

Draft 11/23/11

**Shaftsbury Planning Commission
Cole Hall at Buck Hill Road
Regular Meeting on November 22, 2011**

Members Present: Chris Williams (Chair), David Spurr (Vice Chair), Bill Pennebaker, Norm Gronning,

Others Present: Jay T. Palmer, Mitchell Race, Joanne M. Race, Kathy Geneslaw, Sue Balutis, Tom Huncharek, and Michael Folley

1. The meeting was called to order by Chris Williams at 7:01 PM.
2. The minutes for November 8, 2011 were approved without change by a vote of 3-0-1, with Chris Williams abstaining.
3. Historical District Bylaw. Norm Gronning led the discussion, starting with a review of some of the material he presented at the previous meeting. After further discussion, the PC reached a consensus that a committee of about seven members should be formed consisting of architects, builders and historical experts. This committee would advise parties planning on modifying or repairing buildings of historical importance about the various options that would be appropriate modifications to the outside of buildings. The committee would address questions concerning conversions, new uses for outbuildings, historical landscaping, and new buildings within the Shaftsbury Historic District. It would also provide input on any changes to the outsides of historic structures not in the Historic District.
4. Flood Hazard Bylaw. Chris Williams handed out the latest draft that he and David Spurr had prepared at the end of the PC meeting on November 8th. Ned Swanberg was sent a copy and has promised to have a response within the next week.
5. Commercial Composting Facilities: Bill Pennebaker led the discussion, starting with a draft he had sent out on November 10th. This draft built on discussions at the prior PC meeting on November 8th and placed the section dealing with commercial composting facilities in a new section 7.13. However, it referred back to the section on Transfer Stations (7.11) for most of the regulations. However, as Bill explained, he felt that there were enough differences between Composting Facilities and Transfer Stations that it made better sense in this new section to repeat the structure of section 7.11, subsection by subsection. Then, reference could be made to the corresponding subsections of 7.11 whenever the wording in 7.11 was appropriate, whereas new wording could be devised when 7.11 did not apply.

Sue Balutis raised a question about whether the Shaftsbury Fire Department would be able to handle a composting facility fire. The general consensus was that since the Fire Chief has to sign off on any new facility during the permitting process, that it would.

One question that was discussed at length was whether the Bylaw should specify a fixed setback for all Composting Facilities (as the present Bylaw specifies for Transfer Stations) or if the setback (and the acreage requirements) should follow a sliding size-dependent scale. Tentatively, we will see if a sliding size-dependent scale is workable.

The sliding scale for setbacks suggested by Kathy Geneslaw would be 400 feet for any facility defined as “small” (up to 2,000 cubic yards of food residuals) under the proposed new State regulations and 600 feet for “medium” facilities (up to 5,000 cubic yards per year). Then, noting that the state regulations limited small facilities to no more than 4 acres and medium facilities to no more than 10 acres of active compost management, she suggested a sliding setback scale of 100 feet per acre (but with a 400 foot minimum setback). Under this rule, a “large” facility would need a setback of at least 1000 feet.

Kathy also noted that Vermont State law in 10 VSA section 6605 j (6) limited composting facility siting, and suggested that the landscaping and screening section of 7.13 might be used to encourage suppression of bio-aerosols.

Chris Williams noted that the odor Bylaw that we devised might be used in section 7.13.7 (Performance Standards) where odor problems are addressed.

Chris will work on adapting the odor Bylaw to subsection 7.13.7 and Bill will work on a new draft of the rest of section 7.13.

6. Review proposed budget: The members felt that the budget as proposed was reasonable, with the only major increase being in the ZA salary line because of the increase in weekly hours. The salary line item increase has already been authorized by the Selectboard and the only other increase (small) is for purchase of some software that would allow the ZA to improved her system for keeping records. Therefore, the PC unanimously approved the proposed budget.
7. Other business: Bill noted that he attended the Economic Development Committee meeting held about a week earlier. He warned the PC that since the EDC had serious problems with the new sign ordinance, the PC would very likely have to further revise this ordinance.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Pennebaker