

TOWN OF Chester
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 22, 2021 Minutes

Commission Members Present: Naomi Johnson, Cheryl Joy Lipton, Tim Roper, Peter Hudkins and Barre Pinske all via Zoom Teleconference.

Staff Present: Cathy Hasbrouck, Recording Secretary.

Citizens Present: Steve Mancuso, Lee Gustafson, Sharon Huntley, Shawn Cunningham, Charlie Record.

Call to Order

Peter Hudkins called the meeting to order around 6:30 PM.

Agenda Item 1, Citizen Comments

Steve Mancuso said he wanted to understand why the meeting was being held. Naomi Johnson suggested that Agenda Item 2 be read. She read item 2 of the agenda aloud, "Discuss the presentation Peter Hudkins made to the Selectboard at their Wednesday February 17th meeting."

Agenda Item 2, Discuss the presentation Peter Hudkins made to the Selectboard at their Wednesday February 17th meeting

Peter Hudkins asked if any Commission member was opposed to beginning discussion on Agenda Item 2. No one voiced opposition.

Peter Hudkins began the discussion by saying he was, "your crazy uncle last Wednesday." He said he had been on the Planning Commission for 2 years and had a list of questions to ask. When he first joined the board, he said the chair, Naomi Johnson had asked him to put the questions aside for a while and, "go with the flow." He said he still had questions after 2 years. He had hoped that people who were in favor of forest blocks would have clearly stated that they were in favor of forest blocks. He felt that people in favor of forest blocks had attacked him when he questioned the proposal for forest blocks. He was not offended by the comments, but he had hoped that their support for forest blocks would be more openly spoken.

Peter Hudkins went on to say that the Selectboard meeting on Wednesday February 17, 2021 had quorums from both the Select Board and the Planning Commission. He expected that, at such a meeting, all discussion between members of the two boards would be a matter of public record. He read part of an e-mail from Abigail Freedman from the Vermont League of Cities and Towns. "In the spirit of the open meeting law board members should not be texting back and forth between more than member of the meeting. If two or more board members are communicating it should be part of the public record of the meeting."

Peter Hudson then took up the document prepared by Naomi Johnson and Tim Roper for this meeting, which had been distributed in the packet. Naomi Johnson offered some context for the discussion. She said two documents were presented by the Planning Commission to the Select Board for the Wednesday February 17th meeting in order to update them on the Planning Commission's activities. One document was a draft of the Reporting Form that must be presented to the Regional Planning Commission when the new bylaws are presented for

adoption. She said Peter Hudkins had presented his own report at the Select Board meeting that was prepared independent of the other Planning Commission members, even though two days before the meeting the Planning Commission had discussed what would be provided to the Select Board.

Naomi Johnson said Peter had not told the Planning Commission that he had prepared other remarks. He was fully aware that Naomi Johnson and Cathy Hasbrouck were preparing documents to be presented to the Select Board at that meeting. Naomi said that action was against the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure.

Secondly, Naomi Johnson said, the vast majority of concerns about the bylaws expressed by Peter Hudkins to the Select Board were not items he had discussed at Planning Commission meetings. He certainly had indicated at times that he had issues with the bylaws, but had not stated them verbally or in writing. Naomi said she had offered to help him get his thoughts into writing, but Peter had not accepted the offer.

Finally, Naomi said, when topics such as rural density came up in a Planning Commission meeting, Peter Hudkins had not expressed the concerns he voiced at the Select Board hearing. She wanted everyone at the meeting to know these issues were of grave concern to the Planning Commission.

Naomi also said that Peter's opinions were never discouraged, and the response that she and Tim had prepared was not meant to be an attack. She said the issue Peter brought up about the open meeting law could be addressed separately from the discussion of the memo.

Cheryl Joy Lipton said she believed Peter was supposed to give a report about what the Planning Commission had been working on for the past year, not give personal views on various issues. She said that the Planning Commission as a whole had not been represented, except in the two documents.

