

Cambridge Planning Commission Meeting Minutes- DRAFT until approved in subsequent PC meetings.

Start: 6:30pm. February 15, 2016 Attendees: Doug B, Werner B, Richard W, Michael M, Brian A., Jill R., April E.

Review Agenda: Additional Items: Review of proposed subdivision bylaw modifications for recently updated bylaws.

Review past mtg minutes: November 2014 mtg minutes reviewed and accepted with one minor change.

January mtg minutes reviewed and accepted. **Jill R** did have one question about what: *Incorporation of potential solar screening regulations into all appropriate "bylaws"* meant. This was described as meaning that if a screening bylaw was adopted it would need to be addressed in all relevant municipal bylaws/documents such as Town Plan, Zoning, etc....

Review Mail: no new mail

Review of proposed modifications/clarifications of updated subdivision bylaws. These items are included below the February mtg minutes.

Section 1.02 (B) #3- **Brain A** will contact Seth Jensen from LCPC to discuss whether or not there is a "loophole" regarding frontage requirements.

Section 2.05 certificate of completion process is deemed valid and appropriate for Cambridge, especially given we do not have zoning. Could be further clarified. **Michael M** will discuss with DRB for final decision to add language.

Sections 3.02 (B) and 3.02 (B) 2- The language is deemed sufficient as is- though could be further clarified if desired. **Michael M** will discuss with DRB for final decision to add language.

Section 3.02 (B) 4- Option to require ANR project review sheet is possible. **Michael M** will discuss with DRB.

Section 3.02 (J)- Certificate of completion requirement is covered in sections 302 (E) (2) and 302 (7)

Section 302 (J)- Add "driveways" Can be done- though Seth J recalls that this was intentionally not done.

Section 301 (D) 1- answered

DRB was interested in enabling Admin Officer approval of some small boundary adjustments that would avoid full DRB review. This is possible. **Michael M** will speak with DRB about this.

Richard W also brought up the following subdivision bylaw question not previously addressed:

3.01 (C)- Subdivision sketch plan shall include natural features. The concern is that if these sketch plans do not include natural features- including wetlands locations- then perhaps VT state review

could miss this important info. Does the DRB deny applications or reject submitted sketch plans missing all natural features info that is required by the bylaws?

There has been some confusion about the town highway ordinances and the state of VT orange book guidance document. The PCs current understanding is: The town highway ordinances do follow the orange book guidance, but do not simply refer to the orange book. **Richard W** will ask the town to upload the most recent town highway ordinances (2014) to the municipal website.

Additionally, **Michael M** will follow up with the DRB regarding Road Foreman review process with Admin Officer and road foreman checklist updates.

Richard W will follow up with DRB admin officer regarding WW557035 wastewater/potable water state permits that are supposed to be filed in our offices but do not appear to be there.

Subdivision update and review notes: **Seth Jensen LCPC comments in bold.**

- Section 1.02, (B), #3- Modify existing language to this: Creation of permanent easements and/or rights-of-way. Eliminates possible frontage requirement loophole.

Section 1.02 outlines general applicability of the regulations, not specific standards for approval. Standards are found in 4.01(A)(2), which states that new lots must meet frontage requirements. Does this address the DRB's concerns?

- Add language added that specifies the A.O. process if a final inspection is deemed unsatisfactory. How is unsatisfactory inspection recorded if not fixed by the subdivider? How do we show there is no certificate of completion on the title deed?

If the lot is sold or conveyed without a certificate of completion, this would be considered a violation enforceable under Section 2.05. While this could be further clarified, some of the enforcement/certification that the Town is trying to achieve is very difficult without zoning bylaws.

- Final Plat application requirements should include all requirements of the sketch review in addition to final plat requirements. Section 3.02, (B)

Based on my initial review, it appears that all sketch plan application requirements are included in final plat review. The language is not identical due to the fact that more details are needed for final review. Are there specific items that the DRB is concerned are not included?

- Add language that final Plat also includes meets and bounds information. Section 3.02, (B), 2

The DRB is empowered to request this information under 302(B)(2)(F) "Sufficient data acceptable to the DRB to determine readily the location, bearing, and length of every road line, easement/right-of-way, lot line, building envelope, boundary line and to reproduce these lines on the ground. I think this information would be needed for the surveyor to stamp the plans."

- Add language that Final Plat required documents include proof of Act 250 application/review. Section 3.02, (B), 4

This one is tricky. Most applicants start with the local review process, as there is no reason to go through Act250 if the local DRB denies a subdivision. One option is to require the applicant to submit an ANR project review sheet as part of the final application, which includes a jurisdictional opinion regarding whether or not Act250 approval is needed.

- Add language that clearly states, upon satisfactory final A.O./Road foreman inspection, the subdivider's engineer shall issue the cert of completion to be recorded by the A.O. Section 3.02, (J)

This seems to be addressed under 302(E)(2) and 302(7).

- Add "driveways" to: "Prior to any sale of any lot, all [driveways], shared driveways, private roads..." Section 3.02, (J)

This can definitely be done. However, I believe that it was an intentional policy decision not to require a certification of completion for single driveways due to the fact that some Board members and members of the public felt that this could be overly burdensome and/or was a private responsibility. The Town is fully within its rights to change this policy, but it would require a subdivision amendment.

- What is the process once a one year lapse/deadline for successful approval has been passed?

Does this refer to Section 301(D)(1)? Essentially, the sketch plan findings are no longer in effect, and the applicant loses some of the security gained from doing a sketch plan.

- DRB would like certain boundary line adjustments to be approvable by the A.O. and not require full review by the DRB. Suggested to use language similar to the State Wastewater regs regarding % of property affected as threshold for DRB full review.

Some subdivision regulations include specific provisions for boundary line adjustments, often improving AO approval for smaller subdivisions. LCPC could provide examples. Adding such provisions would definitely require an amendment of the subdivision regulations.

Meeting ended at 8:10pm.