

Addendum to Chris's addendum to the minutes of 4.3.24

I would like to correct the inaccuracies in Chris's addendum as follows:

Page 5 "The Task" –

Paragraph 1:

This paragraph is 100% false. I have never suggested that a proposal be put to the Selectboard with the removal of the commercial requirement as the sole revision to the JC ZD. This is a complete fabrication on Chris's part.

Paragraph 2: This is a flippant comment which minimizes the significant effort that is being put towards amending the JC ZD by myself and the rest of the Planning Commission.

Paragraph 3:

Discussions at the PC to date and going forward have involved multiple factors including density, housing types, traffic and parking. The removal of the commercial requirement was merely the first issue tackled. I believe it was out of line and premature for Chris state to a member of the Selectboard that this was "the proposal" without a full and open discussion of this alleged "position" by the full Planning Commission.

Paragraph 4:

As this addendum was being prepared for dissemination, Chris was quite aware that such an "alternative proposal" had already been presented at the Planning Commission's 4.17.24 meeting and is in the meeting materials for the 5.1.24 meeting, and that all issues are being considered.

In summary:

I find this addendum to be problematic on several counts. Firstly, the premise (paragraph 1) is completely without merit, thus rendering the remainder of this page of the memo irrelevant. Discussions with the Selectboard are planned, as Chris knows, but these will involve both the full board and commission, not individuals who venture out on their own to pursue a particular agenda. Secondly, the rhetoric is inflammatory, rather than helpful in arriving at a consensus solution to the issues involved. The fact that several weeks have elapsed before the presentation of this addendum, which have allowing Chris further time to review the full scope of the proposed discussion (both at the meeting of 4.17.24 and planned for 5.1.24), also suggests that Chris's intent does not "demonstrate respect for others" as is also required by the Code of Ethics.

I would also like to add that it is a violation of the Code of Ethics for individual commissioners to carry out discussions with applicants who wish to persuade the commission to a particular resolution of a matter that is before them. This is not the open and transparent process that we aspire to, but rather speaks to back-room deal-making.

Submitted by Virginia Clarke 5.1.24

