

Granville Planning Commission
August 2, 2021
DRAFT Minutes

Meeting called to order 6:20

Roll call - Rachel Grigorian; Stephanie Walker; Judy Wood; Joe Truman; Diane Eramo

Public - Dan Sargent/Granville Fire Chief; Mike Eramo

Communications & Bills - None

Approval of Draft July Meeting Minutes - Judy made motion to vote to approve; Rachel seconded. All in favor.

Public Comments - None

New Business -

(Judy suggested we address the Fire Dept. agenda item first, in consideration of Dan's attendance in connection with that matter. All agreed.)

Fire Department renovation project:

Rachel had called Bannon Engineering in Randolph regarding the septic system required by the Fire House renovation project. This firm may have pertinent records dating back to Kevin Bagley's contact with them. Dan doesn't think a perc test was done, but Rachel will follow up on this contact; i.e., obtaining the record if perc test was done and, if not, inquiring about a perc test cost. If a site visit by Bannon is arranged, Dan will participate.

Stephanie said she'd spoken with Troy Dare, Manager & Engineering Technician, Rural Fire Protection Program and he

suggested that we may be eligible for up to \$20,000 IF the project has water tanks attached to it. Stephanie also mentioned that the USDA has Rural Development grants that have helped fund other Vermont Fire Department building rehabs and that she's looking into the grant requirements.

Potential to create a noise ordinance:

The difficulties of enforcing a noise ordinance were discussed. A distinction between noise such as fireworks, shooting of guns and detonation of statutorily identified explosives was pointed out; including exactly who might be designated to do any enforcement, e.g., Town Constable, Fire Chief, and/or State Police. Though it was concluded that enforcement was certainly a daunting proposition, we agreed to pursue drafting and adoption of a noise ordinance in the future.

It was also mentioned that a noise ordinance could address helicopter/airplane noise. Stephanie will contact Kevin Geiger/TRORC to see if he thinks it's reasonable to forego a helipad ordinance and if a noise ordinance could cover us in that regard. Rachel proposed forming a subcommittee at the September meeting to start work on this.

Potential to revise land use section of the Town Plan:

This idea was a result of Kevin Geiger's observation, during the July meeting, that the Town Plan's land use section might benefit from including more specifics. But none of us had pursued examination of the Plan toward that end and the item was tabled.

Old Business -

Community Garden - Mulch deliver and stakes

Rachel intends to have Kenyon's deliver mulch this week. Rachel also plans to stake tomato plants and do some weeding the

following week. She will also follow up with Bruce or Kathy Werner to secure the Conservation Commission funds for the garden project.

The difficulty of getting public participation was discussed; Diane pointed out that if a specific date was set and posted on FPF, someone from the PC would have to be there. Rachel said she would pick a date when she plans to be there and post it on FPF.

Telecommunications Ordinance check in - second draft review

Rachel expressed approval of the revised condensed second draft. Judy credited Stephanie for the work to shorten it. Judy noted that no one had submitted any 'Comments' on the revised draft that she'd emailed to members on July 25. She also informed the members that she'd made a change just that morning: adding to the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Background & Purpose Section a reference to "Connectivity" as being one of the Town Plan's long-term goals.

Diane then asked if Background & Purpose was necessary; she also made reference to the brevity of other Granville ordinances. Judy pointed out that a number of the Telecomm Ordinances of other Towns *do* have such a section; and, once again, named the towns that were used as models, i.e., Mendon, Bridgewater, Duxbury, and Barnard. It was also noted that other Towns that have zoning bylaws and incorporated telecomm regulations therein, were not as helpful as models.

