

Town of Barre Planning Commission

The Town of Barre Planning Commission held a meeting on Wednesday, May 19, 2021 beginning at 7:00 p.m. by electronic means, Zoom video conference and teleconference. There was no physical meeting place for this meeting under Covid-19 legislative authority.

MEMBERS PRESENT-ZOOM:

Chris Violette, Mike Gilbar, Cedric Sanborn, George Clain, Deb Pierce, and Bryon Atwood

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT- ZOOM:

Chris Violette and Cindy Spaulding

OTHERS PRESENT

Zoom: Matt Systo, Thomas Martin (Tiny's Trash Service), Paul White, Troy McBride (Norwich Solar)
Teleconference: Ellen Poulin, Cheryl Husk and Christina Martin (Montessori School)

1) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Mr. Sanborn called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were no changes to the agenda.

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 21, 2021

On motion by Mr. Gilbar, second by Ms. Pierce, the Planning Commission approved the minutes of April 21, 2021 as amended. Vote 6-0-0.

3) ALLOWED USE DETERMINATION

On motion by Mr. Clain, seconded by Mr. Gilbar, the Planning Commission opened the Public Hearing for 3a Systo multiple curb-cut continued from April 21 meeting. Vote 6-0-0.

a. Request by Matthew Systo (on land owned by Paul H. Systo Living Trust) for multiple curb-cut request in accordance with the Town of Barre Subdivision Ordinance to add a third driveway on property located at 85 Bridge Street. Parcel ID: 030/017.00; zoned: Low Density Residential; AU-21000003.

This is a warned public hearing for the purpose of a multiple curb-cut request **continued** date certain to the May 19, 2021 Planning Commission meeting from April 21, 2021

Below is a summary from the April hearing:

Mr. Systo explained Old Soul Farm's farming operation which includes one driveway to service vehicle traffic of customers, wholesale deliveries with large box trucks, farm equipment and food scrap collection. Difficulties with the box trucks maneuvering the existing driveway by either turning around on Bridge Street and backing up the driveway, while other vehicle traffic entering or exiting the driveway and the parking area in the barn yard has limited space. The proposed driveway would alleviate the vehicle traffic as it would be

used as one way (entrance or exit).

Discussion ensued amongst PC members and Mr. Systo about several options to avoid a third curb-cut and still make things work better:

There is a sewer line and electrical pole in this area that may make it difficult. It was suggested to contact Green Mountain Power to potentially move the power pole and the town regarding the sewer line.

- Create a turnaround on the property where the (proposed) driveway would enter the parking area to use as a turn-around.
- Contact Green Mountain Power regarding the possibility of moving the telephone pole that inhibits trucks from turning left down Bridge Street.
- Widen the existing driveway to allow two-way traffic. Concern about existing sewer line making the problematic.
- Move the proposed curb cut that goes around the back side of the Husk's property further away. This is difficult as there are established garden beds, green houses and a ravine in the area.
- Move the farm stand to the opposite side (across the road), this could not take place until Systo's purchase that property in the fall or early winter.
- Schedule truck deliveries and pick-ups at certain times of day to avoid traffic congestion.
- Change the existing farmyard, by increasing the parking area, creating a turnaround area and have the employees park at another location.
- Concerns the abutting neighbors would have fencing around their property and lose their scenic views.

While it has not happened as of this writing, a site plan will likely have taken place prior to the May 19th resumed hearing.

Also, as we know there is concern from abutter Husk regarding being surrounded, noise, dust, and an impact to their view.

Below are my original comments:

While the applicant is officially requesting a second curb-cut (driveway), in reality it is a third. This proposed access, along with the other two provide access to parcel located on at 85 Bridge Street, the applicants homestead and agricultural business. The subject parcel is 11.94 acres in size with approximately 400' of road frontage along Bridge Street.

All parcels, except in unique situations, are entitled to one access to a Town road approved by the Town Engineer. Access is generally referred to as a curb-cut. There are some instances where a property owner may desire two and sometimes three curb-cuts. While the Town Engineer would still have to permit second or third curb-cuts, approval is required from the Planning Commission under the authority of Article 4, section 402 E. (2) of the Barre Town Subdivision Ordinance.

When reviewing multiple curb-cut request the Planning Commission relies heavily on input from the Town Engineer regarding these types of request. The Town Engineer has been designated by the Selectboard to review and control access to Town roads. The Town Engineer shall consider such things as; the functional class of the road; site distances; safety; width of the curb-cut; drainage; topography; and any other pertinent factors that a may apply.

