

MORRISTOWN/MORRISVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 1998



Members Present: Dan Demars, Rich Furlong, George Robson, Sam Guy,
Julie Compagna, Pat McCulloch.

Members Absent:

Guests: Attorney Dick Sargent, Morrisville

A site walk convened at 6:45 p.m., between the two bridges on lower Bridge Street. The areas presently owned by Mr. Kelly and the Water & Light Department were canvassed. Examination revealed steep banking on either side of the parcels, dropping sharply to the Lamoille River. Approximately 13 acres of heavily wooded area with rustic access roads.

Following the site walk to the meeting was re-convened at 7:40 p.m. in the Directors Room at Union Bank. The meeting was called to order by Rich Furlong, Chairman. Discussion of the site walk followed.

Rich Furlong explained the proposed conditional uses of the area according to the revised by laws. Dick Sargent expressed his concerns regarding visibility issues and development out to the road. He gave Contractors Crane Service as a property example of what he feared happening. He also expressed concern for the proximity to Lake Lamoille and its future as a valuable resource. George Robson clarified that the site would be zoned "campus style" Business Office Park, not Industrial Park. Richard Sargent indicated he felt the by laws as written were vague in their definitions for the proposed re-zoning. Rich Furlong discussed the definitions and the importance of clarifying them. He will turn the matter over to Ken Sweetser for further research.

A general discussion followed regarding the impact of the Route 100 By-Pass upon the site. George Robson suggested asking the LEDC if they would be willing to draft a proposal of the layout of the property. Board will wait to hear back from LEDC before taking further action.

The minutes of the public hearing on March 17th were reviewed. The following planning related issues were discussed:

- 1) A comment concerning expanded power of the Zoning Administrator.
- 2) The 250 foot vs 125 foot line determination.

It was determined that in actuality the Zoning Administrator's power had not been expanded and is conforming to the permitted use process. The 250 vs 125 issue was explained by the need to move away from relying on property line boundaries, to the more accurate method of using the center line. It was decided that no action needed to be taken regarding these issues.

It was decided that the fence issue would be re-visited at the May 4th meeting for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,


Julia J. Compagna