

- Call SNRCC meeting to order
  - In attendance: Don, Chandler, Gail, Jon, Sean, Bob (SNRCC); Rod & Brandy (PlaceSense); Aaron DeNamur; Steve Kendall, Shawn Sweeney, Jeff Hodgson
- Identify Minute Taker – Chandler
- Review & Approve Agenda Don moved, Jon seconded unanimous approval
- Review & Approve June Minutes Don moved, Gail seconded Sean abstains approved
- Public Comment – None
  
- Discussion with PlaceSense Consultants
  - Rod:
    - provides overview of company profile; municipal consulting firm with 20 years of experience
    - Funding of their work for the Planning Commission is from State grant for bylaw rewriting process... specifies that about 50% of the project will focus on eliminating barriers to housing creation as a priority
    - Comprehensive revision to Shelburne’s land use regulations for those living here now and in the future
    - Act 047 (Home Act) → many changes to permitted housing uses (e.g., min 5 dwelling units per acre in serviced area, duplexes allowed by right)
  - Brandy:
    - Audit has 3 parts; executive findings, identifying housing barriers, evaluating how this relates to the Town Plan
    - Resource protection is a reaction to ‘resource threat’ from the 80s, 90s
    - On average ~8 houses built per year in rural areas... often are already developed lots (only four subdivisions in last 20 years with 4+ lots)
    - Acknowledges Arrowwood report in response to Act 171... indicates that Act 171 doesn’t actually mandate regulatory approaches at the town level... wants SNRCC to identify “important” forest blocks and habitat connectors
    - What are the priorities? Resource types, location in town, are they adequately documented to facilitate regulatory review?
  - Rod:
    - Stormwater... updating regulations regarding stormwater especially important and identified in Town Plan
  - Brandy:
    - Environmental review... role of an “advisory committee” in role of regulatory process... Shelburne Historic & Preservation Committee utilizes 24 VSA 4433 to be an “advisory” committee
    - If SNRCC wanted to do this, would have to conform to statute; additional obligations required to advise and recommend action for all applications by certain deadlines.
    - What would fall under ‘Environmental Review’... Types of development? What areas of town? What important resources are mapped?
  - Rod:

- Early 2024, will have location-based meetings to get a feel of how various neighborhoods of the town feel
  - Spring 2024, topic-based meetings to cover more specific issues
  - PlaceSense has webpage dedicated to the bylaw rewrite process. Can see timeline updates, pose questions, etc... [www.placesense.com/shelburne](http://www.placesense.com/shelburne)
  - PC wants to see community engagement, regular participants in the process
- Hopes & Aspirations? Fears & Concerns?
- Don: Broadly we hope for higher level of regulatory protection of resources that are not today protected.
  - Gail: Can integrate Arrowood report that becomes critical to development review. We recognize the need for growth & change, but want to be thoughtful about where that occurs so that important resources are protected.
  - Jon: Supposed to follow through with and see the Town Plan through, which highlights preservation of the rural zones.
  - Sean: Town Plan has long focused on maintaining rural character. See that natural areas are protected, that development is focused on already developed areas. We have some very important natural resources—including the LaPlatte & Munroe Brook—in Shelburne’s sewer service area... need to think about how development occurs there.
  - Bob: Whether we become advisory committee, or remain as we are now, that we be able to have input early on in project designs before time & energy are expended.
  - Brandy: Advisory committee set up so that review would occur early on, before it would go before DRB.
  - Don: Process has improved over the years. Several years ago DRB somewhat formalized PUDs to add step where various departments would be able to get their input in final review but now notice is early... what is the process moving forward? needs better definition
  - Aaron & Rod: Advisory committee provides actual recommendations to applicants & DRB... as it stands now, SNRCC only provides ‘comments’. SNRCC would actually meet with applicants before they meet with DRB.
  - Brandy: Currently, SNRCC makes a choice of whether or not to look at applications... as an advisory committee, would be \*obligated to\* respond to all applicants.
  - Gail: Timing of when projects comes before committee would be important.
  - Aaron: SNRCC obligated to follow DRB’s schedule.
  - Steve: Likes idea of advisory committee. Predictable, no debate as far as what projects go before SNRCC. Makes it formal.
  - Jon: Committee wasn’t expecting this conversation. If the regulations meet what is envisioned in the Town Plan, then there isn’t necessarily a need for SNRCC to be an advisory committee.

