

June 17, 2021

PC Members Present: Zach Sullivan (Chair), Julie Potter, Kim Watson, Scott Hess, Gianna Petito, Clarice Cutler

Others Present: Kristi Flynn (Recording Secretary), Jean Vissering

Call to Order: 7:03pm

Changes to Agenda: None

Public Comment: None

Discuss Return to In-Person Meetings

The Chair was not able to get this together in time for this meeting, but the members are looking forward to seeing each other in person. The board talked about how the members would like to receive the meeting material: printouts or electronic. The screen can be used for remote participants. The ZA noted that the town Wi-Fi can only handle a few laptops at a time. The board members would prefer to print out a smaller number of copies and use the same screen. There will be a hybrid option. The 7/1 meeting will be hosted at the Town Office.

Discuss Edits to Town Plan Cell Tower Section: Background and Siting Standards

The measurement of foreground refers to the distance when one can see detail. Ms. Vissering has looked at research on how people see landscape detail. Middle ground is ½ mile to 5-7 miles. The US Forest Service developed the standards. The following comments were made:

- Do the standards assume where the view is 360 degrees? When you consider development, the roadside is the viewpoint
- Fields, ridgelines and historic structures contribute to the experience of the view
- Regarding trails, the trails themselves are often scenic resources but the PC did not consider them because most people see scenic resources from the road and trails are in the woods; they are important to mention as part of the scenic quality of the town
- Suggestion: add 'not significantly detract from middle ground view'; not an outright ban
- In the Resources section, add Trails as a short section
- Suggestion: add an Action regarding considering trails as Scenic Resources
- The board discussed opening up inventory for scenic resources; the board agrees to make minor additions and clarifications
- The board discussed what gives teeth to the Town Plan
 - Adding a new section on cell towers
 - Text provides clear statements on what is important to the town, making it easier to engage with the PUC regarding cell towers
 - Discussion language isn't the strongest part; the policy statements and actions are more important
- Cell tower siting are pretty strong policy statements if very clear and not arbitrary
- Why can't proximity to houses be used as this has been heard from residents most often
 - The Chair noted that the current language is based on visibility instead of health
- The board discussed whether they are treating towers differently than other uses
- Suggestion: add prohibited locations language from the zoning regulations
- Setbacks for wind turbines are common, check for language in other town plans
- It is important to check legal issues
- The PC can't ask for anything that they don't ask for in another commercial project without clear justification
- The zoning regulations have prohibition around schools without justification; this is probably legacy language
- Height of tower equals the distance from home/structure; consider using a multiplier as more of a buffer but need a basis for the figure
- PUC criteria talks about aesthetic impact; look at areas that don't allow other industrial uses but make sure this doesn't treat uses differently
- Tie area visibility to aesthetics and be explicit in the text; some not comfortable going down this road
- As there is considerable disagreement among PC members, the Chair will re-work parts of the section based on comments

Discuss Cell Tower Updates to Town Plan: Goals and Actions - tabled

Discuss Village Zoning: Planned Unit Developments

Section 5.6

- Purpose – no change
- Review Process – remove PRD
 - PC discussed coordinating with Conditional Use; this part hasn't changed, must include subdivision review. Both conditional and site plan must be done even in a use is allowed
- General Standards – items were re-ordered and some were added as best practice
 - Removed development envelope and that conserved open space can be divided off/sold; the idea of a PUD is having open space available
- Standards Specific
 - Density – current language is a 25% bonus with a higher bonus for affordable housing; it is hard for the town to justify/quantify affordable
 - G2 – deals with new village districts with a 100% bonus; from a practical standpoint you would need to look at shared infrastructure
- Preference poll – PC okay with changes to the section – yes – 6; no - 0

Updates

- Capital Improvement Committee – no update –
- Energy Committee – no update
- Resilient Roads Committee – Foxfire Tree Service got the County Road project and is taking down ash trees
- Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission – no update
- rbTech – the Certificate of Public Good was approved; the language on native species and decommissioning was accepted; the PC considers this a successful engagement with the PUC

ZA Report

- Four new permits

DRB Report

- Next meeting on 7/6/21:

Other Business

- Ms. Watson will communicate with the Jacob's Road residents regarding teeth in the Town Plan
- The Chair will draft new language based on the last two meetings
- The PC discussed public hearings for the PC and the SB; PC might consider an informational meeting before the hearing

Review Minutes

June 3, 2021

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

Vote on Motion: Passed 6-0

Motion to Adjourn. Made: Mr. Hess, second: Ms. Petito. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:00p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kristi Flynn, Recording Secretary