

Development Review Board and Planning Commission
May 20, 2024

An informative meeting between the Development Review Board and the Planning Commission regarding changes to the proposed bylaw amendments made after the October 17, 2023, public hearing hosted by the Planning Commission.

Warnings were posted on May 1, 2024, at the Greensboro Town Hall, the Greensboro Post Office, the Greensboro Bend Post Office, and Willey's and Smith's Stores. The warning was published in the Hardwick Gazette on May 1, 2024.

Development Review Board members present: Jane Woodruff; Wayne Young; Nat Smith; Mike Metcalf; Tim Brennan; BJ Gray; Lise Armstrong; Brett Stanciu (ex officio).

Development Review Board members absent: None.

Planning Commission members present: Kent Hansen; Janet Showers; Christine Armstrong; Brett Stanciu (ex officio).

Others present: Elissa Mackin.

The hearing was conducted via Zoom.

Summary of Discussion:

Ms. Woodruff, Development Review Board chair, began the hearing at 7:03 p.m. and noted for the record that the purpose of this meeting is informational regarding changes the Planning Commission made to the proposed bylaw amendments after the October 17, 2023, public hearing. Mr. Hansen, Planning Commission chair, said these changes are designed to clarify the bylaw, make the bylaw easier for the zoning administrator and Development Review Board to implement, and conform to the Shoreland Delegation Agreement between the Town and the State. Ms. Woodruff said that the Selectboard voted to forward the Miscellaneous Changes to a public hearing. It appears premature to discuss the voluminous Shoreland Protection District changes until the Selectboard votes to send this version to a public hearing. Some discussion revolved around the Selectboard agenda. Ms. Woodruff determined to table discussion of the Shoreland Protection District changes until the Selectboard voted to forward this section to a public hearing.

Ms. Showers noted most changes in the Miscellaneous section are consolidations or word changes or clarifications.

1.5 Adoption and Effective Date and 1.7 Repeal (page 17). Language was consolidated and clarified.

3.7 Lots in Two Districts (page 28). Ms. Showers said the replacing the wording was too complicated and should be left for a future time.

3.8 Nonconformities (page 28). Some discussion revolved around the word "may" in section A. Ms. Showers said she'd make a note.

4.2 Accessory Dwelling Unit (page 38). These changes are statute changes. The bylaw refers ADUs in the Shoreland Buffer Zone to Article 8. A footnote was moved into the text body.

5.1 Zoning Permits (F) (page 46). Language was removed as repetitious with 5.8 Public Hearings. The wording was simplified and made consistent.

5.8 Public Hearings (pages 52-53). Wording was changed to provide more a reliable method to notify neighbors of public hearings.

5.4 Conditional Uses (page 48). Provisions were added for viewshed that the Planning Commission believes would be helpful to the Development Review Board.

5.4 Conditional Uses (B)4 (page 47). Ms. Showers noted the language mirrors language in other town bylaws and provides additional clarity.


5.7 Appeals (pages 50-51) and **5.8 Public Hearings** (pages 53-54). Small changes are corrections or state statute changes.

The Board asked if the Commission had considered suggesting specific colors for structures around the lake that would blend into the natural shoreline, specifically dark green or dark brown. The Commission had considered this, but determined not to add color into this version as the current bylaw does not include color suggestions. The Board suggested that a flyer might be mailed out to lakeside property owners with suggestions that include color choice, inspecting septic tanks, and avoiding fertilizer use. Mr. Hansen said a flyer is on the consideration list. The Commission retains a list of topics for the next bylaw amendment review. Mr. Metcalf added that the Town had design control in the village in the early eighties when he was a member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Consensus regarding design was not reached and never progressed.


Mr. Hansen agreed to forward the Planning Commission's list of proposed changes to the bylaw. Ms. Patterson noted some changes are larger than others. More significant changes include: lake access paths; how to create and maintain lake views; how to calculate slope and the definition of slope; amended percentages regarding slope and cleared area; some inconsistencies resolved; a more detailed section regarding mitigation; boathouses; nonconforming structures in the buffer zone; the buffer zone expanded from 100' to 150'.

Ms. Woodruff noted that the Development Review Board is the body that implements or applies the bylaw. If the Board identifies an egregious issue before the Selectboard, it is incumbent upon the Board to weigh in. Generally, however, it is important for the Board not to pass judgement before applications come before the Board. She thanked the Commission for their work and time. She and Mr. Hansen agreed to meet jointly again, following the direction of the Selectboard. The Board adjourned by consensus at 7:50 p.m.

Signed:



Jane Woodruff, chair
date May 22, 2024



Brett Ann Stanciu, clerk
date May 23, 2024

NOTICE:

This decision may be appealed to the Vermont Environmental Court by an interested person who participated in the proceeding (in person or in writing) before the Development Review Board. Such appeal must be made within 30 days of the date of this decision, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. #4471 and Rule 5(b) of the Vermont Rules for Environmental Court Proceedings.