

Enfield Planning Board – Meeting Minutes
DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS/ZOOM PLATFORM
December 8, 2021

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard Representative), Jim Bonner (Alternate Member and Videographer), Phil Vermeer (via Zoom platform, joined at 7:43 pm)

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Erik Russell (Vice Chair)

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Taylor- Land Use and Community Development Administrator, Whitney Banker-Recording Secretary

GUESTS: Celie Aufiero (via Zoom platform), Sharon Beaufait (via Zoom platform)

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chair Fracht called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and took a “roll call” of members present for attendance.

Chair Fracht promoted Mr. Bonner to a voting member for this meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

III. SELECTBOARD REPORT:

The Selectboard met Monday, December 6.

There was an update on some donations, and there will be a public hearing for one that will go toward the Lakeside Park.

There are several activities happening now for Hometown Holidays, with the kickoff last Friday of the community tree lighting at Huse Park. There is an “Ugly Sweater” outdoor social this Friday, December 10. Community members can get discounts on takeout for mentioning the community social and wearing an ugly sweater to pick up the food.

Hopefully there is an update on an RFQ for invasive species. Mr. Wozmak is working through the four submissions to decide for a long-term project to control invasive species. The most prominent in town being Japanese knotweed/bamboo.

Hopefully soon there will be an update on a Town Manager – potentially at the next meeting.

The Selectboard had discussed masking due to the higher numbers of COVID. They discussed reiterating the masking resolution, not going out if sick, etc. Ms. Stewart shared that if anyone on the board themselves or within their circle is looking to get their booster, there are extended hours for Saturday, December 11 to do so.

IV. REVIEW MEETING MINUTES: November 10, 2021

Mr. Kiley MOVED to approve the November 10, 2021, Minutes presented in the December 8, 2021, agenda packet as presented.

Seconded by Ms. Stewart

Amendments: N/A

Roll Call Vote:

David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart (Selectboard representative), Jim Bonner **all voting Yea.**

None voted Nay.

None Abstained.

**** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (6-0).***

V. HEARINGS:

None.

VI. PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS:

A. Proposed Zoning Changes - 2022

Mr. Taylor shared that this was the updated version, with edits based on the video and minutes from the previous meeting. He noted that he had removed, as agreed upon at the last meeting, the CB first floor requirement (there will be a future conceptual for a downtown/Village apartment building seeking special exception for no first-floor business). Mr. Taylor also noted that he had removed any items with reference to his title, which he discovered had been corrected two years ago to Land Use Administrator (so did not need to be updated further).

Chair Fracht asked, when we present this to the public on the ballot will it be a single article, or separate articles? Mr. Taylor, Mr. Kiley, and Mr. Gotthardt all noted that they assumed it would be separate articles with like items grouped (such as all 401 sections). Chair Fracht agreed.

The warrant article breakdowns were discussed as:

A. Article 1/Land Use – 401.1 P., 401.2 P., 401.3 P., Land Use Definitions, Street Giving Access to the Lot, Street Frontage, 401.5 G., 401.5.2, 405.2

B. Article 2/Signs – 408 D to Sign Illumination, 408.2 D, 408.5 and 408.7 to Sign Permit Procedures and Enforcement, 408.8 to Maintenance and Obsolescence

Chair Fracht suggested an addition under the final sentence of Externally Illuminated Signs (on page 3 of the draft changes): "...and shall comply with all requirements of sight plan review regulations (section 5.7)".

Ms. Stewart stated, in reference to forms and the way they are traditionally used in town – there are not currently versions referenced. She suggested that referencing versions/revision dates would be a good idea to ensure correct forms. Mr. Taylor agreed and suggested potentially these dates could be included in the foot note of the forms going forward. Mr. Taylor also noted, as Ms. Stewart had suggested last meeting, a fillable form in Adobe would be a great idea too.

Mr. Taylor asked Ms. Stewart if she had spoken to Mr. Wozmak about fines, as outlined in the final section of Maintenance and Obsolescence. Ms. Stewart had not. She noted that in some cases, such as with sewer, the town can remove and issue a fine. This may be a good solution for signs that are in disrepair. The language was changed to "The property owner will be subject to fines and/or penalties for failure to comply with these regulations". Mr. Gotthardt stated that this would be important to add to the form that is signed by property owners. Mr. Taylor stated he would be sure to add this.

Continuing in the Maintenance and Obsolescence section, Chair Fracht asked, what about obsolescence? This does not appear to be referenced in the section. Ms. Jones stated an example of Rafael's Cucina of an obsolete business with a remaining sign. Mr. Gotthardt agreed that once a business is gone, the sign becomes obsolete. Chair Fracht asked, should we add any language regarding this? The board determined that this may be a case-by-case basis (as some signs may be difficult to remove, or could be reused by a future business, etc.).

