

CAPTURE, CLASSIFY, RESPOND: comments on the DRAFT 2010 THETFORD ZONING BYLAWS,
Version 47 November 16, 2010 (comments on Draft for Public Hearing, house]

Key: **G** = general (applies to document); **R** = resolution

a-s = accept, substantive; a-n = accept, non-substantive; d = defer; r = reject; d-f = defer for future consideration; a-m = accept with modification; q = question; c = comment; PC = comment made at Planning Commission meeting; PCH = at Hearing; W = in writing

Sift Key – AP = apropos xxx, Cl = request for clarification, TO = typo, easy wording change ORG = organization of reg, Add – request add'l (new) language or restriction, Ans= answer to a question

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	SIFT	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
							WE GOT TO HERE ON DEC 7		
							WE GOT TO HERE ON DEC 21		
79	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	6.04 (D)3			It is unclear whether these are requirements or not.	a	If the comment refers to the bullets following “Note the following state requirements and recommended practices”, the items are just advisory.
18	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	5.08 (A)	22	D	Can it also be parked on a non-residential lot? (no building)	a	Yes, and we deleted the word “residential” to clarify the intent.
19	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.04 (A)	25	D	Impact on wildlife habitat, corridor – based on State overlay? From 1978? (B)	a	There’s no reference to a state overlay or a 1978 study in the draft regulation. The wildlife habitat assessment would be prepared by the VT F&W Dept or by a private consultant.
31	11/30	PCH	Marilyn Welch Fava	3.07 (A)	11	D	Restriction to single use per lot is not in draft; has been removed, was an issue at hearings on recycling site; may fit some circumstances, but what may be added to “dump” is worrisome;	a	See response to issue #32. We understand the concern.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
32	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	3.07 (A)	11	D	Is mixed use overall a good thing for the community? could there be a grandfathering of a site, based on long-time, prior negotiations? would you consider restricting it to the villages, prohibiting it in rural residential? are apartments above a store restricted now, in a village?	a	We believe that allowing mixed use is the best way to meet many of the goals and objectives set out in the town plan. Our understanding is that a special provision in zoning regulations that is designed to apply to a single property would be considered “spot zoning”. That isn’t allowed. We believe that mixed use has value in all districts. (Note that home-based businesses are de facto mixed use.) We believe that an apartment above a store could be interpreted as not allowed under current zoning, which says “only one principal use shall be permitted on a lot”. With respect to grandfathering, see the response to #33.
33	11/30	PCH	Sandra Miller	4		D	would like to know more about grandfathering, how it applies to previous uses, when new uses come in	a	If the regulations become more restrictive, an existing use “may continue and may be expanded as a conditional use”. See non-conforming uses (Section 4.01). Where the regulations become more permissive, then they apply to any future applications.
80	12/7	W	Patricia Fisker	1.04 (E), 1.04 (F)		C	Why are the two paragraphs above listed as exemptions? They seem to imply that no zoning permit would be required or enforced by the Zoning Administrator. The Town of Thetford has a Wireless Telecommunication Facility Zoning Bylaw that addresses such activities, which are permitted as conditional uses. These exemptions seem to defeat the purpose of having the 2 year-old Wireless Bylaw. It should remain clear that wireless installations merit permits and public warning under the authority of the Development Review Board.	a	These are statutory exemptions in state law [24 V.S.A. § 4412(8)(A) and 30 V.S.A. § 248a]. Thetford's telecommunications bylaw has those exemptions, as well, in Section V. The draft zoning bylaw refers to the telecom bylaw in Tables 1.1, and 2.1. Reference to statute added for clarification.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
3	11/16	PC	Heinz Trebitz	general		C	Explain acronyms in a table (e.g., "PUD")	a-m	DRB is defined in 8.02. Since in most other cases an acronym is used within very close proximity to where it is spelled out in full at the first use, we think a table is unnecessary after these tweaks to the text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "VSWI", referenced only in 3.09(B) & (C), is now defined on first use; • "Planned Unit Development" has been substituted for "PUD", everywhere except for the section on Planned Unit Development regulation.
