

Draft Minutes

**Middlesex Planning Commission
Wednesday, February 15, 2017 6:00 PM
Middlesex Town Clerk's Office
5 Church Street
Middlesex, Vermont 05602
(802) 223-5915**

Planning Commission Members
John Krezinski, Chair
Barry Bolio
Steven Martin
Troy Sumner

The meeting was called to order at 6:00.

The draft minutes for the January 18, 2017 regular meeting were approved unanimously by all Planning Commission members in attendance.

The commission briefly reviewed the two documents that Marian Wolz (Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission) had emailed to the Planning Commission.

Vermont Department & Community Development – The Municipal Plan
Orton Family Foundation – Public Engagement Methods

Members of the Planning Commission disclosed that they haven't had time to fully review the two documents. No further discussion occurred regarding these documents.

John Krezinski received via email a Municipal Energy Survey being conducted by the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission. The purpose of this survey is to develop a comprehensive regional energy plan. The plan will identify goals and policies that can be implemented on a regional level to meet the State of Vermont's Comprehensive Energy Plan Goals. A copy of the Municipal Energy Survey was sent to the Chair of the Middlesex Select Board, The Middlesex Planning Commission, Middlesex Conservation Commission and Middlesex Energy Committee. It is requested that surveys be returned by March 6, 2017.

The Planning Commission answered the Municipal Energy Survey accordingly:

1. What Municipality does your body represent? Middlesex
2. What body is responding to this survey? Planning Commission
3. Review the Regional Constraints Map. These constraint layers include those areas currently under review by CVRPC's Energy Committee Board of Commissioners for Consideration as possible Regional Constraints. Does your municipal body agree or disagree that these layers should be included as possible Regional Constraints? Please indicate support for adding the constraint layer by selecting the box next to the layer below.

If your municipal body thinks that certain layers should not be included as possible Regional Constraints, or should be changed, leave the box next to the constraint unchecked and provide a description of why/suggested changes in the comments box below.

- Elevation Above 2500 Feet
- Lake Shore Protection Buffers (250 Feet)
- Slopes Greater Than 25%
- Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands)

Comments:

- Middlesex has restricted development above 1500 Feet town wide and 1400 Feet on Dumpling hill.
- Wrightsville Dam falls partially in the limits of Middlesex, that shoreline is currently zoned rural residential.

4. Review all three constraint maps (known, possible, and regional). Are there any land use types or areas that your municipal body feels should be included as a regional constraint layer. If so, please list below along with, if your municipal body feels they should be known or possible constraints. Please see the addendum document for details on the significance of known or possible constraints. Also, please provide justification for any land types or areas you list.

If locations are constrained for development of renewable energy due to the desire to protect a locally designated resource (whether a natural resource or community-identified resource, like a view), then the land use policies applicable to other forms of development must be similarly restrictive.

Any regionally or locally identified constraints identified must be supported through data or studies and must be consistent with the regional and local plans.

- None. This municipal body feels the constraints layers identified on the known, possible and regional constraint maps accurately protect the resources of the Central Vermont region. This body does not have further constraints to add.
- Yes. This municipal body feels there are land types or areas that should be protected from development at a regional level that are not currently included on the maps. Constraint layer(s), whether they should be know or possible constraints and justification (why this constraint layer should be added and data or study that supports it) are listed in the comment box below.

Comments: N/A

5. Review the Known and Possible Constraint maps, are there any Possible constraint layers that should be elevated to Known constraints? If so, why? (Please review the included memo for detailed descriptions of the known and possible constraints.)

- Agricultural Soils
- FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas
- Protected Lands
- Deer Wintering Areas
- Vermont Conservation Design Forest Blocks (Connectivity, Interior, Physical Landscape Diversity)
- Hydric Soils
- Act 250 Ag Mitigation Parcels
- None, this municipal body feels that the possible constraints shown on the map should remain as possible constraints.

6. Listed below are suggestions for preferred sites that can be identified in the Central Vermont Regional Energy Plan. Please consider these land types/sites and check those that your municipal body feels would be appropriate to identify as a preferred location for renewable energy development.

Additionally, when considering these land types/sites, consider the size and scale of renewable development that would be appropriate, the type of renewable resource development, economic feasibility of developing that resource in that location and access to transmission and distribution infrastructure.

- Unranked and not currently farmed agriculture soils
- Unused land near already developed infrastructure
- Locations suitable for large-scale biomass district heat or thermal-led cogeneration
- Potential locations for biogas heating and digesters
- Industrial Parks
- Decommissioned Landfills

- Class III Wetlands – Wetlands that are typically difficult to identify without a soil test.
- Development can occur on these wetlands but must abide by local regulations and federal laws.

If your municipality has specific sites in your community that you feel would be appropriate for some scale of renewable energy development, or specific sites that meet the descriptions below, please list those sites in the comment box.

Comments:

Small scale non-commercial wind & solar on private lands

7. The cost of transmission and distribution of electric generation increases as the generation facility moves further away from the energy user. It cost on average, \$1,000,000/miles to build new transmission lines (Transmission & Distribution Infrastructure, Harris Williams & Co., 2010) Location of generation in proximity to the transmission lines that connect to distribution substation and lines can affect the cost of energy for consumers. Considering this, please indicate below preferences for preferred locations for renewable energy generation facilities in relation to existing transmission lines.

- Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a ¼ mile of existing transmission lines
- Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a ¼ mile of existing transmission lines
- Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a ¼ mile of existing transmission lines
- Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a ¼ mile of existing transmission lines
- Existing transmission lines should not be a factor when siting renewable energy generation facilities

8. What is the best way to engage members of your community on energy related planning? Do you have suggestions for mediums, forums or other engagement strategies? Please select the two most effective methods and include additional suggestions in the comment box.

- Email
- Online mapping platform
- Front Porch Forum
- Public evening meetings
- Paper materials available at the town office

Please list below additional engagement methods below:

Town website
Publically warned meetings
Survey mailings

Lastly the Middlesex Zoning Administrator emailed the Planning Commission with a zoning permit question. The question was regarding a 2-lot subdivision in the Mixed Use District to review. In looking at the new regulations the Minimum Lot Size states “as approved in accordance with Section 5.4” which is now Conditional Use Review. In the old regulations it refers you to Section 5.7 which was PUD and PRD. The summary from the PC dated 1/10/17 state any proposed changes were withdrawn and the tables are to revert back to the 3/1/2011 regulations.

The Planning Commission compared the old zoning regulations against the newly adopted zoning regulations and determined that a typographical error had occurred. Steve Martin will contact the Town Clerk to see how this error can be rectified. John Krezinski will contact Cindy Carlson (ZA) to advise that there was an error with the new zoning regulations. The Planning Commission determined that the new Mixed Use table should reference 5.7 of the new regulations, not 5.4 as shown.

There was no other business to discuss.

The next meeting date is set for Wednesday March 15th at 6:00

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05