Peter Hudkins said he had spoken his opinion at the Select Board meeting and other members had a chance to do the same and did so. He said he was sorry if he had offended the other members of the Planning Commission.

Peter said that in his first year on the Commission he went with the flow and worked with the bylaws as they were presented. In his second year on the Commission, while he was the chair and needed to dig into the bylaws more deeply, his opinion changed for the worse. When he brought up issues up that were new to him, but had been discussed by the commission before he joined the commission, he was advised to check the previous meeting minutes and note what had already been discussed. Peter suggested that if a new member of the commission must accept decisions that have already been made, the Select Board should be consulted on the policy.

Tim Roper said the bottom-line issue for him was that Peter was supposed to be representing the Planning Commission at the Select Board meeting, but instead he represented himself. Tim said none of the Planning Commission countered the points Peter was making because that was not the purpose of the meeting. Tim said Peter's assignment was to represent the Planning Commission and report on the progress it had made with the proposed Unified Development Bylaws. Instead, Peter had given his opinion on smaller detailed items, many of which had not yet been resolved. Tim said Peter had degraded the professionalism of the Commission and represented himself. Speaking for himself, Tim said Peter had lost his trust. Peter said he

accepted the blame for that and he had the right to express his opinion at the Select Board meeting.

Cheryl Joy Lipton said Peter's opinion was welcome in the mix of opinions at the Planning Commission. She said the Commission votes on decisions after giving arguments and arrives at a compromise. Those discussions should happen in Planning Commission meetings. She felt the Select Board meeting was to be an update on Planning Commission progress, and Peter should have represented the board as a whole.

Peter acknowledged their thoughts. He said Chester was the only town in Vermont which had decided to completely re-write their bylaws. He said had searched for towns where Brandy Saxton's work had been adopted and did not find any. Naomi Johnson said, "Of the five of us, four of us don't feel that you voiced your concerns (in Planning Commission meetings) and that you weren't given the opportunity to share them."

Barre Pinske said he had been in favor of making Peter the chair because he had experience on the Planning Board. He said he had difficulty with Peter's chairmanship because the Planning Commission's direction was no longer clear. He was puzzled that the Planning Commission had just spent a meeting going over Rules of Procedure that allowed the chair to be replaced and Peter did not read a word of the documents that the Planning Commission expected him to read at the Select Board meeting.

Peter Hudkins suggested that Naomi Johnson begin reading the document prepared by Tim Roper and Naomi for the meeting. Naomi verified that the other members of the Planning Commission wanted her to read the document. She explained the document was composed to make it known to the Select Board members and members of the public, that there was a reporting form and a comparison prepared and those documents are independent from the statements Peter made at the Select Board hearing. The document was a summary of statements made by Peter Hudkins at the Select Board meeting, grouped into one of three categories: false statements, misleading statements and statements needing review, research, further discussion, or explanation.

Under the false statement category, the first statement was, "Subdividing for a 3-acre building lot in R-18 requires at least 36 acres." Naomi Johnson said that would be the case if two residential lots were wanted in the R-18 district. If only one residential lot was wanted, it could be accomplished with a 21-acre lot, which would have 3 acres for the subdivided residential lot and leave 18 acres of undeveloped land. She said the draft bylaws could be clarified on this point.

Naomi Johnson said the next statement, "Subdividing a 3-acre building lot in R-6 requires 12 acres" was similarly false. A lot of 9 acres could be subdivided into a 3-acre building lot leaving 6 acres undeveloped. Twelve acres would be required to create 2 residential lots.

The third item in the list was, "The town will have to subsidize property taxes". Naomi Johnson said she didn't know where that statement came from. Peter Hudkins said, in the example just cited, the 21-acre lot in the R-18 district, the 21 acres would be valued at \$4,000 per acre. If 3 acres were subdivided to form a residential building lot, the remaining 18 acres would simply be forest land and could not be further developed. Peter said forest land is currently valued at \$477 per acre and prime agricultural land is valued at \$766 per acre. The value of the 21 acres would be substantially lower after the subdivision. That lower valuation would have to be subsidized

somewhere. Peter said the Town of Chester currently owns 40 pieces of undevelopable land and he didn't think the town wanted to own any more.

