



## MILTON PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Type: **Regular**  
Date: **Tuesday, March 15, 2016**  
Time: **6:30 p.m.**  
Place: **Municipal Building Community Room**  
Address: **43 Bombardier Road Milton, VT 05468**  
Contact: **(802) 893-1186**  
Website: **www.miltonvt.org**

---

1 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

2 The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.  
3

4 **2. ATTENDANCE**

5 **Members Present:** Lori Donna, Chair; Julie Rutz, Vice-Chair; Tony Micklus, Clerk; Henry Bonges; John  
6 Lindsay.

7 **Members Absent:** None.

8 **Staff Present:** Jacob Hemmerick, Planning Director; Brandy Saxton, PlaceSense consultant.

9 **Public Present:** None.  
10

11 **3. AGENDA REVIEW**

12 None.  
13

14 **4. PUBLIC FORUM**

15 None.  
16

17 **5. STAFF UPDATE**

18 Staff informed the Commission of the resignation of the Director of Public Works, Roger Hunt. The  
19 Commissioners had some questions, and Hemmerick shared what information he had. Staff also let the  
20 Commission know that the Fee Schedule amendment was approved by the Selectboard and is currently in  
21 effect.  
22

23 **6. NEW BUSINESS**

24 **6(A). Green Infrastructure Information and Lot Coverage Discussion**

25 A Memo on Green Infrastructure by Bonges was reviewed and discussed. Unfortunately, permeable  
26 pavement does not appear to be a viable product for the Vermont climate at the present time.  
27 Improvements are constantly being made to the product, so perhaps in the future it could be considered,  
28 but current reviews are not good. Saxton suggested checking with the Burlington Planning office to hear  
29 about their experiences with permeable pavement, as she's seen it in use in that city -- as well as evaluate  
30 how it is being used in stormwater regulation. Hemmerick will reach out to Burlington, and mentioned  
31 he'd been in contact with the Planner in St. Albans, another city that's utilized this product. St. Albans has  
32 experienced problems with the supply chain as well as the maintenance of the pavement, which typically  
33 requires vacuuming.

34 Moving on to lot coverage, Staff urged the Commission to agree upon a number at this meeting in order to  
35 move the process forward. Various illustrations were provided as visual aids to illustrate different levels of  
36 lot coverage. It was clarified that the current definition of "Structure" does not include parking lots. After  
37 brief discussion, the group agreed to proceed to the public workshop with 70% lot coverage proposed for  
38 the M4 Commercial District.  
39

40 **6(B). M4 Zoning District**

1 Staff presented a draft map of the M4 Zoning District, and Saxton pointed out where she thought residential  
2 and commercial could be delineated. Discussion followed. The Commissioners, using and marking up the  
3 map, discussed the pros and cons of various locations for the delineation.  
4

5 Saxton mentioned the Development Standards were discussed previously, but nothing has been definitively  
6 crossed off the list. Saxton asked if anyone had any strong opinions they'd like to express at this time.  
7 Donna stated she'd like more time to review the materials, and wanted to revisit the topic at their next  
8 meeting. Saxton gave a brief recap of where the language stands. There are 2 basic sets of standards:  
9 architectural form elements that break up form and massing, and site development standards, which  
10 include aspects such as eliminating excess pavement up front, screening of mechanical and loading areas,  
11 possible retrofitting of existing sites, etc.  
12

13 Bonges questioned how some of the more vague language would be enforced, such as, "avoid box-like  
14 structures." Discussion followed regarding how the regulations could potentially be structured: must  
15 have vs. should have; required vs. desired, and so forth. Saxton explained that some of the "softer"  
16 language - such as the term specified above - are intended to convey what is desired, and are then backed  
17 up with specific regulations to enforce them while also providing the Development Review Board (DRB)  
18 discretion to apply the vision -- without which the rules could be applied administratively without a DRB.  
19 The functions of the Planning Commission (PC), DRB and Zoning Administrator (ZA) -- and how they  
20 relate -- were discussed. It was then agreed upon that Development Standards be tabled for further  
21 consideration.  
22

23 Moving on to the Checkerberry residential district, the Commission reviewed the map and discussed the  
24 proposed locations. Micklus asked about the transitional district, and Saxton advised that this was the  
25 transitional district between the M4 Commercial and the DB1. The purposes of the transitional area were  
26 brought up, and Saxton suggested adding the concept of stabilizing some existing development to the  
27 Purpose Statement.  
28

29 Donna stated she'd prefer to lower the minimum lot size in order to see single family dwellings rather than  
30 multi-family in this area and asked for others' opinions. The Commission agreed it did not want to see very  
31 high-density multi-family here, but weren't opposed to multi-family altogether. Saxton suggested allowing  
32 multi-family residential up to 4 units.. Micklus added that it correlates to the multi-family real estate  
33 practices. Saxton also suggested that minimum lot size could be tied to number of units, for example: 6,000  
34 sq. ft. for one unit, 12,000 for two units, and so on. Bonges expressed hesitation about such linear scaling,  
35 stating it seems to be too punitive. Saxton suggested using a combination of minimum lot size and density  
36 calculations to address the issue. For example, using a density calculation of 1 unit per 4,500 square feet, the  
37 first unit could go on a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, the second unit could be built if the lot totals  
38 10,500 square feet, a third unit if the lot totals 15,000, and so on up to a maximum of four units. This idea  
39 was well received and agreed upon.  
40

41 Conservation subdivision was brought up, and Saxton stated she would not recommend it in this area. A  
42 residential PUD would be a better alternative, particularly if architectural standards were put in place and  
43 standards were generally higher. The conversation turned to quality of construction and materials.  
44

#### 45 **6(C). Workshop 1 Public Outreach**

46 The Commission reviewed the proposed handouts prepared by Saxton. Saxton asked for feedback, stating  
47 she liked the Dimensional handout but wasn't sure if the one describing Uses was too complex. It was  
48 generally agreed that it was too long and complicated, particularly for those unfamiliar with Zoning.

1 Donna preferred the idea of a wall poster to illustrate the message versus a lengthy handout. Minor editing  
2 occurred, with certain terms being changed and explanations added. Staff mentioned having a definitions  
3 handout for those interested. The group agreed to have Saxton prepare the handouts for the Public  
4 Outreach Workshop, with the changes they'd just discussed and agreed to.  
5

6 Staff mentioned a press release would be done the next day, and distributed some posters for the  
7 Commissioners to hang up. Various outreach methods were discussed, including reaching out to  
8 professional and personal contacts, Front Porch Forum, community groups and events, and so on. The  
9 scheduling of the Workshop was discussed, and it was decided the group will arrive at 5:30 on April 5, 2016  
10 to do general set up and a quick run-through.  
11

12 **7. MINUTES**

13 **7(A). Minutes of March 1, 2016**

14 MOTION by Lindsay to APPROVE the Minutes as written; SECOND by Bonges. Discussion: None.  
15 Unanimously APPROVED.  
16

17 **8. ADJOURNED**

18 MOTION by Micklus to adjourn at 8:09 p.m.; SECOND by Lindsay. Unanimously APPROVED.  
19

20 **Minutes approved by the Commission this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.**  
21  
22  
23

24 **Lori Donna, Chair**

/kt

25  
26 **Draft filed with the Town Clerk this 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2016.**  
27

28 **Filed with the Town Clerk this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.**  
29