



# **TOWN OF RANDOLPH, VERMONT**

**Zoning and Planning Office**

joshua@randolphvt.org

802.728.5433 x19

**Public Hearing Minutes**

**Tuesday June 1, 2021**

Grant Camp/Hebard Hill Rd.

**Planning Commission Members Present:** Matt Chin, Miles Hooper, Sonny Holt, Perry Armstrong, Michael Tragner, Camden Walters, and Paul Rea.

**Municipal Staff:** Josh Jerome

**Public Members:** Brendan Malley, Jenny Carter

1. **Mr. Holt called the Public Hearing to order at 6:38pm.**

2. **Public Comment**

Ms. Carter stated, as the representative for Randolph Area Community Development Corp., they are supportive of all land use changes proposed, but they do not have any opinion on the proposed change to section 107. Mr. Rea asked if we had defined “development” in our regulations. Ms. Carter referenced 24 VSA 4302 as having a state definition for “land development.” It was noted that the intent of taking out “land” in section 107 was to make it clear that all development requires a zoning permit. Ms. Carter suggested keeping the word “land” in section 107 and reference the actual state statute, 24 VSA 4402. Mr. Chin made the comment that if we use the reference, the definition will update automatically if state statute changes. Mr. Tragner suggested we put back in “land” and reference “development as defined in these regulations.”

Mr. Rea asked about changes in section 314 as it relates to sidewalks and how it would impact a developer looking to do a subdivision. He asked hypothetically, would he have to pay to extend the sidewalk from Elm Street down Hargrace for his six-lot subdivision. Mr. Rea although asked why in 506.D.2.c.i can we not identify exactly what we want in terms of a minimum ROW in the Central Business and High-Density Districts. Ms. Carter explained that it still has a 50-foot minimum easement, but allows the DRB flexibility IF the applicant can show that all of the infrastructure i.e. lines, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping etc. can be accommodated with a smaller easement. Mr. Armstrong asked what an acceptable minimum easement distance would be and to clarify that the Fire Services Advisory Committee would weigh in on subdivision requests. Ms. Carter stated that the FSAC said they are only concerned with the ROW and how it affects the stabilization of the large truck. Mr. Jerome stated that there simply is not many lots in the

CB and RVHD districts that can be subdivided and accommodate new roads to access them. Mr. Rea said he's fine with the proposed change as is, but thought a minimum easement stated would help. Mr. Armstrong said he believes the DRB is capable in reviewing the easements as they come up in new subdivision applications.

No other questions, comments or discussion by participants.

A motion was made by Miles to close the public hearing, seconded by Camden and all voted in favor (7-0).

Respectfully submitted: Joshua Jerome