Naomi Johnson said the Planning Commission had no proof of this statement. She said no studies had been done that support it. She noted the Commission had the authority to commission a study.

Barre Pinske said a lot of the land is undevelopable to begin with because it has steep slopes and is far out on Class 3 roads. He thought it was important for the community to understand that. He felt putting such land in the R-18 zoning district was appropriate and recognized that the land was undevelopable for reasons that had nothing to do with which zoning district it was in. Barre said he did not know if part of the Planning Commission's job was economic. He suggested that some of these ideas were above the Planning Commission's pay grade. He said the Commission could examine statistics on this topic and make a judgement if a member wants to supply them. He said the Planning Commission had done that with the consultant. He felt Peter should give reasons for his statements.

Steve Mancuso asked to speak. Peter Hudkins asked him if he could wait until the Commission had finished reviewing the document. Steve Mancuso agreed to wait.

The next statement considered was, "Two acre building envelope is really only 5/8 of an acre and the DRB will tell you what you can clear and what trees." Peter Hudkins acknowledged that this statement was partly a mistake on his part. He said every landowner in Vermont is entitled to a 2-acre homestead. The tax on that land might be higher than on other land. He said the building envelope brings a great many restrictions on the 2-acre homestead area.

Tim Roper said the Planning Commission is on version 4 of the proposed Unified Development Bylaws. Nothing has passed into law. With 5 different perspectives from 5 different members the Planning Commission's job is to talk through the ramifications of the proposed bylaws that they can foresee. He said he was very upset Wednesday night when these points in the bylaws were presented as an accomplished fact, when none of the points spoken of were actually settled and some hadn't even been talked about yet.

Tim Roper said it was important that people understand the proposed bylaws were a draft and not a complete document yet. He said presenting the document as if it were complete is an egregious disservice to the town of Chester.

Returning to the building envelope topic, Naomi Johnson agreed that the Commission had not thoroughly discussed the specifics yet, though it had been spoken of at one meeting. She suggested that the topic be marked as something that did not appear to be correct to herself or Tim upon review, and it could be discussed in more detail at another meeting.

Naomi discussed the next two bullet points, "We've been working on this for four years" and "There's only been one good public meeting" together. She said the bylaw project has been in progress for two and a half years, which included pauses to work on the Town Plan. She recalled three public workshops in 2019 and believed they had been well received by the public. Further, she noted that all Planning Commission meetings were and are open to the public, including the numerous Saturday sessions conducted by Brandy Saxton.

Barre Pinske said he had been part of the workshops and recalled that a lot of people did show up and gave feedback and the Commission had made changes based on that feedback. He thought the workshops had gone very well. Cheryl Joy Lipton said that the Stone Village residents had

attended several meetings and the Planning Commission had warned them ahead of time when the Stone Village was going to be discussed.

Peter Hudkins said he thought there were changes to nearly 75% of the uses and dimensional standards requested at the meeting with the Stone Village even though there had been meetings and workshops before. He felt it was necessary to have meetings for each district to sort this out. Tim Roper objected to the 75% figure. He only recalled 3 or 4 items that were changed. Peter Hudkins suggested that the changes could be counted to verify the statistic. Tim Roper thought that would be a waste of time.

Naomi Johnson reiterated that every meeting is a public meeting and when the Planning Commission is ready to present the document, it is required by law to have more public hearings. She said she didn't know what makes a public meeting good or bad. For her, any public meeting citizens attend is a good public meeting. Barre Pinske said he thought the August meeting with the Stone Village was great and combined with the other meetings shows that the Planning Commission is working hard to bring public opinion in. Cheryl Joy Lipton added that the public does not always want to come. She said she regularly urges people to attend the meetings. The meetings are often boring for them. Barre Pinske said ultimately the Commission with its diverse opinions needs to work as a group and when a vote is taken, someone will always end up a little disappointed. Their disappointment is part of the democratic process.