Josh Martineau, the Town Engineer, has reviewed the request, spoke to Mr. Systo about his plan and determined

that he does not have any concerns with this proposed curb-cut. He further notes that he does not believe it will impact safety or function of the road and that it will meet the required sight distances.

I have spoken to the most impacted abutter Husk at 87 Bridge Street, and she has significant concerns regarding the proposed driveway being so close to their house. The Systo's installed a fence around the North and East (back) of the Husk property so they will not see the driveway behind their house, but they will to the South where it intersects with the road. I suppose a case could be made that the driveway behind their house could impact them with noise and maybe even dust.

From my standpoint I wonder why the proposed driveway is really even necessary. Maybe a case can be made why there is not enough room on the Systo's own property to bypass any congestion within their existing driveway. I guess I will wait to make a final decision when we hear more testimony.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Violette recused himself as a member of the Planning Commission. Mr. Violette as the Zoning Administrator provided an overview of his staff report as stated above. Mr. Violette read his staff report as stated above.

Mr. Sanborn provided synopsis of the Planning Commission's site visit on May 14 at 3:00 p.m. at the Old Soul Farm. The members walked the property including the existing driveway, barn yard and proposed one-way driveway around the Husk's property.

Ms. Husk stated her concerns are the new driveway would impact her property with noise, lack of privacy and dust. She was also concerned that the "farm stand" was now a "store" since the Systo's are selling products not produced on their farm.

Mr. Violette explained the Old Soul Farm currently falls under an agricultural exemption and subject to agricultural practices. Mr. Systo explained that Old Soul Farm must sell fifty percent (50%) of its own produce and products to keep agricultural exemption status. If selling over fifty percent (50%) of non-farm produce and products it would be considered a store and may need a retail license.

Discussion ensued (participants: Sanborn, Clain, Pierce, Gilbar, Atwood, Violette, Husk and Systo)

- Impacting Husk's property by surrounding three sides with fencing
- PC is not endorsing Old Soul Farm's operations only the proposed curb cut
- Historic example of Pastor Milanese's multi curb cut off of Countryside Circle
- Widen the existing driveway to accommodate vehicle traffic both ways
- Topography of the land with steep grade changes and ledge material behind the house and barn
- Safety and liability of Old Soul Farm staff and delivery trucks stopping oncoming traffic on Bridge Street to back up existing driveway.
- Systo's and Husk's will decide upon the type of fencing
- Suggested conditions:
 1. proposed third driveway be 12' wide and one way traffic only (in or out under the discretion of the Systos)
 2. Single Lane
 3. Obtain a driveway permit for the proposed driveway
 4. One way driveway to be used only April 1 to November 1 and blocked off on off season.

5. Proposed signage on Bridge Street during construction of proposed curb cut
6. Dust control on proposed curb cut during season.
7. if Old Soul Farm’s season extends to year round, they will need to come back to the PC.

Further discussion ensued amongst the above mentioned with regards to difficult to enforce proposed signage, dust control and existing driveway from one way to two way on off season.

On motion by Mr. Gilbar, seconded by Mr. Atwood, the Planning Commission approved a request by Matthew Systo (on land owned by Paul H. Systo Living Trust) for multiple curb-cut request in accordance with the Town of Barre Subdivision Ordinance to add a third driveway on property located at 85 Bridge Street. Parcel ID: 030/017.00; zoned: Low Density Residential; AU-21000003; contingent upon the following conditions: proposed third driveway to be 12’ wide single lane and one-way; obtain driveway permit for proposed third curb cut; one-way to be used April 1 to November 1 and blocked off on off season; if season goes to year round, Systo’s must come back to Planning Commission. Vote 4-0-1.

CONDITIONS Yes X No _____

MOTION BY: GILBAR
 SECOND BY: ATWOOD

ROLL CALL:

Cedric Sanborn	<u> YES </u>	George Clain	<u> NO </u>
Bryon Atwood	<u> YES </u>	Deb Pierce	<u> YES </u>
Chris Violette	<u> RECUSED </u>	Mike Gilbar	<u> YES </u>

Mr. Violette returned to the meeting as a Planning Commission member.

