

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
November 20, 2012

Board Members Present: Chico Martin, Kris Perlee, Katie Raycroft-Meyer, Sue Kavanagh, Bill Sayre

Other Present: Mary Arbuckle, NEAT TV, Xian Chiang-Waren, Addison Independent, Adam Lougee-ACRP, Jen Stetson, Eric Forand

Chico called the meeting to order at 7:15 pm.

Sue moved to approve the October 16, 2012, Kris seconded, all were in favor (5-0).

Chico spoke to the board about a letter that was included in each packet that the Greg and Linda Toner had sent to the Planning Commission. Chico had spoken with Bill about this last week and shared his correspondence with Bill Bryant regarding the zoning permits the Toner's received from the Town. Chico spoke to the board about tabling the discussion regarding the Toner's suggestions for the Conservation Zone until the Planning Commission discusses this zone.

Chico asked the board to think about what a reasonable expectation was for attendance keeping in mind that the Planning Commission has 12 meeting per year. He would like the board to keep this number in mind for when the Planning Commission re-address their policies and procedures in March.

Chico and Sue would like to meet before the January meeting and update the zoning bylaws based on the changes that they had what they had discussed thus far allowing the Planning Commission view a draft of the zoning by-laws. This draft would be nothing that was set in stone, but essentially what the changes would look like. Kris asked if the Planning Commission would try to complete revising the entire zoning regulations or if they would try to do it in sections. Chico said that the Planning Commission would hold public hearings regarding each of the planning zones and then have the town vote on the zoning regulations as a whole.

Adam began completing the discussion for the Dimensional Standards for Rural Agricultural 2. The board discussed the minimum acreage per dwelling unit in the RA2 district. Bill wanted the board to consider changing the minimum acreage per dwelling unit for this district perhaps in the future to maintain the character of the district. It was decided that within the RA2 district there would be an increased density for two-family and multi-family dwellings units-this would be an astrics within the RA-2 and RA-5 zoning districts although the acreage would be different for each zone. Chico asked the board why there should be a difference in any of the setbacks between RA-2 and RA-5. Chico motioned to adopt the following: Lot Frontage would be 200 feet, Lot Coverage would be 15% maximum, Road Frontage would be 80 for a principal dwelling and 100 feet for an accessory use, property line setback would be 25 ft minimum, height

maximum would be 35, and there would be no footprint. Kris seconded the motion, all were in favor (5-0). This completed the discussion for RA-2.

The board then began discussion of Rural Agricultural1 District. They discussed the locations of where they would want the RA-1 district to be based on the current density in various locations of the town.

The board discussed using the Hamlet method, but in the current RA-1 zoning did not accomplish the Hamlet theory they had previously talked about. The board decided to use the Hamlet theory as something separate later, but to keep this RA-1 district unchanged.

Chico motioned to leave RA-1 zoning as is including the objectives and guidelines, allowed uses, and specific regulations, Bill seconded. The board discussed the motion. Bill was reluctant to change property rights of owners who have lived there for many years. Kris amended the motion to change the objectives and guidelines, but to keep the permitted uses and specific regulations the same as the current zoning regulations, Chico seconded, all were in favor (5-0).

The objectives and guidelines for the RA-1 district would read as follows: This district consists of areas in which the soils have good capability for handling on-site sewage disposal and where roads provide adequate access without requiring major improvements. The district is intended to provide opportunities for housing at reasonable cost while permitting continued agricultural use. Planned Unit Developments are permitted and encouraged. Chico motioned change the objectives and guidelines to read as stated, Kris seconded, all were in favor (5-0).

Kris proposed that the group leave the names as RA-5, RA-2, and RA-1, the rest of the board agreed.

Adam began leading the group through a discussion regarding the current Residential Commercial Zone. Bill explained the thought process behind the current zoning for the RC-1 zone. The board discussed the residential versus the commercial use on route 116 South of Daniel's Four Corners. Chico and Sue thought that the board should consider leaving the map the way that it was unless there was a compelling reason to change what was there now, and that there needed to be a good plan to do so. Adam explained to the board the use of a Site Plan Review which would allow the use, but would let you review information regarding how it acts, what it does, traffic access, etc.

Adam asked the each board member to develop an objectives and guidelines for either or both Residential Commercial and/or Commercial being able to identify differences or similarities of the two in hopes of creating a vision that everyone can agree to.

Sue moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 pm, Katie seconded, all were in favor (5-0), so voted.