

**WOODSTOCK PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
REGULATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7TH, 2017
7:30 PM
WOODSTOCK TOWN HALL, ROOM A**

Attendance:

Commissioners: Joseph Adiletta, Syd Blodgett, Kenneth Ebbitt, Jeffrey Gordon, David Morse, Douglas Porter, Frederick Rich, and H. Dexter Young.

Staff: Delia Fey

Public: Dawn Adiletta

- I. The meeting was called to order by Chair Gordon at 7: 30 PM. Roll call was taken.

- II. Chair Gordon reported on the following:
 - a. Thank you to Commissioners and to staff for the work that is done.
 - b. Today is Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.
 - c. Welcome to new Commissioner, David Morse.

- III. The Subcommittee continues its review of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - a. The Subcommittee decided to forgo review of maps of approved subdivisions since earlier this year it already did a map review.
 - b. Chair Gordon presented a memo (dated 12/07/2017) in which he outlines a proposal for Subdivision Regulations design changes that builds upon a proposal prior presented by Doug Porter (01/05/2017) that has been reviewed by the Subcommittee and upon which conceptual decisions made. From the 12/07/2017 memo:

“Have two categories of subdivision applications based upon the # of lots proposed. This is akin to what other communities do regarding Minor Subdivisions and Major Subdivisions, something earlier this year we discussed and reviewed.

Minor Subdivision = 1-4 lots. The Subcommittee already voted to move forward a concept of 1-3 lot (“small”) applications having a minimum of 1.25 acres of buildable land per lot and not requiring open space set aside or fee-in-lieu payment. My proposal changes the 1-3 lot designation to 1-4 lot designation. Change the Subdivision Regulations wording so as to match this 1-4 lot category regarding not making mandatory a public hearing. Currently, 1-3 lot applications do not require a public hearing. 5+ lot applications would require public hearings (currently, 4+ lot applications require public hearings).

Major Subdivision = 5+ lots. The Subcommittee already voted to move forward a concept of “medium” (5-8 lots) and “large” (9+ lots) applications.

My proposal keeps it simple and combines these two categories into one category, taking the two design options already conceptually voted upon for "large" lot applications and applying the options to a major subdivision category to keep it simple and uniform. See below.

Have two options for major subdivision design ("standard" and "conservation"). The landowner/applicant would decide which option to apply for, exercising his or her choice. The Regulations can be designed so as to encourage people to consider a "conservation" approach, offering incentives/benefits in exchange for an increased open space set aside requirement. A "standard" approach would not offer such incentives/benefits. The Subcommittee already voted to move forward this concept and further voted to move forward some details of each option. My proposal keeps the concepts below as voted upon, just applies it to the major subdivision category.

Option #1 ("Standard"): 2.5-acre lot yield (density factor = 2.5) based upon the total parcel size. 1.25-acre minimum buildable land per lot. 20% open space requirement (this was the open space requirement prior for this type of subdivision design). Allow for a fee-in-lieu payment (to be determined by the landowner/applicant if to choose this versus an open space set aside). Allow non-buildable land (e.g., wetlands) to count toward a certain % of the open space set aside. For example, some communities say that if a total parcel has X% of non-buildable land, then up to X% of the non-buildable land can be in the open space set aside. No bonus incentives.

Option #2 ("Conservation"): 1.25-acre lot yield (density factor = 1.25) based upon the total parcel size. 1-acre minimum buildable land per lot. 40% open space requirement (this was the open space requirement prior for this type of subdivision design). No fee-in-lieu payment. Allow non-buildable land (e.g., wetlands) to count toward a certain % of the open space set aside. For example, some communities say that if a total parcel has X% of non-buildable land, then up to X% of the non-buildable land can be in the open space set aside. Consider if changes to setback and frontage requirements could be made to allow for "conservation" design. Some communities offer flexible changes within defined parameters based upon open space set aside, etc... Bonus incentives available up to a cap/maximum. For example, if >40% open space set aside."

Motion was made by D. Young, seconded by K. Ebbitt, to go with the Minor Subdivision concept proposed above. There was discussion. A secondary motion was made by K. Ebbitt, seconded by D. Young, to call the question. Secondary motion passed unanimously. The main motion passed unanimously.

Motion was made by D. Young, seconded by F. Rich, to go with the Major Subdivision concept proposed above. There was discussion. A secondary motion was made by D. Porter, seconded by K. Ebbitt, to call the question. Secondary motion passed unanimously. The main motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion about having in the Subdivision Regulations a date about when any new regulation changes would be effective so as not to unfairly, retroactively hurt landowners who have approved residential, subdivided lots made prior to the enactment of zoning.

There was discussion about ways to handle resubdivisions. Prior, the Subcommittee voted to go with a resubdivision process that would require resubdivisions to follow a process that would be used for large-lot subdivisions so as to try to prevent a land developer doing an end-run around the regulations and subdividing a parcel of land in phases using multiple, successive, small-lot proposals over time. Based upon the Subcommittee's vote to go with minor and major subdivision concepts (see above), a resubdivision would follow the process for a major subdivision proposal. D. Fey discussed different ways to handle resubdivisions. Subcommittee wants to have a simple, fair process. Further discussion to follow D. Fey providing more information.

F. Rich raised the idea of having more flexibility in the Subdivision Regulations about what open space set aside land can be used for than what is allowed in the current regulations, but still not allow building upon the open space. Subcommittee to look into this.

Subcommittee to look further into incentive bonuses.

Chair Gordon mentioned that additional work of the Subcommittee is to review distance allowed between driveway cut and the design or cul-de-sacs. Subcommittee asked Chair Gordon and D. Fey to talk with Highway Foreman J. Navarro and the Fire Chiefs about cul-de-sacs so that a proposal can be brought to the Subcommittee.

Chair Gordon reported that he is working with D. Fey on drafting a proposal for other changes to the Subdivision Regulations, based upon D. Fey's 03/05/2015, as well as incorporating proposed changes decided by the Subcommittee, all within one document.

- IV. Citizens' Comments: D. Adiletta provided a document to the Subcommittee containing information about PDR per town.
- V. Agenda for the 01/04/2017 Subcommittee meeting is for continued work on the Subdivision Regulations.

VI. Motion was made by F. Rich, seconded by J. Adlitta, to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting was adjourned at 9:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted.

Jeffrey A. Gordon, M.D.
Chair, PZC