

Royalton Planning Commission

APPROVED – Minutes

Monday, July 26, 2010

Members Attending: Barcelow, Beguin, Brandau, Gravel, Judge, Levasseur

Guests Attending: Christian Petrangelo (Note Taker)

Meeting came to order at 7:03 PM.

1. Meeting Minutes of July 12, 2010

- Barcelow moved to accept minutes as amended (with only green highlighting remaining). Beguin seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.

2. Bylaws – Draft 11

- Levasseur referenced mixed uses on page 5, with additions in yellow highlighting.
- Discussion ensued regarding the need for boxes in this section.
- Gravel asked how one should interpret § 3.1(j) on page 7. Does “three feet in circumference” apply only to antennae or to all three items?
- Beguin moved to change § 3.1(j) to “solar panels, clotheslines, antennae, and satellite dishes.” Judge seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
- Beguin moved to amend the prior motion by adding “Residential” to § 3.1(j). Judge seconded. All in favor. Motion carries.
 - Discussion ensued about where to place “residential” in § 3.1(j).
- Discussion moved to § 3.1(k). Beguin considered “de minimis” too confusing and not user-friendly for non-lawyers and recommended removing it.
 - Discussion ensued about use of “de minimis.” Gravel advocated strongly for inclusion of the term in § 3.1(k).
 - Levasseur moved to place “de minimis” in parentheses after “minimal in their impact” rather than at the beginning of § 3.1(k). Barcelow, Beguin, Brandau, Judge, and Levasseur in favor. Gravel abstained. Motion carries.
- Judge discussed the semantics of “permitted” in the bylaws. Currently, “permitted” uses are enumerated and everything else is presumptively denied.
 - Brandau said that bylaws may be amended later to add “permitted” uses.
 - Judge suggested that conditional language could be included, e.g.: “Those things not enumerated may be permitted” Such language would not close the door on new uses and would not be onerous.

- Judge moved to amend § 1.10.2, page 5, to include: “Other uses not mentioned in this bylaw may be approved as a conditional use after proper review by the development review board.” All in favor. Motion carries.
- Levasseur asked whether or not the term “formula franchise” under § 3.1.4, Conditional Uses, page 9 is sufficiently clear.
 - Gravel asked whether formula franchise is actually defined somewhere.
 - Barcelow suggested that RPC include “formula franchise” in the definitions section. All agreed. (No formal motion.)
- Levasseur directed RPC to § 3.3, Waivers, page 10.
 - Judge recommended that “PUD” be defined somewhere.
 - Barcelow suggested including a definition for “PUD” and other abbreviations in the box on page 10.
- Gravel suggested a definition for “formula franchise”: “A franchise which determines the boundary of its use by a specific, pre-determined formula.”
 - Membership recommended submitting the definition to Kevin.
- Levasseur stated that “minimum lot” will likely be the most contentious standard of all. Discussion ensued about waiver and subdivisions.
 - Levasseur suggested using either a minimum lot size or a waiver consistent across the board.
 - Judge proposed allowing a reduction to one acre if water and sewer are supported in the plan. Less than one acre would be presumptively unfeasible.
 - Levasseur suggested that RPC put some additional thought into § 3.3, Waivers, page 10.
 - Judge suggested asking Kevin if there is any language/criteria to address RPC’s concerns, e.g. a “hardship waiver” or a waiver for existing, non-conforming lots.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT:

Barcelow moved to adjourn. Judge seconded. All in favor. Meeting ended at 8:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christian Petrangelo
christian.petrangelo@gmail.com