



CHESTER PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
April 5, 2021, 6:30 PM

This meeting will take place at the Chester Town Hall and via Zoom Teleconference. See the Town of Chester website for the Planning Commission Zoom link

1. Reorganizational meeting.
2. Review minutes from March 15, 2021 meeting.
3. Citizen comments.
4. Discuss plans for moving forward with bylaw adoption.
5. Discuss agenda and set date for next meeting.

Packet Materials

- Minutes from 3/15/2021
- Naomi's list

Have on hand:

- Rules of Order

1 **TOWN OF Chester**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION**
3 **March 15, 2021 Draft Minutes**

4 **Commission Members Present:** Cheryl Joy Lipton, Tim Roper, Naomi Johnson and Barre
5 Pinske via Zoom Teleconference. Peter Hudkins at the Town Hall.

6 **Staff Present:** Cathy Hasbrouck, Recording Secretary, at the Town Hall. Jill Barger, Zoning
7 Administrator, via Zoom Teleconference.

8 **Citizens Present:** Bill Lindsay and Steve Copping at the Town Hall. Derek Suursoo, Linda
9 Diak, Lee Gustafson, Jeff Holden, Scott MacDonald, Steve Mancuso, Arne Jonynas, Shawn
10 Cunningham and Ken via Zoom Teleconference.

11 **Call to Order**

12 Naomi Johnson was able to call the meeting to order around 6:31 PM.

13 **Agenda Item 1, Citizen Comments**

14 Steve Mancuso said a group called the Chester Business Coalition had formed and would like to
15 play a more active role with the Planning Commission and possibly ask for some workshops on
16 the new bylaws. Naomi Johnson welcomed the news and thanked Steve.

17
18 **Agenda Item 2, Review responses to issues listed on front page of Version 3.4 of proposed**
19 **bylaws.**

20 Naomi Johnson outlined the items to be covered at the meeting. The first was a table of issues
21 on the first page of Version 3.4 of the proposed bylaws. The second item was a memo Naomi
22 had prepared listing other specific items in the bylaws to be addressed. The third item was a
23 press release. Tim Roper suggested that the press release discussion be moved up in the agenda
24 because it was time sensitive. Naomi Johnson said she agreed the press release was important
25 and proposed reserving 15 or 20 minutes at the end of the meeting for that discussion. Tim
26 Roper, Barre Pinske and Peter Hudkins agreed to that schedule.

27 Naomi Johnson began discussing the items listed on the first page of Version 3.4 of the proposed
28 bylaws. Lee Gustafson asked if the documents were available online anywhere. Naomi Johnson
29 said Version 3.4 of the bylaws with the first page list was found on the Planning Commission
30 page of the Chester website.

31 Naomi Johnson said the issues on the list were primarily resolving cross-references in the
32 document. The first item taken up was a cross reference in the Civic and Community uses. The
33 note from Cathy Hasbrouck stated, "Clinic or outpatient care services in the Civic and
34 Community section of 2112 Use table says see Section*. I can't find anything that addresses
35 outpatient care. 1103 addresses hospitals and in-patient care."

36 Naomi Johnson proposed that section 1104, Government and Community Facilities was the
37 intended reference. Tim Roper asked whether section 1104.A(4) Government and Community
38 Facilities which states, "The provisions of this section apply to the following government and
39 community facilities: Public and private hospitals certified by the state;" should be changed to
40 include outpatient care services. No one objected to the proposed change.

