APPROVED

HUNTINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of January 14, 2013

PRESENT: Dana Cummings, Everett Marshall, Knox Cummin, Ginger Lubkowitz, Gordon Miller, Heather Pembrook
ABSENT: Julia Austin
OTHERS PRESENT: Aaron Worthley
MINUTES: Heidi Racht

Agenda

7 pm	MEETING BEGINS
7 pm	Minutes of January 10
7:10-8:30	Town Plan
8:30-9	Village Code
9 pm	Minutes of December 10
	Mail--CHNSA Act 250, Conditional Use, Driveway Permit applications
	Member Business-- Request from Charlie Baker to meet with HPC (set up several possible meeting options)
9:30	MEETING ENDS

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm, chaired by Dana Cummings

With consensus of the group, the agenda was revised and the January 10 minutes were moved to 8:30 pm.

RECEIVED [illegible]
DATE January 14, 2013

Town Plan	The Commission discussed the Town Plan surveys, of which 89 had been filled out and returned. Dana Cummings had gathered the data and presented a 16-page compilation of answers and comments and an assessment of the statistics. He noted that there were several messages in the results, the first being the protection of open spaces, under Question 1. Comments resulting from the discussion included coming up with an inventory; focusing on the intent of protecting the spaces for conservation; there are people who object to having land eyed for conservation; the potential for use of the Conservation Fund for accomplishing some or all of this goal. Question 2 – Should the town encourage development around the town centers? Heather Pembrook noted that the distance from urban areas help keep the town's population down, due to the commute. Everett Marshall said that he expects a revival in local support. But Knox Cummin expressed concern about parking on the road and that this would affect business. Pembrook asked about what could be done. As the discussion continued, Cummin noted that there were divergent needs among the people who want the business and the people who work here. There were other comments made, like that people who commute tend to stop on the way home from work and don't necessarily wait to do business in Huntington. Dana Cummings said that it was hard to find a balance; he then suggested that village code would be a possible solution. He noted that it is hard to know what people mean by commercial – is it a chair in a house for haircuts or is it a metal building with a flat roof? Question 3 – Should the town consider options for sewer and water systems to focus development around the villages? Everett Marshall started the discussion by saying that this would allow for more flexibility. Heather Pembrook added that this would allow a broader use. While water/wastewater might not happen right away, the town should be looking into procuring options. She noted that this doesn't have to be done in the next five years. Cummings agreed that the complexities of owning properties might not be something the town would pursue immediately, but the options could be done. Cummin agreed that it was "worth putting in the plan that this is important." Marshall added that the full price of purchasing the land "is impossible," but "it's not impossible with creative funding." Cummin said, "I think we shouldn't expect anything to happen with the current Selectboard." Pembrook asked, "Could we encourage planning in the future [for septic]?"

Heidi Racht noted that there could be cluster septic like other areas in the town already that had PRDs. Pembrook suggested investigating the option of the sites.

K. Cummin observed that some people in town hadn't made the connection between the focus in the villages. He asked whether the question should have been more specific. He then suggested sending a survey that has a series of questions around the issue of septic. Ginger Lubkowitz noted that a mix of funding could be used. Usually, these projects have 80% Federal funding. However, there is no money available now. D. Cummings suggested that Huntington "get into the system to see what's available," so the town will get the notices about funding. Gordon Miller commented that there were grants from Rural Development.

Question 4 – Should the town promote public transit?

This is a popular concept. Everett Marshall proposed that the Commission find out what businesses subsidize ridership. Gordon Miller suggested asking Charlie Baker (CCRPC – Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission).

Heather Pembrook said, "When I hear public transit, I think bus. What can we do to promote this?"

