

**Montpelier Planning Commission**  
**May 10, 2010**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

**Public Hearing: Montpelier Master Plan**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Jesse Moorman, Chair; David Borgendale, Vice Chair; Missa Aloisi, John Bloch and Tina Ruth.  
Staff: Gwen Hallsmith, Director of Planning and Community Development

**Call to Order:**

The Public Hearing on the Montpelier Master Plan by the Montpelier Planning Commission was called to order by Jesse Moorman, Chair, at 7:00 P.M.

**Slide Show Presentation by Gwen Hallsmith:**

Gwen Hallsmith said she thought it would be good to go over briefly the process they have used for enVision Montpelier because that explains some of the contents of the Master Plan. She wants to talk a little bit about how they did the Master Plan and what makes it different from master plans they have done in the past. The traditional paradigm for planning is really planning our way into the future and they tried to use a new paradigm for planning which involved a lot of learning on the part of the people in the city. Rather than to hire a lot of experts to come in and tell us what we should do with our master plan they relied largely on a large group of stakeholders in the city to try to help us discern the strategies, goals and targets we need.

Planning the way to the future tends to look a lot at the past and replicates what we have been doing in the past and projects it on the future. Traditional plans focus primarily on infrastructure issues and economic issues, and the goal is to predict and control change. Some master plans actually look a lot like architectural drawings because cities have hired architects to come in and draw what they want to see downtown. You won't find too much of that in the plan. The modality they used, which is really more of a learning modality, is more appropriate in times of rapid change like we are in right now between the economy and climate change and other resource challenges we are facing. We do need to adopt more of a learning ethic toward the way we do things. We can't always rely on the way we have done things in the past. Bringing that sensibility to the community involves having each of the stakeholder groups establish learning objectives for their tasks instead of relying on experts and bringing in experts to talk about it. One of her favorite examples of the learning that we have done since this process began, and why we need it, was the ice jam that we experienced the first year she was here on the job. It was a new kind of ice jam. The whole river froze instead of it being the kind we traditionally experience where the ice would lock in down below cemetery curve and flood the village. The new kind of ice jam the old solution didn't work. She can't tell them how many calls they received at City Hall telling us

just to dynamite it. They had to tell people if they dynamited this ice jam the entire downtown would go with it. That won't this time; it is too long and too broad. That same thing applies to the other issues we are going to be facing.

The difference between the two kinds of plans is that the learning plan is vision driven so it is not driven by experts but driven by the vision of the people in the community. They have taken this long term time frame to look at that vision and the goals. The idea was to look long term enough and try to imagine what it would be like in the city if our needs in that area were met. There aren't any quick fixes in this type of planning, and in fact they are trying to shift not only from planning to learning but also from problem solving to acid based development.

When you are looking at a vision driven plan by stakeholders you also need to imbue your whole process with a level of respect and humility. Sometimes the best ideas and the most interesting solutions come from people that might be marginalized otherwise. They are not the experts. They are not the leading citizens but people who may be new in town and you have to welcome everybody and listen carefully to what they are saying.

A sustainable community plan is different also than a traditional master plan. A sustainable community plan is a long term visionary action plan to guide environmental decisions, infrastructure choices, economic development, governance and social development in the community. The key consideration in this type of plan is how we meet our needs today without denying future generations the ability to meet their needs. That is one of the early definitions of what sustainability means.

What are our needs? In this plan we look at needs in five broad categories. The needs that we looked at in the natural environment include our need for water resources, for natural communities and biodiversity, open space and recreation, air and climate, waste management and land and soil. The needs in that section, which are the first section of the plan, are structured around our human needs for these elements of the natural environment. Without these we wouldn't survive as a species so that is why they are put first typically in the plan. Natural environment was first in the old master plan as well.

The built environment, another important element of our community that meets a lot of our needs, they looked at communications, energy, housing and building and transportation. In the economics section of the plan the needs they talked about needing to meet included sustainability, a sustainable economic life in the city, economic well being, entrepreneurial opportunities and opportunities for people to start businesses and achieve their dreams through the business formation process. How do we meet all of the human needs in the city through our economic activities? That is an important consideration. What are our social safety nets? How do we make sure that everybody in the city has adequate food and shelter?