1 The next issue to be addressed was “2112 Use table defines a multi-family house as 3 or more
2 units. Section 3202 Multi-family dwellings applies to 5-unit buildings or 10-unit clusters of
3 buildings. This may be confusing. Perhaps a note in 2112 saying over 4 units see 3202”. Naomi
4 Johnson suggested that putting a number of units in the note referring to section 3202 could be a
5 problem if the number of units cited in section 3202 changes. She thought it might be better to
6 say see Section 3202, Multifamily dwellings, which may apply. Tim Roper verified that the cross
7 reference being addressed is in Section 2112 Use Table. Naomi Johnson confirmed that. Tim
8 Roper asked if the confusion is in the definition of multi-family dwelling, which could be 3 units
9 or 5 units. Peter Hudkins, Tim Roper and Naomi Johnson parsed the applicability paragraph for
10 Section 3202. It was clear the standards laid out in Section 3202 for open space, bulk storage,
11 bicycle parking and pedestrian access were intended to apply to larger developments only, not to
12 3- or 4-unit buildings. Cheryl Joy Lipton asked whether the bylaw needed to be so complicated.
13 Steve Mancuso said the State of Vermont had clearly defined what a multi-unit building was and
14 what standards applied to it. He wondered why the Chester bylaws needed to do the same thing.
15 Naomi Johnson said she believed the issue was not the definition of multi-family, but whether
16 Chester wanted local regulations for multi-family buildings. Tim Roper said a 5-unit building
17 was materially different from a 3-unit building and he questioned whether a 3-unit building
18 needed a playground. The conclusion was to add the word “also” to the note in the Use table.

19 The next item on the list was another cross reference:” 3105.H has a cross reference with an error
20 that probably refers to screening, but I can’t find what it should be.” Naomi Johnson explained
21 that the section is Performance Standards and addressed junk and junk vehicles. She read part of
22 the section aloud:

23 Junk and Junk Vehicles. Except as specifically authorized as part of an approved use
24 under this bylaw, accumulation of junk or storage of more than 3 junk motor vehicles
25 (see Paragraph 2202.I and 5003.J) outside an enclosed structure is prohibited. Applicants
26 must show the location of any proposed junk or junk motor vehicle storage areas on the
27 site plan and must screen such facilities in accordance with Subsection 3106.F. Also see
28 **Section Error! Reference source not found.**

29 Naomi thought the sentence should be deleted. She believes the correct cross reference was
30 already noted in the preceding sentence. Peter Hudkins and Tim Roper thought that Chester’s
31 junk yard ordinance should be referenced here. Naomi Johnson said the ordinance is called
32 Salvage Yard Ordinance. Tim Roper suggested the phrase, “also must be in compliance with the
33 Town of Chester’s Salvage Yard Ordinance.” No one objected to the change.

34 The next item was a reference to a list of noxious weeds in subsection 3101.D **Plant Materials**. Plant
35 materials must meet the specifications in Figure 3-02. Chester strongly encourages use of native
36 species and prohibits use of invasive or potentially invasive species as identified in. . .”. Naomi
37 Johnson said this issue had been discussed in the past and Cheryl Joy Lipton had offered to
38 create a list. Cheryl Joy said she has worked on the list but it still had duplicates.

39 Tim Roper said either the list will need to be added to the bylaws or simply referenced by the
40 bylaws. Cheryl Joy Lipton said the list will need to be updated regularly. Naomi Johnson
41 suggested referencing a list outside of the bylaws or require that the applicant not use plant
42 material that was considered a noxious weed in the state of Vermont. Barre Pinske said putting
43 the burden on the applicant would be easier to manage than maintaining a list. Cheryl Joy Lipton

1 said the phrase, “noxious weed list” had an accepted meaning. She said there were still invasive
2 plants which were not on the noxious weed list and said she would create a list.

3 Tim Roper asked Cheryl Joy if the list she drew up was significantly different from the Vermont
4 Agency of Agriculture list. Cheryl Joy said her list had more plants and included plants listed in
5 surrounding states. Tim Roper said it would be difficult to keep the list current and the problem
6 of invasive species was getting worse in Vermont. He asked if the list could be kept at Town
7 Hall and referenced by the bylaws instead of having to re-adopt the bylaws each time the list
8 needed to be changed.

9 Barre Pinske asked why Chester would need a separate list if there is a state list and a federal list.
10 He pointed out that the list was about which plants could be bought and used in landscaping.
11 Cheryl Joy Lipton said the state and federal lists were incomplete. It could take years for a
12 harmful plant to get on one of those lists. Barre Pinske said he was concerned that someone
13 would buy a plant at a garden center and Chester’s Zoning Administrator would then have to tell
14 the person the plant could not be used. Barre asked if there were plants being sold in Vermont
15 now that were invasive. Cheryl Joy said there were.