Ginger Lubkowitz talked about the "casual carpool" in other areas, where there are pick up points at which people can wait and someone comes by with room in the car and gives a ride. She suggested an "organized" casual carpool. Pembrook asked about specific survey times and D. Cummings proposed registering the carpool with an organization like GoVermont as a means of tracking. Heidi Racht mentioned the bus schedule, which is limited to certain times and does not allow people to take the bus into Burlington for the evening and then come back; others agreed that this was a commuter bus that operated on a schedule for high usership. D. Cummings added that social technology and advocacy by the Commission could be part of the plan. Huntington could benefit from employees asking for the benefit from their employers (Smart Business). The Commission then talked about the school bus ridership. Racht noted that this had been brought up previously by the Commission, when it had last discussed transportation – and the times before that, too.

Question 5 – Should the town promote a recreation path between the three villages?

Knox Cummin discussed the need for the Commission to come up with language that starts to talk about a street form / neighborhood street form, in regards to sidewalks and recreation parks. He observed, "Huntington residents really want to have a recreation path." Dana Cummings talked about action steps. "Someone has to take the lead," he said. K. Cummin asked if the

	Commission would be the group to do this. Everett Marshall talked about the paths in Waitsfield since the town is similar in size to Huntington. He explained that there were a variety of trails for walking and that VAST (Vermont Association of Snow Travellers) had given a walking pass to residents. Heather Pembrook told the Commission that she had been talking to Megs Keir who said that the Fuller House property in the Lower Village would provide a path area near the river and Pembrook said that her property would also be a potential tie-in with this. She said, "We'd be open to a loop." The group then discussed the idea of an Upper Village to Lower Village connecting path that could be used for snowmobiling and skiing in the winter and biking and hiking in the other months. K. Cummin commented that there could be erosion in the low spots. Marshall said that the path doesn't have to go the whole distance. Pembrook added, "You have two willing landowners [Pembrook/Pichler and Keirs in the Lower Village]." After some discussion about sidewalks along the road, Racht advocated for a path off the road, adding that their property, now used by VAST, would be a great path. Marshall said a map could be provided on a website, but K. Cummin objected, "People are ok with local people using their land, but many couldn't want a map on the internet." Marshall then said that he Town Plan should encourage paths and the town could "start small." Aaron Worthley said there should be a discussion about widening roads in areas to be included with the recreation path. The discussion then went on briefly to business – Question 6. Dana Cummings said that a café had the "single most support if you take it out of specific areas. Knox Cummin added that village code could help address this, as does wastewater. He added that parking on the street in the Lower Village would help these businesses succeed. Ginger Lubkowitz and Heather Pembrook put together a timeline for completion of the Town Plan by June 10, 2013. This timeline assumes that there is not a lot of time spent on projects; the Commission decided that projects could be accommodated, but there would need to be a focus at the meetings that included sticking to the time on the agenda.
Village Code	Knox Cummin said that Form-Based Code (aka Village Code) should be mentioned in the Town Plan goals. Heather Pembrook said that there were too many goals now in the Town Plan and Commission should limit the goals in the Town Plan and "be practical." She advocated that the Commission "try to make it a document that is practical."

Dana Cummings said that the Commission had set aside the DRB and wastewater discussion and proposed that it devote a portion of one meeting each month to advance these two topics. He suggested that the Commission discuss subdivision one meeting each month and "send people to Ed Hanson" regarding their pre-sketch plan ideas, so he could guide them before coming to discuss Sketch Plan with the Commission.

The Commission went back to discussing the timeline that Pembrook and Lubkowitz had proposed earlier in the meeting. D. Cummings remarked that June 10 is two weeks behind for a deadline to complete the Town Plan by June 18. Pembrook proposed sharing the timeline with the Selectboard. Knox Cummin added that the Town Plan should be worked on at every HPC meeting and DRB should also be worked on at every meeting.

The Commission then discussed Lubkowitz's departure from the Commission as she is not running for re-election on Town Meeting Day and what this means in terms of getting her Town Plan section assignments completed..

In answer to an inquiry from Pembrook about same assignments and her desire to take on some of the work, the assignments were reviewed.

Pembrook will now do transportation and facilities; Lubkowitz and Racht will work on Historical Features and Schools.

