

MINUTES
FAYSTON PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 20, 2015
DRAFT

Members Present: Carol Chamberlin, Polly McMurtry; Interim member/ZA: John Weir; Public: Kevin Russell, Rowan Cignoni

Polly called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Members first discussed the Minutes of April 6, 2015. Carol moved to approve, and John seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Members then discussed the vacancies on the Board. Kevin Russell, former zoning administrator and Fayston's representative to Transportation Advisory Committee, was present. Rowan Cignoni, a Waitsfield resident interested in serving on the PC was also present. Rowan has interned with the Vermont Natural Resources Council. Kevin felt that a regular appointment to the PC would not fit in his schedule, but offered to help the Board if requested – especially in matters related to transportation and recreation. He also said that if there should be a vacancy in the future, he would be interested. Kevin left the meeting, and Rowan stayed. John will ask Patti to put consideration of appointments for both Rowan and high school student Cole Lavoie (as an ex-officio member) on the next Selectboard agenda.

Members then moved on to discuss the impending revisions to the regulations as necessitated by the town plan rewrite or other reasons. The first item was changing the stream buffer requirements from fifty (50) feet to one-hundred (100) feet. Members had bookmarked areas in the regulations where these buffers are codified and the necessary changes would be made. Polly asked about the stream buffer requirement as it related to driveways. No such reference or discussion is found in the regulations. Members agreed that stream or wetland buffers should be spelled out clearly in the regulations, and Section 3.1 (B) is the place. There were five (5) places in Section 3.13 in which the 50-foot buffer requirement needs to be changed to 100-feet. In Section 3.13 (A), a revision is to be made so that all paths (paved, unpaved or other) proposed within a stream buffer go through conditional use review. In addition, there should be a blanket stream buffer requirement of 100-feet within Section 3.13 (B). The question came up about the language “or two times the width” as it relates to the stream width, and members discussed removing it, as adequate stream setbacks seem just as important for narrow streams as they do for wider rivers. However, before removing Polly said she would check on why it is there, in case there's an important reason. Section 4.4 (A) and Section 4.10 (A) (9) need to be revised so that stream buffers are not included in the provision allowing for reduction or elimination of buffers by the DRB. Carol will draft possible setback language for ponds within Section 4.11. Members will also consider clarifying the distinctions between “buffer” and “setback.” Section

6.2 (C) also needs a change from a 50-foot setback to a 100-foot setback. Members will also consider removing any language concerning “in the judgment of the DRB”, as this language is somewhat ambiguous and deferential. We also spoke of temporary shelters, and ensuring that the word ‘vegetated’ is included where necessary. As well as replacing ‘should’ with ‘shall’ where necessary.

John will print out and leave for pickup by Rowan the following: the 2014 Fayston Town Plan, the Fayston land use regulations, and the VPIC new member brochure.

For the next meeting, members will discuss the revisions to the subdivision regulations. Polly will forward work she does in reviewing the Waitsfield subdivision regulations and highlighting certain language for inclusion in Fayston’s regulations. Carol will locate the Vermont’s Natural Resources Council’s materials related to forest fragmentation and parcelization.

The next meeting of the Fayston Planning Commission will be May 4, 2015 at 5pm.