59	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	8.02	52	D	Forest Fragmentation: Although I agree with it and it is important information, the second sentence of this definition is not a definition, but an explanation of why we shouldn't fragment the forest. The definitions shouldn't be biased, I recommend moving this sentence to Sec 6.04(B). Also, should the heading on the definition be "fragmentation of forest resources" since these are the terms used in that section?	a-m	We deleted the second sentence from the definition.
29	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	1.05	2	D	Limitations on regulations; why is it there in Zoning, if it is the law? Also, why is it not verbatim? "public facilities or" seems to have been added. The difference is substantive, want to retain protection; prefer language in statute;	a-m	The edited text is now identical to statute, although formatted for our bylaw. We feel it is a useful for reference, we quote statute for convenience in several places.
10	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	2.04 (B)	8	C	table 2.1: why some uses not allowed vs. making conditional: "commercial service", could be restaurant ("restaurant")	a-n	This confusion caused by editorial error. Restaurant is a separate category. "Restaurant" has been removed from examples of "commercial service".
26	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	8		C	Definitions: add "PUD" definition.	a-n	Added definition, using language verbatim from 24 V.S.A. § 4303
43	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	6.04.D.3.e	27	C	(3 rd bullet from the bottom): suggest provide pointer to State guidelines on invasive species control	a-n	See the reliable reference in the edited text.
44	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	6.05.E.3	30	C	Guidance on invasives: gives link, may not be persistent, please provide alternate way to obtain.	a-n	The text has been edited to provide reliable contacts.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
58	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	8.01	52	C	Definitions of words/terms are difficult to understand: Choose one and use consistently throughout (I would choose DRB, since the Board could be confused with Select Board).	a-n	Attempted to use DRB consistently, otherwise, see "Board" which is defined in Art 8 as "Development Review Board"
8	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	table 1.1	4	C	table 1.1: Access for curb cut: should be signed by SB and Road Commissioner	a-n	Made this change.
9	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	table 1.1	4	C	table 1.1: should have something about curb cuts on State roads, as reference, even though not regulated by Town	a-n	Made this change.
49	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	2.01	5	D	"general purpose" of Historic Preservation overlay: The zoning districts all have "purposes", so why is the Historic Preservation a "general purpose". What is the difference	a-n	The word "general" has been deleted.
51	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	2.01	5	D	District Map: This term is capitalized, and therefore should be included in the definitions. Is it the same as the map that is attached to this bylaw? These maps are really difficult to read, in the future, I would hope that more attention is paid to the cartography and graphics in the maps. Although the relevant info is on the maps, they are extremely difficult to interpret. Maps convey important information; they should be well designed and easily readable. I hope that in the future, you consider hiring someone who can convey map information clearly.	a-n	The text refers to "District Map" but the map is labeled "Zoning Districts". We've changed the references in the text to "Zoning Districts map".
60	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	8.02	52	D	Might it make sense to reference Sec 1.04(Q) so you head off the questions about birdfeeders and whatnot?	a-n	Will add the reference.
7	11/16	PC	Charlie Goldensher	5.02 C (9)	17	T	typo (is no "9")	a-n	Fixed
65	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	1.04(H)			"substantial repairs" is not defined.	a-n	We agree and deleted the sentence that makes that reference.
68	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	3.04			This wording conflicts with itself. One can't have "requires" followed by "Alternatively."	a-n	Good catch. Fixed.
69	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	3.09			It is not clear from the wording of this section that the wetland itself is protected rather than just the buffer.	a-n	We made a minor edit to clarify.
76	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	5.10		C	Why 3 parking places for the dwelling unit?	a-n	Removed the clause on parking because covered under 3.03 Off Street Parking.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	SIFT	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
30	11/30	PCH	Marilyn Welch Fava	6.05 (E) 9	32	D	Noise: what is the definition of "temporary"? how does it apply to backup alarms, if intermittent, but going on/off all day; would it apply to their site?	a-n	The section has been edited to clarify that intermittent noise is not exempted.
81	12/10	W	Dean Whitlock	8.02	56	T	In the definition of Non-Conforming Use, the final clause references "structure" instead of "use". It appears to have been copied verbatim from the definition of Non-Conforming Structure. Then the copyist forgot to replace "structure" with "use" in the last clause.	a-n	Replaced "structure" with "use".
