

**I - Call to Order**

PC Members attending- Dennis Casey, Chair, Jeff Keeney, Hugh Johnson, Dan Nugent and Kelly Norris

Others present- Tony Porter, Brandy Saxton and Dave Wetmore

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

**II- Adjustments/Minutes**

Adjustments- Dave asked to discuss briefly the work required by Act 64. Dave will present at end of meeting.

6/1/2017 minutes review- moved to end of meeting. Jeff moved minutes as corrected, 2nd by Kelly. Approved 4-yes and 0-no, Dan abstained, Dennis signed.

**III- Visitors Business and Adjustments to agenda**

Tony Porter- here to inform the PC of discussions the Selectboard has been having regarding road classification changes to portions of Mason Hill Road and Brown Hill East. Specifically segments of these roads would be changed from class 4 to trail status. There is support for this change on Brown Hill East. There is less support for the portion between Mason Hill North and Mason Hill South. The right-of-way (ROW) will remain in place. There is not any interest in the Town giving up the ROW. A trail status ROW can be upgraded if needed in the future.

The Farr’s (Brown Hill East) approached the Town requesting this change. Kevin and Valerie Audy (formerly MacIsaac and Langley) supports the change. The change would begin approx. ¼ mile east of Crowley Road and extend to the intersection with Rounds Road. It has been suggested that the Town should leave enough room so people on Rounds Road can continue to park. Perry Sweet Road is also part of the change discussion. Farr’s would like Perry Sweet Road thrown up.

Benefits to Starksboro- Tony shared that Starksboro has never maintained any portion of Perry Sweet or the portion of Brown Hill East described above. Typically, Starksboro has conducted very basic maintenance of class 4 roads.

Jeff- asked how this benefits the Town, we are giving up a ROW. Tony reiterated that the Town would still own a ROW. Trail status would be non-motorized access only. PC expressed concern for the snowmobile trail access. This is the only access to Huntington as the trail in South Starksboro has been discontinued due to uncooperative property owners.

Jeff asked how would the Town transfer rights on portion of Brown Hill East that has been altered over the years.

Dennis- asked if these ROW’s need to be surveyed to preserve them, especially where the road alignment has changed. Tony expressed that the ROW is typically 3-rods wide (49.5 feet) and that the areas where the road has changed that it is still basically within the ROW.

Tony- The Selectboard has included the Mason Hill section because this portion of Mason Hill has been discussed in the past. Public hearings would need to be conducted before any changes can be made. The Selectboard will discuss at greater length Tuesday night.

Dave- encouraged the Selectboard to seek the PC's input more in the future regarding land transactions. The PC is charged with planning for the Town and their input would be helpful.

**IV- PC Business**

**1. Brandy Saxton- Starksboro Planning Consultant**

Dennis welcomed Brandy and invited her to lead the discussion.

Brandy began by stating that 221 surveys were returned, 109 on line and 113 written. This shows a 50% increase over the 2008/09 survey. That survey was 3 parts and averaged between 75- 100 survey participants.

Curiously most participants responded to all the questions. Brandy also informed the PC that the survey results can be filtered.

Dennis- expressed that maybe some of the higher return rates results from so much discussion about the Zoning Regulations last year.

Discussion of Survey results-

1. The first few questions are very similar to the 2008 questions and responses remained consistent.
2. Only three responses from the Mobile Home Parks, 2 from Brookside and 1 from Lazy Brook. As was in 2008, there is a higher response rate from the South Starksboro area.
3. There remains strong support for agricultural operations, however more concern was expressed about the large scale sugaring operations.
4. Question #8 asked about small business support and appropriateness in Starksboro. Seemed to be support across the board for small scale low intensity business development that is appropriate. Continued support for home business use. This was further reflected in the lack of support for intensive land development that requires development of municipal wastewater.
5. There remains strong support for limiting development in the Forest Conservation district and protecting agricultural land resources as the zoning regulations seek to accomplish.
6. Question 15 may reflect the high rate of return from South Starksboro. Dave expressed that many may not be aware that the High Density Residential and Commercial district changes that took place with the new adoption of the 2016 Regulations. There remains strong support for elderly housing (Q#16).
7. Brandy suggested that Q #17 caused some confusion and would be a good question to follow up with at a forum. Dennis shared that this question was meant to be broadly considered. It's not just about sidewalks along Rte. 116 and reducing speeds. Response comments suggested that most do not want to see the speed reduced through the Village.
8. Q #18 and #19- suggest very little public transportation participation. This would be a discussion point relative to any energy discussions and energy planning.
9. Concern related to trails between Cota Field and Brookside seem to center on safety concerns especially children and the inappropriate use by unwanted users.
10. Q #23, seemed to be split (25% and 23% respectively) between improvement and maintenance of Town roads and conserving of land.

- 11. No viewsheds identified in Q#24 stood out as critical. In the end, if one supports renewables then views are not that important. If you don't support renewables, views are important. This area needs work as weighing all viewsheds equally cannot be supported. A forum exercise would be to prioritize these viewsheds. Also need more consensus between those who strongly support renewables and those who don't.
- 12. Related to energy (Q's 26-31), Brandy asked Dave to follow up with ACRPC about the State energy data. It will be a good exercise to compare this information with the data gathered from the survey and validate. This information will provide a good jumping off point for a forum.

Next Steps plan-

- A. Brandy will review plan for required State Statutes requirements.
- B. Still waiting for comments from Conservation Commission on natural resources.
- C. Dave should follow up with Tim regarding mitigation planning and share with Brandy.
- D. Jeff will work to get the Energy working group started and follow up with September or October forum. Energy group will meet on June 21, 2016. Jeff will get key from Cheryl. Dave need to check with Adam about State energy data.
- E. PC should decide whether to include river corridors where significant infrastructure is in place, mainly States Prison Hollow Ext. Brandy will provide an overlay with the Flood Hazard Area for July 20<sup>th</sup>. Briefly discussed ground water mapping. What is this information? Who uses it? Brandy suggested that only one or two quadrangles are completed annually. Brandy will check to see if any of Starksboro has been completed. Eric Hanson is also a resource for ground water.
- F. Brandy will meet with PC on July 20. Any new information to Brandy before then.

Brandy left at 8:30 PM

- 2. Act 64-  
Dave explained that he attended with Tom a road Forman's workshop on Act 64. This is the stormwater management piece that needs to be in place in 2018. This year Tom and Dave will be working to assess road segments that are connected to waterways and then prioritizing and developing a 20 year plan to correct issues.

**V- Other**

**Mail/Correspondence-**

Dave announced an a ACCT meeting at Robinson School on 6/27/2017 @6:00 PM

VLCT Spring Planning and Zoning Forum – June 14, 2017, Dave attended.

**PC decided not to meet on July 6.** Next meeting July 20, 2017

**VI- Adjournment**

Kelly moved to adjourn at 9:00 PM, Jeff 2nds. Motion to adjourn approved, 5- yes, 0-no.