16 Naomi Johnson said Cheryl Joy had offered to create a list and the Planning Commission could
17 decide once they have the list how to implement it in the bylaws. Cheryl Joy suggested the
18 bylaw require that the applicant check the updated list kept at Chester Town Hall. Naomi
19 Johnson reiterated her suggestion that the Planning Commission figure out how to implement the
20 list once the list is complete. There was general agreement for that action.

21 The next issue has to do with a notation that probably indicates the business or village districts as
22 a group. An example is in 3104.C(6) Parking. Naomi Johnson proposed removing asterisk or
23 list out individual districts.

24 Cheryl Joy Lipton asked why bicycle parking was not a standard in every district. Naomi
25 Johnson said the issue of where bicycle parking is required may be discussed separately. It had
26 been discussed in some detail during the first Saturday sessions in the fall of 2018. The issue of
27 how to specify a group of districts was what was before the Commission at present. Tim Roper
28 said he thought the asterisk may have been employed because the names of the districts had not
29 been settled on when that part of the bylaw was written. Naomi Johnson suggested removing the
30 asterisks. Tim Roper suggested the wording “all non-residential uses in any village or business
31 district.” The Commission accepted the wording Tim proposed.

32 Barre Pinske also questioned requiring bicycle parking in so many districts. Naomi Johnson said
33 the issue would remain on the list of issues to be settled and could be discussed at a later time.

34 The next issue was found in section 5003.D(3). It refers to a setback issue illustration that is
35 missing from the document. Naomi Johnson suggested deleting the reference. Tim Roper said he
36 thought the definition of Degree of non-conformity was clear and understandable. He did not see
37 a need for an illustration and suggested striking the reference to the illustration. Cheryl Joy
38 Lipton agreed.

39 Cathy Hasbrouck said this issue is currently before the Zoning Administrator. There was
40 language which very specifically addressed the meaning of increasing the degree of non-
41 conformance in section 3.19.C.5. Naomi Johnson read the section aloud:

42 The phrase ‘shall not increase the degree of non-conformance’ shall be interpreted to mean
43 that the portion of the structure which is nonconforming shall not increase in size (or

1 decrease in the event of failing to meet minimum standards such as parking and lighting).
2 Therefore, portions of a structure within a setback area cannot be enlarged, portions above
3 the maximum height cannot be expanded where parking is deficient the number or size of
4 spaces cannot be reduced, etc. This phrase is not intended to prevent existing unfinished
5 space from being finished or other similar scenarios provided there is no increase in size.

6 She also read the definition of degree of non-conformity in the new bylaw aloud:

7 **DEGREE OF NONCONFORMITY** means the extent to which a structure or portion of a structure
8 encroaches over a minimum setback or above a maximum height, exceeds a maximum footprint,
9 or otherwise does not conform to a dimensional requirement of this bylaw.

10 She noted that the discussion of increasing the degree of non-conformance was in the body of the
11 adopted bylaw document while the degree of non-conformity is discussed in the definitions
12 section of the proposed bylaws. She suggested looking at Section 130 Nonconformities in the
13 proposed bylaws and considering whether the language in the adopted bylaws is woven in to
14 Section 130. She suggested waiting to do this until another issue to be covered in the evening's
15 agenda. In the meantime, the sentence about the illustration may be deleted. The rest of the
16 Commission Members agreed.

17 The next item on the list addresses language in the V12 Zoning District section 2101.D which
18 discusses when a site plan review is needed. The V12 district is the village green and the
19 immediate surrounding area. New single- and two-family homes are not allowed in the district.
20 The paragraph that regulates Site Plan review said:

21 An applicant must obtain site plan approval before the Zoning Administrator may issue a
22 permit for all uses other than single- and two-family dwellings, and accessory uses
23 including home occupation, family child care home, bed-and-breakfast, short term rental
24 and farming or forestry (see Section 4304).