82	12/10	W	Dean Whitlock	5.11	23	C	<p>Point of confusion regarding duplexes and accessory dwelling units:</p> <p>5.11(C)1. the text says "The maximum number of dwelling units on a single lot without PUD approval is two, one principal dwelling unit and one accessory dwelling unit."</p> <p>24 VSA 4412(E) says, " No bylaw shall have the effect of excluding as a permitted use one accessory dwelling unit that is located within or appurtenant to an owner-occupied <i>single family dwelling</i>." (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>The statute is clear but 5.11 creates a possible confusion. In (A) it says, "The purpose for Accessory Dwelling Units is to allow an owner of a single family dwelling <i>unit</i> to create a subordinate dwelling unit..." (emphasis added).</p> <p>However, we allow a duplex to be built on a single lot. If it is possible for a duplex to be owned by two people - one for each single- family dwelling unit in the duplex - then this implies that each of these owners could put in an accessory dwelling unit. That would result in 4 dwelling units on the lot. Perhaps "unit" should be removed from 5.11 (A), so it is clear that this does not apply to a duplex.</p>	a-n	Deleted "unit" from purpose statement in 5.11(A).

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	SIFT	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
46	11/30	PCH	Scot Zens	6.05/6.06	27ff	D	Energy Committee: discussed with PC how to increase efficiency of building stock in Town; has been a concern of the Legislature as well. Legislator has passed Residential Building Energy Standard. Standards generally met or surpassed, not all do. We determined not feasible to make it requirement of building permit, however, when there is more extensive review, through Conditional Use (CU), considered to require submitting RBES paperwork. What did the PC think of that proposal? Was it decided against in principle?	a-s	Probably an oversight that certification not an automatic condition for CU, since it is for PUD. All new residential buildings are required by state law to meet RBES, except for owner-built. Compliance is by contractor-certification, to be filed w/ Town Clerk. Most new buildings likely meet RBES, however, most fail to file. We had discussed whether to make filing a condition for occupancy. Decided that failure to file is cloud on the Title, best to let private sector enforce this. If enforced by Town, would require Certificate of Occupancy (CO), which we don't have, would be extra work for ZA (costly). So, seems like insufficient grounds for CO. Added sentence to 6.06(F) to make filing of RBES certification an explicit condition where there is CU review for residential construction. ZA does inform applicants that filing is required.
71	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	4.04			This is pretty restrictive and unforgiving. What about uses that are by nature intermittent, such as some gravel pits? Or a business stuck in probate? Or an owner with a long illness? How about allowing resumption as a conditional use?	a-s	We added language to allow limited extensions, see revised draft.
15	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	4.04	15	D	Request adding, per 4.05 for non-conforming buildings, might be beyond owner's capacity to restore within 12 months. Should allow consideration for circumstances for non-conforming uses, as we allow for structures. (Add same language as in 4.05 (C).)	a-s	Exception for fire or other casualty added. (see response to comment 71)

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
17	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	5.04	19	D	Why have a requirement for fire extinguisher? Shouldn't we just follow the State, which is more strict?	a-s	This requirement was verbatim from current zoning, however, we believe it is best to remove it as these provisions are fully covered by the State.
12	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	3.01 (A)	10	C	Nothing higher than 3 ft allowed within 25 ft of centerline, but there are sections where the bank is higher, so would give Road Crew carte blanche to cut down stuff over 3 ft, but that is disallowed by tree ordinance.	c	(See response #50).
47	11/30	PCH	Sean Mullen	6.05/6.06	27ff	C	Subdivision also important; another opportunity to address same issues	c	We agree
53	11/30	PCH	Scot Zens	3.07 (A)	11	C	Encouraged by mixed use, allowing more people to work in Thetford; many kinds of small businesses that could be done at home, sustainably; see mixed use in RR as healthy, encourages independence, traditional; hopes that our Transfer Station would have special provisions	c	Transfer station issue more whether it is appropriate because of noise, rather than mixed use, which could be fine in another setting.
