

Bristol Town Administrator

From: Kevin Hanson <khanson.pc@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2023 7:12 PM
To: Bristol Town Administrator
Cc: Adam Lougee; Kris Perlee
Subject: Re: Statement made to Planning Commission November 7 2023

Valerie,

It all makes sense and we will continue to work to provide you (and the SB) with a report by the 24th.

Kevin

On Sun, Nov 12, 2023 at 6:45 PM Bristol Town Administrator <townadmin@bristolvt.org> wrote:

Hi Kevin,

I appreciate the intent, but respectfully disagree. Unless the state statute has changed and I was not paying attention (totally possible), the PC’s official transmittal to the Selectboard with the PC report typically triggers the next level of review. It would be awkward for the Selectboard to publish a hearing or pre-hearing notice on documents it has not officially received or really had a chance to review yet. Related to the purpose of public hearings, it may also turn out that, after the Nov. 21 hearing, the PC does decide to tweak a thing or two before sending it on the SB, in which case the proposed version from October would be out of date. It does not seem to be a good use of a special Selectboard meeting and could open the process up to a challenge.

I propose we plan to go back to Dec. 11 for the first SB hearing and plan to receive the final version and PC report by Nov. 24 that I will be able to post online. If the Selectboard agrees tomorrow night, you will be able to share this update folks at your Nov. 21 meeting.

Thanks,

--Valerie

Valerie Capels, Town Administrator
Town of Bristol
1 South Street
P.O. Box 249
Bristol, VT 05443
P: (802) 453-2410 Ext. 1
F: (802) 453-5188
E: townadmin@bristolvt.org
W: www.bristolvt.org
FB: <https://www.facebook.com/bristolvt/>
IG: <https://www.instagram.com/townofbristolvt/>
Tw: @BristolTownAdm

Please note this email message, along with any response or reply, may be considered a public record subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Law (1 V.S.A. §§ 315-320).

From: Kevin Hanson <khanson.pc@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2023 6:03 PM
To: Bristol Town Administrator <townadmin@bristolvt.org>
Cc: Adam Lougee <alougee@acrpc.org>
Subject: Re: Statement made to Planning Commission November 7 2023

Valerie,

We are planning to have our second public hearing on the 21st and then consider public comment and (hopefully) adopt the proposed by-laws at that meeting. My intent is to leave that meeting with an adopted proposed regs to send to the SB. It is doable. And we could have the docs to the SB on the 22nd if ACRPC can support?

That way the Selectboard hearing on the 4th is effectively informal and the one on the 11th would be the (only 1 official meeting required) official hearing. We have talked amongst us kids (with Adam Lougee) and believe this all works if you want to keep the 4th and 11th dates.

From our 1st public hearing the following comments were raised that the PC needs to consider:

1. Historical lack of enforcement, hope for improvement.
2. Remove Business Yard from RA-5. Disruptive to “neighborhood”, “industrial” activity, not permitted in most districts, definition allows for large equipment.
3. Is a density increase for Rockydale workable (flood plain corridor, wildlife corridor, pedestrian access)?
4. Airbnb’s should be regulated.

For these items (my personal opinion only) is that 1 - is a soapbox statement that does not pertain to the regs or modifying the regs, 2 - has been already discussed based on public comment at a prior meeting during the work on the modifications (commenter is not satisfied with PC decision from prior comments) and unless someone changes their mind/vote will stand, 3 - was not really thought about during the work and seemed to stop and make people step back - but after looking at the area (me only), there are some are some inaccuracies in the statements made that seems like this will become (hopefully) a non-action, 4 - this is beyond the scope of the by-law modernization work and hopefully become a parking lot item of disappear.

Not sure that if the meetings are moved back to the 11th and 18th, it makes much of a difference for the PC.....

