

September 3, 2020

PC Members Present: Julie Potter (Chair), Siu Tip Lam, Zach Sullivan, Clarice Cutler, Jack Pauly, Kim Watson, Scott Hess, Paul Eley

Others Present: Kristi Flynn (Recording Secretary)

**Call to Order:** 7:04pm

**Roll Call Attendance**

The Chair took roll call attendance; the PC members noted above were present.

**Statement Regarding Remote Public Meeting**

The Chair noted that as a public body, the PC must still follow open meeting laws. Vermont is allowing remote meeting. The Chair read the recommended statement from VLCT regarding meeting remotely.

**Changes to Agenda:** None

**Public Comment:** None

**Village Zoning Discussion**

The PC continued the review of the village zone.

The Chair reported that sidewalks are not included in calculations of lot coverage. The sidewalks in the village are controlled by VTrans; they are not included in lot coverage or tax calculations.

**Lot Coverage**

- PC reviewed draft provided by Mr. Sullivan, including a graph of lot coverage examples
  - He is proposing a straight line instead of drop-off at the different lot size breaks
  - Draft language: less than 1/4 acre = 80% of lot; 1/4-1/2 acre = greater of 70% or 0.20 acres; 1/2 – 1 acre = greater of 60% or 0.35 acres; more than 1 acre = greater of 45% or 0.60 acres
- Preference poll- original – 0; draft - 8

**Setbacks**

- The PC discussed measurement of setbacks: minimum or maximum between boundaries and structures, usually the cause of most questions; also provide buffer from and between structures
- In village, preferable to have buildings and houses closer to the road, promotes walkability; consider smaller minimum front setbacks
- Minimum front setback: 40' from centerline or 25' from ROW, whichever is greater
  - Is 15' arbitrary?
  - PC would like to run setbacks by the ZA for feedback
  - PC discussed the RPC suggestions for village setbacks; need further discussion on other areas in town
- Preference poll – 40' front setback – 8 agree
- Side/rear setback – 10'
  - Middlesex and Calais are 10' in village districts
- Preference poll – 10' side/rear setback – 8 agree
- Maximum front setback – new concept
  - Rationale in the village, with properties close to the street, farther back looks off balance
  - Consider language that matches adjoining structures
  - There were different opinions on whether there should be a max or not
- Preference poll – seven members were against including a maximum; will re-visit the issue

**Height**

- Maximum height – 35' max in all districts
  - Based on how high the fire department can go
  - Don't complicate the issue
- Preference poll – 35' – 8 agree

**Section E – Supplemental Standards**

- 1) Site plan required for all permitted uses except single/double family homes – in all districts
- 2) Uses comply with Articles 3 & 4 – in all districts
- 3) PRD/PUD allowed in village district – see Section 5.6; more density may be possible with shared infrastructure
- 4) Corporate/franchise architecture prohibited
  - a. Need definition of what this means, make sure it is clear enough for enforcement
  - b. PC wants business development but wants some control over what the buildings look like
- 5) Hours of operation
  - a. Residential vs non-residential
  - b. Limit hours based on adjacent uses – new concept – recommendation from CVRPC

- 6) Lighting on non-residential uses – shielded for no spillover
  - a. Consistent with what DRB has been doing
- 7) Lighting dimmed at night to provide visibility but limit usage
  - a. Language is a little vague; remove or keep with revision to wording
  - b. Refers to light pollution
  - c. Preference poll – maybe – 2; no – 6
- 8) No outdoor storage for Light Industrial uses
  - a. Doesn't preclude residential storage
  - b. Refers to storing bulk material without a building structure; indoor storage is okay

PC agrees with standards 1-6 and 8.

### Updates

- Capital Improvement Committee – met on 9/2, received notice from Resilient Roads Committee for \$25,000 over 10 years for tree maintenance; declined the request because it should be included in the annual operating budget for maintenance
  - 2021 budget will be finalized in October and presented to the SB
  - Paving is a capital project
  - Road maintenance is a routine operating item
- Energy Committee – no update
- Resilient Roads Committee – no update, meeting scheduled for 9/15
- Old LaPerle Farm Property Committee – sale closed on 8/27; no formal plan for the farmhouse property, will get seeded after construction equipment is gone

### ZA Report

- 4 permits since last meeting – 1 granted, 3 pending

### DRB Report

- Met on 9/1/20 –
  - reviewed garden shed variance request that was subsequently denied; requested revised application and scheduled special meeting on 9/8
  - sketch plan review for Morse subdivision – approved large lot survey waiver

### Review Minutes

August 20, 2020

**Motion: I move to approve the minutes as written.** Made: Mr. Hess, second: Ms. Watson

**Vote on Motion:** Passed 8-0

### Training/Conferences

- Northern New England Planning Virtual Conference – 9/30 & 10/1 – free
- Community Wildlife Program Webinar – various dates - free

### Other Business

- Notification of balloon testing of possible cell tower from ZA
- Town of Plainfield hearing on Town Plan – hybrid in-person/Zoom meeting - let Chair know if interested

The next meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2020.

**Motion to Adjourn.** Made: Mr. Pauly, second: Mr. Hess. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:35p.m.

*Respectfully submitted by Kristi Flynn, Recording Secretary*