55	11/30	PCH	Bill Bridge	3.07 (A)	11	C	Mixed use is good; advocated for it, glad to see it.	c	thanks
41	11/30	PCH	Mike Pomeroy	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	Would take North Thetford off the map, would change status for accessory buildings, if 3 channel widths.	c	No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
62	12/6	W	Tara Bamford			C	Sign regulations no longer in zoning. Important to have a stand-alone sign ordinance in effect when new zoning bylaw is adopted.	c	We agree.
64	12/6	W	Tara Bamford			C	The document would be much more user friendly if the definitions section was at the beginning.	c	We have definitions at the end, consistent with the current ordinance.
66	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	1.04(O) & 3.10			Fence regulations unclear	c	The ZA had found the previous fence regulations unclear and we worked with him to clarify them, particularly where a fence or hedge is exempt and where a permit is required.
57	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	6.04	25	D	Vernal Pools: There seems to be no mention of these important natural features. [review]	d-f	That's correct. There is no State regulation for vernal pools to provide a precedent. We suggest this be considered during the development of the next Town Plan.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
61	12/6	W	Tara Bamford				Insufficient protection for agriculture in draft; shortcomings in farmworker housing and lack of encouragement of economies of scale through cooperative ventures [review all 3 items]	d-f	Specific suggestions that exceed the exemptions under State law and current zoning should be considered during the development of the next Town Plan and the next revision of zoning.
67	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	3.03			Opportunity to support local agriculture by relaxing the requirements for agricultural enterprises not necessarily covered by the state's accepted agricultural practices (AAP) regs. [see above]	d-f	See response #61
78	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	6.03(B)			Here is another opportunity to make the ordinance more farm friendly by exempting agricultural enterprises not covered under the state's AAP regs. [refers to exemptions from Site Plan Review; discuss broadening the exemptions]	d-f	We recommend discussing this concept during the drafting of the next town plan. We believe that fully addressing this will take considerable time and public participation.
16	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	5.01	17	D	Why have specific statements on land required for churches (we cover parking elsewhere)? Most of our churches would not conform. Why are they required to have this much land? [review the rationale; consider changing]	d-f	This regulation is identical to what's in the current ordinance. We don't have any guidance – either from a church or the town plan -- on why or how to change it.
50	11/30	W	Mark Schindler (question forwarded by Dean)	3.01		C	shrubs, w/in 25' of centerline; Does this mean we have to cut down the bushes we put in front of our house years ago to cut down on traffic noise?	q	Existing hedges don't need to be removed. New hedges within 25' must be approved by DRB as a conditional use.
4	11/16	PC	Charlie Goldensher	1.04 E	1	C	Exemptions: is a satellite dish considered an antenna?	q	It is exempted by State law; added citation of statute in this section; a dish is an antenna.
5	11/16	PC	Charlie Goldensher	1.04 E	1	C	How is the area calculated?	q	The statute doesn't say. As a practical matter this determination is left to the zoning administrator.
6	11/16	PC	Charlie Goldensher	1.04 P	2	C	Who interprets "a few days"? ZA?	q	the ZA
11	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	2.04 (B)	9	C	Table 2.2: why decreased minimum lot size?	q	Not changed; tables were always 80,000 sq ft

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
13	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	3.02	10	C	Structures over 35' are conditional use; many 2-story houses are that high. Why conditional use and how is it measured, if on slope? (Should be standard way to measure.)	q	This regulation is unchanged from current ordinance. We believe the rationale is fire protection, height of fire-fighting equipment.
14	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	3.13 (B)	14	C	Steepness: driveway grade, measured over what distance? At one point, for a 10' section, may be greater slope, but overall, less than 12%.	q	We intend for the methodology to be the same for zoning as for permits issued by the Select Board.
20	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.04 (B), (C)	25	C	Says development envelop shouldn't break up forest; under agricultural land, minimize disruption to ag land. So, where should development be?	q	General Standards in 6.04 don't apply to building permit on single house. The standards apply to subdivision, PUD, Site Plan Review, Conditional Use.
