

**I - Call to Order**

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

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- Dave asked to have time to review the PC Report for the Town Report- Dennis suggested that the PC review now. Dave had prepared a draft for PC review and sent it to them on Monday.

Norm moved the report with the following corrections;

1. Change the number of open PC positions from 2 to 3 this year, and
2. Change “effected” to “elected”.

2nd by Hugh. No further discussion. PC approved report as corrected 7-yes and 0-no

Scott deBaise- Scott stressed that he believes that the proposed Bylaws do not comply with the Town Plan, page 70, objectives 9 and 10. Specifically, the Bylaws should discourage commercial single-story structures. Further, that the HDRC district as it is proposed to be extended, should only allow residential uses. He is on record of opposing the self-store use that had been approved by the DRB and later overturned by the Court. He feels that this Bylaw will allow this type of use and suggested that the standards were specifically created around that parcel (section 348). Dan Harris expressed that this was not the case and that the minimum 2 acre requirements accounts for consideration of setback and landscaping requirements. Scott asked if speed limits would be reduced along this area of Rte. 116? This would be a request of the Selectboard to the State. PC discussed that the section Scott cites are the objectives for the “Starksboro Village Planning Area” (PA) of which there are 10 objectives outlined. The PA clearly notes that this area should remain mixed use. As mixed use districts all commercial uses should be compatible with adjacent residential uses. PC expressed that the PA objectives must be looked at together and that the Bylaws proposed do provide standards that seek to make commercial and residential uses compatible with each other. PC notes that the special district standards are being strengthened as the PC will review tonight. Additionally, the PC agreed to set the standard for minimum roof pitch for commercial structures to 6/12. PC expressed that the changes proposed coupled with other architectural guidelines such as those identified in section 224.A complies with the Town Plan and addresses Mr. deBaise’s concerns. PC stated that they never considered that this area should be only residential.

Dan Baker- Asked about density based zoning? Where is it clear how it will be implemented? PC expressed that they feel it is quite clear and cites sections 212, 242A, figure 6, and 352 C and D. This very closely resembles the current set aside provisions and extends to ASRR and FC but also to LDRC district. PC stated that all building rights will be tracked on the approved Mylar and once they are used up no further subdivision of the properties would be allowed.

Dave Wetmore- Shared that he had attended the Selectboard (SB) meeting on 1/5/2016. He asked the SB to support updates to the Town Plan and parcel maps. The PC is aware that Starksboro was not awarded a planning grant for 2016. Total budget request is \$12,600. This is an increase to the zoning and planning budget of about \$9000. Dan Nugent asked why only \$5000 had been requested when Brandy had estimated \$8500 for updates to the Town Plan. Dave noted that significant planning costs have been

reduced by utilizing the ZA time to manage planning tasks directly with the PC. Brandy is needed to make edits and conduct citizen input.

Dave also shared his conversation with Toby Gay ( ACCT Director of Maintenance), specifically around tax delinquencies, abandonment, proposed Bylaws, resident quality of life/needs and mostly lack of communication and cooperation from the Trust. He is aware this has been a problem in the past but hopes things will improve. Dave invited Tobey to sit down with him to discuss the changes outlined in the proposed Bylaws that might affect park residents.

**II- Minutes**

PC reviewed 12/3/2015 minutes- Jason moved as presented. Dan N. 2nds. 12/3/2105 minutes approved 6-yes, 0-no, Hugh abstained.

PC reviewed 12/17/2015 minutes- Norm moved as presented. Jason 2nds. Norm asked about the cap on permits, specifically as it relates to units. As currently adopted the Bylaws clearly limit the growth cap to one unit/year which limits the development of 2 or 3 family homes. 12/17/2105 minutes approved 6-yes, 0-no, Dan H. abstained.

**III- PC Business**

Dave- reviewed the edits that had been discussed resulting from the public hearing. They include;

- Section 114- add “and less than” 10-ft tall.
- Section 116- Need to add that farm signs are not exempt from zoning.
- Figure 1- “Degree of non-conformity”. Jim Runcie had suggested that figure C was an increase. ZA notes that it had been agreed that the line of non-compliance would be the portion of the structure closest to the road or property line.
- Section 125.B- This is the section that prevents SP or CU approval from being forever.
- Section 125.D- Change this to “... “two or more” of the ...” .
- Figure 3 “Use Table”- change “parking or transit facility” to CU.
- Section 212- PC agrees that lot coverage (expressed as a %) should not exceed 3 acres in any district.
- Section 224, 234, 244,255 and 264- Edits to “Special district standards” making them required with allowance for waiver possibility.
- Section 224.A(5)- remove 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- Edits to “Purpose”.
- Section 255.D(2)- change to “Provide a higher standard of energy efficiency and/or improves and enhances the agricultural viability and/or resource protection”.
- Section 261.A- Edits to “Purpose”.
- Section 264.B- Edit to strengthen district standards. Separate (2) into two standards as they are different themes.
- Section 264.H (2)- change to “Provide a higher standard of energy efficiency and/or improves and enhances woodland production/viability and/or resource protection”.
- Section 271.A- need definition for “adverse effect”.
- Table 7- At bottom of table clearly show that “-“ means “prohibited”.
- Section 302- Do we need to define “right-of-way”.
- Section 303.C- Changes to how height “waiver” will be considered.

- Section 304.C- Separate 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- Need applicability statements for Site Engineering and design.
- Section 312- Upgrades will be required if the modification/changes will increase the intensity of use, i.e. bedrooms.
- Section 314.C and E- edit strongly encouraged to “required”.
- Section 315.G- Does this apply to existing “residential uses”?
- Section 317.C- Edit landscaping requirements to be consistent.
- Section 320.B- Change the weighted average to “10 minutes”.
- Section 331.A, 332.A, 335, 336.B - change to “all land development”- Need to include definition of “land development”.
- Section 337- remove
- Section 342- How long will a temporary use be good for? Same as any zoning permit, 2 years?
- Section 346- Need to define “mobile home”. PC incline to restrict permanent housing (single or doublewides on foundations). Is this legal?
- Section 346.A – something missing at end of 1<sup>st</sup> sentence “... in accordance with”. (?)
- Section 347.B- Clarification on firearms ranges.
- Section 348- Define “Self-storage”.
- Section 359.E- Define elderly and affordable housing guidelines.
- Section 359.H (1) and (4)- Change “should” to “shall”.

PC did not consider/discuss “growth management” tonight. Brandy is to make recommendations.

**IV- Other**

Scott deBaise- No further comments beyond those he expressed earlier.

**VII- Adjournment**

Norm moved to adjourn at 9:40 PM, Jason 2nds. Motion to adjourn 7- yes, 0-no.