

APPROVED

HUNTINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes July 11, 2016



PRESENT: Everett Marshall, Terry Ryan, Joe Segale, Shayne Jaquith, Mark Smith

ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

MINUTES: Heidi Racht

RECEIVED *[Signature]*
DATE *July 21, 2016*

Public Comment

Minutes of June 27, 2016

Mail

Review CCPRC application and funding - brief discussion

Review finish Flood, Fluvial Erosion, Stream and River Buffer, Stormwater

Plan for next public meeting

Member Business

Adjourn

The meeting began at 7:03 pm; chaired by Everett Marshall.

Public Comment: No public was present.

Minutes of June 27, 2016: Terry Ryan moved to approve; second, Shayne Jaquith. Approved unanimously.

Mail: No mail requiring action.

Review CCRPC funding and moving forward on project:

CCRPC professional consultants will help the HPC make the regs "legal and readable." Segale noted that the Commission had already done a great deal of the work and what is needed is someone to "give it that fresh set of eyes." He proposed to have them give it a thorough review as "if they were a developer or someone to challenge the town." Smith said that the thought the HPC operates in a local area and he was excited to learn more about planning, transitive planning. He said, "We're not normally exposed to this. I happily view it as a big learning experience for this Board."

After some more discussion the Commission decided to try to meet with Regina from CCRPC at 3:30 pm on July 20 to work on a timeline. Marshall proposed that the Commission could review the flood information session and the final hearing as part of the planning session. Marshall will confirm date.

The Commission then discussed the final acceptance of the regs, wondering whether it would be better to have the document approved by the Selectboard or the voters. Ryan observed that the more people involved with a document the less effective it would be. Smith disagreed noting that Town Meeting would provide opportunity to engender enough confidence in the document. Marshall noted that it is the Selectboard that makes the decision and can decide to have it go before a town vote.

Flood Hazard Regulations:

Marshall explained to the group the difference between the 2013 and 2015 State Flood Regulations document. One of the key factors that influences the type of document that a town might pass is the state match for flood damage. If a town has nothing, there is an 8% match; with a minimum floodplain regulations, the match is 12.5%; with a river corridor protection, the match is 17%. "We will confirm with the state that the current draft is restrictive enough to receive full match funding."

Smith asked Jaquith how other towns are dealing with this. Twenty-plus towns have adopted new river corridor protections; most towns have minimum flood plain regulations. The Commission then reviewed Terry Ryan's updates to the document, based on the discussion at the last meeting. There are still some odd points in the regulations.

Segale asked about nonresidential structures for which there seems to be fewer restrictions than for residential structures. There followed discussion about what is meant here, resulting in the question "Do we want to have anything else to be built where it is going to flood?"

Ryan noted that the regs should allow some structures [in the Lower Villages] in the Flood Hazard area as it is the most desirable area. Segale argued to allowing residential structures in this area. Jaquith then talked about that the Rivers Program has long held that they aren't going to prohibit development on the village as long as it isn't allowed outside the village. Segale suggested specifying village/non-village areas. Jaquith commented that he has a question into Rebecca Pfeiffer about how "we are going to deal with the village."

The Commission decided that the table in the draft flood regulations is important and this is the easiest way for a property owner to determine whether something is allowed. Development in the river corridor in the village could be conditional.

Seagle opined that residential and nonresidential structures should be treated the same. He said, "A structure is a structure."

Jaquith clarified that everyone was in agreement regarding the flood regulations. Property owners will go through Conditional Use for development in the village and outside it's prohibited. However, the Commission needs to carefully examine the maps, which could show details like bedrock. The East Street bridge was then discussed.

In reviewing the proposed regulation, Smith noted that the regulation table shows that residential channel management is permitted. It isn't clear as it indicates that this is a permitted use. However, the state prohibits it. It needs to be made clear in the document and the table. Ryan referred to the regulation statement that says a state permit is required. He explained that he had added several definitions from the state flood regulations. Smith was concerned that people only reading the table would think that they could do this without overview. It was decided that the Commission needed to have a separate line category in the table that states that channel alteration is allowed (permitted) only with state approval.

Marshall reminded the Commission that the regulations were getting rid of the 50-foot and 100-foot buffers. There was more discussion of who could build where. Marshall said that no building should be closer than an existing structure.

Segale noted that riprap was allowed in the villages. It has to be resilient.

The discussion then moved to agriculture versus development in the village. Someone pointed out that houses along the road would allow agriculture near the river. The fields in the Lower Village planted with onions and squash crops were heralded as a great example of this.

The Commission set August 22 as the date for the next hearing. Racht will write a brief article for The Times Ink and circulate it. Jaquith's Powerpoint was critiqued and helpful suggestions were made: explain three areas, reduces the number of images of channel evolution; build in a way that structure survives; don't use the term fluvial erosion.

Member Business:

Smith gave an update on DRB activities. Various projects under review were discussed. Segale talked about his attendance at the ACD Municipal Planning Grant meeting.

Adjournment: Marks Smith moved to adjourn; second by Joe Segale. The meeting adjourned at 8:56 pm.

Draft Minutes on town website: July 18, 2016

Unapproved Minutes to HPC: July 18, 2016

Minutes Approved: July 20, 2016

Minutes submitted to Town Clerk: July 21, 2016