Peter Hudkins said zoning was formerly done with a composite board made up of members of the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He had appreciated the input as a member of each board. He said it is no longer the case that the boards work together on the bylaws and he finds that to be a problem. He would prefer that they work together.

Moving on to the next statement, "Extraction is no longer permitted in any district" Naomi Johnson said extraction is proposed to be permitted in 3 districts: the General Business, R-6 and R-18. She said a memo that was part of the 2/15/21 packet listed a task of considering that use for other districts as well. Peter Hudkins said he was concerned that the definition of extraction approved many years ago by a town-wide vote was not part of the proposed bylaws. Naomi Johnson said that definition was also mentioned in the 2/15 memo. Peter said that item had not previously been on the list of issues to be discussed before the public hearings take place. Since other items he is concerned about were not on the list, he believed they had already been discussed and settled and would not be brought up again.

Naomi Johnson said of the next statement, "Regional Planning told Brandy Saxton not to change everything" that "It is our understanding that Regional Planning did not give Brandy any specific direction on what to do." Peter Hudkins said he had asked Jason Rasmussen of the Regional Planning Commission for help when he became chair of the Planning Commission in March 2020. Peter said the statement about asking Brandy not changing everything had been part of their conversation. He was told Regional Planning would not have time to help Chester. Peter said, since then, Barre Pinske and Arne Jonynas had both spoken to Regional Planning. They would now be able to offer assistance and he would really appreciate their help. Naomi Johnson concluded that this could have been a misunderstanding and there was no way to resolve the issue now.

The last statement in the category was, "Paving /repaving will require a major site plan approval and will trigger tree planting requirement" Naomi Johnson said there is a list of items that would trigger a major site plan review and resurfacing of existing impervious surfaces was specifically

mentioned as not requiring a major site plan review. Peter Hudkins said there were two different places in the bylaws where this is mentioned but he didn't have his notes with him to locate them.

Naomi Johnson said the list that excludes repaving was in 4304.C(2)(e). Tim Roper said the second mention Peter could be referring to was 3104.G (Parking and Loading Areas). Naomi Johnson read the text of the second sub-bullet of the list, "Under section 3104 G there is some language which could trigger tree planting requirement in one specific scenario. The PC has not yet discussed this section to determine its suitability as currently written. We will discuss, determine suitability and adjust language as deemed appropriate by a majority of commissioners"

Barre Pinske said that requirement was put in to address major development. Tim Roper recapped the bylaw re-write process as he recalled it. He said the town had hired a professional consultant to do an audit, which was included in the Select Board packet. The goal of the audit was to compare the town plan and the existing bylaws, find places where they were not in alignment and make adjustments based on that. Part of the consultant's work was to write a draft set of Unified Development Bylaws as our starting point. Tim called that version 1. He said the Planning Commission is now on version 4. The Planning Commission has altered a great deal of the document and has not discussed the entire document yet. He said it was important that everyone understand the Planning Commission has not voted for everything that is in version 4. Item 3104.G is a perfect example of something that has not yet been voted on.

Peter Hudkins began reading aloud a section of 3104.G(11) which discussed curb cuts and storm water management. Peter suggested these requirements would cause considerable expense for a business such as Lisai's or an institution such as the Chester Town Hall if their parking lot were to be resurfaced. Peter thought the young couple who just purchased Erskine's Feed Store would be similarly affected.

Naomi Johnson said at the beginning of the section the bylaw reads, "Applicability. Proposed development subject to major site plan" (Editor's note: Afterward Naomi Johnson confirmed these words are found in Section 3101.B Landscaping.) She said that if the only development involved was re-paving, then the project did not require major site plan approval and the standards in 3104.G did not have to be met.

Barre Pinske said he recalled going through this issue with Brandy. He said under the proposed bylaws his parking lot should have catch basins to keep snow melt on his property and he felt this was an appropriate requirement for a business. Tim Roper said he did not recall discussing section 3104 with Brandy. Naomi said the minutes document could be searched to find any references to the section. She again pointed to Section 4304.C(2)(e) which clearly states that resurfacing an existing impervious surface on its own will not require a major site plan review.

