

Draft Minutes

**Middlesex Planning Commission
Public Hearing (Permit #19-06 C. Ellison & T. Lannes)
Wednesday, July 17, 2019
7:15 PM
Middlesex Town Clerk's Office
5 Church Street
Middlesex, Vermont 05602
(802) 223-5915**

Site Visit – 248 Nellie Chase Road at 6:30 PM

Planning Commission Members Present

Elias Gardner
Sandy Levine
Mitch Osiecki

Guests:

Casey Ellison
Twylla Lannes
Rupert Thouron
Michael Miller
Andrew Popper
Jan Thouron

Introductions made. Casey Ellison gave an overview of lot layout for the area containing the proposed development and briefly described proposed project.

Site visit concluded approximately 6:50 PM

Public Hearing for Permit #19-06 C. Ellison – Planned Residential Development (PRD)

Planning Commission members present:

Sandy Levine
Elias Gardner
Mitch Osiecki

Absent: Theo Kennedy & Dick Alderman

Others present:

Casey Ellison

Twylla Lannes

Michael Miller

Andrew Popper

Call to Order

The Hearing was called to order at 7:15 pm.

Welcome of guests

Guests were welcomed to the hearing. A quick round of introductions were made.

Casey Ellison shared a brief overview of the proposed project. The proposal envisions constructions of two small cabins (each approximately 800 sq. ft.), plus a non-residential studio, likely 800-1000 sq. ft.

In addition, project includes a small parking area for guests.

Mitch explained that the reason this project was being proposed as a PRD for a couple of reasons. Zoning regulations allow for a single accessory dwelling, which is restricted to the larger of 600 sq. ft. or 30% of the living space of the principal residence. Project envisions two such dwellings, and each is slightly larger than what would can be approved as an accessory dwelling.

Michael Miller explained that, while not an abutting land-owner, he is attending the hearing on behalf of his sister, Marie Robbins, a non-resident land-owner of abutting property who hopes to learn more about the proposed development.

Mitch shared an email received from Marie Robbins which listed a few concerns:

- Project proposes use of an existing access road along property boundary leading to parking areas and proposed studio;
- Curious how many cars this lot would host;
- Questions whether this proposal envisions a commercial use of the property;
- Raises concern whether parking will impact a pristine brook running through the area;
- Wishes to ensure any development will comply with minimum setbacks from waterways.

Casey responded that the lot will be small, and that no commercial use of the property is being proposed. Mitch stated that any development will need to meet all setback requirements.

(Correspondence will be attached.)

With no further questions of comments being raised, the Public Hearing concluded at 7:35 PM.

Meeting of the Planning Commission commenced at 7:40 PM

Planning Commission members present:

Sandy Levine

Elias Gardner

Mitch Osiecki

Absent: Theo Kennedy & Dick Alderman

New Business

Review of C. Ellison/T. Lannes PRD proposal.

Under current zoning regulations, proposed project can only be approved as a PRD. A single accessory dwelling could be approved; but not two.

PRD Review elements:

A. Purpose

The purpose of a PRD is to promote one or more of the following objectives:

- (1) Encourage compact, pedestrian-oriented development and re-development ... especially in downtowns, villages, town centers and associated neighborhoods;
- (2) Implement the polices of the Town Plan, such as provision of affordable housing;
- (3) Encourage development to be compatible with the use and character of surrounding rural lands;
- (4) Provide for flexibility in site and lot layout, building design placement and clustering of buildings, use of open areas, provision of circulation facilities, including pedestrian facilities and parking, and related site and design considerations that will best achieve the goals for the area as articulated in the Town Plan and these regulations within the particular character of the site and its surroundings;
- (5) Provide for the conservation of open space features recognized as worthy of conservation in the Town Plan and Land Use and Development Regulations, such as the preservation of agricultural land, forest land, trails, and other recreational resources, critical and sensitive natural areas, scenic resources, and protection from natural hazards;
- (6) Provide for efficient use of public facilities and infrastructure; and
- (7) Encourage and preserve opportunities for energy-efficient development and redevelopment.

It appears that one or more of the goals (numbers 3, 4, 5 or 7, in particular) might be addressed by this project, but the Planning Commission may need to seek further comment from the applicants to support this.

B. Review Procedures

Applicants seek relief from zoning standards (number of dwellings, dimensional standards)

C. Coordination with Conditional Use Review

Does not seem applicable

D. General Standards

There are a few areas that require clarification:

(1) The PC should ensure that the site plan meets state regulations with respect to sewage disposal due to the proximity to Patterson Brook. This could be addressed as a condition of approval.

(2) Should seek comment from applicants addressing how the proposed PRD addresses preservation or protection of surface and ground water, wetlands and floodplain, significant topographic features, including hilltops and ridgelines, areas of steep slope or shallow soil, significant resource lands ... natural and critical habitat areas, and open spaces and scenic views.

(3) Not likely an issue, but applicants should specify the lot acreage of the proposed PRD that encompasses the building envelope.

(4) Does not apply, since project is on a Private Road.

(5) The general provisions of this section raise no serious concerns. There are some smaller points that need further comment.

a) The applicants should identify the portion of the parcel that is to be conserved as an open space (e.g., if 5 acres is set aside as the building envelope, another 25 acres would need to be conserved as open space abutting the building envelope).

b) No issues.

c) No issues.

d) The applicants should describe any plans to improve or maintain the open spaces identified above.

(6) Does not apply.

(7) Does not apply.

(8) Does not apply.

E. Specific Standards to Planned Residential Developments

(1) No lot bonus is needed.

(2) No issues.

F. Specific Standards to Planned Unit Developments

Does not apply.

Article 6 Standards

Not a concern for this project.

Old Business

The CVRPC was generally happy with our Draft Town Plan. Sandy has correspondence identifying minor suggestions.

The Select Board has also reviewed the Draft Town Plan. They have also suggested some minor edits. We've got correspondence identifying those edits as well.

The Select Board has warned their Public Hearing on the Town Plan for Tuesday, July 30.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Public Hearing and Planning Commission meeting of June 19 were approved.

Next Meetings:

Monday, July 22	Special Meeting to discuss Village Center Designation
Tuesday, August 21	Next monthly meeting (Sandy away – ensure we can get a quorum)

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Dick Alderman _____XXX_____

Elias Gardner _____

Theo Kennedy _____XXX_____

Sandra Levine _____

Mitch Osiecki _____