On motion by Mr. Clain Seconded by Ms. Pierce, the Planning Commission the public hearing for item 3a Systo multiple curb cut and opened item 3b Fuller proposed use (business office). Vote 6-0-0.

b. Request by Aaron Fuller (property owned by Pierre Couture) in accordance with Article 2, section 2.4 (c) whereas the applicant is proposing a use (business office) not specifically allowed in Very High-Density Residential zone, Property is located at 34 Churchill Road; Parcel ID: 023/015.00; AU-21000004.

This is a warned public hearing to consider a request by Aaron Fuller who is seeking an allowed use determination in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, Article 2, section 2.4 that reads as follows:

(C) Any uses not specifically permitted in any given zone may be considered and allowed if, after review by the Planning Commission in a public hearing, the Planning Commission determines that the use will not alter the characteristics of the area and will not cause an undue burden on the community.

Mr. Fuller is hoping to purchase the property located at 34 Churchill Road which is currently home to an apartment and a vacant retail use. Mr. Fuller is hoping to use a small portion of the building to house his land surveying and permit business. In effect the use will be a business office, no retail is expected.

Mr. Fuller is also hoping to convert the building to a two-family dwelling. That requires a conditional use permit issued by the Development Review Board which is scheduled to hold a public hearing during their May 12 meeting. Approval is anticipated and will be known before the Planning Commission meeting.

Below are the criteria historically used to help make the determination of no undue burden on the community or the proposed use not altering the characteristics of the area. Number 9 is not applicable in this case.

1. Emergency services:
2. Water, sewer, or other municipal utility systems:
3. The character of the area affected as defined by the purpose(s) of the zone within which the project is located, and specifically stated policies and standards of the municipal plan:
4. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity:
5. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect:
6. The impact on neighboring uses:
7. Minimum lot size:
8. Off-street parking requirements in accordance with standards outlined in Article 3, Sec. 3.9 of this bylaw:
9. Loading/unloading facilities:

The addition of a small office business to the building at 34 Churchill Road will not have a negative impact on emergency services, all three can serve the proposed use.

While both the Town's public water and sewer can handle the additional use of an office, the use will likely need its own dedicated sewer allocation. What form that allocation comes in will be determined by the Town Engineer. The building already has two sewer units assigned but those will be used by the two residential dwellings. The sewer allocation need will be determined when the change of use permit is applied for if this AUD is approved.

The character of the area is mixed use. Residential use dominates the area both in the form of single and multi-family dwellings. A small general store sits just above this parcel and the post office is across the street. Not far away are industrial uses as well. Not long ago this building had a retail use which existed in one form or another for a very long time. The use is not inconsistent with the history of Barre Town's compact villages.

The proposed use is located on Churchill Road which is a Town class 3 paved road with moderate traffic. The addition of a small office will likely generate some traffic but probably less than some of the previous retail uses has. In any case the traffic should not be sufficient to negatively impact the area roads or cause any undue safety concerns.

With regard to the Zoning Bylaws in effect, Article 2, section 2.4 (c) contemplates uses not specifically allowed in certain zones to allow some discretion. If approved by the Planning Commission for an Allowed Use Determination, then the proposed use would be compliant with the Zoning Bylaw in effect.

The impact on neighboring uses which was previously established as mixed should not be significant. A small office would not generate noise, smells, or other objectionable concerns. It would generate some traffic but likely minimal and less than a retail establishment would.

At .7 acres the lot is much larger than the minimum lot size of 8,500 s.f.

There is no indication regarding the size of the office use. Square feet calculation is what is used (except residential) to determine the amount of parking necessary. The required parking for a professional use as required by the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw is two parking space plus one for every 200 s.f. of area. It is important to remember there are already two apartments (assuming DRB approval of the second one) which requires a total of four parking spaces. I think before a determination can be made regarding parking we'd need to hear from the applicant as to what the square footage of the office space will be and what there is for available parking after subtracting the residential use.

RECOMMENDATION

This building has had a variety of uses for decades, likely going back into the 1800's. The proposed office use

sound relatively minimal and likely less intrusive than a retail use. The parking question needs to be answered but if it can be satisfactorily, I do not think that the proposed office use, based on the criteria above, would alter the characteristics of the area and will not cause an undue burden on the community. I propose the following conditions be attached if approved.

