July 1, 2021

PC Members Present: Zach Sullivan (Chair), Julie Potter, Kim Watson, Richard Hall, Clarice Cutler, Siu Tip Lam (remote)

Others Present: Kristi Flynn (Recording Secretary)

<u>Call to Order:</u> 7:12pm <u>Changes to Agenda:</u> None <u>Public Comment</u>: None

Discuss Zoning Updates: Accessory Dwelling Units

Ms. Potter reviewed state statute §4412(1)(E); there is an increase to 30% of the primary dwelling or 900 square feet, whichever is greater. The statute sets a floor not a ceiling. The EM regulations are currently based on 600 square feet. The PC reviewed draft Section 4.2, Accessory Dwellings.

- \rightarrow (A)(2) new language
 - What is meant by 'clearly associated?' should be an accessory and clearly subordinate; could be located over a
 detached garage
- (A)(3) changed the square feet from 600 square feet to 1200 square feet or 30% of the primary dwelling, whichever is greater; Ms. Saxton and the ZA had recommended 1200 square feet
 - o ADUs are popular and help provide affordability
- ➤ (A)(6) SB approves access/driveways

PC agrees to use 1200 square feet in the draft section.

The PC reviewed definitions associated with PUD and Accessory Dwellings.

- Removed Planned Residential Development (PRD) and added Planned Unit Development (PUD)
- > PUD definition dropped mixed use language because this definition encompasses all development
- ➤ Dwelling unit/Accessory definition this is a shorter definition that points to Section 4.2; less change needs to be made if the definition points to the section
- Discussion keep 'retain common ownership...'; PC agreed to keep this language
- ➤ Building Envelope definition used in site plan review, not necessarily subdivision review; the draft clarifies and simplifies the definition; it doesn't apply to the village zones but the PC decided to fix it now

The PC is fine with the draft definitions as edited.

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

Section F – Telecommunications Infrastructure

Regulatory Process, page 3

- Line 25 town cannot deny permit based on health concerns
- Line 28 impacts of radio waves with examples, visual impacts and impacts on wildlife
- > PC agrees with the clarification changes

Resources to be protected, page 3

- > Clarified foreground and provided rationale
- Trails treat the same as scenic resources
- > PC discussed adding trails to the Scenic Resources section in the next update
- Ms. Lam suggested separating trails from cell towers and putting them in Scenic Resources section instead; Chair would like to mention trails in this section
- Ms. Watson suggested removing reference to Chapter 9 (page 4, lines 10-12); Ms. Potter would like to leave in for more regulatory protection going before the PUC
- Trails are protected because they are already on conserved land in many cases; issue may come into play if a tower is proposed on land that is not conserved
- > PC agrees to remove lines 10-12 on page 4 regarding reference to Chapter 9

Areas not suitable for cell towers, page 5

- > Proposed language 'proximity to homes creates an undue aesthetic'; this ties it legitimately to the aesthetics piece
- > Typo corrections page 1, line 33 landline is one word; page 3, line 18 change 'my' to 'may'

The Chair will provide a clean copy for the next meeting.

Discuss Cell Tower Updates to Town Plan: Goals and Actions

The PC reviewed the Goals and Actions on Page 6.

- > Action 6.18.2 this action pertains to conducting an inventory of suitable cell siting locations
- Discussion about how PC should go about and where the funds would come from

- Ms. Potter believes this is not a great idea because a study would cost a lot, PC would need to work with the carriers and it would put a bullseye on locations and potentially upset neighbors
- The PC needs to research the issue before going ahead, though it a worthwhile debate
- ➤ Is there a town property that makes sense?
- ➤ Needs multi-town effort to do it right
- Action 6.18.1 regarding filing as an intervener, the PC must make a determination in order to file as an intervener and/or submit comments
- > PC is okay with the Goals and Actions as presented

The Chair will add the review of draft language for Chapter 9 from Jean Vissering to the next agenda.

Updates

- > Capital Improvement Committee the CIC Chair put out a notice on Front Porch Forum for capital projects
- ➤ Energy Committee no update
- ➤ Resilient Roads Committee no update
- ➤ Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission no update

ZA Report

Five new permits

DRB Report

Next meeting on 7/6/21: final plan review for Kaplan subdivision and conditional use review for Green Mountain Day Spa

Review Minutes

June 17, 2021

Motion: I move to approve the minutes as amended. Made: Ms. Watson, second: Ms. Cutler

Vote on Motion: Passed 6-0

Motion to Adjourn. Made: Ms. Watson, second: Ms. Cutler. Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:55p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kristi Flynn, Recording Secretary