Chair Fracht then asked, what does "immediately" mean? This is vague. Ms. Stewart suggested "within a month". The language was changed to "A sign of any type...shall be repaired or removed within 30 days upon order of the Land Use Administrator."

B. Draft Zoning Amendment 2022

Chair Fracht shared that he and Vice Chair Russell had put together this document, with several edits made by himself which Vice Chair Russell agreed with. Chair Fracht shared for the board that the purpose of these changes is so that developers are aware of what the zoning restrictions are for the Shedd Street lots.

Chair Fracht shared that the minimum lot size for the proposed Village Residential District is 1/8th acre. The decision was made to keep the minimum size at 1/8 acre, with the idea that parking regulations and setback regulations would help to limit what could be put on the lot. Site Plan review requirements for both a single principal building (with more than 5 dwelling units) and more than one principal building were included in the proposed amendment. Vice Chair

Russell had made a note in the draft that for multiple dwelling units, the board may also wish to specify a minimum number that would trigger a site plan review.

Ms. Jones stated that based on the proposed language, she had come up with a drawing for the number of dwelling units per acre. She did not feel that the requirements matched the possibility for a large apartment building, they are minimum requirements. Ms. Stewart stated that she felt it left the possibility there. Mr. Kiley stated that the other thing about this would be that the Selectboard can select what they want for the Shedd Street lots from the RFP. Ms. Jones stated that based on the language there could not be an apartment complex there? Mr. Kiley stated that the language is for minimums, and a developer could choose to use a larger lot. Chair Fracht stated that the language minimums are one method to make increased housing density possible in the Village where there is water and sewer. This seems to be desired in town. Ms. Stewart added that the RFP could also be something more than a simple housing unit – it could be elderly housing, or housing with a gym/daycare/etc. Mr. Kiley added the example Vice Chair Russell had used previously of Anne's Place, which is a well-constructed and nicely laid out complex with many housing units on a small lot, which fits in with the neighborhood. Ms. Jones stated that she did not see anything in the language about fitting in with the neighborhood. Chair Fracht stated that the board would have the ability for some say in the final look of the building. There was some discussion about other town businesses and differing between their planned buildings vs. what was built (Jake's and Family Dollar were referenced). Ms. Stewart noted that if a developer agrees with the Selectboard on an RFP, and attempts to build something entirely different, that there would likely be a contract and oversight by the Selectboard in place to prevent this.

C. Drawings – Shedd St. Lots and anywhere in the Village Residential District: Mr. Gotthardt

Mr. Gotthardt shared that he had put together several drawings to illustrate how the lots could be used, and what the proposed language would look like on paper.

The first, is for the Shedd. St. lots based on the currently proposed dimensions. It shows 10 individual lots can be created.

The second, using ¼ acre lots, shows that 6 lots could be created with some space left over.

The third, using 1/8 acre lots, shows that each would have a 30'x70' buildable area.

The fourth, using 1/8 acre lots, shows what future Village Residential developments might look like without the rail-trail access. These would have 30'x80' buildable area.

Mr. Gotthardt shared that the Zoning Amendment did not include any requirement for multi-family dwelling units. Mr. Kiley and Chair Fracht stated this is correct, as this would be part of

165 the RFP. Ms. Stewart stated that concerns for multi-family-required in the RFP could be
166 expressed to each Selectboard member individually. Chair Fracht stated that he felt the board
167 and community would need to put trust in the Selectboard's management of the sale and RFP
168 review. If there were concerns on the way it were to be handled, the public hearing process could
169 put the board on notice about the best way to handle the sale.

170
171 Ms. Jones asked Ms. Stewart what she, as a Selectboard member, envisions for the Shedd St.
172 properties? Ms. Stewart shared that she does not envision a single thing but can see multiple
173 ideas. What she wants to see is it developed into something that is an affordable way to stay in or
174 entry point to Enfield – this might be for aging citizens or young families. She mentioned
175 additional niches that make the space unique – potentially a snack bar or similar small business,
176 a daycare, a gym, sidewalk access, EV charging stations, high speed internet etc. Ms. Jones
177 stated that she liked the idea of having a concept that supports the ideal residence type. Mr.
178 Gotthardt stated that his concern lies with who buys the lots and what they envision. He asked
179 Ms. Stewart where the Selectboard is with the RFP? Ms. Stewart shared that she emailed Mr.
180 Wozmak and CC'd Mr. Taylor to get the planning board a copy of his draft for this. Mr.
181 Gotthardt asked what the timeline is? Ms. Stewart stated she did not have one, but her
182 understanding is that there is a current draft, and it seems reasonable for the board to review a
183 copy. Mr. Taylor stated that there is additionally the issue of cleaning up the lots properly for a
184 future developer (a hydraulic oil spill, asbestos, etc.). Chair Fracht stated he felt the question that
185 needs to be asked, which he assumes Mr. Wozmak is on top of, is federal or state funding
186 availability for the clean-up – and does it fall to the town? Ms. Stewart stated that having a part-
187 time town manager has been a challenge for prioritizing projects.

