

Cabot Planning Commission Minutes

September 4, 2014

6:30 pm upper meeting room Willey Building

In attendance Gary Gulka, Chuck Marian, Ellie Blachly, Milly Archer VLCT, David Talbert

2. Review of Draft regulations Milly Archer, Vermont League of Cities and Towns, Shoreland regulation review

Milly Archer presented the important features of the new VT Shoreland Protection Act. With an emphasis on the 20% slope, 20% impervious surface 40% cleared area. These three items in conjunction with the vegetative protected buffer are the key points to the new proposed legislation, materials were distributed discussing Shoreland development. After Milly's presentation on the new legislation she reviewed the sections of our current draft that would require revision as we move forward. Depending on if we wish to have delegation authority.

1.3 exemptions should list shoreland protection standards

1.6 - 124 - should include - pre-existing shoreland properties that currently exist developed and undeveloped, and do not comply may still be developed but would be considered nonconforming lots.

2.2 suggested set depth of lot to 250'

2.12 - 254 - 20' from mean high water line 100' wooded buffer
Building lot coverage and cleared areas would need to adjust to state definition

2.14 lot coverage and impervious review and coordinate

261 - we proposing regulating 800' buffer state buffer 250' (cleared area must not conflict w/ state requirement in that first 250' coordinate)

4.27 – 428 - regulating hazardous materials shoreland not in state requirements

4.31 - 433 - 100' buffer on preexisting lots indicate need for state permit

4.32 c mitigation? Must meet state vegetation requirements for protection

4.33 - 435 - steep slopes state requires mitigation on slopes greater than 25%

441 - Accessory dwelling conflict possibly in increasing impervious area and or surfaces

448 - Every lot cannot have more than single path cleared 6' wide this would include stairs and docks and decks in the 100' buffer zone to the water constructed decks and docks on water may require encroachment permit from the state as well.

452 - E-would comply with shoreland

4-53 cannot create cannot create lots that are nonconforming thru subdivision

472 - PUD in shoreland density bonus would conflict with state requirements

For implementation if we choose to consider delegation authority consider using an overlay district, while maintaining other regulations for zone beyond the buffer. Recommended keeping any subdivision as a Major subdivision to require higher level of review.

Milly is available and willing to assist with writing or altering regulations to meet requirements either to support delegation or to avoid conflicts with state review.

Discussion on delegation authority, It was determined that delegation authority would require further discussion, Pluses on the side of acceptance of delegation include

Pro's

Local review

Lower level of fees

Coordination of permitting

Con's

Increased local review

More time required to review and develop each project

Gary would like to hear from residents as to thoughts on local delegation vs state control

Mr. Talbert was of the opinion of the opinion that local review would be beneficial

1. Review Meeting minutes

Gary made motion to approve minutes from August 21st Chuck seconded vote 3-0

3. Other Business

4. Next meeting date September 18th 6:30 will start with Planned Unit Development

Submitted by Karen Deasy 9/8/2014