Peter Hudkins said he thought it would be easier and safer to use the zoning bylaw audit to modify the existing bylaws than to locate all the potential problems in the proposed bylaws. Cheryl Joy Lipton said that course of action should have been chosen three years ago. Peter Hudkins said he was not a member of the Commission three years ago.

Barre Pinske suggested that looking at a town similar to Chester in size which had done a good job re-writing their bylaws for guidance and examples to follow. He asked Peter Hudkins if he could accept some other town's zoning laws or if he was only willing to look at his own ideas.

Peter Hudkins said he did not know where Chester should be going. He said he evaluates the proposed bylaws by picking an example of controversial development and walking it through the text. He said Chester is not growing. He personally has no plans to subdivide or develop land. He said the biggest impediment to subdivisions in Chester is the cost of building a road. He pointed out that the last development of any size in Chester was Remington Road and it still has not sold. He asked why there was a hurry to change the entire bylaw when there was so little growth to regulate.

Tim Roper said it was difficult to listen to Peter state his opinion as fact. That was a big issue for him at the Select Board meeting. Barre Pinske agreed. He thought the commission could not function with someone who acted as a boss and the final and only authority on facts as the chair. Peter must be one vote on the commission, like the other members.

Peter said he spends 10 to 13 hours preparing for the meetings and he gets deeply involved in the details of the bylaws. He acknowledged his thinking process is unusual. He looks for the path through the bylaws that a transaction would take and finds details in the bylaws that would prevent a successful application for land development. He said he joined the Planning Commission when Brandy was almost finished presenting the bylaws and had only attended a couple of meetings with her. His opinion of the bylaw was not formed by Brandy's presentation as the opinion of the other members had been formed.

Tim Roper strongly objected to the characterization that Brandy had formed the member's opinions of the bylaws. He felt Peter was stating that as a fact when it was his opinion. Peter said he was stating his opinion. He pointed out that the membership of the commission would be changing in March and the commission could elect another chair. Peter said it was difficult to prepare for a meeting and fully understand what the other members thought when he wasn't present for a lot of what had gone before.

Barre Pinske said if someone joins a team, they need to learn the plays before they can participate. He said Peter had been elected chair because he had experience in the past as chair. Barre did not want to go over issues that had been resolved in the past.

Naomi Johnson suggested the group continue to go over the list of issues and that members make it clear when they are stating an opinion and not a fact.

The next statement to be discussed was categorized as misleading. It said, "Peter can't find anywhere that the consultant's plans have been used". Naomi Johnson said that does not mean that there are not other Vermont municipalities that are using the work of Brandy Saxton. She said she had spoken to Brattleboro when Chester was considering hiring Brandy Saxton and they were very happy with the work she had done on their bylaws. She said Tim Roper had noted that Vergennes was another community where she had done work.

Peter said that he had seen changes to districts and uses she had done in Bristol, but the work did not extend beyond districts and uses. Tim Roper said it would have been good to ask Brandy that question. Barre Pinske said he recalled Brandy mentioning Williston and Vergennes. Naomi Johnson said Brandy had sent a statement of qualifications that could be checked.

There were four items on the list that needed review, research, further discussion or explanation. The first was, "Maximum building size anywhere in town is 6,000 square feet". Naomi read the second sub bullet that said, "There appears to be an omission with regard to exceptions for commercial, municipal and school buildings. We will revisit this in a future meeting." Barre

Pinske emphasized that 6,000 square feet was the footprint of the building, not the total floor space.

The next statement was “Home occupation will only be permitted in currently existing dwellings in R-18.” Naomi Johnson said it was true the bylaw had been written that way. She said the commission had decided in April 2019 that home occupation should be allowed in all districts and the language of the bylaw should be changed.

