

NOTES FROM PUBLIC HEARING
 UPDATED TOWN PLAN DRAFT
 ELMORE PLANNING COMMISSION
 MAY 22, 2013

Attendance: Sue Cano, Len Plant, Shelia Rysz, Nancy Allen – Elmore Planning Commission
 Whit Hartt – Elmore Select Board

Interested Parties: Karen LaPoint	2296 Guy Lot Rd., Craftsbury, VT
Cliff LaPoint	“ “ “ “ “ “
Eric LaPoint	“ “ “ “ “ “
Ted Barnett	PO Box 307, Stowe, VT
Monique Barnett	“ “ “ “
Charles Barnett	“ “ “ “
Paul Gillies	Tarrant, Gillies, Merriman & Richardson PO Box 1440, Montpelier, VT
John H. Stuart	Civil/Environmental Engineer PO Box 8367, Essex, VT
Roy Marble	Marble Real Estate Rt. 1, Box 710, Morrisville, VT
Terry Boyle	3260 Main Road, Huntington, VT
Jill Lindenmeyr	662 Eagles Ledge Rd., Elmore, VT
Stuart Weppler	1787 Elmore Mountain Rd., Elmore, VT
Maureen Labenski	3309 Elmore Mountain Road, Elmore, VT
Ed Labenski	“ “ “ “ “ “
Andrew Martin	News & Citizen Newspaper
Matt Marble	Morrisville, VT
(Linda Leahy; written comment)	Leahy Road, Elmore, VT
Jill Lindenmeyr	Wolcott, VT

Sue Cano opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. She explained to those in attendance the process of the work that the Elmore Planning Commission had done to update the town plan.

Those who wished to make comments would be allowed three (3) minutes to speak. Speakers were asked to come forward to sit at the table, and speak into a microphone. Comments were recorded.

The first to speak was *Ted Barnett*. Mr. Barnett made reference to the FLESA (Forest Land Evaluation and Site Assessment) Report. He feels that the FLESA Report is outdated. He also commented that he feels very much a part of the town of Elmore.

Paul Gillies, attorney for Mr. Barnett. He referenced the Forest Reserve District, and said that Elmore is the “most restrictive” re: zoning and development. He said that there is “lots of land above 1,500 feet that is developable.” He asked that the EPC consider changing/softening the plan when we address updating the by-laws. He referred to three properties with a “Grand List” value of \$4 million, with \$600 thousand in tax generation.

John Stuart: Engineer for Ted Barnett. Mr. Stuart referenced the soil conditions of two-hundred-fifty acres of land suitable for development above 1,500 feet. He recommends that ordinances reflect the soils mapping.

Roy Marble: Commented that he was at the hearing to support Ted Barnett and Steven Broyhill, who are adjoining landowners. He expressed concern re: denial of PRD’s (Planned Residential Development).

Terry Boyle: Mr. Boyle was at the hearing to support Ted Barnett. Mr. Boyle is an expert in aesthetics and responsible architectural landscaping. He recommended adopting PRD’s and cluster planning. He said that lot/development location made for good planning for esthetics; re: visibility – “to be able to see out, but not see in.”

Stuart Weppler: Elmore Zoning Administrator. Mr. Weppler asked what the process is for changing zoning laws when the by-laws are changed/updated? He expressed concern over the thirty-five foot height limit for lakefront properties, with regard of the ten percent (10%) lot coverage.

Maureen Labenski: Ms. Labenski agrees with and supports the 1,500-foot development restriction, and noted that is the reason they bought their property, and built their home. The Labenski’s own one-hundred-fifty acres inclusive in the Worcester Ridgeline. She wants to keep the area as a forest reserve district. She commented that the Sterling View development can be seen from Randolph Road and Stagecoach Road.

Ed Labenski: Commented that covenants are worthless, since there is no one to enforce them. Also that “only zoning is important.”

Matt Marble: Commented that the current development can be seen only from the Morrisville-side of the Worcester Ridge. Also that Ted Barnett has the only forestry operation in the area.

Cliff LaPoint: Owns ninety (90) acres on the Worcester Ridge. He asked what the state average is for height development? The *state* average for development restrictions is 2,500 feet. He has

knowledge of building in lots of towns. Supports PRD. There is land that has passed perk tests above 1,500 feet. He indicated that the seven-acre lot-size restriction (zoning) was a problem they had to work with. He questioned the seven acre rule in the zoning bylaws and asked why it was not four or five acres. He considers this important and will work with the Town.

Comment –time ended and the EPC allowed for additional brief comments.

Mr. Barnett and *Mr. Boyle* shared photos of homes built in the referenced area, and views, and said they are the result of restrictive covenants.

Mr. Boyle referenced the Development Review Board.

Mr. Labenski said that it is the developer who puts the covenants in place.

Written comment from *Linda Leahy* was shared. Ms. Leahy supports the current Forest District zoning regulations. She also asked that the EPC consider replacing the word “blessed” in the introduction to the Town Plan, with something less religious.

Jill Lindenmeyr commented that there will be a big impact re: utilities, fire prevention/response, etc., regardless of development above 1,500 feet.

Public comment time was closed at 7:15 p.m.

The Elmore Planning Commission will consider the public comments.