

**Montpelier Planning Commission Meeting
January 12, 2015**

Approved January 26, 2015

Present: Kim Cheney, Jon Anderson, Tina Ruth, John Adams, Leslie Welts, Michael Miller, Brandy Saxton (by telephone).

Call to order by the Chair: Kim called the meeting to order.

Approval of the agenda: Jon would like to report on meeting with the Conservation Commission.

Election of Chair: Jon nominated Kim, John Adams seconded, the motion passed on a 4-0 vote. Kim nominated Jon as vice-chair, Tina seconded, the motion passed on a 4-0 vote.

Comments from the Chair: John Bloch and Eileen are absent.

Update on meeting with Conservation Commission: Jon was asked to meet with the Conservation Commission by their Chair. He updated them on the "two door approach" that is being discussed. They would like to attend any meetings that they might have feedback. They will present an official map.

The only parts left are the PUD and reworking of the design review outside the historical section.

Sasha Peeler will does flood reviews for Department of Environmental Conservation, she will be in attendance at the next meeting. The Conservation Commission could attend that meeting to hear what she has to say and to meet with the Planning Commission.

Jon asked why the road construction piece was included in the zoning. Mike said they don't really have their own set of standards for that. Brandy will add a caveat that if DPW created their own standards in the future, theirs will be precedence over the zoning standards.

Continue review chapter 230 (planned unit developments) and chapter 300 (Special Use standards): Brandy had broadly reviewed 230 with the Planning Commission. It is set up to be that "door B", so it is fairly specific for the developers and bonuses.

Infill housing development section was based on Ottawa's standards. (Leslie joined the meeting at this point). Only affordable units would get the bonuses, it was mentioned that it might be based on a percentage of affordable units instead of all of them. The State's Neighborhood Development Area Designation might be referenced to determine what percentage.

Smaller projects might be decided administratively instead of by the DRB.

Page 239 – the section on small houses "to maximize compatibility"...now says "must" and could be changed to "may". After discussion, it was decided to remove section C.

Illustrations on each definition would be extremely helpful in digesting the information.

233.B had a question on possibly removing low density residential and it was decided to remove it.

238 will be part of the agenda for the next meeting, as will river corridors.

Adjournment: There was a motion and a second to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Tami Furry
Recording Secretary