

I - Call to Order

PC Members attending- Dennis Casey, Chair, Jason Barnard, Norm Cota, Dan Harris, Kelly Norris and Dan Nugent.

Others attending- Dan Baker, Scott deBaise and Dave Wetmore.

7:00 PM –Dennis called the PC meeting to order.

Visitor Business and adjustments to agenda- none at this time

Continued review of minutes for Public Hearing on 11/5/2015

Question- Where did the definitions for bed and breakfast and Inn originate?

PC answer- The definition comes from planning sources and are in use throughout VT.

Question- Are commercial and industrial (nonresidential) use setback less than residential?

PC answer- Section 212, figure 4 outlines the minimum required setbacks for residential and nonresidential uses. Additionally, chapter 340 “specific use standards” may have additional setback requirements. All nonresidential setbacks are at least equal to or greater than residential setback requirements.

Jody Higgs- Will the lighting and noise (performance standards) apply to both residential and nonresidential uses? When would the standards be applied?

PC answer- The answer to this question may not be as clear as it should be. All land development that comes before the DRB would need to comply. The Board agrees that if there is no change being requested, then the property owner would not need to comply, whether residential or nonresidential (see chapter 120). It had been decided that significant, major alterations (either residential or nonresidential) should require compliance with site engineering, i.e. improvements to access, parking requirements, outdoor lighting. What qualifies as a major change/alterations? Porch, bedrooms, new lighting?? Performance standards seem to be clear that these standards will be applied by the DRB, section 321. Where and to what extent section 300 (Development Standards) are applied to proposed land development, permitted or conditional, needs to be clear. Would section 300 benefit from an “applicability” section like #321 (performance standards)? To be clear section 300 includes general, site engineering, resource protection, and specific use standards and it needs to be clear what and when a standard applies.

Dan Baker- Asked why the Bylaws don’t include a growth management tool and limit?

PC answer- Noted that Brandy expressed that a growth management program with a permit cap without a capital management budget to support the cap is not legal pursuant to State law. PC will ask Brandy for some examples of growth management tools. PC asked if Dan B. had any suggestions for planning tools that he would feel are acceptable growth management and conservation of farmland? Dan stated that it was up to the PC and their staff/planner to propose something that is acceptable to the residents. PC members expressed that they feel the proposed Bylaws do work to conserve agricultural resources and that some have an interest in some form of growth management.

Linda Saunders- commented that growth should be encouraged along State Roads. She observed that a zoning permit is a form of growth management and that responsible and controlled growth is a personal responsibility as well. PC offers no additional comment except that the Bylaws do provide tools to encourage development along the State Roads while conserving agricultural resources.

Peter Ketchum- commented that he is not as concerned with growth in the outlying areas. No growth cap does concern him.

Answer- PC expressed that the Bylaws do not attempt to specifically restrict growth in the outlying areas. However, development in the outlying areas is expensive for the Town and that is why development in the HDRC, MDRC along Rte. 116 and 17 is preferable. PC will look at growth management.

Donna Lescoe- Agreed with Dan Baker that she doesn't want Starksboro Village to look like Hinesburg, and asked why storage unit setbacks are only 25-ft?

Answer- PC stated that storage unit setback is the minimum required. It was the intent of the PC that setbacks would apply to all development (i.e. parking and service areas) not just the building. This needs to be amended. PC asked what is so offensive about commercial development? How about elderly housing? What size is acceptable? Dan Baker stated that commercial development is not what most residents identify as Starksboro's character. Dan B. noted that he did not support or feel that franchises such as Maplefields are acceptable. PC members state that scale is important and that there are plenty of examples of well-designed and sited franchises that fit nicely into the community. Some PC members expressed that having gas in Town would be a benefit. Dennis expressed that a store or other gathering place is characteristic of small Town VT.

Jeff Keeney- stated that sewer and water has had a huge effect on Hinesburg development. Water and sewer severely restrict Starksboro's HDRC development potential.

Linda Saunders- asked what type of development could be sited in Starksboro?

Answer- Identified uses are outlined in section 212

Peter Ryersbach- would extending the HDRC district allow for a gas/convenience store?

Answer- PC stated that based on section 211 and 329, both uses would be a conditional use.

Dave Thompson- asked how a site plan and conditional use work?

Answer- Both are reviewed by the DRB. The DRB is a quasi-judicial board that would review an application pursuant to section 425 or 426 and then approve or deny an application with possible conditions.

Alan Quittner- expressed that he did not feel the Town wide surveys were relevant due to the low rate of responses. PC expressed no comment.

Dale Hoffman- asked when will the PC conduct another survey.

Answer- PC noted that the Town Plan is up for re-adoption next year (2016) and a new survey will likely be completed as part of that amendment process.

Dan Baker-expressed that 7 years between surveys is too much! Dan asked about water extraction, section 337. How does this section apply to businesses that use water in the course of their business and where does the 30,000 gals/day come from?

Answer- The survey was developed to inform the Town Plan development. A new survey will likely be taken for the 2016 Town Plan. Dave noted that Town Plan and Bylaw development is a slow process and takes time, often overlapping each. Dan B. suggested that the PC should step back and revise/readopt the Town Plan before moving forward with the Bylaw adoption. PC does not agree.

Regarding water extraction PC cannot speak to the 30,000 gals/day figure, but Jason noted that State review kicks in well before 30,000 gals/day. Based on the discussion **Norm moved to remove section 337, Jason 2nds. Motion to remove section 337 approved 6-yes and 0-no.**

Tom Perry- asked how the MDRC district serves the Towns interest?

Answer- PC stated that both these proposed districts are located on State roads and include existing developed uses. This objective/proposal is outlined in the Town Plan and responds resident requests. Serves as a buffer and transition to areas where higher density uses already exists. This district would allow for more infill, and hopefully take the development pressure off the outlying and ASSR district.

Donna-express concern also about water extraction, but from a subdivision or development perspective. Is there any way to protect adjacent uses?

Answer- PC noted that we don't have any regulation currently, but this type of use is regulated by the State and would be considered as part of the water and wastewater permit review.

12/17/2015- Agenda

Review edits to Bylaws

- Density Bonus, section 359E
- Jim Dumont/Jim Runcie comments regarding "should and shall"
- Clean up development standards, where and when do they apply, residential? Nonresidential?
- Consider growth management objectives/standards
- Limiting nonresidential structure sizes.
- Other

Visitor comments-

Dan Baker- stressed that he does not see that the proposed bylaws do enough to conserve agricultural resources.

Scott deBaise- Really would like the PC to strengthen the language. Consider making the new portion of the HDRC district, residential only. Discourage single-story structures, as outlined in Town Plan.

VII- Adjournment

Jason moved to adjourn at 9:40 PM, Dan H. 2nds, Dennis thanked Dan and Scott for coming tonight. Motion to adjourn 6- yes, 0-no.