



**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES - JULY 8, 2024**  
**TOWN OF GREENSBORO PLANNING COMMISSION and DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**  
**Greensboro Free Library and via zoom**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kent Hansen, Christine Armstrong, Janet Patterson, Jane Woodruff, Nat Smith, Wayne Young, Tim Brennan, Lise Armstrong, Mike Metcalf, Brett Stanciu (ex officio).

**ABSENT MEMBERS:** Kelli Story, Alexis Mattos, B.J. Gray, R. Brigham, G. Fisher

**OTHERS PRESENT:** D. Day, M. Day, P. Romans, E. Hanson, D. Kelley

**1. CALL TO ORDER: (6:35 PM)**

2. Kent offered a brief history of these bylaw amendments. He stated that the SB wanted the GPC and DRB to meet together to review them. Kent stated the GPC always welcomes continued communication with the DRB. The GPC goals for these amendments were to improve clarity; fix gray areas (use 'shall' vs 'may'); and to deliver measurable, unambiguous standards to better align with the SPA. The GPC researched Best Management Practices; the 16 page SPA and the 22 page Handbook with its 6 Appendices; the State's application forms and instructions; input from DEC, NVDA, DRB; other town bylaws; other state's shoreland standards. Greensboro made a pledge to align with the Shoreland Protection Act by its 2014 signing of the Self Delegation Agreement. Thus, our proposed bylaw is understandably lengthy and detailed in order to become compliant. Jane then relayed that the driving force behind these amendments is to bring our Shoreland Protection bylaws into compliance with the State's SPA. She encouraged the DRB members to understand the legislation behind the proposed amendments. She reiterated that this is not a public hearing.

**PRESENTATION:** Janet summarized the few changes since the October GPC Public Hearing. SPA provisions apply to lakes greater than 10 acres and within the 250 feet of the water. Bylaws change to reflect that. Nat wondered about Impervious Surface limits, wondering if it's even a problem. Tim reiterated that the point is to protect against those types of abuses. Janet noted that a large number of the lots are non-conforming: 68% have a main structure within 150 feet of the lake and 58% within 100 feet of the lake. Many parcels are smaller than ½ acre. It is on these smaller parcels that Impervious Surface limits are most likely to come into play.

Nat noted that policing bylaws is too expensive and the ZA is not going to do it. Janet noted that education, starting with a clear bylaw and an application that provides all relevant information to make a decision, is the first step for compliance. Janet noted the State's employees who evaluate the SPA permit applications are experts.

Janet then continued to review the various changes in the proposed SPD Bylaw.



Non conforming structures in the Buffer zone: she noted that currently it is possible to expand an existing dwelling's footprint in the buffer zone with mitigation without a clear limit but new construction must be set back 150 feet from the lake. This inconsistency needed to be remedied. Discussion.

Discussion about Area of Encroachment as compared with historic consideration of 'Footprint.' ie—the state does not require a permit for enclosing a porch because it does not increase the Impervious Surface while the current Greensboro bylaw does not allow a nonconforming porch to be enclosed. Recollection of a permit given for a project that allowed cantilevered spaces, which increased the roof size but avoided footprint constraints— but this increased Impervious Surface which defeats the purpose of the SPA. Tim notes that was playing with the rules and that AofE solves that.

Brett inquired about Enlargement and Volume - particularly with smaller size structures.

Discussion about the rationale to regulate Area of Encroachment versus Footprint; Volume versus Habitable Floor Space; discussion about the proposed limit of 10% increase in the size of the Area of Encroachment of the primary dwelling unit which includes its attached porches, garages, storage. Consider a "sliding scale" of limits of expansion depending on size of the existing structure. Discussion about the need for a variance and a conditional use approval for some projects.

Discussion about mitigation. Clarified how supplemental mitigation can be considered if the parcel is already heavily wooded.

8.8F2. Modifying a non conforming structure with no increase in Area of Encroachment—Discussion about the use of 'may' vs "shall' for DRB requirements for mitigation. Members of the DRB and GPC agreed that 'shall' is clearer.

Discussion about building on Steep Slopes and the requirements for building. On steep slopes, expertise with qualified professionals is needed for best outcomes. Following Jane's comment, it was agreed that the definition of a qualified professional (which includes people with experience and not only a degree) does work.

A question came from the public whether there would be public comments taken at this meeting. They were referred to the Public Hearing to be scheduled by the SB. Nat clarified that if the SB does not move forward with these amendments in a timely way, much of the GPC work will need to be redone.

Discussion about Cleared Area and Vegetative Cover. Applicants are required to give information to determine compliance with %'s.

Discussion about vegetative management for viewshed.

Footpaths: Discussion about the rationale to allow a second footpath with a ZA permit conditional on the use of Best Management Practices to manage stormwater runoff even though the State does not allow a second footpath. Contractors who do this work may not know how to construct one using Best Management Practices. Discussion about how to promote this education. Kent noted Dave and Eric were going to clarify ROW access/additional footpath construction with the Town attorney. Dave agreed.



Boathouses: Janet noted the BH applications do not contain enough information—ie where will the new footpaths go? New bylaw adds specificity. 200sf, 25 feet from the lake. An existing non-conforming function in an existing BH cannot be expanded.

Questions: Nat—applauded a lot of the proposed changes. Questioned self delegation vs State permitting. Janet noted that the emphasis of our bylaws needs to be on restoration of shoreland in our highly developed lakeshore. Kent noted personal attention by local ZA and the DRB’s personal knowledge is helpful in our current Self Delegated arrangement. Discussion that the State recognizes that Greensboro is working towards compliance with the Self Delegation Agreement. The State can be supportive of Greensboro’s efforts if we remain self delegated.

Mike—wondered about tree cutting/topping in relation to solar panels.

Wayne noted he does not like the insistence on native species for revegetation.

Tim noted great progress done by Janet and the GPC.

Kent noted the GPC will discuss the few outstanding questions at their next meeting and will share the outcomes with the DRB at that time. He noted the next steps in the Bylaw adoption process will be driven by the SB.

**ADJOURNMENT: 8:30 PM**