

Shaftsbury Planning Commission

Meeting held remotely via GoToMeeting platform August 25, 2020

The meeting came to order at 6:02 p.m. Present were commissioners Chris Williams (chair), Mike Cichanowski, Mike Foley, and Naomi Miller. Zoning administrator Shelly Stiles was also present, as were several citizens.

Mr. Foley moved to approve the August 11 minutes. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. Ms. Miller moved to amend the minutes to include (changes in parentheses) “Dorothy Buxbaum shared her contact information with the Commission in case they should wish to contact her in the future, *as previous minutes reported that Commission members had tried to contact her but she could not be found.*” Mr. Foley seconded the amended motion, which passed 4-0-0.

Without objection, the Commission moved to “other business” on the agenda to permit citizens attending to speak. Andrea Bacchi asked where the recordings of the Commission meetings could be found. Mr. Cichanowski will ask Tim Scoggins to put a link to the recordings on the town website. Dorothy Buxbaum asked that the emails between Jim Sullivan and Tim Scoggins and the maps illustrating the various RC proposals be placed on the website, as promised. She also asked that the Whitman proposal have a date placed on it. Mr. Cichanowski will ask Mr. Scoggins to put the maps and Sullivan emails on the website.

Ms. Stiles asked the Commission to consider drafting bylaw language to address the following:

- The bylaw is silent on the matter of pick your own operations and farm stands.
- The subdivision regulations devote only a sentence or two to boundary line adjustments. Language is needed specifying what the applications should contain and how they should be reviewed.
- There is nothing in the bylaw offering guidance in how to or whom should review permit amendments. Perhaps a de minimis clause could be added.

(The last two omissions have caused the Development Review Board some frustration recently.)

Ms. Miller read out loud the suggested draft language for a kennel bylaw, below:

“Section 8 Special Regulations

8.16. Dog Breeding and Boarding Facilities

8.16.1 Districts Allowed These facilities shall be permitted in all districts except Village Center (VC) and Forest and Recreation (FR) as a Conditional Use subject to review and approval by the DRB with the possibility that more conditions may be added.

8.16.2. Minimum Lot Size and Setback Five acres shall be the minimum lot size for this use. A setback of 100 feet shall be maintained from side and rear lot lines for all animal activities. Animal areas shall be securely fenced.

Definition:

A dog breeding or boarding facility is defined for the purposes of this by-law as any facility that houses, in exchange for a fee, more than 4 dogs at a time who are not licensed at the address of the facility.”

Mr. Foley expressed concern that a 100’ setback alone would not protect a neighbor whose residence, for example, were located near the property line. He wondered if the Commission shouldn’t leave that decision up to the Development Review Board. Ms. Miller suggested “a minimum setback of at least

100'' instead. Rather than vote on the revised language that night, Mr. Foley asked for time to think about it further, and plan on holding a vote at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned by acclamation at 6:34 p.m.

Notes by ZA Stiles.