The discussion then went back to Village Code and where it can fit in with the Town Plan. Aaron Worthley participated in the discussion. Pembrook suggested customizing the Village Code to Huntington. Worthley replied, "The charge that this is being brought in from outside is not true."

There then followed discussion about change in Huntington, with Dana Commings noting that some people had "fear of change" and there was a sentiment that "we're perfect the way we are." Gordon Miller added, "People are naturally resistant to change," and, he added, "The village is going to change." He went on, "Having planned the framework, you are going to guide change." He then talked about the closing of Jaques Store being an example of change and mentioned that the Huntington Post Office is also going to change.

Worthley then related that the Sunday before the Village Code hearing, he had visited with his parents and they had written their concerns about the proposal. Almost all of the items under concern were allowed in the current zoning. He added that the Commission needs to look at what is currently possible in the village.

Pembrook asked that in the village would change in the current regulations – the village is locked in by natural features like the river. Worthley replied with

	the example of the closing of Jaques Store as a change. Pembrook then said that adopting Village Code would allow for a lot more change in the villages. Dana Cummings responded that many of the houses in the Lower Village already met the Village Code and then gave an example of a burned house being replaced by something that did not meet the code. Gordon Miller talked about the stream of cars going through the village, regardless of the Village Code and that this would be a way of having them not continue down the road – development would be concentrated. Pembrook then said that more could be done in Huntington and the Commission could also take into consideration that connectivity can happen through walking and bike riding. If there is no Village Code, D. Cummings said, development will increase in the hills. Knox Cummin expressed support for on-street parking. Pembrook commented that there was a level of development that she supported in the village, but five houses per lot is not this level. She said she wanted the development of the village to "mimic the historic settlement pattern." Lubkowitz asked if the Lower Village has the existing minimum had been looked at. Worthley responded that if there was a ¼-acre minimum, what's the point? There is a suggestion of unlimited density on any lot size, but it has to be on a public street. Lubkowitz asked Worthley for the depth of the village lots. He responded that each could have two structures that are residential for a total of three structures. Knox Cummin stated that there was a difference of opinion. With dead end roads, people want to live there. There is a problem with connecting blocks. He added, "It's not about city blocks in the Lower Village." This was more possible in the Center. Pembrook said she hoped this discussion will focus on how Village Code would be addressed in the Town Plan. The Commission needs to talk about the work that has been done and what of the Town Plan can be focused on it. She added that the Planning Commission should decide whether to support this code. Knox Cummin listed the sections of the Town Plan that would reflect the Village Code: Land Use, Economic Development, Transportation, Facilities (streetscapes), Energy (solar exposure). He emphasized that the Village Code should encourage south-facing roofs.

	Pembrook asked Worthley, "Did you have any discussion about what you wanted to have after the meeting? He responded that the committee assumed that the Planning Commission would continue. "It has momentum," he said. "If it gets pushed out, the details erode." K. Cummin said that the Commission should take what happened at the meeting and make adjustments. He proposed that the next hearing show the Center. Worthley added that the work on the document needs to happen based on comments. He said that more education of the public needs to be done. Pembrook asked about having a table at Town Meeting to further educate townspeople. Worthley responded that the committee has disbanded and there is no more money to pay Paul Dreher for his expertise. K. Cummin said he thought the document should be revised before going before the public again. Lubkowitz suggested having an alternate work date to the regular HPC meetings. After more discussion and a phone call to Tom Bailey about his availability, it was decided to have a work session on January 31, 7-9 pm. A copy of the document in Word is needed since changes can't be made to the PDFs , which is the only version now in possession by the Commission. **ACTION ITEM: Members of the HPC who are available will meet on Thursday, January 31, 7-9 pm, at the Town Clerk's Office to work on revisions to the Village Code**
Mail	The Commission reviewed the following mail: 1. CHNSA Action 250 Minor Application: an opportunity for comment, including a recreational opportunity. Aaron Worthley noted that the warming hut is already there and people are already parking there. He noted that generally, the neighborhood is in favor of it; one neighbor has drainage concerns and is submitting comments. Dana Cummings noted that the town's concerns will be addressed in the Conditional Use hearing. Everett Marshall said that the town needs a "compelling reason" to submit comments and "we don't have this." Other mail, not discussed: 1. ANR: Katherine Wolff, off Handy Road, Wastewater Permit (WW-4-3846-1), December 14, 2012 2. ANR: Jeffrey Palin, 15 Hinesburg Hollow Road, Wastewater Permit (WW-4-2936-2, amended), November 28, 2012 3. ANR: Rosemary King, Main Road (10.01-acre lot), letter acknowledging receipt of application for Wastewater Permit, January 10, 2013
Minutes of December 10, 2012	**Knox Cummin moved to table; seconded by Ginger Lubkowitz. Unanimously approved. Minutes tabled until January 28.**