The third statement said, “Commercial uses in the R-6 district required 300 feet of road frontage.” Naomi Johnson confirmed that this is the language in the bylaw. She said the commission needs to revisit this, taking into account any public opinion given and decide the issue with a majority vote.

The last item in the list was “Single-family dwelling is a conditional use in the R-18.” Naomi Johnson said that is the actual wording in the bylaw. She said it was made a conditional use in order to have a more detailed review of the development. Cheryl Joy Lipton said the R-18 district is all 1,000 feet from the road. Peter Hudkins said there was nothing in the bylaws that required the R-18 to be 1,000 feet from the road. Cheryl Joy Lipton said the 1,000 feet could only be seen on the maps. Tim Roper said the maps were adjusted when Peter was a member of the commission.

Naomi Johnson recapped the history of the R-18 district saying the starting point for the R-18 was 1,000 feet from the road. When the Planning Commission reviewed the districts, it changed that in some places, bringing it down to the road, notably in Smokeshire. Peter Hudkins said he thought there had been a 1,000-foot limit on the length of a driveway but he does not see it in the document now.

There being no further discussion about the letter, Steve Mancuso asked to speak. He said that everyone appreciates a crazy uncle now and then. Steve Mancuso said he had been following the Planning Commission progress for years. He had printed drafts of the bylaws. He said the Commission was seated to reflect the will of the people of Chester, but few members of the public have input to the process. He said it was sad and he did not know of a remedy for the problem. He said citizens to whom he had shown the proposed document had not been aware that Chester had a Planning Commission or had quite a bit to say about the details of the bylaw document. He said if the Planning Commission wanted representation, more members of the public need to be involved. The Planning Commission had to respond to the wishes of the tax payers.

Steve said he realized that the Planning Commission is wrestling with a lot of details. He said the factions on the Commission are becoming apparent. He said the public realizes the Planning Commission was created by an agenda and is agenda-driven. He said it appears the Planning Commission wants to create a bedroom community. One nickname for Chester which has been circulating is “Grafton Light”. He acknowledged there is a lot of squabbling behind the scenes and he wanted the Planning Commission to come together with a mutual direction for the benefit of everyone. The economy is in jeopardy and he would like to think Chester has some kind of stability based on the decisions the Planning Commission is making.

Barre Pinske said he had joined the Planning Commission because they needed members. He said his goal was to represent the town, listen to citizen’s opinions and make sure that nothing too crazy happens. He acknowledged Naomi’s expertise. He said what she brings to the table is

extraordinary. He said he had learned a lot from Brandy Saxton. He said he respected Peter's passion but the board can't simply do what Peter wants.

Cheryl Joy Lipton said the Commission is working hard to bring citizens to the meetings and to take information from them. The Planning Commission meets every first and third Monday of the month. The agendas are posted and may be found on the Chester Telegraph. She said she thought there was quite a bit of diversity on the board and it represents the whole town. She said the goal or purpose of a planning board is not necessarily to represent the people of the town, though they try to do that and take into consideration and work for the good of the people. It doesn't necessarily mean doing what every individual wants them to do, because what is good for one person may not be good for another. She said it's a juggling act and compromise is necessary.

Steve Mancuso asked Cheryl if the commission could make the town more business friendly. He said he was a small businessman. The tax base is founded on small businessmen.

Peter Hudkins asked Charlie Record if he had any comments. Charlie said he hadn't been following the meetings until he heard what happened at the Select Board meeting last week. He said he agreed with Peter on some of the issues. He doesn't know what is true of what was said today and what is not. He said he didn't want to have to go through a site plan review in order to repave his parking lot. He didn't own 36 acres but if he did, he would want to be able to divide it into more than 2 lots. He also disagreed with a maximum building size of 6,000 square feet. The EMS building is bigger than 6,000 square feet.

Barre Pinske asked Charlie Record if, given what he heard at the meeting, did he now see how those statements were untrue. Charlie said no, it seemed like some of it was truth. Barre said frequently when people discuss the issues at a meeting, they change their mind when they get more information. Barre pointed out that the documents are available online and may be viewed at any time. Charlie agreed to take a look.

