

I - Call to Order

PC Members attending- Dennis Casey, Chair, Norm Cota, Dan Harris, Hugh Johnson, and Kelly Norris

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

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

Visitor Business and adjustments to agenda-

Norm- announced that Hugh Johnson received the award as Line Officer of the Year award for 2015.

Dan Baker- Acknowledged that the PC has worked hard for many years on the proposed Bylaws currently being considered. Dan also stated that the Town Plan expires later this year and asks the PC to table the adoption process until the new Town Plan has been adopted. The Town Plan development process could test Town resident support of the proposed Bylaws. He expressed that this will bring the Town together. Dan does not want the adoption process to be divisive, and notes that he would feel more inclined to support the Bylaws if they had vetted through the Town Plan process. Scott agreed and stated that the Bylaws have been shoved down resident throats, suggesting that many people feel that the proposed Bylaws do not serve the Town.

PC- Kelly asked if there is a Bylaw that will please everyone- Dan acknowledged that that was not likely. Norm stated that he feels the Bylaws are supported by the Town Plan. Dennis expressed that as he has listened even Dan Baker and Scott deBaise don't always agree on commercial and agricultural uses in the HDRC. Similarly, concerns expressed the public hearing, varied and that he felt the PC had done a good job at responding to the questions raised by making the edits the PC has made to the Bylaws.

Dennis surveys the PC for reaction to Dan Bakers request.

Dan Harris- Supports the Bylaw as it has been proposed and edited and wants to move forward. This is the process outlined in VT Statute and feels the Bylaws do reflect the Town Plan. Dan disagrees with Scott's assertion that the PC is shoving this down resident's throats. This has been a long and complete process. We speak often of the forum and the survey results, but PC members are also out in the community and listen to what people have to say. We have a duty as elected officials. The Bylaws proposed with the edits made over the last couple of months are evidence of that. Dan stated that he heard some opposition to the Bylaws at the hearing, but most were question/comment. Many of the edits presently in the draft Bylaws are in direct response to the concerns/comments we have heard from Scott and Dan as well. It is a better/improved document now over the 10/1/2015 draft.

Kelly - Supports the Bylaw as it has been proposed and edited and wants to move forward.

Norm- Supports the Bylaw as it has been proposed and edited and wants to move forward.

Hugh- Supports the Bylaw as it has been proposed and edited and wants to move forward. It may not be perfect but this is a process and changes can be made later on.

Dan Baker- doesn't agree and feels the PC has not answered the concerns raised. He asked what are the critical deficiencies with the current zoning?

Dave – expressed that there were many identified by ACRP in 2006 and that the PC did not include any of them in the 2006 amendment. He suggested that the current Bylaw definitions are inadequate or inconsistent and need much improvement. An example of this would be the struggle the DRB had with the word “storage”, pursuant to the definition of “light industrial”.

Dennis- stated that the draft Bylaws seek to encourage development along the class 2 roads, specifically, Rte. 116 and 17. He feels they provide for more flexibility for residents, while recognizing the direct costs to the community from certain types of development.

Norm moved to proceed with the adoption process, by considering/affirming the edits already agreed too and those proposed tonight, anticipating that once complete that ACRPC, Jim Runcie and Jim Carroll will review before they will be submitted to the Selectboard to continue the adoption process. Hugh 2nds. Motion carried 5-yes and 0-no.

II- Minutes

PC reviewed 1/7/2016 minutes- Dan Harris moved as corrected. Norm 2nds. 1/7/2106 minutes approved 5-yes, 0-no.

III- PC Business

Dave- reviewed and confirmed the edits that had been discussed 1/7/2016 and the change Brandy has suggested. They include;

- The terms “development” and “land development” has been used interchangeably. All development is now referenced as “land development”. Definition included.
- Section 114- add “and less than” 10-ft tall.
- Section 116- farm signs added.
- Figure 1- “Degree of non-conformity” has been defined.
- Section 125.- Strengthen limits on SP or CU approval.
- Section 125.D- Changed to “... “two or more” of the ...” .
- Figure 3 “Use Table”- change “parking or transit facility” to CU.
- Section 212- changed lot coverage to max. of 3 acres
- Section 224, 234, 244 - Edits to “Special district standards” making them required with allowance for waiver possibility.
- Section 224.A(5)- removed reference to 2500 sq. ft. of roof and add required 6/12 pitch.
- Section 241.A- change “CU” to “land use development”.
- Section 251.A- Edited “Purpose”.
- Section 255.- added “and/or improves and enhances the agricultural viability and/or resource protection”.
- Section 261.A- Edited “Purpose”.
- Section 264.B- Separated into two standards as they are different themes.
- Section 271.A- Added definition for “adverse effect” and “undue adverse effect”.
- Table 7- “X“ means “prohibited”.
- Section 302- Added definition for “right-of-way”.
- Section 303.C- Changed to how height “waiver” will be considered.

- Section 304.C- Separated wind turbines from solar. Solar projects shall be comply with required setbacks for non-residential uses and shall be sited and screened from view of roads and adjoining properties.
- Section 310- Site Engineering and design. Added “applicability” statements to sections, 311, 312, 313,314, 315 and 317
- Section 312- Upgrades will be required if the modification/changes increase the intensity of use, including bedrooms. PC is a little uncomfortable with this.
- Section 314.C and E- Change “strongly encouraged” to “required”.
- Section 317.C- Changed landscaping requirements to be consistent.
- Section 320.B- Changed the weighted average to “10 minutes”.
- Section 331.A, 332.A, 335, 336.B - changed to “all land development”- Include definition of “land development”.
- Section 337- removed
- Section 342- A temporary use will be good for 2 years.
- Section 346- Defined “mobile home”. PC inclined to restrict permanent housing (single or doublewides on foundations). Definition includes permanent foundations.
- Section 346.A – eliminated “... in accordance with”.
- Section 347.B- Clarified that firearms ranges are commercial.
- Section 348- Defined “Self-storage”.
- Section 359.E- Defined elderly and affordable housing guidelines.

Dave presented a comparison of the Statute regarding conditional use criteria and the way the draft is presented in section 426. Brandy indicated that she believes that the draft Bylaws comply with the law. The only piece that is not reflected in the CU criteria is “utilization of renewable energy resources”. She expressed to Dave that while not included in the review criteria that Starksboro developments standards effectively protect access to renewable energy resources.

Dave- asked if the PC wished to review the zoning district map to consider adjusting the boundaries to some property lines or significant. PC decided not make any changes.

IV- Other

Dave will confirm edits and share with ACRPC, Jim Runcie and Jim Carroll.

VII- Adjournment

Norm moved to adjourn at 9:40 PM, Hugh 2nds. Motion to adjourn 5- yes, 0-no.