We need work as human beings, and that is an important role that the economy plays, which is our need for productive and meaningful work. In Montpelier we are very interested in having a vibrant downtown so they looked at a lot of strategies for that. Food, interestingly enough, ended up in our economy section. It started in the natural environment section because food grows there; it migrated to built environment for awhile because there is a lot of infrastructure associated with food, but then the Economics and Livelihood Committee grabbed it because it was such an important economic issue. They were the ones who did the most work on it so food ended up in the economics section.

The other two elements of the plan are those of social and human development and governance. The needs we have in these areas include sense of community, safe neighborhoods, education, resilience, health and wellness, faith, wisdom and spirituality, aesthetic enjoyment and creative self expression which speaks a lot about our arts community, and our need for good families and relationships. This is not an element that is traditionally in a master plan so this area of the plan is new. There wouldn't be a lot in this category in the previous master plans you might have seen. Governance is like that. Typically, master plans don't look at governance issues, but because we have these needs for governance resources. We have a need to have a level of self determination in the world. You can tell our need for that any time you look at an oppressive government trying to deny people that right. We have a need for access for governmental resources. We have a need for equity. Again, this strikes people as an unusual need, but as soon as you are working in a job and somebody else who is a different race or sex or religion or earns a lot more money you do for the same job you feel that need right in the middle of your stomach. Conflict resolution is another need we have for the use of governance structures or the use of power in our community.

The process for the plan was first and foremost was to do a massive amount of community outreach. They really did want to bring all of the stakeholders into the dialogue. Typically, in a Master Plan this event, the public hearing, would be one of the first opportunities that anybody had to have input on the planning process. The Planning Commission would have hired an expert and brought them in to write the plan and have the hearing, and that would be your chance and that would be the last of it. This actually is one of many, many chances people in the community have had to have a voice in this process. There have been VISTA volunteers and AmeriCorps volunteers for all of the years of planning that have gone to community events all over the community, gone to schools and talked to students. There have been stakeholder meetings on a monthly basis for the first year and a half of the plan and the committee of the stakeholder group continued to meet in the third year of the plan. They were at the Farmer's Market. The first year the AmeriCorps volunteers organized something for Martin Luther King Day where they received input from all of the young children in town about what their dream was for the city. It was an "I Have a Dream for Montpelier" exercise in the schools. There was a time machine they organized for a couple of First Nights where people would come to the First Night celebration at City Hall and

have them go back 100 years in time or downstairs to go 100 years forward in time and tell us what they wanted in 100 years for the city.

They also tried to do a lot of publicity with articles in the paper. There was a celebrity session where they got celebrities to answer our visioning questions, including Rusty Dewees and some of the other notable folks around town. They did regular press releases and regular shows on ORCA to try to make everybody aware of what was going on.

The plan is a shift from the Master Planning processes that have been done traditionally, and one of the major components of this shift is that it is an asset based approach as opposed to a problem based approach. What we do to determine our assets is look at each of those needs we identified and any program, policy, or piece of infrastructure that meets those needs is considered a community asset. The first year of the plan the subcommittees of the stakeholder group would look comprehensively at those needs and try to identify all of the assets that met those needs in the community, and they would generate the goals we have in the plan from that asset inventory. They would consult with relevant groups. They would bring in the Community Justice Center if they were considering the assets we have in conflict resolution, or bring in a lot of the doctors, nurses and health providers in the community when they were considering health and wellness. The recreation meeting they had included a lot of the people who represent sport teams and the recreation programs in the city, and the people who use the recreational activities. Judy Walke did a wonderful job organizing those meetings.

Another element of looking at it this way is the current trends. They would look at current trends that are active in the community to try and figure out how they relate to the plan so the growing demand for local food, increased interest in energy independence, the interest we have had in strengthening our neighborhoods, and also the creative economy that has been growing in Montpelier. What does that mean for our economy, and what does that mean for our land use planning? Some of the zoning we have isn't particularly appropriate for that economic sector.

