

Royalton Planning Commission

APPROVED – Minutes

Monday, February 14, 2011

Members Attending: Beguin, Gravel, Judge, Levasseur

Guests Attending: Christian Petrangelo (Note Taker)

Meeting came to order at 7:05 PM.

1. Minutes of January 10, 2011

- Judge moved to accept the minutes as written. Gravel seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.

2. Proposed Development Bylaws

- Levasseur, referring to Draft 13 (Dec. 2010) of the Proposed Development Bylaws, stated that she had difficulty with page numbers on the Table of Contents, so additional editing must be done. She changed certain numbered headings. The chart on page 24 also failed to print, so this must be fixed.
- Beguin requested that RPC discuss public space issues on page 13 (§ 4.5), last paragraph.
 - Beguin, concerned about future public parks and fields, suggested that “public” should be inserted in this section.
 - Levasseur offered: “Most suitable for agricultural use . . . or future open space for public use.”
 - Judge inquired why the section refers solely to *future* agricultural use.
 - Beguin suggested omitting both “current” and “future,” simplifying the text to just “agricultural.”
 - Levasseur and Beguin suggested: “Opens space for public use, including parks, nature preserves, or recreational fields.”
 - Levasseur clarified that this section deals with conditional uses.
 - Beguin suggested inserting, after the agricultural use clause, “or open space for public use such as a park, nature preserve, or recreational field.” Beguin moved to accept Proposed Bylaws § 4.5 as amended. Judge seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
- Levasseur, referencing page 25 of Proposed Bylaws, stated that Kevin inserted a section—Subdivision Application Procedures—that RPC has not discussed yet. Levasseur pointed to the “OPTIONAL LANGUAGE” subsection, meant to clarify an applicant’s rights without constituting a binding ruling. What parts should be kept?

- Judge commented that he liked the subsection because it allows one to “get a sense of the issue.”
- Levasseur suggested taking out the “OPTIONAL LANGUAGE” heading, merging the paragraph below with the existing paragraph on that page. Judge moved to accept Levasseur’s recommendation. Beguin seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
- Levasseur next addressed Article 9 of Proposed Bylaws on page 30, suggesting that green highlighting be deleted since all listed definitions are present somewhere in Bylaws.
- Judge moved to accept Proposed Development Bylaws as amended to submit to Select Board. Beguin seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
- Levasseur added that she would send updated copies of Bylaws to all once available.

3. Vermont Law School – RE: Parking at Former Freck’s Building

- Levasseur stated that Vermont Law School (“VLS”), which bought the former Freck’s building, has presented RPC with architectural plans. VLS seeks input on prospective parking issues and argues that past Act 250 permits designate parking as adequate.
 - Levasseur added that RPC should consider parking issues stemming from VLS’s proposed changes to and/or expansion of Freck’s, which could impact parking for nearby residences. Levasseur proposed that parking may be insufficient under Act 250 and added that a VLS representative would be willing to attend a future RPC meeting on this issue.
 - Beguin inquired whether any relevant parking spaces are being preserved for general use. Or is VLS acquiring all of them?
 - Levasseur, referring to on-street parking, thought that VLS intended to acquire all of them.
 - Gravel inquired whether VLS had set aside parking specifically for visiting clients.
 - Beguin added that VLS’s Barrister’s Bookstore currently uses on-street parking and will continue to need parking in addition to whatever VLS requires for Freck’s.
 - Judge asked what legal authority RPC has to question parking. Do we actually have an enforcement role? Must VLS heed our recommendation?
 - Beguin answered that RPC can offer its opinion on whether parking is adequate, and it will go on record.
- Levasseur stated that she would e-mail Lorraine at VLS and ask if someone from VLS could come to RPC’s next meeting on February 28.
 - Gravel, concerned about a timing conflict, inquired about the timeline leading up to Town Meeting.
 - Levasseur confirmed that a conflict would occur on February 28.
 - Beguin suggested that the law school representative could write a letter or an e-mail rather than attend a formal meeting.

- Judge offered in the alternative that RPC could send an emissary to meet with VLS to address this issue before Town Meeting. Specifically, RPC could give Levasseur the authority to speak with VLS on behalf of RPC to determine whether parking is a concern and to making a formal recommendation. Beguin seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
- Levasseur added that, due to Town Meeting conflicts, RPC will not be meeting on February 28. The next meeting will be on March 14.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT:

Judge moved to adjourn. Beguin seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.

Meeting ended at 7:45 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christian Petrangelo
christian.petrangelo@gmail.com