25 Naomi proposed removing the mention of single- and two-family dwellings since they are not
26 allowed uses in the district, qualifying accessory uses by adding the words existing single- and
27 two-family dwellings. The new paragraph would read:

28 An applicant must obtain site plan approval before the Zoning Administrator may issue a
29 permit for all uses other than accessory uses to existing single- and two-family dwellings
30 including home occupation, family child care home, bed-and-breakfast, and short-term
31 rental, farming or forestry (see Section 4304).

32 Cheryl Joy Lipton said it was odd not to allow new single- and two-family dwellings in the V12
33 district and allow farming and forestry. Naomi Johnson and Tim Roper explained that farming
34 and forestry may not be excluded under state statute. Naomi asked the Commission members if
35 they had been able to read the paragraph about this change with the recommendation and the
36 reasoning for it. Peter Hudkins asked about home occupation as an accessory use to a pre-
37 existing dwelling. He didn't think it was legal to confine it to a pre-existing dwelling. Tim
38 Roper pointed out that home occupation was a permitted use in any case. Cheryl Joy Lipton said
39 she didn't agree with not allowing new single- and two- family homes in the district.

40 Cathy Hasbrouck said, just to be clear, the uses listed in the statement were allowed and did not
41 require site plan review. Peter Hudkins asked if it was a zoning administrator's prerogative to
42 require site plan approval or not. Naomi Johnson repeated the text she wanted changed, which
43 was not actually addressing which uses a zoning administrator may issue a permit for. Rather

1 she wanted her change to clarify when site plan approval was not necessary in order to obtain a
2 zoning permit. Barre Pinske asked if this applied to rebuilding a building which was destroyed.
3 Naomi said that wasn't the point either. Tim Roper said he agreed with the change and wanted
4 to move on. Cheryl Joy Lipton concurred.

5 Naomi Johnson then turned to section 4304.A. She read the original text of the section aloud:

6 **Applicability.** All proposed development other than a single-family or two-family
7 dwelling, and any accessory uses or structures to such a dwelling, requires site plan
8 approval before the Zoning Administrator may issue a zoning permit.

9 She then read the proposed change:

10 **Applicability.** The uses requiring site plan approval before the Zoning Administrator
11 may issue a zoning permit are listed on each zoning district page.

12 She said that several weeks ago she had noted the change and was concerned about it, but the
13 more she looked at it now the more she thought it was acceptable given the change made to each
14 zoning page where the permitted and conditional uses are listed. Tim Roper and Cheryl Joy
15 Lipton agreed that the change was succinct and simple and it should stay.

16 The next change to be considered was in section 4307.D. She read the old version:

17 Sketch Plan Review

18 The applicant must file a complete application and sketch plan for review by the Zoning
19 Administrator.

20 She then read the new version:

21 Sketch Plan Review

22 The applicant must file a complete application and a .pdf of the initial survey for review
23 by the Zoning Administrator.

24 Naomi Johnson said the applicant may come in with just a sketch of the proposal and should not
25 be required to work with a surveyor to get a drawing before discussing the proposal with the
26 Zoning Administrator. Cheryl Joy Lipton asked if the sketch should be to scale. Cathy
27 Hasbrouck reminded the Commission that the sketch plan review was for a subdivision, not a
28 conditional use application. Naomi Johnson thought that a sketch would be appropriate because
29 less effort would be wasted if the subdivision is not possible as proposed. Cheryl Joy Lipton said
30 if the sketch did not show enough information, the Zoning Administrator could ask for more
31 detail. Naomi Johnson said the applicant could get a print out of the parcel map from the Chester
32 website and use that as a basis for a sketch. Peter Hudkins said that when the Planning
33 Commission handled subdivision, it had an informal, off the record session with the applicant to
34 go over the proposal and a sketch was sufficient. He said the judicial nature of the DRB made an
35 informal review impossible. The Commission agreed to restore the original language.

36 Naomi Johnson then turned to the last 3 items on the document. She read through them quickly
37 and wanted the minutes to note that those items were not covered during the meeting due to a
38 lack of time.