Rachel and Diane noted that some other ordinances were more "bullet point" formatted, with fewer 'paragraphs' and less "narrative." Diane had a further question about "redundancy" vis-à-vis the current "vigorous review process" and oversight by state and/or federal agencies; she referred to Kevin Geiger's indication that the ordinances used as models may have pre-dated those state/federal regulations. Judy said that the draft does refer to those regulations, but that Granville's ordinance needed to include areas covered by them for "clarity" and "as a statement of our values and

concerns.” Dan suggested and Diane agreed that such inclusions are or may be unnecessary and that a simple generalized statement of agreement with and adherence to state/federal oversight is sufficient. Judy said she would review the draft again with an eye to cutting what may actually be redundant in that regard. Stephanie suggested that it would be helpful for Diane to identify specific parts she considered redundant. Rachel suggested that, for example, cutting some of the explanation of VT Act 171 and that its precepts might be reduced and to bullet points. Judy explained that Act 171 is primarily statement of policy, rather than enumeration of regulations.

Judy proposed making a motion to have a revised and final draft ready for a PC vote (re forwarding to the Selectboard) at the September PC meeting. Diane objected to such a motion being made. Instead, we agreed to edit the draft further, based on comments at this meeting as well as comments to be submitted in time for another version to be prepared for consideration at the September meeting, with an actual vote deferred until October.

Diane also brought up the importance of not violating VT Open Meeting Law in the course of communications about the draft outside of formal meetings, i.e., “comments back and forth.” Judy pointed out that simply requesting email comments *without* any “back and forth” would not be such a violation, and that that is exactly what she’d done on July 25 - sending the draft to all PC members and providing them “Comment” status. As Diane continued her generalized criticism, when Judy interrupted her and refused to let her go on, Diane left the meeting.

Mike Eramo expressed concern that an early draft was sent to TRORC before being shared with the entire PC. Stephanie and Judy, as two members of the drafting subcommittee, explained that the rationale for doing this - asking TRORC for a preliminary informal review - was to save other members’ time by avoiding

submitting it to the members first and *then* having TRORC point out whatever might be wrong with it, such as any impermissible provisos. Furthermore, it was reiterated that before anything formal or official happens - such as the PC voting to submit it to the SB - the entire PC will have been presented with a final draft with ample time allowed for their review of it. It was also reiterated that Judy, Stephanie and John submitted the draft to TRORC for informal review *as a duly appointed subcommittee* - the whole point of this subcommittee being to delegate drafting responsibility to that threesome in order to save other members, who *didn't* volunteer for it, from spending time and energy in the process of drafting the ordinance.

However, it was agreed that in future ordinance drafting by a subcommittee, if a draft is sent to TRORC or any other state agency, the entire PC will be cc'd.

Judy made a motion that the final draft be presented for an approval/disapproval vote at the October meeting; Rachel seconded. All in favor.

Multi-use path system

Rachel expressed discouragement about this project because of certain landowners denial of use of their property for this purpose. Due to such denials, the path would need to be routed, in part, along the shoulder/right of way of Route 100 and Vtrans is unlikely to allow that. Rachel will bring maps of the proposed route to the next meeting. Rachel will also contact Rita, who's connected to grants for such a project, to see if she can make progress with Vtrans.

Mike Eramo referred to existing trails on the west side of the river; but it was concluded that routing the path on the west side of the river and attempting to use those trails, to avoid the property(s) denying access, isn't feasible terrain-wise; nor would it serve the purposes of the multi-use path system as initially conceived. It was agreed that the path should stick to the valley floor.

Since the folks who own the house across from Maston Hill Rd. said that while they didn't want the path routed along the river (their back yard) they wouldn't object to it traversing their property's eastern edge, along Rte. 100. They also suggested that the highway bridge at their southern border, if slated for repair, might be reconstructed to accommodate the multi-use path with a pedestrian/bike lane. Rachel has yet to speak with the owners of Old Farm - another large stretch of the proposed route - but will attend to that soon.

Helipad Ordinance

The decision to table drafting this ordinance, but striving to include some relevant regulation in the proposed noise ordinance, was reiterated.

Adjournment - Rachel made a motion to adjourn at 7:20; Judy seconded. All in favor.

Submitted by,
Judy Wood - Secretary, Granville Planning Commission