

Second Public Forum concerning revisions in Town Zoning ByLaws January 26th, 2016

Attending:

Members of the Planning Commission: Matt Tell, Staley McDermet, Patti Smith, Tim Segar, Edie Mas, Kate Buttolph

Public: Mary Sargent , Jean Boardman, Nancy Anderson, Jim Herrick, Sunny Tappan, Nat Waring, Evan Wyse, Brent Seabrook, Francie Marbury, Ashley Bies

The topics for this Forum was Article V- Planned Unit Development, and Article Article VI – Telecommunications Facilities

Matt opened the meeting at 6:05, turning it over to Staley, using the overhead projector. As a general comment, various people mentioned that it was difficult to find the Zoning Draft at the Town's website. Staley said that he also had trouble, and had talked to Marcia who had explained that the website was down, but was now back.

Article V- Planned Unit Development

Staley first described what a PUD was to clarify some questions. The only PUD allowed currently in Marlboro is the one owned by the Music School.

In answer to a question about whether land that would otherwise be undevelopable – eg too steep, a wetland, etc- could be counted in the allowable units for the PUD, which would result in actually more houses being allowed than if it was not a PUD, it was pointed out that the DRB had in fact done this for the Music School project. They wanted to build five houses, so needed 15 acres. Marlboro College gave them the needed additional acreage, and about 2/3 of the total land was unbuildable as a wetland, but was counted so 5 houses could be approved.

Staley responded by going over Section 506, #4, which says that the overall density of the PUD shall not exceed the number that could be developed if the land were subdivided in accordance with district lot requirements. There was still some misgiving that there was a potential loophole here. The PC will look at it.

It was also felt that there was a potential loophole in Section 510, Density Requirements, in that someone might acquire neighboring unbuildable lands to boost the number of units that could be built in the PUD. PC members said they would look into this.

In answer to a question concerning the changes the PC had made to this section, Staley reviewed the document on the overhead screen.

There was also a comment that any development will impact wildlife, not just PUDs, and another comment that the one area where the 500 foot setback might be good would be in the EDU district, to make sure the College restricted its buildings to within 500 feet of roads.

Article VI- Telecommunications

There was first a general discussion about the current situation where the State has prioritized towers so that Towns can be over-ridden by the Public Service Board (under Act 248). However, in the recent experience in Marlboro, the developers have observed the standards outlined in this section, and in

some cases have modified their applications. Nevertheless, ultimately the decision is up to the PSB, even if the proposed site, as in Central Mountain, is strongly opposed by the Town.

A question was raised concerning why only telecommunication towers were included in this section, why it was different than a commercial radio or TV tower. There was a general discussion about who regulates these constructions, beyond the FCC. A recommendation was made to have this section regulate all communication structural developments, and only exclude those constructed for personal use. PC will look into this.

A last question was raised about how to submit further information to the Planning Commission on the Sections already covered. Everyone was reminded that the PC meetings are public, warned meetings where anyone is welcome, and that written comments will also be accepted and reviewed. The PC outline for review was gone over, mentioning that the PC would be discussing revisions to the draft zoning at its meetings in February and March, and will put out a new draft in March, that will be warned in April, and presented at a Public Hearing in May.

The public forum ended at 7:40.

Respectfully submitted, Edie Mas