Just another couple of words about assets versus problems. Her experience working with both strategies for doing plans has showed her pretty conclusively that when you start with a problem and work on solving problems you end up throwing a lot of money at the problems and ignoring the work you need to do to strengthen your assets whereas when you start with your assets you already are starting with the things that are going well and mobilizing them more effectively so that a lot of the problems in those areas tend to be addressed. She isn't saying they are ignoring problems or putting on rose colored glasses, but if you address the problems through the assets that tends to be a more effective strategy. You start with strengths and build on a system momentum and envisioning positive outcomes. At the same you are hopefully avoiding unintended consequences. That is the other real positive thing about assets, that when you are trying to solve problems sometimes by solving the problem you create new ones you never anticipated.

What do we mean by unintended consequences? Her favorite story about is from the Clinton Administration where he was trying to stop Cubans from leaving Cuba on ships and going to Florida. If you were President Clinton and you could stop the Cubans from coming to Florida, what would you do? You have the resources of the President at your disposal. What would you do?

A participant said to open the borders to Cubans.

Ms. Hallsmith said or maybe lifts the embargo. After all, why are the Cubans trying to get off the island and come here? It is because they have harder economic times because there has been this embargo in place since the 1960's. Mind you, China and Russia are favored trading partners right now, but Cuba is still embargoed. But what he did instead was the problem solving approach. He deployed Coast Guard ships. Now, the Cubans saw the Coast Guard ships and thought they didn't have to get all the way to Florida but just to the ship. Immigration increased ten-fold; that is policy failure. That is what happens a lot of the time when you focus on solving problems instead of building on your assets.

By envisioning positive outcomes and structuring the plan around these positive goals you are also starting from a place of agreement and working to develop strategies that everybody can agree to and taking advantage of the systems in place that achieve these other goals for the community. We can't achieve these goals on our own as individuals. We only achieve them through our community actions, things like health and well being, empowerment and responsibility, economic security, efficient services and infrastructure, and ecological integrity. These are what we call the emerging properties of all of these systems that we are looking at in the Master Plan. When we use the asset based approach and use this approach to planning we can have more of a hope of achieving those goals.

The goals you see in the plan reflect what the city would look like if the needs that are identified in the plan are satisfied. That is what they were designed to do and the assets are the facilities and systems that meet the needs. Of course, the idea ultimately and what they are doing now is checking the strategies against each other to make sure they don't have strategies in conflict.

The other thing that is an important part of the plan is what they call the targets or objectives, and those are indicated in the plan's strategies section with the big numbers. Each of the targets in the plan are a step in the direction of the goals, something that can be measured, something that has a timeline attached to it, something that is achievable and specific instead of the broad nice sounding goals they hope to achieve in the 100 year timeframe. They are realistic when they are compared to other regions and practices, and again they have a time element to it. The traditional part of the Master Plan for the next five years you can see in all of the strategy sections because they usually begin with a statement by 2015. The elements that say by 2020 or by 2030 wouldn't be part of the traditional five-year master plan here in the city. They have also tried to develop indicators we can use to

determine how successful we are meeting the targets. They plan to report on these indicators annually so the city can measure our progress toward implementing the plan.

A big part of the plan is actually putting it into action, and this is not a plan that was ever intended to be entirely up to the City of Montpelier. You will see a lot of things that are listed in the plan that are not necessarily something that the city is going to do and it is very clear about that. There is a responsibility party column that identifies other people and other players that are going to take a role in implementing the plan. That is why they used a multi stakeholder approach because the city can't possibly do everything it takes to make this community a healthy sustainable community. We can take a leadership role in some things. We can provide initiative in some areas. We can do a lot to make it happen, but don't imagine that the city is 100 percent responsible for everything you think and that everything that you are reading necessarily has a tax impact. That's the flip side of that. That is just not the case. There could be many other things that even where they have identified the city as a key player that will be relying on the stakeholders and the broader community to implement.

