

**AGENDA
TOWN OF SHELBURNE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4TH 2023
7:00 PM
IN-PERSON MEETING**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER (7:00)**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT (7:01, or upon completion of Item 1)**
Topics not otherwise included in agenda
- 3. DISCUSSION OF DRB INPUT ON BYLAW CHANGES (7:05, or upon completion of Item 2)**
- 4. OTHER BUSINESS (Upon completion of Item 3)**
 - January 18th DRB meeting. Regular DRB business.
- 5. ADJOURN (Upon completion of Item 4)**

Join Zoom Meeting:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81606261873?
pwd=RXUxQnhPODVNNFI2dVZGdVplMWdWQT09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81606261873?pwd=RXUxQnhPODVNNFI2dVZGdVplMWdWQT09)

Meeting ID: 816 0626 1873

Passcode: K4S1EY

Memo

To: Planning Commission

From: Aaron DeNamur, Planning Coordinator

Date: 12/09/2022

Re: Update on status of work reviewing the bylaws and town plan

As you know, the Planning staff have been busy reviewing the bylaw and town plan for inconsistencies and needed changes. After many discussions, we would like to recommend a framework for which to organize and view the ongoing labor of reviewing and updating the town's bylaws. Dividing the work into 2 categories, organization/structure of the bylaw (quality of life improvements?) and policy decisions/ inconsistencies between the bylaw and town plan.

The following are a list of some of the issues we recommend addressing in regards to the first category, organization/structure. These are in no particular order of importance and we have no doubt many more will be added to the list.

- Simplifying the regulations regarding signs, found in Article XIX.
- There is no severability clause within the bylaw and subdivision regulations.
- Consolidation of the zoning districts and overlays (there are too many).
- Consider the order that articles appear in, for example, should Article XX (Administration and Enforcement) be in the front or at least closer to it?

Next is a list of items we feel need to be addressed that belongs to the 2nd category, policy decisions/ inconsistencies. Again, these are in no particular order but the PC should begin to consider what changes you would like to see made. As in the first category, there will undoubtedly be more things added to this list as staff continues the review process.

- There is no explicit process in the bylaw or subdivision regulations for merging lots.
- Recommend Action #1 in the Growth Area 2 section of the town plan has not been implemented.
- The same is true for the 2nd Recommended Action in Growth Area 2.

Additionally, still in the 2nd category, Recommended Action #4 under Growth Area 1 (Village Center) in the town plan states that allowed residential densities in the Village should generally be higher than in other parts of town. However, Objective #5 of Growth Area 2 calls for the

majority of future residential growth taking place there. It is true that currently the Village Center (contains Growth Area 1) does have the highest allowed residential density. Looking at the Village Center, we wonder where any noticeable and impactful residential development could possibly occur there. Also, if the town plan explicitly states that most residential growth should be directed to Growth Area 2 does it not make sense that this area should at least have the same allowed density as Growth Area 1? Recommended Action #4 under Growth Area 2 provides a mandate to at least consider this and other possibilities.

None of these decisions need be made right now but we do feel it is important that the PC begin thinking about what course of action (if any) it would like to take on these issues and more as they are added to the lists. This will be a long process, but we need to be thorough and methodical if we want to achieve the best outcome.

We have also reached out to people in Vermont who regularly assist municipalities in this kind of work to get a really rough idea of possible cost, timeframe, and process in order to inform the PC as much as possible. They have provided an estimated outline and draft table of contents for regulations they're drafting for the Town of Dorset which has been included in the packet for your review.

Lastly, staff have begun the process of engaging with the DRB and a 'workshop' meeting with them has been scheduled for their January 4 meeting time. Our aim is to gather as much feedback and suggestions from them as we can to further inform the PC during this process. Also, staff met with the Housing Subcommittee and they have expressed great interest in presenting some specific recommendations to the PC regarding bylaw changes and housing. They suggested they could be ready to present their data and recommendations before the PC at the 2nd meeting in February. Staff will continue to communicate with them about this.