

Dummerston Planning Commission

Public Hearing on Zoning Bylaw update

April 7, 2015

Members Present: Rich Cogliano, Sam Farwell, Maria Glabach, Annamarie Pluhar, Andrew MacFarland,

Absent: Cynthia Wilcox, Deb Forrett

Also present: Allan Seymour Sally Seymour, Gurudharm Khalsa, Charlotte Annis, Zeke Goodband, Paul and Jody Normandeau, Marie Buttrey, Catherine Dianich Gruver, Ines McGillion, Michael Fedoruk, Michael Renaud, Cory Frehsee

Sam Farwell opens the meeting at 7:02. Reads the notice of the hearing and reviews the changes that are proposed.

Public Comment

Ines McGillion: Notice that there is the same general purpose and description for all three of the settlement areas. States that the descriptions should be different as in the Town Plan. Three settlement districts should have some autonomy.

Jody Normandeau: Agrees and says she thought there would be three different descriptions.

Catherine Dianich Gruver: This was her understanding that there would be three separate descriptions for each of the settlement districts. Dummerston Center more of a hamlet, while W. Dummerston is a village.

Cory Frehsee representing Mike Renaud: States that the definition in the proposed bylaws is a new definition that isn't in the current bylaw. Would like the definition to be consistent with their current DRB permit. Presented a letter that includes a suggested definition.

Mike Renaud: Wants to be on the same page with the town and approved uses. Wants to be sure that they would be okay.

Jody Normandeau: Disappointed in the bylaw with agricultural land in Rural Commercial districts on Route 5. Strictly residential area (Poplar Commons) in Rural Commercial. Don't think it is in line with the Town Plan for protecting agricultural land.

Ines McGillion: Agrees with Jody's comments

Catherine Dianich Gruver: Agrees with Jody and Ines. Commercial zoning seems so short-sighted.

Paul Normandeau: Agrees with Jody. We've heard over and over that it was undesirable to have strip development or a Putney Road in Dummerston. We seem to have created this possibility. Especially Dummerston Station Road. Incongruous to have PUD and make it a commercial area. Obviously residential and will remain residential. Seems to be ignoring good planning.

Zeke Goodband: Presents a question he received from a resident. Why are communication towers allowed in all districts except in conservation? Seems like a communication tower might be more out of sight in a conservation district.

Allan Seymour: I support everything Paul said about Route 5. Alarming to think all that wonderful soil is going to be Rural Commercial. All that river bottom soil we're going to lose.

Marie Buttrey: Interested in that there is so much conservation. What is it being conserved for? What for?

Ines McGillion: Another concern is that the zoning map is locking up twice the acreage, and it looks like Rural Residential is being locked up. Planning for growth hasn't been looked at. Conservation will push lots of pressure on residential. Discouraged the availability of housing. No way it can support the rest of Dummerston.

Paul Normandeau: Questions uses in several areas. Is "Storage container " one of those containers that are on ships. If so, opposes. Repair shop is inconsistent with residential living. – Auto service repair shop is incompatible. Rural Commercial footprint maximum of 15,000 sq. ft. 1/3 acre coverage is a pretty big house, seems to be inconsistent with residential.

Public Hearing Closes at 7:40