What happens when you take this asset based approach and apply it to land use? This is another element of the plan that is reflected in the future land use maps they have developed and the recommendations they are making for changes to the zoning. If you take a problem based approach to planning you look at issues like sprawl, traffic congestion, incompatible uses next to each other, rapid unplanned growth, eroding our resource base in the loss of biodiversity. These are some of the planning issues that our zoning bylaws typically address. The problem solving approach goes after mastering these problems rather than looking at how we build our assets that address these problems.

What are the assets that address those same issues? In sprawl the asset that we actually have already here in Montpelier that is very relevant to the sprawl question are the compact neighborhoods that are walkable and have mixed uses in them that are not based on large lot starter castle zoning. For traffic congestion the pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities that we have and continue to develop are a really important way of addressing traffic congestion even as we see more growth in the city. The incompatible uses are addressed by having clear neighborhood goals and criteria so when a developer comes and wants to build in an area and expand our housing stock, which is an important overriding goal of this plan, they have a really clear idea of what kind of things would fit into that neighborhood because it is spelled out with a lot of clarity in the zoning. That is different than spelling out what we don't want with a lot of clarity. We are still are not going to open the door for all of the things we don't want, but we have to be a lot clearer in our zoning about what we want.

Unplanned rapid growth can be addressed to having clearly established growth priorities and criteria, and they are working on that as well and trying to identify the high priority areas in the city for growth and the lower priority areas for growth.

Loss of natural resource space can be addressed through clear resource protection standards and a revaluing of our natural environment and our natural resources. There is a lot of that described in the plan. Of course, biodiversity and loss of biodiversity can be addressed through bringing in this bio diverse conservation areas.

This is the future land use map she described, and there are two fundamental approaches they have been talking about with this in their recommendations for new zoning. One is neighborhood level development standards. There are a lot of names and words for this that aren't particularly understandable for the public. One is form based codes. They talked about smart codes a few years ago and that has some similarities to these standards, as well as performance zoning. Those are some of the code names for it, but what they are really getting at is neighborhood by neighborhood standards. They hope to really work with the neighborhoods in this process to help neighbors articulate what those standards ought to be for the neighborhoods they value and live in and treasure so much.

Over those neighborhood based standards are three larger districts. One is the Historic Design District which right now is proposed to be contiguous with our National Register District. The Design District currently is not contiguous with the National Register District so there are properties that are on the National Register and that are contributing properties to our district, which is one of the largest districts in the state, that don't address historic design issues. They would like to see that expanded. They would also like to see the way the historic design is handled changed, and those changes they are recommended are also articulated in the plan.

The other larger district is the Smart Growth District where we would encourage housing development primarily to try to increase our housing stock. What they have talked about doing in this district is extending minimum density standards instead of maximum density standards. A lot of cities use this technique, especially up in Canada, because they understand for example how many housing units it takes on a water and sewer line to keep those lines maintained over time so they require if you are extending services to different areas that there be the minimum density there to accept it and support it.

The third area is the Low Density Rural District. In this area they would encourage traditional rural livelihoods, farming, forestry and other types of agricultural production and rural living.

Mr. Moorman said it is great to see many people attend the Planning Commission meeting. This meeting is really about the public's comments, questions and input. He asked that people identify themselves when they speak. Let's take it section by section. The first section is Natural Environment. This is a lot of information to marshal let alone take in at one meeting.

City Council Member Nancy Sherman said on page 23 it says the Winooski River runs from northwest to southeast through the central area, and she thinks it runs from the northeast to the southwest.

Barry McPhee said he is speaking as the Coordinator of the Montpelier Energy Team. There are some energy usage and energy savings figures that the Montpelier Energy Team could provide to the plan and also figures that are tracking our fuel switch transition away from fossil fuel and towards biomass.

Ms. Hallsmith said there is some additional data on energy trends.

Mr. McPhee said they are talking about energy usage for up to 2008 and in other cases up to the current date and the savings up to 2008.

