

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

**TOWN OF CHARLOTTE
PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 29, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff McDonald, Chair; Peter Joslin, Gerald Bouchard, Charles Pughe. **ABSENT:** Donna Stearns; Marty Illick

ADMINISTRATION: Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator.

OTHERS: Mike Russell, Howard Seaver

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McDonald, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

6:30PM Work session – Proposed Town Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

The Commission agreed to start their post-hearing discussion with the amendment related to conditional uses as this garnered the most comment during the public hearing.

Proposed Bylaw Amendment #3

Village Commercial and Commercial / Light Industrial Use Changes

Mr. Seaver and Mr. Russell of the Charlotte Community Development Group were present to discuss the amendments. Mr. Seaver summarized the concerns he heard at the hearing on 10/22 as follows: 1) water supply / table in the village area; 2) septic capacity in the village area; 3) traffic concerns at the intersection of Ferry Road / Greenbush Road and 4) design review for any uses proposed east of Route 7 (location of old gas station).

Mr. Seaver explained that water and wastewater would need to be addressed as part of the wastewater permitting process for any proposed new or different use. There was some discussion as to what level of detail would be required for water. Ms. McCrumb and Mr. Seaver referred to §1-801(f) of the Vermont Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Rules which states “When designing projects under these Rules, a designer shall review not only the project itself but also all potable water supplies and wastewater systems, in existence or permitted at the time the permit application for the project is deemed complete, that are potentially affected by the proposed project. This review shall, at a minimum, assure that the project will not adversely affect such potable water supplies and / or wastewater systems.” Mr. Seaver noted that changing these from permitted to conditional did not protect people from this issue but rather that WW/WS permit would do that.

As relates to traffic, Mr. Seaver contended that the offenders of the four way stop and speeders were likely ferry users. He added that traffic will not change. He used the Senior Center as an example of what the traffic might look like. He doesn't think a small shop (craft, café etc) would not affect the volume or speed at that intersection.

Mr. Seaver felt that a full blown design review standard was not worth waiting for. He referred to ‘undue adverse aesthetic’ aspect of current site plan review standards and the ability of the Commission to prevent unwanted development from occurring. Mr. Russell agreed that water supply and traffic issues are legitimate concerns but concurred with Mr. Seaver that these are not addressed through the type of use categorization. Both Mr. Russell and Mr. Seaver felt that reducing hurdles for business development could catalyze discussion and movement towards use of the town's excess wastewater capacity.

48 Mr. McDonald asked if the format of the section would change or if A) Purpose, B) Allowed, C) Permitted and D)
 49 Conditional would be retained. Ms. McCrumb agreed to retain previous format.
 50 There was some discussion about limiting chain stores. Ms. McCrumb stated that it's not legal to preclude
 51 certain stores this way. Commission agreed that size, scale and design were of greatest importance. Mr. Pughe
 52 recommended adding an 'age-specific retail' to conditional uses for stores like
 53 Good Times in Waterbury which sells products only geared towards adults. The Commission agreed with this
 54 addition.

55
 56 Mr. McDonald indicated his preference that we eliminate the east / west of Route 7 categories and list uses as
 57 either permitted or conditional in the Village Commercial district. The Commission spent some time on this and
 58 decided to add the following as permitted uses: adaptive reuses not involving any conditional uses, cultural
 59 facility (5000 sf max), multi-family dwellings, financial institution (2500 sf max), inn (5000 sf max), indoor
 60 recreation (5000 sf max), restaurant (5000 sf max), retail (3500 sf max) and snack bar (2500 sf max). Gasoline
 61 stations were added as a permitted use only in the West Charlotte VCM District located east of Route 7. The
 62 following were returned to conditional uses: Agricultural sales & service, boat sales & service, contractor's yard,
 63 gasoline station, motor vehicle sales & service, parking facility, light industry (5000 sf max) and warehouse
 64 (5000 sf max unless in PUD). 10,000 sf retail was eliminated from this district as was mobile home sales &
 65 service.

66
 67 Moving on to Table 2.4, the Commission was in favor of the amendment as last revised. Staff will reformat to fit
 68 with current regulations. Following a comment against removing residential as a use in this district, the
 69 Commission agreed to return these to this district.

70
 71 **Proposed Bylaw Amendment #4**

72 **Two-family dwellings in the Village Commercial and Village Residential Districts**

73 Ms. McCrumb put forth an alternative as proposed by staff that would allow two-family dwellings as a permitted
 74 use under adaptive reuse in the village districts (i.e. village commercial, village residential, commercial / light
 75 industrial) and as a conditional use under adaptive reuse in the rural district. This reduces the density
 76 requirement for two-family dwellings to be the same as that for single-family dwellings for those properties that
 77 qualify as adaptive reuse properties. The Commission concurred with this alternative.

78
 79 **Proposed Town Plan Amendment #2**

80 **Energy Plan – Today and Tomorrow**

81 And

82 **Proposed Bylaw Amendment #1**

83 **Energy Facility Siting and Development Standards**

84
 85 Ms. McCrumb distributed the changes to the Town Plan section as proposed by the Energy Committee following
 86 the hearing. She also referred to Mr. Pughe's suggested revisions to 'good solar / bad solar'.
 87 Strategy #4 was discussed in that we were not sure how we could measure this. Commission agreed to leave as
 88 recommended by Committee. Strategy #6 – the word facilitated was removed. Strategy 7 (renumbered from
 89 old 6) – 'and solar ready roofs' removed. The Commission felt like this is one of many design related alternatives
 90 that could be used and didn't feel this should be called out necessarily.

91
 92 The Commission and the Committee acknowledged receipt of Ms. Foulk's comments concerning waste disposal
 93 and energy usage. The Commission agreed that this might be better addressed under the facilities and utilities
 94 section of the Town Plan.

95

96 The Commission accepted Mr. Pughe’s ‘good solar / bad solar’ revision as further revised by Ms. Illick (via email)
 97 to eliminate “No’ in front of natural screening:

98 Careful planning of solar projects, particularly larger projects, will often incorporate several of the following
 99 characteristics:

- 100 • Roof-mounted systems; where feasible
- 101 • Active engagement with neighboring property owners early in the planning stages;
- 102 • Systems located in close proximity to, or screened by, existing large-scale commercial, industrial or
 103 agricultural buildings;
- 104 • Proximity to existing hedgerows, evergreen vegetation, berms, hills, or other topographical features
 105 that naturally minimize the aesthetic impact of the proposed solar project;
- 106 • Reuse of former brownfields or otherwise impacted property, which otherwise complies with the
 107 setback requirements of these regulations.

108
 109 Projects that have not been carefully planned often fail to consider the following :

- 110 • No natural screening;
- 111 • Placement within topography that causes the solar project to be highly visible against the skyline, or a
 112 dominant feature when viewed from public, historic or scenic places, and common vantage points like
 113 roads, neighborhoods or within a significant viewshed. Significant viewsheds within the Town of
 114 Charlotte include the Town’s scenic roads and vistas (Town Plan Map 13) ;
- 115 • A location that requires clear-cutting or fragmentation of the working landscape;;
- 116 • Disruption of wildlife habitat including core habitat areas, migratory routes, and travel corridors;

117
 118 **Proposed Town Plan Amendment #1**

119 **Village Designation**

120 And

121 **Proposed Bylaw Amendment #2**

122 **Housekeeping Changes**

123
 124 There were no new comments or suggested revisions for these sections.

125
 126 **8:45PM Motion by Joslin, second by Bouchard to adjourn. Vote: 4-0 in favor.**

127
 128 Minutes respectfully submitted, Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner / Zoning Administrator.