- Don: Reiterates some of Jon's points, indicates we should continue discussing this as a committee.
  - Brandy: Is there anything in specific SNRCC wants to see in the regulations?
  - Don: Have SNRCC/Arrowwood map addressed somehow. P&Z have it as a tool.
  - Brandy: Is it a static map, or improved incrementally?
  - Don: Have been working on it for several years, working towards getting it approved by the Town and included.
  - Brandy: From a regulatory perspective, resource maps could be integrated. Have to be 'fixed, official thing', approved by formal process with public comment Process by which they would be changed in the future—same, public comment.
  - Gail: If we came up with updates over time, what would be the process?
  - Rod: Initiate work with PC, who would need to revise regulation language. That process in Vermont is relatively cumbersome.
  - Brandy: There are other ways to do it (e.g., reference maps in Town Plan) but can make Town Plan & bylaw regulations out of sync.
  - Don: If we would come up with a package to include in this bylaw update, could it be included?
  - Brandy: Would have opportunity... bylaw process taking ~12 months.
  - Sean: With forest habitat block & connections, now defined, unlikely to have more added. What is more of a concern is having the map included.
  - Rod: What are the fears? What type of development is the biggest threat?
  - Gail: One concern in the past—Town Plan speaks to open spaces, conserved lands. Need better, clear definitions of what these things are.
  - Don: How do we keep Shelburne with the characteristics it has? Buffers around LaPlatte & Munroe? Habitat connections to surrounding towns.
  - Sean: Concern of sprawl. New development should be clustered, close to already existing transportation corridors. Leaving natural areas untouched if possible, minimizing impact to them.
  - Gail: Can the town put the Open Space Plan & its precursor back on the website so that they are available to PlaceSense, others.
  - Jon: Do your meetings overlap with VCRD meetings? Rod: Would be happy to engage.
  - Don: Is the rural area considered a neighborhood? Brandy: Still figuring that out.
- Development Review for 7/19 DRB Meeting
    - Kotorman Subdivision
      - No additional comments.
    - Brandon Project
      - Want to expand development envelope to be able to build a barn.
      - Don indicates there are RTEs around area; forested as well.
      - Proposed location preserves views of property owners & neighbors.

- Comments: verify that the RTEs are, limit cutting of trees.
- Jon makes motion that SNRCC provide comments to Brandon to verify RTEs, tree cutting; and that no additional comments be made for Kotorman. Passes unanimous.
- SNRCC Shelburne Day Table
  - Gail & Chandler will discuss. Bring some Arrowwood maps? Light conversation with people about what kind of species they are seeing, what natural resources interest them.
- Vermont Council on Urban Development Update
  - Meeting July 27. Do outreach to get as many people, largest demographic to attend.
- ARPA Fund Allocations
  - Gail: ARPA committee has been dismissed, thanked for work. Seemed like there was not as much discussion regarding natural resources as there had been early on.
- Outreach to Landowners Between Town Forest? Other uses for ARPA \$ if approved?
  - Don: If we got additional \$50,000 ARPA allocation, would we want to consider outreach to the properties in between the town's two major forest blocks.
  - Sean: Properties are effectively landlocked, would be lower priority than other conservation projects.
  - Aaron: There is a property owner in the rural district interested in conserving their land. Select Board in communication with them. Will keep us updated.

Chandler motions to adjourn; seconded by Jon. All in favor (Bob left earlier).