21	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.05/ 3.09 (B,C)	27	C	Site Plan Review (SPR). Refer to unmapped wetlands. (3.09 B, C) If there is a possible wetland, supposed to get SPR. Concern about ambiguity where unmapped. What if not investigated, permit issued, no objection, build garage, and turns out to be a wetland? Can be fined, required to take garage down. Is there a liability for the Town, if the Town issues the permit?	q	Wetland delineation done by State (or privately). If unmapped, ZA can call for delineation. If in front of DRB, DRB can request delineation. Our understanding is that once a permit is issued, building is legal, even if wetland discovered later. Also, Town is doing an inventory of potential wetlands.
22	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.05 (E) 8	31	C	Lighting: why here? (noise, etc.)	q	These lighting standards apply only to Site Plan Review. See table 2.1 and Sections 6.03(B) & (C)
23	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.04 (D)	26	C	wetland buffer, why 50'?	q	50' applies to a riparian area, as a setback, not a buffer
24	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	6.05 (E) 14, 15	33	C	Why is this here? Can it restrict what can be done?	q	These clauses describe what Site Plan Review should cover to ensure that development meets standards.
25	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	7.03 (B) 1	45	C	New requirement to include a plan drawn to scale. Is this an unreasonable requirement?	q	Professional assistance is not required. Intent is to show locations with reasonable accuracy. This clarification was requested by ZA.
27	11/16	PC	Mike Pomeroy	8	57	C	"Structure": need building permit for mailbox?	q	No. Look under exemptions, 1.04 (Q), p.2

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
28	11/30	PCH	Sean Mullen	1.04	2	C	Exemptions: accessory buildings, where are they, can they be in the setback?	q	The exemption does not apply to accessory buildings located within setbacks (in standards table, 1.02)
34	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	5.11	22	C	What is an accessory dwelling unit? how related to requirements for septic?	q	Additional unit, with restrictions on size, related to principle dwelling; Septic regulated by State, would be affected by # of bedrooms.
42	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	5.06,B.5	20	C	What defines a “public water supply system”? Must it be shared by a number of households?	q	Defined by statute; threshold set by state. There is a public water supply near old Post Mills landfill, others.
45	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	general		C	how is distance measured? in case of bank, for example? should this be clarified	q	Typically, as would be on map, along horizontal; up to Zoning Administrator
48	11/30	PCH	Kate Cone	1.04.F	2	C	Exemption for telecommunications: required by State: what does this mean? No requirement for conformance to local zoning?	q	State law changed a few years ago; intent to extend broadband through linked towers, would be exempt from local zoning under plan approved by VT Telecommunications Authority.
51	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	table 2.1	8	C	Surprised to see language on hotels/motels, is there a proposal? Hate to see the character of the Town dissipated incrementally	q	Is in current zoning ordinance; allowed, but requires Site Plan Review
52	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	table 2.1	7	C	How are summer camps covered?	q	In the category of Outdoor Recreation: Youth Camp
54	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	5.03	18	C	Is mixed use needed for home business?	q	No, they are a specific category but effectively all home-based businesses are mixed uses.
55	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	6.04	25	D	Setbacks for Lakes: What makes these lakes more special than others? If we agree on the purpose of the setback (6.04(D)1 – why doesn’t it apply to all the lakes in town?	q	Rather than try to define “lake” – as distinct from “pond”, we identified, by name, those large water bodies to which we intended the setback to apply.
52	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	3.13	14	D	Driveway steepness: 12% is a really really steep grade. Can an emergency vehicle or fuel truck safely navigate this grade after a winter storm? Can a vehicle safely stop when driving down a 12% grade when there are icy conditions? Think about how fragile the traffic is on Thetford Hill which is 8% (or is it 10%) after a winter dusting.	q	This is the existing standard for driveways and private roads that was adopted by the selectboard.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
63	12/6	W	Tara Bamford			C	Is the floodplain ordinance also a separate ordinance?	q	yes
72	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	4.05(A)		C	This wording – “lack any major structural element” is unclear. Is it abandoned if it lacks just one of these or all?	q	It only needs to lack one for it to be at risk of falling down.
74	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	5.03 (B)		C	What about retail sales that don’t involve customers coming on-site, such as an Ebay store?	q	Retail sales are allowed only for “goods and/or crafts created on the premises or retail sales that are incidental to the home business”.
