot so that his son could own it and build equity. No conservation swap of equal or greater value was contemplated. Inconsistent with the conservation easement purposes.