

APPROVED

**Huntington Planning Commission
MINUTES
March 8, 2010**

Commissioners Attending: Everett Marshall, Gordon Miller, Tom Bailey, Heidi Weston

Commissioners Absent: Beverly Little Thunder

Others Present: Lucinda Hill, Dori Barton, Michel Gilbert, Michael Gilbert, Mack Riddick, Jay Centerbar

Minutes: Heidi Racht

- 7 pm Reorganization of the Board
- Mail
- Minutes of February 22, 2010
- 7:15 Public Comment
- 7:20 Flood Regulations
- 9 pm Regulations updates
- 9:15 Member Business
- 9:30 Adjourn

RECEIVED 
DATE March 25, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm, chaired by Everett Marshall.

Items for Discussion	Discussion	Action
Reorganization of the Board	After a brief discussion, Tom Bailey moved the following slate; seconded by Heidi Weston: Everett Marshall, chair Tom Bailey, vice chair Heidi Racht, clerk	Officers of the Board were approved unanimously.
Mail	Attached on separate sheet.	Commission members reviewed the Hinesburg Flood Regulations. Gordon Miller will keep a copy of the letter from Tate Jeffrey on the Mayo project in order work with the applicant.
Minutes of February 22, 2010	Tom Bailey moved to approve the minutes of February 22, 2010; seconded by Gordon Miller.	The minutes were approved as corrected.
Public Comment	The public in attendance was there for the next agenda item.	
Flood Hazard Regulations	Everett Marshall introduced discussion by explaining that the Commission was looking at FEMA-regulated area (inundation) where the river comes up. This	

Items for Discussion	Discussion	Action
	<p>regulation is necessary for residents to obtain flood insurance. He also explained that the regs need to be adopted and then accepted by FEMA.</p> <p>Tom Bailey passed out another draft of Section 3.5, which is based on Model 5. He explained that he made the changes that he “would like to see.”</p> <p>Marshall noted that the proposed draft 3.5 allows small structures in the Flood Hazard Zone and also meets the FEMA requirements. No new structures, as defined by FEMA, would be allowed. Also, defined was substantial improvement, which means an addition that is half the value of the existing structure built over three years.</p> <p>There was much discussion about accessory structure, which was finally clarified when Dori Barton pointed out that the definition was the same as in the Zoning Regs and does not include residential buildings.. The current 100-foot buffer along the Huntington River restricts people from building in much of the FHOD.</p> <p>The discussion of the flood hazard regulations also dealt with the question of FEMA’s minimum requirements. Marshall concluded that for new structures permitting becomes more involved, but “otherwise we’re not that much different than the minimum.”</p> <p>Michel Gilbert asked if FEMA set the standard and then the state’s standard was “tighter.” Marshall replied that Huntington’s proposed regs are not as strict as the state since the town is not addressing fluvial erosion in this draft of the regs.</p> <p>In answer to Gilbert’s question, Tom Bailey added that there is river management information on the state’s environmental conservation website. He then reiterated that the reg needs to be approved by the state and then FEMA.</p> <p>Gilbert asked doesn’t FEMA allow structures with a permit.</p> <p>Marshall said, “Do we want to have fill in the flood</p>	

Items for Discussion	Discussion	Action
	<p>zone? We want to accommodate property owners, but we need to avoid unreasonable development in flood areas. Any development in flood areas is highly regulated by FEMA. The town has 14 properties that aren't developed (no structures) that are in this zone with no possibility for upland development.</p> <p>Heidi Weston asked the people attending the meeting how they felt about no new residential structures in the flood zone.</p> <p>Mack Riddick said that she was more concerned with grading and channel management and also had a concern with the map. She said she thought it made sense to limit new structures.</p> <p>Jay Centerbar talked about his property in Florida where structures are allowed at 10' above mean high tid, where houses are built on stilts.</p> <p>Michel Gilbert, whose house is in the flood zone, said that a new house should be built above the flood plain. Restricting new building is a "good idea. It's a stupid place to build and could be damaging the river." He said he liked flexibility "as long as it is not compromising the people around me." What I'm hearing seems to be reasonable." He said that he was concerned with the impact on property value if the flood plain area changed.</p> <p>Marshall invited the public to look at the map and there was informal discussion for about ten minutes, while members of the public looked at the orthophoto flood hazard overlay on his laptop.</p> <p>After the meeting resumed, the discussion turned to accepted agricultural practices (AAPs), which are allowed by FEMA.</p> <p>There was then a protracted discussion about what constituted "storage." It was decided that this could not be a business use in this zone and it would be hard to regulate, so the word was removed from the definitions and the table. Junkyards continued as a prohibited use.</p> <p>Tom Bailey passed out a sheet that listed the</p>	

Items for Discussion	Discussion	Action
	<p>Proposal Relating to Flood Hazards.</p> <p>Dori Barton suggested that if a vote by the town on the regs were necessary, it could be held during the Primary Election which will likely be moved by the Legislature from the second Tuesday of September to the fourth Tuesday of August. Bailey offered to draft a description of the proposed change in the Flood Hazard Regs.</p> <p>The Commission also discussed incorporating the Zoning Administrative Officer's "housekeeping" changes, if they are not controversial.</p> <p>Dori Barton asked if there was a timeline and when the document would be provided to the Selectboard.</p> <p>Tim Bailey suggested adopting this draft and then sending it to Ned Swanberg for review. The draft could then be revised again, if necessary, and a hearing date set.</p> <p>MOTION: Tom Bailey moved to preliminarily approve Section 3.5 (Flood Hazard Overlay District) as modified this evening and the Huntington Planning Commission's proposal as relating to Flood Hazards as it stands, as well, subject to review at the next meeting, and submit it to Ned Swanberg. Motion seconded by Gordon Miller.</p> <p>Discussion ensued about what this all meant. The Commission will look at Ned Swanberg's comments and reread the document to be sure no issues are missed. It may be sent back to Swanberg after the hearing.</p> <p>Heidi Weston expressed reservations about taking action on this draft and said she wanted to wait until the next meeting. Others thought that there would be a chance to revisit the draft at the next meeting after Swanberg had had an opportunity to review it and to wait until the next meeting was merely postponing the decision for two weeks.</p>	<p>Tom Bailey will draft a description of changes to FHOD regulation (3.5).</p> <p>Review potential changes to zoning regs to vote along with FHOD.</p> <p>Tom Bailey will send draft to Ned Swanberg for review.</p> <p>Motion to preliminary approve Section 3.5 passed 3-1 with Marshall, Bailey and Miller voting for the motion and Weston voting against.</p>
Member Business	Everett Marshall reported that the Municipal Planning Grants are available. Applications are due in May.	Commission members will consider possibilities for a

Items for Discussion	Discussion	Action
		planning grant proposal.

Adjournment	Tom Bailey moved to adjourn; seconded by Gordon Miller and unanimously adopted. Meeting adjourned at 10:20 pm.
--------------------	--

Date UNAPPROVED minutes submitted to HPC: March 11, 2010

Date minutes APPROVED by the HPC: March 22, 2010

Date Approved Minutes submitted to Town Clerk: March 25, 2010

AGENDA – Tentative

March 22, 2010

7:70-8:30 Mayo subdivision preliminary – continuation

8:30 FHOD

9 pm Other Zoning

9:30 Member Business

AGENDA-Tentative

April 8

Work plan for 2010