188
189 Chair Fracht asked for any further items under the proposed zoning changes? There were none.

190
191 Mr. Taylor shared that December 8, today, was the last day to accept petitions to amend the
192 zoning ordinance. None were received.

193
194 Mr. Taylor shared that Thursday, January 6, is the final date to post and publish notice for the
195 first hearing on proposed adoption and amendment of the zoning ordinance. Ms. Stewart asked
196 Mr. Taylor to send a draft to Mr. Wozmak to circulate to the Selectboard. She stated she will set
197 the expectation that Selectboard members read through the lengthy proposed changes.

198
199 Mr. Taylor will work up the narrative and send this along to the Selectboard.

200
201 Chair Fracht asked if any guests wish to make further comments. Ms. Beaufait stated, perhaps it
202 is her unfamiliarity with the process – she has depended on the Planning Board and Zoning
203 Amendments to guide what happens in town. She states she could see, if things are too open-
204 ended, she is concerned with the number of units allowed in the proposed Village Residential
205 plan. She stated that she feels the reality is that someone will come in and develop the units to

“the letter of the law”, be within their rights to do so, and it may cause hardships to abutters as it did in her own case with Jake’s. She stated she would hate to see “cookie cutter boxes” come to town where every square inch is utilized, the building is a big block, there are no patios/porches. This would add no quality to life in Enfield. She stated that she cautions the board going forward to be prudent about nice apartments, and nice buildings. Anne’s Place, previously mentioned, is a development that is very nice. She noted the concept of living in the Enfield community, and the importance of what people see in the community. Ms. Beaufait also asked, is parking allowed on the setback? Mr. Gotthardt, Mr. Kiley, Chair Fracht, and Mr. Taylor confirmed yes. A car can be parked within 20’ of the road, for example, but a shed could not be built within 20’ of the road. Ms. Stewart stated that this is seen a lot downtown with parking. Ms. Beaufait stated she feels this is part of the problem with downtown – the lack of parking and where people will park. She noted the issues of visitor parking, particularly for those who may need services such as visiting nurses, etc. Ms. Beaufait stated she supports the work of the Planning Board and thanked them for listening to her comments.

Mr. Vermeer stated he is on board with adding housing in town. He added that if EV charging stations are desired, the town should consider solar arrays and land to support them.

VII. CONCEPTUALS:

None.

VIII. UPDATE ON MASTER PLANNING TASK FORCE WORK

Co-Chair Fracht shared that the community-wide survey had been online for ~3 weeks. As of Monday, December 6 there had been ~310 responses (this does not include paper respondents). He anticipates that the survey will close with around 350 responses.

Co-Chair Fracht shared the MPTF will next meet Monday, December 13.

Co-Chair Fracht shared that the Visioning subcommittee came up with a succinct statement which he anticipates will be expanded. He will plan to share this at the next Planning Board meeting. The goal for each upcoming MPTF meeting is to come up with a draft for each chapter, which takes the work into early March. The task force will also put together focus groups to review and provide feedback early chapters, likely after the first of the year.

IX. NEXT MEETING: January 12, 2022

Mr. Kiley asked, for the scheduled. December 22, 2021, meeting - do we have anything for this upcoming meeting? Mr. Taylor stated there are no applications. The board decided not to meet on December 22.

247 **X. ADJOURNMENT:**

248

249 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Kiley to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m.*

250 *The MOTION was seconded by Mr. Bonner.*

251

252 **Roll Call Vote:**

253 David Fracht (Chair), Dan Kiley, Linda Jones, Kurt Gotthardt, Kate Plumley Stewart
254 (Selectboard representative), Jim Bonner, Phil Vermeer **all voting Yea.**

255 **None voted Nay.**

256 **None Abstained.**

257

258 ** The Vote on the MOTION was approved (7-0).*

259

260 Respectfully submitted,

261 Whitney Banker

262 Recording Secretary