39 **Agenda Item 3 Discuss various provisions of the proposed bylaws including:**

40 **a. Requirement for locating utilities underground**

1 **b. Requirement for Erosion Prevention Sediment Control Plan**

2 **c. Requirement for site visits**

3 **d. Non-conforming lots language**

4 Naomi Johnson turned to a memo dated March 9, 2021. The first item to be considered was
5 underground utilities:

6 **3305.M Public and Private Utilities.** The applicant must design the subdivision to provide utility service to
7 each lot (this will not be interpreted to include lots with no development rights intended for
8 agriculture, forestry or open space use) in accordance with the following:

- 9 (1) All utilities must be located underground unless prevented by ledge or other
10 physical conditions that make burying lines impractical;
- 11 (2) Utilities must be located within road rights-of-way to the maximum extent
12 feasible; and
- 13 (3) The applicant must provide the town with a maintenance and access
14 easement for any utilities not located within a public right-of-way.

15 In the memo Naomi Johnson explained:

16 *The issue is the requirement for locating power, phone/internet/cable TV lines underground.*
17 *The cost of underground utilities is much higher than overhead. The item for discussion is the*
18 *suggestion to eliminate item (1).*

19 Naomi Johnson said any developer was going to prefer to put utilities overhead because it is so
20 much more expensive to put them underground. Cheryl Joy Lipton asked if burying utilities was
21 or is currently a requirement. One of her neighbors told her their utilities had to be underground.
22 Naomi Johnson said this was not currently a requirement. Naomi Johnson said she had run into
23 an issue with running 3-phase power about 1,500 feet for the city of Lebanon. The cost of
24 upgrading the 3-phase service was \$250,000. The cost of running the power underground was
25 \$1,000,000. The city saved about 60% on the project by running the power above ground. Steve
26 Mancuso said the town of Chester has service partly underground and partly overhead around the
27 green. It has been difficult to resolve because there is no organization with the authority to
28 require a resolution. Bill Lindsay said increasing the cost of building would further discourage
29 young people from settling in Vermont. He said it was important to consider the cost of non-
30 state sponsored housing and its impact on people who are thinking of building a house.

31 Tim Roper said the DRB had said they did not want gray areas in the bylaws. He thought a rural
32 subdivision would be benefitted by burying utilities and burying utilities should be an
33 aspirational goal, not a requirement. Peter Hudkins suggested that the DRB could make it a
34 condition of a subdivision permit in a rural area. Cheryl Joy Lipton agreed that burying utilities
35 should not be required. Tim Roper said he did not know how to express the aspirational goal of
36 underground utilities. Barre Pinske suggested that a list of aspirational goals such as
37 underground utilities and bicycle racks be added to the end of the bylaws. Peter Hudkins said
38 language allowing the requirement to be waived would work. Jill Barger suggested that the
39 bylaw state underground utilities must be considered. The Commission accepted that suggestion.

40 The next issue to be considered was the requirement for an Erosion Prevention Sediment Control
41 Plan in Section 3012.F

1 3012.F Erosion Control Plan Required. Applicants for major site plan approval proposing construction
2 or demolition activities that will disturb more than 10,000 square feet of soil must submit and
3 implement a professionally prepared erosion control plan in accordance with the *Vermont*
4 *Standards and Specifications for Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control*.

5 Naomi Johnson said the issue is that this proposed language is a requirement that is more
6 stringent than the State requirements under the Construction General Permit (CGP), which
7 generally requires permit coverage for disturbance of 1 acre or more. The Construction General
8 Permit does not require a site-specific Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan for Low-
9 Risk projects.

10 Naomi said section 3012.C requires proof of compliance with State permit regulations and
11 3012.E requires compliance with fourteen listed practices for Erosion Prevention and Sediment
12 Control. Naomi suggested deleting 3012.F. She doubted whether there was a need for the town
13 to be more restrictive and require more precautions than the state. She estimated the cost of a
14 professionally prepared plan to be \$2,000.
15

16 Cheryl Joy Lipton said the location of the disturbance should be considered. Precautions should
17 be more stringent along a stream bank or near a wetland, where there would be very little space
18 to buffer sediment. Tim Roper asked if the DRB could determine where the compliance should
19 be more stringent. He said he remembered discussing the issue and deciding on the 10,000
20 square feet (approximately one-quarter of an acre) number with some reluctance. Naomi
21 Johnson recalled the conversation as well.