Hope this helps,
Kevin

On Sun, Nov 12, 2023 at 5:31 PM Bristol Town Administrator <townadmin@bristolvt.org> wrote:

Hi Kevin,

I planned to send the public hearing notice to the Addy Indy tomorrow (Monday) for the Selectboard’s December 4 public hearing on the proposed zoning revisions. That would have meant that when the hearing notice is published on Thursday, Nov. 16, the final proposed document(s) should be available to the public for review, along with the PC’s report and transmittal to the Selectboard.

I realize now that is not going to work. The PC has not concluded its public hearings (next one is Nov. 21) and that the Selectboard/we jumped the gun a bit in planning for a hearing on Dec. 4. If we go back to the

original plan of Dec. 11 and Dec. 18, I would need the PC's final document(s) and transmittal to the Selectboard by Nov. 23 (whoops. that's Thanksgiving). I don't know if the Addy Indy will be publishing on Wednesday or Friday of that week.

I will plan to add an agenda item to tomorrow night's SB meeting about the need to adjust the hearing schedule back to Dec. 11 and 18.

Let me know your thoughts.

Thanks,

--Valerie

Valerie Capels, Town Administrator
Town of Bristol
1 South Street
P.O. Box 249
Bristol, VT 05443
P: (802) 453-2410 Ext. 1
F: (802) 453-5188
E: townadmin@bristolvt.org
W: www.bristolvt.org
FB: <https://www.facebook.com/bristolvt/>
IG: <https://www.instagram.com/townofbristolvt/>
Tw: @BristolTownAdm

Please note this email message, along with any response or reply, may be considered a public record subject to disclosure under the Vermont Public Records Law (1 V.S.A. §§ 315-320).

From: Kevin Hanson <khanson.pc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2023 10:13 AM
To: Tom Fox <tomfox@gmavt.net>
Cc: Robert Rooker <robert.rooker@yahoo.com>; Kris Perlee <zoning@bristolvt.org>; Bristol Town Administrator <townadmin@bristolvt.org>
Subject: Re: Statement made to Planning Commission November 7 2023

Tom,

As a follow up to your email of Nov 8th, the responses are as follows:

"How did the current definition of "Business Yard" in the marked up UDR get there?"

As was stated at the 11/7 public hearing, the marked up definition in the proposed UDR was acted on and approved by the Planning Commission at one of the PC meetings (not sure but might be the 10/24 meeting).

"Can we remove "Business Yard" from RA5 in the UDR?"

This item was discussed and acted upon at a recent PC meeting after your public comments at a meeting. An action to remove a Business Yard from Village Mix and RA-5 failed to pass. Then a motion to remove a Business Yard from Village Mix was approved. Subsequently the additional language was approved to add to Business Yard.

The Planning Commission will be re-considering whether to allow a Business Yard in RA-5 as part of addressing public hearing comments.

Kevin Hanson
Chair, Bristol Planning Commission

On Wed, Nov 8, 2023 at 9:30 AM Tom Fox <tomfox@gmavt.net> wrote:

Attached is copy that I made my statement from last night.

I'd like to provide a better summary here than I provided last night.

Zoning Guidelines for Vermont Neighborhoods does not permit any Industrial uses in neighborhoods. "Business Yard" is an industrial use.

The definition of "Business Yard" as it exists in the marked up UDR today places no limits on the size of trucks and equipment that can operate from and drive through a neighborhood where the business yard is situated as long as they are driven on a paved road.

CON, HDR, VR, BPC, RA1, RA2 and RA5 are all grouped together in the UDR as primarily residential districts. Currently "Business Yard" is only permitted in RA5. It should not be permitted in a primarily residential neighborhood.

To the best of my knowledge there are no Business Yard permit holders in RA5. There are numerous other businesses holding permits in this district that would be injured by a Business Yard operating in their neighborhood.

If the intention of the Planning Commission is to promote housing in Bristol then allowing a "Business Yard" as currently defined in the marked up UDR to exist in a residential district is counterproductive.

These are questions that I would like answers to.

How did the current definition of "Business Yard" in the marked up UDR get there?

Can we remove "Business Yard" from RA5 in the UDR?

Thank you for your interest in this matter and your service on the Planning Commission.

Tom

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows