

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2012

Board Members Present: Kris Perlee, Ken Weston, Sue Kavanagh, John Elder, Willow Wheelock, Katie Raycroft-Meyer, Chico Martin, Bill Sayre

Others: Adam Lougee, ACRP, Mary Arbuckle, NEAT TV, Jen Stetson

Public: None

Chico called the meeting to order at 7:06.

Kris moved to approve the minutes from August 21, 2012, Sue seconded. The minutes were discussed. Chico motioned to approve the amended minutes, Ken seconded. All were in favor (8-0).

Chico thanked Willow for including her handout from the last meeting.

Adam reviewed with the group where they left off in discussing RA-5. They had completed the table and they were in the process of reviewing the map. Adam had recreated a map based on the suggested changes the board had agreed upon regarding RA-5.

Adam asked the group if they thought there should be any changes in the area south of the village, there were no proposed suggestions. Adam asked the board if there were any other changes they wanted to make to the west side of the village, there were no proposed suggestions.

Chico proposed that Hardscrabble road be changed to RA-2 so all the zoning would be the same. Ken felt that the board should consider this change as giving single landowners a potential to develop more while taking some away from others. Adam encouraged the group to think logically and reflect what the plan they created says. Katie and Ken suggested using a PUD or a density based approach for the RA-5 zone, which would still allow the lots to be 2 acre lots, but keeping the rest of the surrounding land as an RA-5, creating more flexibility. The board then discussed this as an option for the RA-5 zone.

Chico asked all who were in favor of considering changing Hardscrabble Road to an RA-2 zone, (4 in favor (Sayre, Elder, Martin, and Perlee) 4 opposed (Kavanagh, Raycroft-Meyer, Weston, Wheelock).

The board then discussed the RA-5 district in the upper northeast corner of the town.

Ken suggested that the flood plane north of Route 17 following along Route 116 be zoned as conservation verses RA-5. The board voted on Ken's suggestion of keeping his idea for changing the flood plain into conservation land open for discussion in the future

(6 in opposed (Kavanah, Sayre, Elder, Martin, Perlee, Raycroft-Meyer) 2 in favor (Weston and Wheelock).

The board moved into discussing the Upper Notch Road.

Adam thought this brought the board through the conclusion of RA-5 both in the language and on the map. The one thing the board hadn't discussed was the dimensional standards. The board decided whether or not to restrict the density based zoning to just the RA-5 district or to all Rural zoning districts except for the Village Planning Area and the Conservation Zone.

The board then revisited density based zoning and PUDs.

Chico asked the group to vote on density based zoning in RA-5 or larger, by agreeing to this the board would move to approve density based zoning within this district and anything greater as a tool they can choose to use. It was approved by a vote of 6-2, Martin, Wheelock, Weston, Raycroft-Meyer, Kavanagh, Sayre in agreement, Elder and Perlee opposed.

The board voted on considering the height of the building verses the side yard setback, 2-6 were in favor of (Perlee and Weston in favor, Martin, Sayre, Elder, Kavanagh, Wheelock, Raycroft-Meyer opposed).

The board then returned to discussing Ken's suggestion about width to depth ratio. There was no interest by the board to consider width to depth ratio as a new dimensional aspect for the zoning regulations.

The board then began discussion of RA-2, beginning with objectives and guidelines.

After comparing the current and the proposed objectives and guidelines the board decided the on the following:

RA-2 districts were set up consistent with historical development patterns and generally have adequate public road access. This district includes lands general well-suited for moderate-density residential development. It is the purpose of this district to allow moderate –density, rural residential development while protecting the small-town atmosphere and quality of life enjoyed by district residents. Planned Unit Development is permitted and encouraged.

Chico motioned to adjourn at 9:35, Sue seconded. All were in favor (8-0), so voted.