

Planning Commission Minutes
February 14, 2022

Present: Don Simonini, Doug Day (Chair), Pete Ludlow, Jennifer Hammond, Rick Swanson, Carol Chamberlin, Karen Sauther, Hanna Neill (ZA)

The Meeting was called to Order: 5:32pm

The minutes of January 10, 2022 were approved with minor edits.

Liaison Report/Don MRVPD:

Don is trying to get update on Vtrans.

Josh and MRVPD have more hours of work then hours they are allotted so they asked input to give direction through these 11 buckets. They asked for the PC to give their opinion on where we would like them to put emphasis.

Carol stated that environmental impacts for planning was the formation of the planning district, this focus has disappeared and is critical and needs more focus.

Rick shared that the municipal support box was very important and all three towns need to work together. Changes need consistent unified action. He also stressed the importance of transportation. Karen listed her top three as housing, rural resources, cultural. She stressed that it is important that Fayston maintain its own identity.

Carol explained that municipal support is needed for transportation which is tied to environmental. Housing would be best served if all three towns had a similar approach. We need to think out of the box, throwing money at it is not a good solution. A suggestion was to limit the size of houses that can be built which controls what houses sell for and lets the market do some of the work.

The PC discussed the importance of being aware of Sugarbush's current operations and their long-term plans. This was especially important in the area of the environment. It is crucial for the PC to have foresight now because the future of our Ski Resorts is unknown.

Don will compile the PC's input and present that to the MRVPD.

Carol to provide proposed edits to 3.7 (B) Lot and Yard Requirements:

The PC decided to adjust 3.7 (B) to read "Only one single principal use or structure may be located on a single lot. More than one principal use may be permitted within the specific district as a mixed use or as an adaptive reuse of a historic accessory structure (e.g. barn), or otherwise approved by the DRB as part of a PUD or PRD under Article 8."

Review minor revisions to Conditional Use/Subdivision Applications by Hanna:

ZA has stated that 6 hard copies are no longer necessary for Conditional Use and Subdivision Applications as most are submitted and viewed digitally. The PC accepted the proposed "1 original and 3 copies" in Section 5.2 pg. 78, 7.3 (A) pg. 104, and 7.4 (A) pg. 105 And Section

7.3 (A)/ 7.4 (A) at least 21 days prior (in place of 15 days) to allow proper time to warn and process complete applications.

Peter to discuss needs for LUR for Tree Clearing; qualification of proper tree cutting and management:

Pete brought up the question of “Do we need to address LUR specifications for Tree Clearing?” We currently do not have a good quantitative measure to keep track of this.

The PC decided that this is an important issue to discuss and plan for.

Questions arose as to if this should be tied in the elevation standards? Or do we make an overlay district?

Thinning vs. Clearing

We need to align Town Plan with added LUR Language in regards to tree clearing and elevation standards. Currently we have measures for erosion control and visibility of housing, but we should add landscaping plans as a requirement for DRB to be able to enforce. Warren’s Land Use Regulations would provide a good resource to help us define what we need to add, Waterbury and Stowe would be good to look at as well.

Fayston needs to balance between leaving a healthy forest and having a tree police. Moving forward we will look at more specific regulations from other towns as a starting point and determine ways to quantitatively measure and implement new bylaws for Tree Clearing and High Elevation Standards.

Discussion of High Elevation Standards:

It was brought up that Warren has color, non-reflective glass, ridgeline development, plus high elevation standards. We have a good backbone in Town Plan to build on to implement similar standards here in Fayston. Carol suggested that the PC may need to look at our Town Plan sooner and get community input on what we want our Town to look like moving forward.

We need to organize a skeletal idea of what we are talking about to get people thinking about this so they can give input on what they want. Then bring them together whether in person or in an online platform to gather data.

Karen suggested taking a look at East Montpelier, Stowe, and Waterbury’s High Elevation Regs. Fayston’s Soil and Water Conservation District line needs to be determined to help us decide where to set High Elevations. The PC needs to decide to revisit the idea of an overlay district, use the Soil and Water Conservation District Line or create a new line or create a new district. Hanna will get a topo map that shows District lines and elevations for next meeting. And pull together other Town Regs for us to look at on this topic.

Other Business/Future Topics:

PC decided to cancel the Feb. 28th meeting, will meet again March 14th, 2022.

Any candidate for PC positions will be invited to attend an upcoming meeting and the PC can meet them, then make a suggestion to the SB to appoint.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.