Members Attending:	**Members Absent:**
Gary Baierlein	**none**
Wayne Clarke	
Mark Frost	
Melissa LaCount	
Eric Mach	
Rik Sassa	
Harry Van Meter	

Others Attending:
Brooke Burnham, West Pawlet
Lawrence Burnham, West Pawlet
Olivia Burnham, West Pawlet
Owen Burnham, West Pawlet
Melissa Clarke, West Pawlet
Paul Elsholz, clerk
Frank Nelson, West Pawlet
Eli Anita Norman, West Pawlet
Ken Norman, West Pawlet
Lucy Norman (Charles), West Pawlet
Barbara Noyes-Pulling, Rutland Regional Planning Commission
Jon Weiss, Pawlet

Eric called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

Item 1: Meeting Agenda
Harry made a motion to approve the meeting agenda; Melissa seconded; motion passed.

Item 2: Minutes of October 24, 2016 Meeting
Gary moved that the minutes be approved; Mark seconded; motion passed.

Item 3: Public Hearing on Proposed Changes to the Bylaws
As Eric began to describe the proposed changes in the bylaws, members of the public began asking questions. Will taxes increase? What is the effect on property values? Could a junkyard be put in? Concerns were particularly focused around the long narrow strip of land along the

Granville/West Pawlet border that was proposed to be changed from Agricultural/Rural Residential zone into an industrial zone. Several residents from that section of town were in attendance.

Eric said the zoning changes should have no effect on taxes (based on a conversation he had with the listers) and that he doubts there would be an effect on property values due to these changes. Wayne cautioned that we cannot truly predict property values. Outside forces are at work over which the Planning Commission has no control. Eric suggested that we could do additional research on property values.

Junk cars have been accumulating in one of the lots in that area. Legally, a junkyard is not allowed according to the current bylaws nor would it be according to the proposed changes. (Note that a regional solid waste facility is not a junkyard). Gary pointed out that the Planning Commission has no role in enforcement; its job is to design useful boundaries.

When the board was asked, "Why make that one strip of land an industrial zone?" Gary responded by saying the Commission was trying to free up some land to promote growth and that there is already a quarry hole there. One resident responded by saying that is not a quarry hole, it is just a pond.

Eric asked if anyone thought the other proposed changes in the zoning map were problematic. No one spoke out.

Melissa made a motion to leave that strip of land along the western edge of Pawlet unchanged from its previous land use. Harry seconded; motion carried unanimously.

Wayne moved that the Commission approve the proposed changes to the rest of the zoning map; Harry seconded; motion carried unanimously.

Eric outlined other proposed changes in the bylaws.
- Park and Ride Lots have been added as conditional uses in Industrial Zones.
- In Village and Commercial Districts, new conditional uses have been added:
    o Microbrewery/Distillery
    o Agricultural Processing Plant
    o Park and Ride Lots
- In Agricultural/Rural Residential Zones,
    o Organized Camps have been removed
    o Child-care/Day-care/Adult-care facility has been added as a conditional use and
    o Municipal/State Building/Garage for sand and salt storage has been added as a conditional use
- Regulations regarding Flood Hazard Areas and River Corridors (that were previously separate) have been combined into one section.

John Weiss, a member of the Pawlet Development Review Board (DRB), had some concerns. He said that some of the language sounds obscure (i.e. "fluvial geomorphic equilibrium"), particularly from the perspective of a landowner who wants to make changes along the river. Furthermore the expense to a homeowner of doing a formal study of the flood hazard area would be prohibitive.

In particular he was looking for guidance on how the DRB should interpret the rules in Section 6, Item 6: Variances. (See page 42). Section A requires that the VT Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) review any variances. Does this mean that the DRB has to interpret the ANR's rulings? Barbara Noyes-Pulling responded by saying that ANR is like a second opinion; decisions are ultimately up to DRB.

John continued by pointing out that Section B requires that any variance not increase flood heights. How is this determined? Could the language be changed to allow the DRB some discretion in the decision making process? Barbara responded by saying that realistically, very few variances will be allowed in the flood hazard area. However the DRB can contact the state flood plain manager in Rutland for guidance on specific issues.

While reviewing the definitions, Eric found an error in the proposed bylaws. The definition of a clinic was used for that of a child/adult daytime care facility. The intended definition follows. A daytime care facility is for those who cannot be fully independent, such as the elderly or children.

Melissa made a motion to send the recommendations for the new unified bylaws to select board. Harry seconded; motion passed unanimously.

Due to the late hour, the Zoning Administrator's report and a discussion on economic development and infrastructure improvements were postponed.

Item 4: Next Meeting
Because of the Christmas holiday, there will be no Planning Commission meeting in December. However, Lyle Jepson of the Rutland Economic Development Corporation plans to address a joint meeting of the Select Board and Planning Commission in January. (The specific date has not yet been determined.)

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission will be on January 23, 2016. The agenda is: 1) approve agenda 2) approve minutes 3) public comments 4) Zoning Administrator's report 5) economic development and infrastructure improvements 6) set agenda for next meeting.

Harry moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 PM; meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Paul Elsholz