

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
DECEMBER 17, 2015**

Minutes are subject to correction by the Charlotte Planning Commission. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the next Planning Commission meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff McDonald, Chair; Gerald Bouchard, Charles Pughe, and Marty Illick.

ADMINISTRATION: Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator.

OTHERS: Denise and Tom Kessler

AGENDA ITEMS:

Minutes review – 12/3

Town Plan Responsiveness Summary - Chapter 9 Transportation

Brainstorming discussion Re: Future Land Use Discussion

Amendments status

Upcoming agenda

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McDonald, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF REGULAR AGENDA/CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. McCrumb asked to enter executive session to discuss personnel issue.

Motion by Pughe, second by Bouchard to enter executive session.

The Commission exited executive session at 7:15PM.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MINUTES: 12/3/15

Review of minutes was deferred.

Town Plan Responsiveness Summary - Chapter 9 Transportation

Future Land Use Discussion

These items were also deferred.

Amendments Status

Town Plan 1 – Village Center Designation

The Commission discussed questions heard at the hearing and noted need to clarify that future boundaries of this area would be based on the current uses of a property and not historical uses of the property. The Commission also felt that it was not necessary to add a statement indicating consideration for design review at this time because 1) the site plan review standards (Section 5.5) speak to need for compatibility with surroundings and 2) the current town plan already contains a strategy for consideration of design review guidelines for village and hamlet areas.

48 **Town Plan 2 and Bylaw 1 – Energy**

49 Commission agreed to remove wildlife habitat from excluded areas noting that projects
50 would be reviewed against Areas of High Public Value of which wildlife habitat is one.
51 They also agreed to remove the Shoreland Area if that was consistent with State
52 Shoreland Permit Permitting Requirements. Staff to research. Location within this area
53 could be permitted under State Permit and local regulations allow accessory uses /
54 structures to a permitted use. Staff recommends that not permitting within 150' (current
55 local setback) unless mounted on an existing structure.

56

57 **Bylaw 2 – Oops list**

58 Commission agreed to eliminate suggested revision to Section 3.13 (A) as intent of
59 current regulation is to allow small, temporary signs.

60

61 **Bylaw 3 – Conditional to Permitted Uses**

62 Commission reviewed and although no changes suggested by Selectboard, the
63 Commission felt it important to capture the importance of review of groundwater
64 resources for new projects. Staff recommended highlighting that a capacity and
65 interference analysis would be required for projects requiring additional water /
66 wastewater capacity in all village districts. There was some discussion on where to note
67 this in the regulation (as footnote to use table under Chapter 2 or as an addendum to
68 Section 3.16 Water & Wastewater System Requirements.

69

70 **Bylaw 4 – Two – family dwellings and density**

71 Tom and Denise Kessler asked why the Commission had forwarded the proposal that
72 requires conditional use review in the Rural district. They noted the Town's commitment
73 to affordable housing and felt permitting duplexes town-wide would go a long way
74 towards meeting this goal. Mr. Pughe felt that the creation of two-family dwellings does
75 not necessarily mean they will be affordable. He saw these as two separate issues that
76 may or may not overlap. Mr. Bouchard agreed that two-family dwellings may not be
77 affordable and added that largely dependent on bedrooms. The Kessler's proposed
78 limiting bedrooms as a means to permit without conditional use review. Mr. McDonald
79 was not comfortable with this approach. Ms. McCrumb noted that the current proposal
80 was a means for consensus as the initial proposal to allow wherever single-family
81 dwellings are permitted was not amenable to all during previous work sessions. The
82 Commission did not propose any changes at this time and deferred to the Selectboard for
83 discussion. Mr. and Mrs. Kessler indicated their intent to attend the Selectboard /
84 Planning Commission work session on Monday evening.

85

86 **ADJOURNMENT**

87 Motion by Mr. Pughe to adjourn, second by Ms. Illick. Vote: 4-0 in favor. The meeting
88 was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

89

90 Minutes respectfully submitted, Jeannine McCrumb, Town Planner.

91