Called to Order 7:06pm

In Attendance: Mark Fausel, Virginia Clarke, Alison Anand, Scott Nickerson, Lauck Parke, Jessica Draper, Josh Arneson, Brendan O’Reilly, Colin Moffat, Bard Hill, David Sander, David Sunshine, Matt Dyer, Gabe Firman, Lars Whitman

Absent: Joy Reap, Brian Tellstone

Public Comment: NA

Jolina Court:

Brendan O’Reilly gave a brief presentation of the background of the Creamery Redevelopment project being done by Buttermilk LLC on Jolina Court. He explained that there had been confusion between the town and Buttermilk regarding the adoption of zoning regulations that would allow the development to move forward and evolve. He requested that now that the plan has been adopted and supports their project that the planning commission move forward with adoption of regulations that encompass what was allowed under interim zoning.

The representation from the DRB asked if interim zoning could be redone, and Jessica Draper explained that it could not be reopened without an emergency reason and that it would take longer than just adopting permanent zoning. Jessica explained that permanent zoning for Jolina Court is the most straightforward way to allow Buttermilk to continue and amend permits as needed. Brendan also explained that a site plan and conditional use application to amend the permit has been submitted and they intend to go before the DRB in March.

The planning commission discussed that they also have a larger task at hand to adopt zoning changes town wide over time. The representation from the selectboard explained that the Jolina Court interim zoning had been thoroughly vetted and crafted with many considerations and people involved at the time, and they agree that it’s reasonable to move forward with adopting those regulations into permanent zoning with possible revision later during the larger scale review. Discussion ensued about authority over the project, and Jessica clarified that only the DRB has authority to review and approve site plan amendments and that it takes a minimum of 70 days to adopt a zoning amendment.

The DRB representation asked if they could approve their amendment similarly to how they approved their application for building 2 last April. Virginia Clarke asked what the justification would be in that case if last year it was based on the selectboard’s previous decisions. Brendan said that the request would be that they act as though interim zoning is still in effect knowing that it will likely be adopted. Discussion ensued regarding the commercial:residential use ratio set forth in the interim zoning. Everyone agreed that digging too deep into larger changes would slow down the process of getting at least the minimum zoning changes needed to move forward adopted in the meantime.

Jessica explained that she would need to alter the language in the expired interim zoning document that is no longer relevant to the permanent zoning such as selectboard authority and the purpose that discussed the blight of the former buildings. A few members of the planning commission expressed concern about editing out parts of the document that may cause controversy with members of the community. Jessica said that she didn’t believe that removing language about the selectboard would be offensive.

Lauck Parke asked if it would be possible to create an MOU of sorts that would outline an agreement between the parties that it will move forward. Mark Fausel asked if a letter of support may be more pertinent. Matt Dyer said it would be good to have a letter from the selectboard as well. The planning commission and representation from the selectboard agreed to write letters of support for the project to be included as materials in their application. David Sander concluded the discussion remarking that we have come a long way from the hazard that the creamery parcel had been and it is nice to be at a place where we are having discussions about the development instead of the dangers.

Village Zoning:

Gabe Firman and Lars Whitman discussed their proposed project at the former Toscano building. They asked the planning commission to consider altering residential density so that they could have up to 4 units in the building opposed to the one unit they are allowed to construct under current regulations. The planning commission asked what the density was of buildings on the other side of bridge street. Jessica explained that those buildings actually have higher density in some cases, but that they are grandfathered. Discussion ensued about what parcels or parts of town would be encompassed in a density change. The planning commission agreed that they needed more time to consider a density change for any part of town and that it could take several months for that process to occur.

Next Agenda:

-Review and possibly finalize a draft regulation for Jolina Court

-Review and approve letter of support for Buttermilk DRB application

-Discuss possible paths forward for village zoning and schedule discussions with zoning and economics experts regarding zoning density and form-based zoning.

Scott Nickerson moved to adjourn. Seconded by Virginia Clarke. Adjourned 9:30pm.