56	11/30	PCH	Charlie Goldensher	6.1.e.5		C	Historic District: take out 5, leave 9; 5 is unclear, redundant	r	This language is from current ordinance; prefer to keep as is
35	11/30	PCH	Kate Cone	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	Referring to Town Plan (p.51) for purpose of natural resources, Riparian and Shoreline Setbacks: 3.c, why is there an exception for the Connecticut River? It is the major water body in town. What is the rationale? Kate: existence of Flood Plain regulation shouldn’t trump Town Plan.	r	At the meeting following the public hearing we re-considered the exemption and a proposal to have a 100’ setback. A majority of the planning commission did not agree to make changes in that section of the draft. For details of the discussion and vote, see the minutes of the meeting of 12/7/2010.
36	11/30	PCH	Bill Bridge	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	Lyme, Norwich, others, have setback, is a concern for fluvial erosion; major omission in this draft Flood plain: doesn’t cover bank erosion	r	100’ is recommendation from CT Joint Rivers Commission. No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
37	11/30	PCH	Terry Longo	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	One approach: determine a reasonable distance, take union of that and the flood zone	r	State recommends: 3 channel widths. No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
38	11/30	PCH	Amy McIlroy	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	Seems like we need something; can you just take out the exception?	r	No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
39	11/30	PCH	Kate Cone	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	Does anyone here not think we need something?	r	No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
40	11/30	PCH	Roy Fava	6.04 (D)3.c	26	D	greater of flood plain or buffer, should satisfy both positions	r	No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
54	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	6.04	25	D	CT River setback: The bylaw defines the purpose of these setbacks. These purposes are still important for the CT River and it should be afforded the same protection. I do understand that erosion on the CT is generally from undercutting due to the reservoir impact, but erosion control is just one of the many reasons that setbacks are important.	r	No change was made by the PC. See comment #35.
56	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	6.04 (D) 3.c	25	D	3 rd order streams: I would add a minimum of 75 feet since in some areas the stream could have a narrow restricted channel and thus the buffer would be less than 75 feet.	r	At the meeting following the public hearing we considered this change and did not reach agreement. For details of the discussion and vote, see the minutes of the meeting of 12/7/2010.
53	11/30	W	Heather Carlos	3.14	14	D	Drive-in/Drive Through: I suggest not allowing these at all. They don't fit with the character of Thetford. Additionally, the public health community has determined that these are detrimental to our health since cars idle (and the workers and others breath these fumes, not to mention the fuel that is wasted and the impact on the environment) and we should encourage walking.	r	When reviewed by the PC there was not a majority if favor of prohibition. This could be reviewed in preparation for the next Town Plan.
1	11/16	PC	Heinz Trebitz	2	9	O	Make it easier to find Table 2.2	r	It's in the Table of Contents. Don't know how to improve on that.
2	11/16	PC	Heinz Trebitz	2	9	O	Add reference to Table 2.2 in beginning of Article 2	r	There's a reference to Table 2.2 at the end of Section 2.04, which seems like the logical place to put it.
70	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	3.14		T	Section is out of place here. (Also typo – remove “and.”)	r	We think the section belongs here. We fixed the typo.
73	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	5.02			I have not worked in Vermont for a few years and am unfamiliar with the laws regarding excavations. In New Hampshire towns can also require bonding for damage to town roads. Again, 12 months may not be reasonable for abandonment. Some gravel pits only operate when a nearby road construction project creates a demand. Application materials should include access and sight distance.	r	We defer the question of bonding to the Selectboard. As for abandonment, the operator should go through a new CU approval process. We believe the DRB can request information required for CU review.

#	DATE	VENUE	PERSON /ORG	ART / SECT	PG.	S I F T	COMMENT	R	PC RESPONSE
75	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	5.08 (A)			This seems overly restrictive and inappropriate in a rural area with difficult terrain. Many of us have driveways that are only in the front dooryard.	r	See minutes of Dec. 21, 2010
77	12/6	W	Tara Bamford	5.11			conflicts with the allowance for two-family dwellings in Table 2.2. Section 5.11 should be deleted; it is overly restrictive and not supportive of the need for affordable housing or the needs of an aging population.	r	There is a misunderstanding in this comment about the distinction between 2-family dwellings and accessory dwelling units. Also a misunderstanding of state requirements regarding ADUs.