- 1) A change of use permit is applied for and approved by the Zoning Administrator.
- 2) All State of Vermont permits necessary are received and proof of such permits being issued supplied with the Change of Use applications.
- 3) The Town Engineer will determine sewer allocation prior to issuance of a Change of Use permit.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Violette as the Zoning Administrator read his staff report as stated above. Mr. Fuller nor Mr. Couture were in attendance. Discussion ensued regarding the square footage of the proposed business office needs for parking space and sewer. The PC would like to see the entrance/exit to the property more defined.

On motion by Mr. Gilbar, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the Planning Commission voted to continue a Request by Aaron Fuller (property owned by Pierre Couture) in accordance with Article 2, section 2.4 (c) whereas the applicant is proposing a use (business office) not specifically allowed in Very High-Density Residential zone, Property is located at 34 Churchill Road; Parcel ID: 023/015.00; AU-21000004, to date certain June 16, 2021. Vote 6-0-0.

On motion by Mr. Clain, seconded by Mr. Gilbar, the Planning Commission closed item 3b Fuller proposed use (business office) and open 3c Tiny's Trash Service use proposal for trash bag drop. Vote 6-0-0.

c. Request by Thomas Martin (dba: Tiny's Trash Service) on land owned by Ellen Poulin at the corner of Farwell Street and Nichols Road, in accordance with Article 2, section 2.4 (c) whereas the applicant is proposing a use (trash bag drop and recycling collection) not specifically allowed in a Medium Density Residential zone, Parcel ID: 009/009.02; AU-21000005.

This is a warned public hearing to consider a request by Thomas Martin (Tiny) who is seeking an allowed use determination in accordance with the Barre Town Zoning Bylaw, Article 2, section 2.4 that reads as follows:

(C) Any uses not specifically permitted in any given zone may be considered and allowed if, after review by the Planning Commission in a public hearing, the Planning Commission determines that the use will not alter the characteristics of the area and will not cause an undue burden on the community.

Mr. Martin is hoping to use the newly created parcel of land, located at Southwest corner of Farwell Street and Nichols Road, to operate his trash bag drop and recycling collection business. Mr. Martin has operated this business for many years in the area, he is currently located at Trio Motor Transfer located at 270 East Montpelier Road. The property was recently subdivided, creating this 2.91-acre parcel and is owned by Ellen Poulin.

As we all know roadside trash drop offs play an important role when it comes to solid waste management. Generally, these services follow State and Solid Waste Districts rules and regulations and do not need permits

from a Town. I do not believe that they necessarily enjoy an exemption from zoning as Solid Waste Facilities sometimes do. There uses are short term and not something that have been permitted.

In this case, when Mr. Martin approached me, I was not comfortable telling him that he could operate at this location (like he had been doing on East Montpelier Road) without a permit of some form. He agreed and did not want to invest time and money into this project only to have it become a concern later and required to cease operation. I suggested the allowed use determination path because, if approved, he wouldn't have to worry that he'd be shut down later.

His primary focus on this parcel is that it is close to his house and he will not have to worry about being asked to relocate by the business he is operating at. Over the course of Mr. Martin operating his business he has had to move a few times. As one can imagine this does not offer a sense of security for operating his business. As a result, that is one reason he is seeking this approval, the other is that it will be less than a ¼ mile from his house which is also on

Below are the criteria historically used to help make the determination of no undue burden on the community or the proposed use not altering the characteristics of the area. Number 9 is not applicable in this case.

1. Emergency services:
2. Water, sewer, or other municipal utility systems:
3. The character of the area affected as defined by the purpose(s) of the zone within which the project is located, and specifically stated policies and standards of the municipal plan:
4. Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity:
5. Zoning bylaws and bylaws then in effect:
6. The impact on neighboring uses:
7. Minimum lot size:
8. Off-street parking requirements in accordance with standards outlined in Article 3, Sec. 3.9 of this bylaw:
9. Loading/unloading facilities:

This type of use will have minimal impact on emergency services. Especially in light of the fact the use has been in operation since 2011 with little to no impact that I am aware of. That should continue in the proposed location.

No sewer or water is being proposed at this time and if there was it would be onsite and regulated via the State because municipal services are not available at this location.

The character of the area is probably the biggest concern. How well does a trash drop off fit in with the area and could it alter the character? The area is mixed use now, residential is the closest use, one house, and then a commercial private school, a horse farm, cemetery, and an industrial gravel pit just down the road. The use as proposed will be weekends only so it will not operate the same time as the school. One question I think that is valid is appearance and Mr. Martin so far has a good track record of being neat.

