

**EAST MONTPELIER VILLAGE MASTER PLAN
OCTOBER 20, 2016 OPEN HOUSE QUESTIONS**

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Additional information, including this questionnaire, can be found on the Town of East Montpelier Website at: <http://eastmontpeliervt.org/community/east-montpelier-village/>

A. VILLAGE BOUNDARY

1. Do you support EXPANDING THE VILLAGE BOUNDARY to include the property along Vincent Flats Road and Cherry Tree Hill Road?

Yes __17__ No __4__

- Not sure how it would affect homeowners.

B. LOWER VILLAGE MIXED USE SUBAREA

1. Do you agree with the PURPOSE STATEMENT for the Lower Village Mixed Use Subarea?

Yes __20__ No __2__

If not, what do you think the purpose should be?

- There is no room for the Master Plan. ¼ acre lot size would cause major traffic concerns.
- Yes except concerned about the ¼ acre minimum and too much density. Sidewalks definitely needed.
- But include multi-family dwellings
- Please include a statement about slower traffic patterns

2. Do you think the SIZE of the Lower Village Mixed Use Subarea is:

Just Right __16__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __4__

3. Do you think the proposed LOT SIZE of the Lower Village Mixed Use Subarea is:

Just Right __15__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __3__

COMMENTS on the Lower Village Mixed Use Subarea:

- Too small as is! Jamming more housing in is not a good idea.
- I'm concerned about overdeveloping the LaPerle Farm. The concept is okay; don't want to see too much packed in there. Maybe ½ acre would be better.
- Assuming this allows for commercial/residential buildings that have multiple units – would be nice to see some affordable rental units

- “Lot Size” only is useful for single family homes. Multi-family dwellings are useful too.
- Water & wastewater?
- Not sure of the lot size.
- Does ¼ acre include future denser potential planned developments?
- Needs access to municipal water and sewer
- The village area always feels “too tight to the road” with very little setback of business.
- High density & clustered – not cul-de-sac “ticky tacky” land as pictured in your sample photos! – include townhomes and multi-unit
- It is too spread out – it is not a village

C. UPPER VILLAGE MIXED USE SUBAREA

1. Do you agree with the PURPOSE STATEMENT for the Upper Village Mixed Use Subarea?

Yes __17__ No __3__

If not, what do you think the purpose should be?

- Many people moved here because of existing zoning – I think the fall out of having sales will increase as people relocate to find what the[y] currently have. I think lot size should increase to keep rural setting.
- But include multi-family dwellings.
- It is unclear how it is different from Lower Village Mixed Use. It almost sounds like there might be heavy industry and no restaurants.
- I think there is more opportunity for commercial & mixed use in the upper village.
- Why have two separate villages? – rather, concentrate on lower village which already has the beginning of a village.

2. Do you think the SIZE of the Upper Village Mixed Use Subarea is:

Just Right __16__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __2__

3. Do you think the proposed LOT SIZE of the Upper Village Mixed Use Subarea is:

Just Right __10__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __5__

COMMENTS on the Upper Village Mixed Use Subarea:

- This master plan is not realistic at all. Keep lot sizes the way they are!
- There doesn't seem to be much room for more development. Prefer ½ acre lots and the size is slightly too big. It should end closer to Lyle Young Road
- “Lot Size” only is useful for single family homes. Multi-family dwellings are useful too.
- Wastewater?
- Does ¼ acre include future denser potential planned developments?
- Proposed boundary includes mobile home park – would any improvements be included there?

- I'm not clear on the reason for upper village having similar density to lower – could it be light industry focused?

D. MEDIUM DENSITY VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL SUBAREA – Lower Village

1. Do you agree with the PURPOSE STATEMENT for the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Lower Village?

Yes ___14___ No ___3___

If not, what do you think the purpose should be?

- Keep 1 acre minimum. Do not want to see this area intentionally developed especially do not want apartment houses.
- If you enumerate “single family, duplex, multi-family is encouraged” in the purpose it certainly should be in the upper village and lower village mixed use.
- I don't think commercial and office use works in the “orange” areas.