Lee Gustafson said the Select Board meeting was an eye opener for him. He said he had a discussion with a couple on Sunday. He described how the Planning Commission, the DRB and the Select Board worked and the couple said they had no idea that was how the town government worked. Based on a suggestion made to him, he talked to Julie Hance and suggested that a video be made describing how the whole process works. He said it would be a short presentation without a lot of details. He said that all the Chester town boards have difficulties stirring up public interest in their work. He said he would suggest some type of form or survey that will make it easy for the public to give input if they don't have time or resources to attend a meeting.

Cheryl Joy Lipton asked whether the proposed video could be a written document as well. Lee said the video would certainly begin as a written document, but he thought a 3-minute video would be much more popular. He said that if anyone from the Planning Commission wants to draft an outline of how the video should be put together it would be a step in the right direction. The document could go on the website as well as the video.

Barre Pinske said Chester is a small town, that often feels like an island, but is not actually that isolated and unique. He said it's possible some other town has created a video that would serve Chester's purposes. Steve Mancuso agreed with Barre and said there was no reason to re-invent the wheel. He said that the commission also had to consider that the torch and pitchfork crowd

was always going to be on their heels. Cheryl Joy Lipton invited Steve Mancuso to tell them what the Planning Commission could do to make Chester more business friendly.

Lee Gustafson went back to the issue of taxes that Peter Hudkins had brought up. Lee asked whose job it was to look at the economics of the zoning changes. Peter Hudkins quoted Naomi Johnson who said the Planning Commission could commission a study. Peter said he had looked at Springfield, where there is a 25-acre minimum zoning district. He compared large lots in the 25-acre minimum zone with other lots and their value was much lower. He said he was concerned about property taxes. The Town of Chester gets \$280,000 from the state for parcels that are in current use.

Lee Gustafson said he thought the Planning Commission should be considering the economic impact of every rule they implement. He said he honestly believed that considering the impact of the bylaws on the citizens in the village and rural areas and the economic impact this would have on the town was the Planning Commission's job.

Naomi Johnson said some analysis had been done on this as part of the project. The Commission has counts of the number of lots that would be affected by the change and how many lots no longer could be subdivided. Naomi said she thought the economic issue was beyond the Commission's capabilities and that the commission should exercise its authority to hire an expert to evaluate the economic impact.

Steve Mancuso said he served as an EMT with people who had served as medical corpsmen in the military. He noticed they did many things on calls that weren't in the EMT manuals. He asked them why they did things that weren't in the manuals. He said his mentors told him, what works, works. He said he felt the economic issue needs to be addressed even if it isn't in the book.

Peter Hudkins asked if there were any more comments. Tim Roper said the next meeting should have an agenda item for drafting or finalizing a letter to the Select Board explaining the non-report to the Select Board on Wednesday night.

Tim Roper went on to say that, speaking for himself, after the Select Board meeting Wednesday night he did not feel he could trust Peter and he could not follow leadership that he cannot trust to tell him the truth. He therefore moved to remove Peter as chair. Barre Pinske seconded the motion.

Barre Pinske said he respected Peter as a member of the board and valued his opinions, but he didn't think that the chair was the right position for Peter. Peter Hudkins said he agreed with Barre and doing 10 or more hours of work before each meeting to lead the board was not working out for him. Naomi Johnson said she was disappointed in how things worked out. Peter had opportunities to clarify his points with the Planning Commission. She found his refusal to discuss the report that had been prepared with the Select Board unbelievable. She said she had been the chair herself and recognized that not every member pulls the same amount of weight. Cheryl Joy Lipton said she was most uncomfortable with the fact that Peter as chair did not represent the Commission at the Select Board hearing.

A vote was taken and the motion to remove Peter Hudkins as chair carried 4 - 0. Naomi Johnson acting as vice-chair said she would entertain a motion to adjourn. Cheryl Joy Lipton moved to adjourn the meeting. Barre Pinske seconded it. A vote was taken and the meeting was adjourned.