As noted, the proposed location is at the corner of Farwell Street and Nichols Road, both are Town class 3 paved roads. The intersection itself can be pretty busy at times, far less on weekends than during the weekday. I know this because I live less than a ½ mile from here on Pine Hill Road.

The proposed use is not specifically allowed in a medium density residential zone. The allowed use determination is the method for the Town to review and if a use meets the standards to be allowed and if allowed would then be in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw in effect.

At this point, I believe the biggest impact could be on the neighboring residential use only a little over a hundred feet away. There is some common ground here though between the two parcels and could end up under the same ownership. The current owner of the residential property has a large metal garage located on

the subject parcel. I believe how this proposed use impacts that residential use is the point that needs clarification. It is important to note that I have not had an inquiry from the abutter. The other uses in close proximity should not be impacted other than maybe some traffic increase.

The lot at 2.91 acres is compliant with the minimum lot size for a medium density residential zone (2.0 acres)

While off street parking will not have a specific standard to review because minimum parking is based on the size of a building, obviously there will need to be parking for Mr. Martin's equipment and enough room for people to pull into the property, turn around and exit.

Mr. Martin has supplied a site plan which shows an access from Farwell Street prior to the intersection, just beyond the driveway to the abutters residential use. At one point Mr. Martin was proposing a loop that would have customers enter from Farwell and exit onto Nichols Road. This concept might actually work best but requires a second curb-cut authorization so for now the one curb-cut will be used. Customers will loop around and exist from the same place they entered. The site plan also shows how Mr. Martin plans to layout his equipment.

RECOMMENDATION:

Overall, I do not have a big concern for the proposed use. It is limited to weekends only and while it will generate traffic, I do not feel that it will cause an undue burden. Like I said, traffic is generally heavier during the week anyway. We would need some assurance that traffic will not back out onto Farwell Street which then could impact the intersection. Mr. Martin's should address this issue. Also, I'd like to hear more about the situation with the abutter, will it come under common ownership? What are Mr. Martins thoughts on this? No doubt there will be an impact.

While Mr. Martin has a good track record of keeping his operation neat, I would want some reassurance that will continue. I also suggest that this permit be issued to only Mr. Martin and not run with the land.

It is my opinion that the proposed use could work, other than the one close house there really aren't other uses that will be negatively impacted. With some questions still to be answered, I will hold my recommendation until the meeting.

1. Permit is issued to Mr. Martin only and is not transferable.
2. Days and hours of operation are limited to Saturday (7:00 am to 1:00 pm) and Sunday (7:00 am to 2:00 pm)
3. Traffic must not stack out onto Farwell Street.
 - a. Trash shall be disposed of in accordance with accepted solid waste practices and in accordance with Mr. Martins narrative stating that Saturday's trash is taken to the transfer station same day and Sundays is taken on Monday morning. Trailers shall be covered when not in use. No trash is allowed onsite during the week.
4. The property is to be kept neat and clear of uncontained trash.
5. A driveway permit issued by the Town Engineer must be obtained before operation begins.
6. If a second curb-cut is desired at a later date, an application shall be filed and reviewed by the Planning Commission in accordance with the Barre Town Subdivision regulation.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Violette read his staff report as stated above.

Mr. Martin provided an overview of "Tiny's Trash Service's operation at the proposed location at the

corner of Farwell Street and Nichols Road. The trash would be collected on Saturday and Sunday, with trash taken to the Solid Waste Facility the next business day to keep the site area clean and deterrent of vermin or other wildlife.

Mr. Atwood asked if the property is purchased would this be a permanent home for the business. Mr. Martin replied yes, but he could move the trailers to his personal property down the road.

Mr. Clain asked if he had a plan if something were to happen to him, who would be the back up to take care of the business. Mr. Marin replied that it would be his wife, family members or friends.

Ms. Martin (no relation to applicant) of the Montessori School expressed her concerns that customers of Tiny’s Trash Service does not use the school’s parking lot as an overflow waiting point when dropping trash off. Mr. Martin stated that the lines to drop trash are not long and the customers are in and out quickly.

Mrs. Poulin stated she had no concerns.

Mr. Gilbar commented the business is well organized and clean.

