

MORRISTOWN/MORRISVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 748
MORRISVILLE, VT 05661
Phone (802) 888-6373

Meeting Minutes of January 3, 2012

Members Present: Paul Griswold, Reeves Larson, John Meyer & Max Paine

Members Absent: Bill Henchey (Chair), Lauren Traister & Andrew Volansky

Staff: Todd Thomas, Zoning Administrator & Planner

Guests: None

Call to Order: Acting Chair John Meyer called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

Approve prior meeting minutes – Upon a motion made by Member Paine, the December 6th meeting minutes were accepted. The motion was affirmed by a vote of 4-0.

Discussion: North End / Uptown circulation master plan – ZA Thomas reviewed the one page executive summary of the North End Master Plan that he prepared upon request of Commission Members from the December 6th meeting. ZA Thomas discussed the report's findings, as well as the projected impacts of Bypass construction on the district. ZA Thomas noted that Brooklyn Street was projected to see an 80% decrease in traffic and that Bridge Street (between Brooklyn Street and the Bypass) was projected to see a 252% increase in traffic, both as the result of Bypass construction. Members discussed traffic and access issues on the section of Rte 100 directly south of its intersection with Rte 15. ZA Thomas said that access management standards should be added to COM zoning to avoid recreating this high traffic area on the section of Rte 15 east of the intersection with Rte 100. Member Larson asked ZA Thomas to invite CCS, the owners of the undeveloped Langdell Farm commercially zoned parcel, to appear before the Commission to discuss future development plans for the area.

Discussion: Review “zoning change worksheet” for agenda – The Commission reviewed the highlighted zoning issues on the “zoning change worksheet” slated for discussion at the meeting.

Discussion: Family Child Care Facility & Day Care Facility uses – ZA Thomas led the Commission through a discussion regarding Family Child Care Facility & Day Care Facility uses. ZA Thomas suggested that definitions be added for both uses that mimicked the language contained in 24 VSA §4412. The Commission was amenable to the proposed definitions. ZA Thomas then explained that the current zoning in the COM & SI zones was illegal because a single-family dwelling use was allowed therein and a Family Child Care Facility use was not. The Commission agreed that they should correct this issue in the COM & SI zones, but decided that it should discuss where Day Care Facilities should be allowed at the next meeting. ZA Thomas said that statute had no bearing on where Day Care Facilities could be located and that he would prepare a matrix highlighting the Commission's choices for the next meeting.

Discussion: Proposed definition for Lot Coverage – The Commission reviewed the Lot Coverage definition study prepared by ZA Thomas. Member Larson noted that most communities thereon regulate impervious surface. ZA Thomas recommended that the Commission not regulate impervious surface and adopt Middlebury’s like-minded definition. The Commission agree to not regulate impervious surface, as the intent of such a regulation would be to simply ensure that green space remain on developed lots. It was agreed that the more straightforward way of doing such is to require that a percentage of BED lots remain landscaped or undeveloped.

Discussion: Review BED zoning and multi-site zoning compliance report – The Commission spent a considerable amount of time reviewing ZA Thomas’ prepared zoning analysis of Rock Art Brewery, Union Bank and Alpine Snowguards, as if all three developments were being newly proposed in the revised BED zone. ZA Thomas noted that the current Lot Width zoning requirement of “1/2 of lot depth” was problematic in all three instances. The Commission asked ZA Thomas to propose an alternative Lot Width that did not operate on a sliding scale. The Commission also debated the subjectivity of the zone’s architectural unity requirement. The Commission ultimately decided to move the existing architectural unity requirement into the zone’s objective statement. Given the Commission’s previous decision to not include impervious surfaces within the definition for Lot Width, a discussion ensued regarding how to ensure that some green space remained on the lot. Member Larson said that he preferred allotted green space be located at the front of the lot. ZA Thomas said that he would revise the proposed BED zoning for the next meeting to include Member Meyer’s suggested 25% green space requirement and a larger front setback (to ensure that the green space was not all allocated at the rear of the lot).

Discussion: Architectural design contest for BE changes – Due to the late hour of the evening and the absence of Member Volansky, this agenda item was tabled until the January 17th meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 PM.
Respectfully submitted: Todd Thomas, ZA & Planner