

Hartland Planning Commission
Meeting Mminutes
March 7, 2012

Planning Commission Present: Jay Boeri, Roger Shepard, Bill Brogdan, Dan Jerman, Charlie Jeffries, Eric Dicke, Bob Bibby

Selectboard Present: Gordon Richardson, Tom White, Town Manager Bob Stacey

TRORC Staff Present: Peter Gregory, Chris Sargent, Emma Zavez

Public Present: Dave Cooper

Meeting called to order at 7:05 P.M.

Peter Gregory, the Executive Director for the regional planning commission gave a brief overview of the Enhanced Consultation Review process provided for member towns contrasting it with the former process, ongoing since 1980. He stressed that their endeavor was for consistency with the state planning law and that while optional for towns to have a town plan, when such a plan existed it was required that it be in conformance with the state law. The TRORC planners had reviewed our old plan, done an analysis of it's strengths and weakness, a prepared a write-up of their analysis.

Chris Sargent, a senior planner with the commission then proceeded with his analysis of our plan with a give and take dialogue between the HPC members and the TRORC members present. The points that were stressed are as follows:

limited on Facilities section

Energy section requires attention (Chris has a template)

Natural Resources section is good

Jay felt that we were weak an the the Economic Development section, Peter to provide assistance, re: stimulating the village economy

Education section requires more detail

The Planning Goals section on page 2 has some conflicts,(1 acre zoning doesn't reconcile with the Open Spaces language, requiring clarification)

Page 8, # 18 confusing ((language of 1 acre throughout town is confusing)

The “may” statements should be changed to “must” or shall to reflect the state mandates

Good job of both the Natural Resources and Historical Resources sections

Need more detail on the public transit section

No language on planning for high density housing and family development; Roger pointed out that such development unlikely without both sewerage/water infrastructure available and somewhat incompatible with the Character of the Village section

Degree of incompatibility between the regional plan and our town plan regarding development around the I-91 /Route 5 intersection- needs rewording to stress some development necessary but of the right kind

The intersection of Routes 4 and 12: needs more information regarding use for both services and retail as planning for the next 20 years

THE BOMB: Peter stated that a Town Plan must be in place in order for the town to adopt its recently completed Land Use Bylaws (which we were planning to hold the warned public meetings on commencing in early April) A consensus developed that the work necessary to complete the rewrite for the new town before the expiration of the old plan would be impossible

Chris offered that since this was his “day job”, he could bring the old plan up to date regarding the points he'd made above by late in the month

Roger reminded everyone that Kevin of TRORC was setting up the first public hearing for early April on the Land Use Bylaw and that such a meeting had a 45 day window for notification of surrounding towns and the public

A poll of the members present found that not enough members could make a special, Mar. 21, meeting so that the next meeting was scheduled for Apr. 4.

Charlie asked about “brownfields” assistance for the Regional Comm. And Peter responded that Kevin was their expert in these matter and could respond the next time we saw Kevin in April

Peter also asked about the level of service being provided to us by the TRORC and received an unanimous vote of confidence; he then advised that a solution to the time constraints posed by the expiration of town plan and the scheduled public meeting required before adoption of the new bylaw might be to readopt the old plan which is currently working, allowing the process for the Bylaws to continue as scheduled and shoot for the revision of the Town Plan over the Summer and Fall, when grant monies and time would enable a more thorough process.

Peter's suggestion was adopted by a unanimous vote of the HPC members present

Other HPC issues followed with Roger asking if Act 250 allows towns to accept electronic transmission only of applications, etc. or if a paper copy was also necessary. The consensus developed that a paper copy was still necessary as towns like Hartland do not yet have the logistical capacity for the solely electronic transactions.

Jay mentioned that the HPC had received an Act 250 Application for a five lot subdivision with an existing single family home at 138 Brownsville Road dated Jan. 30, 2012 and that we had a 45 day window for any response the HPC wished to make.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M. Respectfully submitted: Bob Bibby