On motion by Mr. Gilbar, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the Planning Commission approved a request by Thomas Martin (dba: Tiny’s Trash Service) on land owned by Ellen Poulin at the corner of Farwell Street and Nichols Road, in accordance with Article 2, section 2.4 (c) whereas the applicant is proposing a use (trash bag drop and recycling collection) not specifically allowed in a Medium Density Residential zone, Parcel ID: 009/009.02; AU-21000005; contingent upon conditions 1-6. Vote 6-0-0.

CONDITIONS Yes X No _____

MOTION BY: GILBAR
 SECOND BY: PIERCE

ROLL CALL:

Cedric Sanborn	<u> YES </u>	George Clain	<u> YES </u>
Bryon Atwood	<u> YES </u>	Deb Pierce	<u> YES </u>
Chris Violette	<u> YES </u>	Mike Gilbar	<u> YES </u>

4) DISCUSS RETAIL SALE OF CANNABIS AND HOW IT RELATES TO ZONING

Mr. Violette reported that legislature (House) has not taken up action on ACT 164 amendment S.25 and may still be in committee..

Highlights of discussion between Mr. White (Chair of Selectboard) and committee members:

- Town wide vote in March or May to opt in or out of allowing retail sale of cannabis
- Options to regulate locations of retail sale of cannabis within the zoning bylaws

5) ZONING BYLAW DISCUSSION AND AMENDMENT (as needed)

This item was skipped.

6) **TOWN PLAN DISCUSSION AND AMENDMENTS (as needed)**

This item was skipped.

7) **OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Discussion with Troy McBride of Norwich Solar Technology about the site plan change for Granview Solar as it relates to the preferred siting letter written in support of the project.**

Mr. McBride contacted me regarding the joint letter sent to the Public Utility Commission. He asked what the main concern was, and I relayed to him that being told one thing and having something else done without notification was the main concern. We talked about related issues as well but again reiterated the problem with seeking a very specific approval from the Planning Commission and Selectboard and then doing something very different. He asked what he could do, I suggested he meet with the Planning Commission to explain what happened. I also suggest more screening would not hurt.

We also received a rebuttal letter from Norwich Solar Technologies written by Mr. McBride. I have enclosed that letter.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Violette provided an overview of his staff report as stated above.

Mr. McBride provided an overview of the Grandview Solar Project's application process. He explained the following as to why the solar site was not built as presented during the 45-day notice for preferred site:

- Avoid wetlands as a result of the environmental review site visit
- Lack of communications to point out to the town the modification
- Preferred site letter process to include the town's concerns for the proposed project area

Mr. Sanborn and Mr. Violette requested more screening plants around the Grandview solar array. Mr. McBride agreed to work with the landscaper and provide a list of plantings for screen that will be submitted to the Planning and Zoning office for review.

Mr. Clain expressed his concerns that Mr. McBride's affidavit and pre-application testimony was not truthful to the changes to the CPG application as the town's Selectboard, Planning Commission (PC) and Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) were not contacted to the sufficient change in the solar project. Mr. McBride stated his intentions were to provide and updated layout based upon the environmental data and apologizing for not communicating the changes to the Selectboard, PC and CVRPC. He (McBride) did not believe that he was testifying in an erroneous manner.

Mr. Clain pointed out that the town's joint preferred site letter with plans was received by the PUC fifteen days prior to Mr. McBride's testimony. Mr. McBride explained that he had to act fast to secure the higher REIT rates. He (McBride) suggested for the town to follow the "preferred site" process and be more explicit. Mr. Sanborn stated that the town's "preferred site" letters now include language that it is approving the site based upon the plans presented at the time.

Mr. Clain pointed out the culverts that goes to the settlement pond be maintained as some are plugged.

8) **OTHER**

Members expressed their appreciation to Deb Pierce for her years of service as a member of the commission and she will be missed.

Mr. Violette announced that Novus as submitted their application for the Bridge Street Solar Array to the Public Utility Commission.

9) **FOLLOW UP**

None

10) **ROUND TABLE**

None

11) **DELIBERATIVE SESSION AS NEEDED**

None

12) **ADJOURN!**

On motion by Mr. Gilbar, seconded by Mr. Sanborn, the Planning Commission voted to adjourn at 8:56 p.m. Vote 6-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Spaulding, Clerk

Cedric Sanborn, Chair

Mike Gilbar

George Clain

Bryon Atwood

Chris Violette

Deb Pierce