2. Do you think the SIZE of the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Lower Village is:

Just Right ___12___ Too Big ___1___ Too Small ___2___

3. Do you think the proposed LOT SIZE of the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Lower Village is:

Just Right ___10___ Too Big ___1___ Too Small ___4___

COMMENTS on the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Lower Village:

- All the designated village areas should have high density building options.
- I like this area the way it is.
- Would be nice to encourage clustered development so we can keep some of that pretty view.
- Maybe it continues too far south?
- I am leaning towards too small of lot size because without stipulating which areas are optimally developable, I think ¼ acre is too small for certain parts of it.
- Great potential for housing here. Incentives here for PRDs

E. MEDIUM DENSITY VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL SUBAREA – Upper Village

1. Do you agree with the PURPOSE STATEMENT for the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Upper Village?

Yes ___16___ No ___2___

If not, what do you think the purpose should be?

- I think it is fine as is.
- But I think a statement should be added about the speed of traffic reduced to promote a walkable village!

2. Do you think the SIZE of the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Upper Village is:

Just Right __14__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __2__

3. Do you think the proposed LOT SIZE of the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Upper Village is:

Just Right __11__ Too Big __0__ Too Small __5__

COMMENTS on the Medium Density Village Mixed Use Subarea – Upper Village:

- High density along rail/bike path sounds interesting. Could be a great spot for say, innovative solutions.
- Keep 1 acre minor at most ½ acre minimum.
- Maybe it continues too far south?
- Like the variety of housing types and greenspace.
- Is there any actual sense of community in this area? Do people interact or just live there?
- I think it would be better to focus residential in a tighter way – would this area be good for agriculture?

F. VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL SUBAREA

1. Do you agree with the PURPOSE STATEMENT for the Village Residential Subarea?

Yes __17__ No __3__

If not, what do you think the purpose should be?

- I don't want to see this area developed intentionally
- I think the village size is probably a little big – many soils in this area will not support septic systems.

2. Do you think the SIZE of the Village Residential Subarea is:

Just Right __13__ Too Big __4__ Too Small __2__

3. Do you think the proposed LOT SIZE of the Village Residential Subarea is:

Just Right __14__ Too Big __1__ Too Small __1__

COMMENTS on the Village Residential Subarea:

- People move to 7 acre minimums for a reason. Paid lots of [money] for that land and privacy – devaluing their investment and creating unwanted development is a bad idea.
- I think there's room for a little development without hurting the rural character but not a lot of room.
- Would like to keep existing Zone E on west side of Vincent Flats to preserve the view – ok otherwise.
- Keep the existing Zone E on the west side of Vincent Flats open.
- Go with the bigger boundary.
- Not sure what the lot size is.
- Some more potential here for rural housing with good access to both East Montpelier Village and Montpelier (jobs!)
- I think some of this area should be designated for affordable housing near the school – not sure about lot size.
- I think existing agricultural land should stay as is.

G. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Please provide any additional questions or comments below:

- If you want neighborhoods, move to Montpelier or Barre or wherever you think has characteristics you seek. Don't change a good thing because you're bored on a Friday night.
- We need an organized township. Things are getting out of hand.
- Formal letter submitted from Jayne Parker – Cherry Tree Hill Road
- Connect village to both XVT Trail and EM Trails' Mallory Brook Trail! A great goal worth working toward.
- No sewer no expansion.
- Zero your affordable housing efforts in the village where septic, water, site work, electric could be shared by a number of homes. Zoning sizes should be more flexible to promote affordable housing and land conservation.
- Looking forward to a café!
- Clustered instead of spread out residential
- Concept of high density, multi-unit clustered development in lower, upper, and medium density village areas.
- That's a big enough area
- ¼ to ½ acre residential zoning to encourage clusters and with planned open space for communal recreation/gardening etc. – yes near school & recreation field
- Lower village – walkable mixed use multi-unit easy accessible parking lot to walk to shops/restaurants
- Upper village multi-use – no Dollar Store but more car-necessary businesses.

22 Surveys were returned in full or in part.