

**Work Session of the Planning Commission
March 14, 2016 – Town Hall, Greensboro, Vermont
Re: Comprehensive Community Assessment
MINUTES**

In Attendance: Phil Gray, Christine Armstrong, Lily McAteer, Linda Romans, and Dylan Laflam, Acting Chair

Absent: Joe Wood, David Miltenberger

Also in Attendance: Kristen Leahy, Zoning Administrator (ZA), Alison Low, Planner from the Northeastern Vermont Development Association (NVDA), Hal Gray and MacNeil – members of the public.

Meeting opened at 7:03 pm.

A review was made of the minutes from the work session on February 8, 2016. Motion to accept minutes as amended was made by Lily McAteer and seconded by Linda Romans. All members were in favor.

Alison Low from the Northeastern Vermont Development Association (NVDA) was in attendance. She provided Housing numbers for Greensboro from the American Community Survey and the Vermont Department of Taxes. (Attached) Alison believes that these numbers may help the Planning Commission when they are considering housing development patterns.

The GPC then reviewed the 2nd version of the Draft Community Survey. (Attached). This version reflects the questions created by the GPC at the February 8, 2016 meeting. There was a question about the use of 5 year increments. This number was created to reflect the statutory requirement (every five years) for updating the Greensboro Town Plan.

- In questions, #4, #8, #9, and #17 – the word “town” will be amended to read “township.”
- In question 6 and 7, there was concern as to whether the issue of age was adequately covered and Alison believes (from her experience with surveys) that the wording of #6 & #7 will adequately cover the issue.
- In #9, another choice was suggested “No more residential building needed.”
- In #11, the word “resident” needs to be changed to “residence”
- In #12, Alison provided a new version with the word “cost driver.” This new version was approved the members in attendance.
- In #17, the line item “assisted living” will be divided into two lines – one for “assisted” living and one for “senior” living. In addition, another choice was again suggested – “No more commercial development needed.”
- In #18 and #19, the members decided that they preferred the new wording.
- In #20, the choice “Protecting rural character” will be added.
- In #20 and #21, a ranking on a matrix of 1-5 will be incorporated.
- A new question will be added as #21 (shifting the remaining question numbers). This question will be asking people to define “rural character.” A list of possible attributes will be included – they will check all that apply. These attributes will include (at least) a) dark skies, b) dirt roads, c) access to passive recreation (hunting and hiking), d) limited traffic, e) working farms, f) freedom to do on my land what I see fit to do, g) ability to live close to the land, h) sense of community, i) no noise, j) wildlife, k) scenic vistas, l) peace and tranquility, and m) a comment box.
- In #23, the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th sections will remain a question and the option of “somewhat disagree” will be added.
- An additional question will replace the 5th, 6th, and 7th sections.

Alison addressed David’s question - “Should rentals within the Shoreland Protection Area of Greensboro be limited to not less than one week?” She provided a copy of the Toors decision (attached) which discusses this issue from a decision by the Vermont Supreme Court. Alison reached out to the planners of Vermont for their experience with this question. One community has set up a registry for people who wish to rent their properties on a short term basis. Each registrant is made aware of the extensive State Fire Marshal regulations. She also suggested that the GPC look into ordinances that address the negative impacts – such as parking and noise. These ordinances would be created by the Selectboard and would be enforced by the Zoning Administrator.

Ultimately, Alison advised that the rental question should not be incorporated into the survey because there isn’t any room for dynamic discussion about the issue. She did, however, suggest that this may be a perfect topic for focus groups.

Phil had reported earlier that he had forwarded the initial draft to the Greensboro Association and was awaiting their response. Lily McAteer asked about the Greensboro Association involvement in the drafting of the survey. GA has created a new ad-hoc committee, the "2016 Town Plan" committee.

An action plan for the survey was requested by Christine. Alison will draft one. And she will send out a test link of the draft survey for the GPC members to take the survey and identify any issues. The goal will be to have the survey intake closed by the middle of July, so that the results can be tabulated prior to the end of the summer months.

The next meeting is April 11, 2016 at 7pm.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Submitted by Kristen Leahy, Zoning Administrator

Who is Responsible for Each Section?

- I. Section 1 History (Proof reading – Okay as is) **Willie Smith**
- II. Section 2 Major Objectives **N/A**
- III. Section 3 Population (Written with NVDA)
- IV. Section 4 Land Use **Mark Snyder & Dylan Laflam (Greensboro Bend emphasis), Linda Romans**
- V. Section 5 Transportation **Kristen Leahy and Lily McAteer**
- VI. Section 6 Utilities and Facilities **Dylan Laflam**
- VII. Section 7 Natural Resources **David Miltenberger, Linda Romans, and Christine Armstrong**
- VIII. Section 8 Education **Phil Gray and Dylan Laflam**
- IX. Section 9 Energy **Mark Snyder and Dylan Laflam**
- X. Section 10 Housing (Written with NVDA) **Joe Wood and Lily McAteer**
- XI. Section 11 Economic Development **Joe Wood and Kristen Leahy**
- XII. Section 12 Recreation **Kristen Leahy and David Miltenberger**
- XIII. Section 13 Flood Resiliency (Written in 2014/15) (Proof reading Essentially) **Phil Gray**
- XIV. Section 14 Regional Impact