



Town of Shelburne, Vermont

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

Thursday, October 10, 2024

7:00 P.M.

Meeting will be hybrid: in person and via Zoom, Meeting Room 1

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83206668391?pwd=MfkcNZlzl0aOPEwulUCadOUI5F1plz.1>

Meeting ID: 832 0666 8391

Passcode: 1vcVLV

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Call to order | 7:00 P.M. |
| 2. Approve agenda | 7:01 P.M. |
| 3. Approve meeting minutes of September 12, 2024 | 7:02 P.M. |
| 4. Disclosure related to potential conflicts of interest | 7:04 P.M. |
| 5. Public comments | 7:05 P.M. |
| 6. Capital budget discussion with Town Manager | 7:15 P.M. |
| 7. Discussion with Arrowwood regarding forest blocks | 7:45 P.M. |
| 8. Other business | 8:30 P.M. |
| 9. Adjourn | 8:45 P.M. |

Next Meeting: October 24

TOWN OF SHELBURNE

**TOWN OF SHELBURNE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
SEPTEMBER 12, 2024**

Hybrid meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Kendall, Chair; Tom Karlhuber; Marla Keene; Stephen Selin; Shawn Sweeney

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jeff Hodgson; Jean Sirois, Vice-Chair

STAFF PRESENT: Aaron DeNamur, Planning Director; Joe Cavanaugh, Assistant Town Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Maya Balassa (CCRPC), Tracey Beaudoin, James Farrington, Joyce George, Taylor Newton (CCRPC), Don Rendall, Brandy Saxton, David Webster

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes (08/29/24)
4. Disclosures/Potential Conflicts of Interest
5. Public Comments
6. Bylaw Draft 2 Workshop
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment

1. CALL TO ORDER

S. Kendall called the meeting to order at 7 PM.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by STEPHEN SELIN, seconded by TOM KARLHUBER, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed 5-0.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 29, 2024

Motion by SHAWN SWEENEY, seconded by MARLA KEENE, to approve the minutes of August 29, 2024 as amended. Motion passed 5-0.

-References to B. Francis were changed to R. Francis throughout.

-In the second paragraph on the second page, it was clarified that the first ten units of a multi-family development would require 200 square feet of common greenspace space, and the subsequent number of units would require 100 square feet.

4. DISCLOSURES/POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

J. Farrington, architect, said that he is representing the owners of the Countryside Motel. He said that they are requesting their property to be in the V2 district in the updated bylaws. This is because

they would like to expand the number of hotel units, or possibly turn the property into a multi-family district. Their current proposed zoning district would not allow them to do so. M. Keene said that the property is disconnected from other V2 properties, but said other solutions are likely possible. J. Cavanaugh, the new Assistant Town Planner, introduced himself to the PC. D. Rendall, of the Shelburne Natural Resources and Conservation Commission suggested that the two boards hold a joint meeting.

6. BYLAW DRAFT 2 WORKSHOP

B. Saxton discussed the worker housing section and said that it would not count towards density standards in a zoning district. It cannot be converted to another form of housing without getting a change of use. M. Keene discussed conflicts with enforcement. Answering a question from A. DeNamur, B. Saxton said that it is allowable to regulate the number of non-related adults living on a property.

Regarding the demolition of historic structures, B. Saxton said that this is a new section and something that is not in the current regulations. The standards would apply to any structure, in any district, of more than 100 years old with a square footage of 500 feet or more. The applicant must prove the economic hardship for removal of the building and show how they intended to develop the property. The first step in the process would be to determine if the building has significant value, which would be done by the Historic Preservation & Design Review Commission. If it is deemed significant, it would require conditional use. The determination of significance would be needed for the demolition of an addition as well.

D. Webster said that the Historic Preservation and Design Review Commission had comments which were submitted. He noted that fifty years is the current federal standard and said that there are buildings that are less than 100 years old that are considered significant. The PC chose to state that the DRB is “encouraged” to seek the advice of the Historic Preservation and Design Review Commission or a third party. S. Sweeney said that many people do not have the funds to maintain their historic homes and suggested that the economic hardship criteria be lessened. The PC decided to state that all homes built after 1945 or listed on the historic register are to be included. The PC discussed who should be responsible for determining if a building is structurally sound and how to make the economic hardship process simpler.

The PC discussed inclusionary zoning, with S. Kendell stating that Shelburne Forward Together has affordable housing as a top objective. B. Saxton said that inclusionary zoning can be a cost shift issue, with the remaining units costing more. It is not ideal but one of the few tools available for adding affordable housing. M. Keene said that she has professional experience implementing inclusionary zoning. She said that she believes that it would not be successful at this scale but said that additional incentives could be included to make it more attractive. The PC decided to implement inclusionary zoning at properties of fifty or more. T. Newton, of the CCRPC, said that there is a need for larger affordable rental units for families. The PC discussed the possibility of offering more of a credit for units that meet the needs of lower-income people than “missing middle” housing. The administrative burden of implementing this program was discussed. Ms. George, of the Housing Committee, said that land in Shelburne is very expensive, making affordable housing difficult. The PC expressed a desire to ensure that the mix of affordable units is like the mix of market rate units in a development. Senior housing will not be exempt from

these provisions. Affordable units will be required to be brought onto the market at the same rate as the other units.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. DeNamur said that the next meeting will be on October 10. This meeting will cover the Capital Improvements Plan and forest blocks in the serviced area of Shelburne.

8. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by STEPHEN SELIN, seconded by SHAWN SWEENEY, to adjourn the meeting.
Motion passed 5-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Darby Mayville

From: [Rod Francis](#)
To: [Aaron DeNamur](#)
Cc: [Brandy Saxton](#)
Subject: 6475, 6507 Shelburne Rd
Date: Saturday, September 14, 2024 8:41:39 PM

Aaron,

Please forward this email to the Planning Commission, and include this correspondence in the next meeting packet.

Under the adopted regulations 6475 Shelburne RD is zoned Commerce and Industry (south).

Under the proposed regulations 6475 Shelburne RD is Business and Industry.

The motel is permitted under the adopted regulations (see Section 1210) which grandfathered existing motel use as of March 17, 2009.

The proposed Business and Industry district does not allow for lodging as a use.

Following the passage of Act 181 municipalities cannot prevent the conversion of lodging (motel) to permanent affordable housing.

Commissioners have two options to consider:

1: Change the parcel(s) under consideration to Heritage and Tourism

Lodging is a permitted use in this district. The western side of Shelburne RD is zoned Heritage and Tourism under the proposed regulations.

2: Change the parcel(s) under consideration to Residential Neighborhood

Lodging is not permitted, but multi-unit residential is permitted under the proposed regulations. The current motel could continue as a use (pre-existing non-conforming) but the potential for redevelopment into residential is clearer. Lands to the west of Shelburne RD are zoned Residential Neighborhood under the proposed regulations.

The owners of 6475 (1.73 acres) also own 6507 Shelburne RD (0.79 acres), currently in residential use. By zoning both parcels as Heritage and Tourism or Residential Neighborhood modest expansion is provided for.

Rod