

LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES - March 25, 1991

Present: A. Schweikert; T. Sullivan; J. Greene; L. Jason;
B. Bryant; B. Hall; M. Donaroma; J. Best.

Mr. Schweikert called the meeting to order at 5:22 p.m. A discussion of the possibility of changing the meeting times of the regular Commission meeting followed.

Mr. Clifford read a letter from Martin Tomassian regarding the possibility of using a portion of the Rogers building for boat assembly. A discussion of this matter followed. A discussion of potential impact of allowing this to happen followed.

A discussion of the history of the original DRI followed. A discussion of with whom the decision rested followed. It was noted that the decision was usually left to the Executive Director in matters such as this.

Mr. Clifford questioned whether the Committee wanted to deal with Cronig's or the Standards and Criteria. The Standards were chosen.

The DRI Standards and Criteria were discussed item by item.

The Committee began with 3.101 and 3.102. No changes were proposed.

Ms. Sibley suggested dealing with a change to the definition section. A classification of the meaning of "change of use" followed. A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Jason discussed explaining the term "floor area". A discussion of this matter followed.

Mr. Clifford discussed the need for defining what is meant by an increase in intensity of use. A discussion of this matter followed. Mr. Clifford suggested the following wording: "such as an increase in the number of units in a structure or a change from a less intense use to a more intense use such as a change from residential to commercial."

Mr. Clifford noted that the first major problem with the revision was 3.104. Historic Properties. A discussion of how the wording should read followed. All agreed that the local historic commissions should handle things in local historic areas and the MVC deal with everything else.

A discussion of the wording followed.

A discussion of which boards became the review boards and which town had building officials followed.

A discussion of whether the Commission should provide a list of historic buildings to towns followed. A discussion of structure followed. A discussion of why this item just appeared on the checklist followed.

A discussion of the archeological portion of this item followed.
A discussion of what defined archeological and by whom followed.
A discussion of changing the wording to include "with the concurrence of the MVC" followed.
A general discussion followed.

Mr. Clifford suggested that if the fee schedule was a problem then change the fee schedule and not the checklist.

The Committee discussed at length the usage of "with the concurrence of the MVC" followed.

A discussion of the wording of the long term goals and objectives of plans and programs followed. A discussion of types of or general categories of open space lands followed.
Some members wished to table this matter and a discussion of how this item may have been used in the past followed.
A discussion of dropping the item followed. A general discussion of the need for open space and for this item followed.

Mr. Clifford noted that the requested agricultural map had been displayed and he explained the categories shown. Mr. Jason felt that moving the item to "division of land" would be better. A discussion of the size followed. A discussion of the use of 10 acres as the cut-off followed.
A discussion of threshold points followed.
A further discussion of placing this item under the category of division of land followed.
A discussion of the reasons for protecting agricultural lands followed.
A discussion of the reason for this item followed.

Mr. Jason suggested that the criteria could indicate that any proposal that does not protect agricultural soils should be a DRI.

A discussion of this matter followed. All agreed to try this approach.

The Committee then decided to adjourn and finish the items at a later date.