

48 Planning Commission or Selectboard remained silent, or overlooked relevant issues in
49 the specific wording of the ordinances. Specifically, he noted that in the case of the
50 interim zoning for Jolina Court the DRB felt it had to make judgmental decisions that
51 they were not entirely comfortable making, especially as the developer was actively
52 building as the decisions were being made in the review process. Both Anand and Cole
53 indicated that all of us have been uncomfortable with the unusual nature of this special
54 interim zoning situation. Sunshine expressed his appreciation that our efforts to deliver
55 a clearly written zoning ordinance for Jolina Court would go a very long way in assisting
56 the DRB in discharging its responsibilities.

57
58 Cole: clearly in the future the Planning Commission would like to get our proposed
59 revisions to the DRB well before we entered the formal adoption phase so that the
60 Selectboard would have a clear understanding as to the preferred desires of both the
61 PC and the DRB.

62
63 Cole requested whether or not members of the DRB had any other specific examples of
64 where the PC could improve things for the DRB? Sunshine's immediate response was
65 to indicate that the DRB would like to streamline the approval hearing process in the
66 sub division regulations, moving from three hearings to two. Thus he envisions the
67 process as demanding the petitioner to participate in a "preliminary hearing" and then a
68 "final hearing." Not only would this simplify the process for petitioners, it would also
69 serve to put the applicants on notice that they MUST follow standard procedures. In
70 addition, it would serve to save the applicant time, fees, and frustration—and this is
71 currently a major source of frustration and complains from petitioners. Cole inquired if it
72 was section 5.4 of the current subdivision regulations that Sunshine was noting?
73 Sunshine: "yes."

74
75 In reference to this, Mantegna stated that Hinesburg currently has three meetings in its
76 zoning regulations: (1) Sketch; (2) Preliminary; and (3) Final. Petersen interjected that
77 the key is to have clarity in the regulations as to what the DRB requires in an application
78 so that petitioners know exactly what is required of them at the very start of the process.
79 Cole said that we clearly should examine and compare Hinesburg's regulations as we
80 seek to update ours. Clarke noted that section 5.4 needs to be refined and updated as
81 one of our first steps after Jolina Court draft is finished.

82
83 Sunshine then indicated that sooner than later a number of problematic issues and
84 areas need to be addressed, and that perhaps we could schedule another joint session
85 so we can think about and discuss the most pressing problem areas in the current
86 regulations. He also noted that most of the DRB problems arise in the most densely
87 populated areas of the town.

88
89 Cole, Clarke, and Petersen, all stated that definitions are very often one of the most
90 problematic aspects of the regulations. Fausel noted that we should turn more
91 frequently to the "Red Book" in order to streamline and standardize the definitions we
92 include in our revised regulations. As an examples Sunshine raised the definition of
93 "professional offices," asking if this is meant to mean only offices staffed by those
94 professional with official certification, or does it simply mean "all" offices? As another

95 definitional example, Moules raised the question of PUDs as another example in section
96 5.12 where applicants have flexibility, yet in section 5.2.12 there arises a confusing
97 conflict.

98

99 At this point, Parke suggested that the formation of a joint subcommittee might be very
100 useful in identifying and screening the most important and pressing topics or issues.
101 Cole immediately initiated such a subcommittee, with Parke, Fausel, and Anand
102 volunteering from the Planning Commission, member(s) from the DRB to be determined
103 at a later date.

104

105 Cole asked if there were any additional problematic areas:

106

107 -Moules: tall structures in section 6.0.6, What is the definition of “steeply pitched
108 roof?”

109 -Dyer: accessory dwellings in section 5.9.1d, there is much confusion in what the
110 regulations actually say and how we should interpret this section, i.e. for
111 example what should be the maximum percentage in relation to the state
112 regulations on this matter?

113 -Petersen and Dyer: Air b-n-b is also an issue (Cole noted that the PC plans to
114 engage the broader community in a discussion of this issue in the near
115 future).

116

117 Cole closed out the joint session by indicating that a detailed review of the current Jolina
118 Court draft and the compilation of a “red-hot” list of the DRB’s most pressing issues and
119 concerns would be a great place for the newly formed joint subcommittee to start its
120 efforts. Sunshine thanked the Planning Commission for organizing this session and
121 noted that Mantegna would distribute the most current draft of the Jolina Court proposal
122 to the DRB members

123

124 **3. Administrative Items:**

125

126 Cole asked for motions to approve the minutes from 5/1/19; 5/9/19; 5/15/19; 5/22/19;
127 6/5/19; and 10/16/19. Clarke suggested that we approve all in one motion, so moved,
128 Parke seconded, unanimous approval.

129

130 Cole indicated that he and town manager Josh Aronson were in the process of
131 negotiating a contract with Jessica Draper for part time support of the Planning
132 Commission until her replacement was hired. Interviews of candidates for the position
133 should begin shortly, Cole stated he would keep us updated as the process progressed.

134

135 Fausel encouraged members to re-read the 2012 proposed zoning changes as there
136 were many sound suggestion in that document that might be included in our current
137 efforts.

138

139 Parke raised the issue of our need to simultaneously engage in discussions about some
140 long-range planning issues such as future traffic flows and possible congestion from the
141 Jolina Court development necessitating a second exit from the site; the possibility of

142 creating a transportation hub at the town center complex with additional parking on
143 Jolina property; the possibility of securing purchase options on property abutting the
144 town center; and a review of new town plan in order to establish priorities for our
145 planning efforts.

146
147 Cole meetings of the newly formed transportation committee are open to the public-he
148 encouraged interested members to attend.

149
150 Cole—issues for the remaining 15 minutes?

151
152 **4. Jolina Court Zoning Amendment Update from Selectboard**

153
154 Clarke, we need to get this section done! Following is what the Selectboard seems
155 ready to adopt:

156
157 -Uses: three categories—allowable; allowable with site plan; conditional use
158 the selectboard seems ready to accept the revisions we recently made in each
159 of these categories.

160
161 -Residential density: 15 units/acre, above OR below the main floor (i.e. can be in
162 the basement provided relevant fire codes are met). Main floor reserved for
163 commercial use (i.e. NO residential dwellings).

164
165 -Lot coverage: maximum 80% of the entire 6 acre parcel.

166
167 -Building height: maximum 35 feet; 32 feet to window sill for fire code.

168
169 -Compatibility of all buildings on the site: (Cole noted we should highlight this to
170 the DRB).

171
172 -New definitions: main floor; residential use+ dwelling units and residential
173 services.

174
175 Cole-members should read the Seleccboard’s most recent draft of the Jolina Court
176 Zoning Regulations before our next meeting. In addition, hopefully we will fill the
177 planner position with a full time candidate soon.

178
179 Cole call for a motion to adjourn? Tellestone, so moved, Granda, second, unanimously
180 approved at 9:08 pm.

181
182 Respectfully submitted: Parke

183
184
185