

February 16, 2017

PC Members Present: Jean Vissering (Chair), Julie Potter, Ray Stout, Norman Hill, Jay Stewart, Scott Hess, Mark Lane

Others Present: Bruce Johnson (Zoning Administrator), Kristi Flynn (Recording Clerk), Gene Troia, Michelle McFadden, Lindy Biggs, Cort Richardson, Carl Etnier

Call to order: 7:01pm

Changes to Agenda – report on a meeting with someone concerning land conservation

Public Comment – None

East Montpelier Village Master Plan: Discussion on PRD/PUD Regulation with East Montpelier Zoning Administrator Bruce Johnson

Because of the discussion at the last meeting regarding ¼-acre versus 1/2 –acre minimums in the lower and upper villages, the PC requested more information about the PRD/PUD regulations. The ZA attended the meeting to help understand the regulations and how they work. There are four instances in town: Pine Ridge, Shapiro, Cate and Clark. Pine Ridge has 17 lots, 12 of which are developed: reduced setbacks, smaller lots, includes common land, and no 1/4-acre lots were created. Shapiro has 6 houses clustered together on 40+ acres, each resident owns their own condo and share the remaining common land; heat, water and septic are shared. The advantage of the PRD is density allowances, would eliminate scatter-shot housing. The PC is considering ½-acre minimums with density bonuses to encourage clustered housing.

The following was a discussion regarding ¼ and ½ acre minimums:

- Some members feel ¼-acre is appropriate and would discourage rental properties
- Others feel this may encourage rentals and would be smart development growth
- In order to make housing affordable, ¼-acre minimums may maximize landowners' potential
- ½-acre minimums may not encourage people to come in to build infrastructure
- There is not a lot of property that can be developed in the village; PRD/PUD regulations give landowners' the flexibility to do what they want
- A PRD/PUD must go through conditional use review and would give neighbors more say in the process; some people might not want their neighbors to have more say in what they do with their property

Motion: I move to adopt ½-acre minimums with the PRD/PUD density bonuses in the lower and upper village subareas. Made: Mr. Stout, second: Mr. Hill

Vote on Motion: Passed 6-1 (Stewart)

East Montpelier Master Plan: Review and Discuss Draft Village Vision

The PC reviewed the draft vision and felt it provides the vision of what we want in the village and what was want the village to look like. The EM Town Plan does not currently have a vision and this could be included. The themes came from what people have told the PC in the public forums. Make sure to encourage village-scaled businesses.

East Montpelier Village Master Plan: Review Draft 2017 Town Meeting Presentation Materials

The PC reviewed the presentation materials. The following suggestions/comments were made:

- Change 2nd bullet to 'our Village'
- How do we benefit from having a master plan
- Change the titles from questions to statements: who does it, how do you do it, here's a map to look at
- Include PC's names and contact information
- Man the table during breaks
- Each member needs to tell 4 people outside your circle about the work you are doing to get the word out to a larger audience

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission's Energy Plan Municipal Survey: Review and Discuss Survey Questions

Ms. Potter gave a brief overview of what the CVRPC is doing. The state has a comprehensive energy plan and has asked the regional planning commissions to create regional plans. CVRPC received grant money to create the regional energy plan, as well as some money to help municipalities develop energy plans to incorporate into their town plan. East Montpelier was chosen as one of the first municipalities to receive help. A big piece of the state's plan is energy siting: what are the known constraints and where do you prefer the siting to be?

The CVRPC has sent out a survey to be filled out by different boards/committees in town. The PC and the Energy Committee agreed to fill it out together to be sure to be a unified front. Mr. Etnier stated that the SB would be willing to send a letter to the CVRPC in support of the town's survey answers. The deadline for the return of the survey is March 6 and the PC and the Energy Committee will devote the March 2 meeting to completing the survey. The PC will invite the Conservation Committee to the March 2 meeting, as well.

Regarding possible constraints, many parcels will depend on the circumstances. They might also require mitigation and/or additional research.

The PC and the Energy Committee reviewed the survey questions to make sure that all parties understand what needs to be answered. In terms of constraints and preferred siting areas, scale is very important. A known constraint is a place where no development can happen and a possible constraint is subject to further review, depending on circumstances and scale. Ms. Potter will get some clarification on the term town-owned lands; is it town-owned land, conserved lands, or both. Mr. Richardson and Ms. Biggs will check with a WEC board member regarding 3-phase power lines and distance from transmission lines for siting purposes.

Action items:

- Ask Bruce Johnson to review the CVRPC maps for accuracy
- Chair will contact Conservation Committee regarding the March 2nd meeting
- Ms. Potter will get clarification from CVRPC on issues in question
- Mr. Richardson and Ms. Biggs will contact WEC regarding distances

Update on East Montpelier Old LaPerle Farm Property Committee

The next meeting is next Tuesday.

Review Minutes

February 2, 2017

Motion: I move to approve the minutes as amended. Made: Mr. Stout, second: Mr. Hess

Vote on Motion: Passed 7-0

ZA Report

Five new permits since last meeting

DRB Report

Nothing new to report; meeting next Tuesday with a site plan and two sketch plans

Other Business

The Chair noted that she spoke with Celina Moore, who has property in North Montpelier. Ms. Moore would like to conserve some of her land; she is not asking for any town funding. Because North Montpelier is a potential growth area, the Chair wondered if Ms. Moore would consider some residential areas on portions of her property with 1-acre zoning and she was open to the idea. The Chair was encouraged that the Vermont Land Trust sent Ms. Moore to talk with the PC.

Motion to Adjourn. Made: Mr. Hill, second: Mr. Lane. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kristi Flynn, Recording Clerk