Minutes of January 10, 2013	tabled until January 28.
Member Business	1. The Commission discussed a request from Charlie Baker of CCRPC to meet with the HPC to discuss the ECOS grant. The Commission proposed that either meeting in February would work. It was noted that the CCRPC reps are also meeting with the Huntington Selectboard about the ECOS grant on February 4 – could this meeting include the HPC and then it could forego a second meeting. Racht will contact Baker and pose the question. 2. Heidi Racht inquired as to whether the HPC Report had been submitted for the Town Report as it is due on January 16. **Dana Cummings said he would do this.** 3. Everett Marshall reported that the ECOS grant is short on funding. He reported that the committee will look at alternate funding and he is meeting with the Huntington Conservation Commission and the Foundation for a Sustainable Future.

Adjournment: Heather Pembrook moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Knox Cummin. The Commission adjourned the meeting at 9:50 pm.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES TO THE HPC: January 24, 2013
MINUTES APPROVED: February 11, 2013
APPROVED MINUTES TO THE TOWN CLERK: February 14, 2013

January 28, 2013 Proposed Agenda

7-8:30	Town Plan
8:30-9	Village Code
9 pm	Minutes of December 10, 2012
	Minutes of January 10, 2013
	Minutes of January 14, 2013
	Mail

Town Plan Timeline:
One path to get there

Assumptions:

- This plan targets June 10 as deadline for PC finalizing its version of the plan for warning and allows the second half of 2013 for Warnings, Selectbrd review, and buffer.
- Generally there is a "content generation" phase – now through March 11; then a "content review" phase, March 12 through May 13; then a "bring it all together phase" – May 14 through June 10. Of course the boundaries aren't rigid and the work may end up going on/morphing simultaneously, but this offers a framework and deadlines.
- Individuals will take responsibility for sections as previously assigned (with shifts in light of new members, interests, etc.)
- Work on each section will generally take place outside of meeting, with the individual responsible consulting with other town volunteers/ boards/members of the public/PC members as needed. Three meetings (March 25 – April 22) will be used to check-in on road bumps, items requiring full group discussion, etc.
- Intention is to make sections generally more concise, and add visuals wherever possible.
- Perhaps target 5 "Goals" and "Priority Recommendations" for each section. (Discuss level of specificity.)
- Someone on PC or another person will have to be identified to complete the "holistic review" and/or do the final editing and/or layout.

Meeting Date	Goal
Jan 28 – Feb 25	3 meetings for discussing sections
(March 5	Town Meeting day)
March 11	**Section drafts finalized, circulated to full commission for Review** (Welcome new PC members!)
March 25 – Apr 22	3 meetings for discussion of section drafts
May 13	**All sections finalized.** Full draft handed over to 1-3 people to review holistically. (Edit, check consistency across sections, add/enhance graphics, layout, etc.)
May 27	Check-in on holistic review. Address questions/concerns.
(June 3	Final draft should be circulated to PC so it can review document for June 10 approval.)
June 10	**PC approves document as final, ready for warning.**

(Presumably after this point, PC will hold hearing, make edits as needed, send to Selectboard which will review and do the same by end of December).