



TOWN OF RANDOLPH, VERMONT

Zoning and Planning Office

zoning@randolphvt.org

802.728.5433 x13

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 2, 2022 at 6:30pm

Town Hall – 7 Summer Street

Members Present: Sonny Holt, Perry Armstrong, Paul Rea, Miles Hooper and Jeff Grout

Members Absent: Camden Walters

Staff: Joshua Jerome

Mr. Holt called the meeting to order at 6:34pm:

1. **Public Comment** – There was no public comment.
2. **Approval of Agenda** – Motion made by Perry Armstrong, Seconded by Miles Hooper – all voted to approve the agenda (5-0-0)
3. **Approval of Minutes** – Motion made by Perry Armstrong, Seconded by Paul Rea to approve the minutes of January 4, 2022. All voted in favor (5-0-0)
4. **New Business**
 - a. **Cannabis Control Commission:** Josh distributed materials for the rules proposed and Guidance for Municipalities documents created by the Cannabis Control Board. The guidance from the CCB states that cannabis businesses still need to adhere to municipalities zoning bylaws as they are still a business. The question remains then, should Randolph create a Cannabis Control Commission which is assumed to operate much like the liquor control board function of the selectboard. Mr. Holt asked whether the local option tax was still in play. Mr. Jerome said no, but that two bills H.701 and S.152 were in committee and S.152 had provisions in it for municipalities to capture some of the revenue which was supported by VLCT. Mr. Armstrong said that he wants the Selectboard to weigh in on what approach we should take. Mr. Rea suggested that we should take a wait and see approach. One suggestion was that if the Selectboard adopted a Cannabis Control Commission, a cannabis application would first apply for a zoning permit for the business, and then the ZA would process the permit and then submit it to the Cannabis Control Commission to receive the local license just like the Liquor Control Board does now. There was conversation about the tax and excise structure and it was clarified that all of it would be going to the state under the

proposed rules and none would be coming to the municipality. A discussion on how to adopt a local option tax and it was agreed that was nothing the Randolph community would want. Has VLCT or TRORC come out with guidance? No, they have not. The question is how are our uses structured now within our land use regulations going to interact with cannabis related businesses. The only piece of the value chain that does not have a defined use category is indoor and outdoor cultivation. What can we do to help the Selectboard for next week's meeting? Most agreed that they didn't want to have a system that would create additional work for municipal staff. Most agreed that they still didn't have enough information to make a determination at this time, but are leaning towards adopting the Cannabis Control Commission and will reflect that to the Selectboard. A motion was made by Miles Hooper, Seconded by Perry Armstrong to tell the Select they are leaning towards adoption of a CCC, all voted in favor (5-0-0).

- b. Lot Line Adjustment to Approved Subdivisions:** The ZA asked for clarity on when §506.2.d is used and when §506.B.1.d. should be used. How old do subdivisions need to be in order for the lot line adjustment to not go to the DRB? Some discussion over whether we need to change the bylaws or just provide clarifying language. Everyone agreed that it does not make sense to send a lot line adjustment to the DRB when a subdivision has happened over six months from the date of application of the lot line adjustment. A motion was made by Perry Armstrong, Seconded by Sonny Holt that the intention of lot line adjustment process to previously approved subdivisions is not applicable to subdivisions that are older than six months from the date of application, all voted in favor (5-0-0)
- c. Bylaw Change Process:** The ZA asked for clarity on the discussion and motions provided at the last meeting where it was discussed that a process to bundle up bylaw changes over a period of time and then adopt changes in the second half of the year, but at the end of the meeting there was a desire and motion to enact bylaw changes right away. There was some discussion on this but came to the conclusion that the best course of action would be to pursue bylaw changes as they come in as they have only averaged once a year anyway. A motion was made by Miles Hooper, seconded by Perry Armstrong to maintain the existing process of adopting bylaw changes as they are identified, all voted in favor (5-0-0)

5. Other Business: None

6. Adjournment: Perry Armstrong made the motion to adjourn at 7:53pm, Miles Hooper seconded and all voted in favor (5-0-0)

Respectfully submitted: Joshua Jerome

DRAFT