22 Tim Roper said he didn't think a plan would be necessary if other safeguards were in place.
23 Peter Hudkins said the State of Vermont is vigilant and has shown up at horse-logging landings
24 he has had which were much smaller than 10,000 square feet. He asked whether the town would
25 have to hire someone to evaluate the plan or if the Zoning Administrator would be expected to
26 evaluate it. Steve Mancuso agreed that the state was stringent and there was no need for Chester
27 to increase the requirements.

28 Barre Pinske asked whether the town would get in trouble because an applicant had not obtained
29 a permit from the state and if the bylaw was trying to prevent that from happening. Cathy
30 Hasbrouck said part of the Zoning Administrator's job was to inform an applicant of state
31 requirements and put them in touch with a state permit specialist. Barre Pinske asked if the DRB
32 would verify that a state permit specialist had been consulted. Cathy Hasbrouck said it was the
33 Zoning Administrator's job to work with the applicant. Naomi Johnson said the applicant will
34 describe the project to the specialist and the specialist will check the box for a permit unless the
35 area disturbed is under an acre.

36 Tim Roper clarified this, asking if the permit specialist would tell the applicant he or she does
37 not need to do anything if the project is under one acre. Peter Hudkins said the applicant would
38 still need to follow the best management practices. Cheryl Joy Lipton asked whether the list in
39 3012 was the Vermont best management practices. Naomi Johnson said the list was from the
40 Low-Risk Erosion Control manual. She said logging operations are subject to best management
41 practices. A home owner, looking for a permit from Chester would be referred to the state
42 permit specialist who would determine whether the home owner needed a state stormwater
43 construction general permit. If a permit is not required, the home owner would still have to meet
44 the 14 requirements listed in the bylaws and the Low-Risk Erosion Control manual. Cheryl Joy

1 asked if there was a copy of the storm water best management practices at the town hall and
2 asked if the bylaws should refer to that.

3 Tim Roper said that, given these safeguards, he was in favor of dropping 3012.F. The other
4 members agreed. Cheryl Joy Lipton said she still thought there should be a copy of the best
5 management practices at the town hall. Steve Mancuso agreed with Cheryl Joy's points.

6 Naomi Johnson moved on to site visits in Section 4502. She noted that the proposed bylaws do
7 not mandate site visits. The adopted bylaws do mandate site visits and require that the property
8 owner allow access. Peter Hudkins said he was in favor of site visits. He felt they had been very
9 useful in the years he was on the Development Review Board and the Planning Commission.

10 Tim Roper asked if there had ever been a site visit that did not seem necessary. Peter Hudkins
11 said there had been some in his time. Tim suggested the bylaw say that the DRB may waive a
12 site visit if it thinks it is unnecessary. Peter Hudkins said no one could be sure the site visit was
13 unnecessary until it had been made. Barre Pinske thought the Zoning Administrator could make
14 a determination if the site visit was necessary. Tim said he thought the Zoning Administrator
15 should visit the site and make a recommendation, but the DRB would make the decision.

16 Peter Hudkins said the site visit takes place before the hearing. Tim said the application is
17 received by the Zoning Administrator and the Zoning Administrator should take the application
18 to the DRB who would then determine whether a site visit is needed. Barre Pinske said there
19 was no reason for a site visit on small issues such as a shed. Cathy Hasbrouck said the DRB
20 would not be involved in something very small such as a shed or fence. She said the only time in
21 her five years' experience with the DRB that a site visit was not needed was on the second
22 hearing for a subdivision when there were very few problems with the initial plat. Noting the
23 lack of consensus, Naomi Johnson suggested that the issue be flagged. She referred people to
24 paragraph 4.6 in the adopted bylaws for comparison purposes.

