

# Cabot Planning Commission Minutes

September 18, 2014 6:00 PM

PC Members Gary Gulka, Ellie Blachly, Chuck Marian, Frank Kampf, Greg Burt, (left early)

Karen Deasy, Vene Harding

1. Site inspection for New Town Garage, meet at Willey Building - Please bring Boots

Visited New Town Garage site, reviewed project location. Locations drive and structures indicated, Board members walked site to view proposed location. Traffic entering and exiting will have signs posted indicating truck access. Neighboring properties that could have site line are Randy Searles, and the Paquin Farm. There is adequate screening on the North Boundary, the Planning Commission would like to see some additional screening next to the property line ( to be most effective) to block site lines.

2. Site plan review New Town Garage Location

## Findings

Relocation of this facility is a Town Plan goal, it is also advised and encouraged by the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources.

## Decision and Conditions

Project site plan is approved as presented with the following conditions

## Site Plan Review Conditions

### **Adequacy of parking, traffic access and circulation for pedestrians and vehicles:**

Site parking and traffic flow are sufficient, it is recommended that the trucks entering signs as planned be installed in both travel directions

### **Landscaping and Screening:**

Additional screening shall be provided and maintained between the house on the parcel currently owned by Randy Searles and The Town of Cabot, plantings shall be native vegetation and suitable for soils present.

### **The protection and the utilization of renewable energy resources:**

No issue

### **Exterior Lighting:**

Exterior lighting shall be shielded and night sky rated. Lighting plan is being coordinated with Efficiency Vermont.

Motion to approve application made Gary, Seconded Ellie vote 5-0

3. Review Meeting minutes

Previous minutes approved noting two corrections. Gary made motion to approve 3-0

4. Discussion on delegation authority – Shoreland district review comments

There is discussion on shoreland regulations with respect to the State's new shoreland protection provisions and taking local delegation authority. Several members have heard comments and reviewed feedback from various residents; the difficulty will arise with properties that are currently considered nonconforming under new rules. A brief review indicates that 46 of 51 parcels in the proposed developed shoreland zone are nonconforming. Planning Commission felt as a whole that currently there is more than the town is willing to take on. Developing mitigation plans and compliance could be difficult at best especially if requirements change over time. Greensboro ZA commented that she would not take on delegation authority if there was a choice.

5. Zoning Questions Review of regulations for use new vs old regulations examples

Not discussed

6. Review of Draft regulations – Begin with PUD section

Vene Harding came with a few comments regarding the regulations. He wanted to know if the proposed regulations were developed from agenda 21.

PC response to this issue after a discussion on what Agenda 21 is - - all but one member of the Planning Commission were not familiar with Agenda 21 and have never discussed its principles. The draft regulations have been developed based on Cabot's Town plan, resident feedback and comments and general principles of Smart Growth as defined in the definitions section. Mr. Harding did not understand regulations regarding the number of sets of stairs that could be allowed on a shoreland. The PC response to this was that this whole section is being considered for elimination from the draft, since the State will be regulating development in the shoreland buffer zone down to the water's edge.

There was general discussion about public comment that the regulations are too long and too complex. The PC will continue to review and remove unnecessary sections and simplify where possible. There was discussion that some sections of the regulations that are procedural, definitions, or special circumstances (like flood hazard regulations) could be moved to a stand-alone appendix, so that the more commonly used regulatory provisions appear in a separate, shorter document. There was also a suggestion that perhaps commercial development standards could be separated from residential.

There was discussion about simplifying subdivision requirements and focus subdivision regulations on the large subdivisions (five or more lots). There was general consensus to consider leaving rural district lot sizes at two acres without a maximum density provision (currently at one unit per 8 acres in the draft) – this would be no change over the current lot size for this district. There was general discussion that planned unit development (PUD) regulations apply better to large rather than small subdivisions and the main purpose/benefit is maintaining open space. There was a comment that PUD density bonus incentives should be carefully reviewed and that some should be removed if they are excessive, difficult to monitor or enforce over time, or do not warrant a density bonus.

At the next meeting, PUD and subdivision regulations will be reviewed in more depth.

7. Other Business

8 Next meeting date October 2<sup>nd</sup> 6:30 pm  
approved 10/2/2014

Submitted by Karen Deasy 9/23/2014