25 The last issue discussed in the memo was non-conforming lots. Naomi noted there was
26 considerable text from the minutes of meetings where the issue was discussed. There was not
27 time to discuss this further. Naomi noted that the proposed bylaws matched the adopted bylaws
28 on this issue.

29 **Agenda Item 4 Discuss a press release prepared by Tim Roper about proposed rural**
30 **districts**

31 Tim Roper explained that, based upon the press the Chester Planning Commission had received
32 recently there was some concern about misperceptions about what the Planning Commission
33 does, how it does it, when it is being done and who has a say in it. He said the press release
34 might be a little long. He was trying to make the point that what the Planning Commission does
35 is above board and encourage citizens to attend meetings and participate. He hoped it would put
36 people's minds at ease.

37 Naomi Johnson said she liked the message and the bullet points are concise. Barre Pinske said
38 the document created clarity. He asked if the press release had links to the map of the R-18.
39 Barre was anxious to get the maps in front of the public. He thought a lot of useful information
40 was available on the maps. Tim Roper said he did not include maps for two reasons. First, he
41 found it too difficult to explain the R-18 in a few words. Second, he realized nothing has been
42 finalized and he didn't want people thinking that this was the final plan. In the end he decided
43 that trust needed to be rebuilt and open communication reestablished.

1 Cheryl Joy Lipton said she thought the press release was good. She said people knew there were
2 maps available on the town website and that maps were hanging on the wall in the Town Hall.

3 Tim Roper asked for 3 small corrections before the press release was sent out. Naomi Johnson
4 asked if it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to send this out. All members agreed
5 and thanked Tim for his efforts. It was agreed that Cathy Hasbrouck would submit the release to
6 the Chester Telegraph, the Vermont Journal and the Eagle-Times.

7 Naomi Johnson said the next two possible dates for the meetings are March 29 and April 5. Tim
8 Roper said he was feeling pressure as a Planning Commission member to bring the proposed
9 bylaws to public hearings and the June target date was coming up fast. Naomi Johnson reminded
10 the Commission that two appointment to the Commission were due to be made in two days and
11 the new members would need time to receive materials and get oriented. She also reminded
12 them that the next meeting will start with a reorganization when a chair and vice chair will be
13 elected. Given all those factors, the Commission decided it would meet next on April 5 at 6:30
14 PM.

15 Barre Pinske thanked Naomi Johnson for her long service to the town. Peter Hudkins said he
16 wanted to allow new members to have a say in decision that have been made. Steve Mancuso
17 thanked the Commission for their service. Scott MacDonald said he was concerned that the
18 Commission did not understand how many people were very upset about the new bylaws. He
19 felt that, given the pandemic, the Planning Commission should put as much information as
20 possible online so that people who are not yet vaccinated can access it without going into a
21 public space. He said he had not been able to find the maps online. He also felt public hearings
22 in June were a little early. Tim Roper was able to offer Scott advice about finding the maps.

23 Naomi Johnson said she was available to help with projects if asked. The Commissioner thanked
24 her for her efforts. A vote was taken and the meeting was adjourned.

Naomi's final list of priority items to complete

1. Add Stone Processing as a use
2. Consider adding Contractor's yard as a conditional use in more districts
3. Consult with Jason Rasmussen on
 - a. Group Home
 - b. Define On-farm Business Levels 1 and 2 and match definitions with statutory language for on-farm business
 - c. Property value implications when minimum lot sizes change and suggestions for independent analysis
4. Consider adding Utility Facilities such as wastewater pump station as a conditional use in Res 2, Res 4, Rural 6 and Rural 18 districts
5. Consider adding extraction in Rural 3 and other districts
6. Define Stone Village district boundary
7. Review Village 4 and 6 boundaries to consider having a V4 district set back a distance from Main Street west of Church Street
8. Review site visit language
9. Review invasive species/noxious weed language
10. Find a better way to describe the prohibition of single- and two-family homes in the V12, and General Business District and the allowing of single-family home only as a Conditional use in the R18, including references to accessory uses normally tied to single- and two-family homes.