Mr. Moorman asked Mr. McPhee if that was information he wanted included in the plan.

Mr. McPhee replied yes. He understands there is a place in the plan that says energy plan, but it is hard to find it. It is interspersed in the text. One other comment about the energy usage numbers. He has been talking with Ann Watson who runs Service Learning at Montpelier High School. They have been looking for a project, or projects, that the service learners can dig into. He and Stan Brinkerhoff have begun gathering these numbers, but this may be a good opportunity to get better numbers. There is the possibility they could get a year long project for next school year and get a lot of good up to date energy related numbers. There are also pieces in the plan he doesn't see they might want to see. He would like to see an implementation plan gathered together for energy usage for the city. The closest he has seen is the set of goals at the end. There should be more of a plan for the real implementation of energy usage reduction, fuel switching, etc.

Ms. Hallsmith asked Mr. McPhee if he had seen the energy section in the Built Environment.

Mr. McPhee said some of them look to be taken from the vision statement and some from the enVision process. He has some numbers that could be added in the plan now and other more extensive numbers the Montpelier Energy Team could be adding to an early draft of the 2015 plan. There are other pieces they could develop, but it is too early to commit the Montpelier Energy Team to that now.

Ms. Hallsmith said if he wanted to take the display copy of the plan and look at pages 119 to 121 it would be helpful to know from the Montpelier Energy Team what they need to add there for strategies and implementation.

Mr. Moorman said that is specifically Goal B under infrastructure and development. In the Table of Contents it might be helpful to list out under the goals for each chapter what the title of each goal is.

Council Member Sarah Jarvis said in a few of the sections the strategies specifically identify the notion of working with private businesses to achieve the goals. She would encourage them to add that to more of the sections. That is obviously one of our assets and something we can do better at. Many of the strategies suggest incentives that the city offer incentives for people to develop in a certain way. She thinks that is all well and good but she was surprised how many times she saw that wording throughout the document which gave her a little fear being someone who works with the budget every year. There are all kinds of incentives but she assumed the reference was to tax incentives or financial incentives. That would, of course, either reduce the income coming in for the general fund or require an output of funds from the general fund which is already stretched pretty thin, especially if they are talking about the water or sewer fund if not the general fund. The open space map and the conservation lands map, figures 9 and 11, both seem to identify the Sabin's Pasture property. One does in terms of a planned park, and the other one does in terms of conservation lands designation. She would suggest that is misleading at this point in time unfortunately and perhaps we could say proposed park or add words to make it clear it is something we would like to do but unfortunately don't have any plans right now.

Mr. Moorman said at the last meeting they talked about this at length and he suggested they take that designation off.

Ms. Hallsmith said this is an interesting map because it is actually referenced in our zoning, which is why it was put back in here again. We need the map for our zoning. What this map does from a zoning standpoint is it identifies those areas where developers could achieve a density bonus for cluster development. In that respect that is the only meaning of those conservation lands in that map. If you cluster development here you can get a density bonus.

Mr. Borgendale said the map does reference the specific zoning section and regulations.

Council Member Jarvis said moving on to the goals in the water resources, the responsible party identified for a bunch of these strategies is the Department of Public Works and also the City Manager and City Council. It is really against the city's interest to promote conservation, unfortunately, from a financial perspective. Right now our water fund is in the hole. It is not to say that the city and the city staff should not be encouraging or educating about conservation, but she doesn't think the Department of Public Works is the appropriate party to rely on to achieve conservation. They could be a team member. The city could certainly work with others, but we would need a kick or push from someone else.

Mr. Moorman asked her to help him understand the financial disincentive to conserve. Is it because we are based on flow through?

Council Member Jarvis replied yes, if people are conserving they are paying less and we have the same costs regardless for use at this time.

Mr. Bloch said there are fixed costs and the conservation efforts which were seen in play are diminishing the usage so what you generate through use does fall short of what your fixed costs are.

Mr. Moorman said they shouldn't have the city designated as the responsible party here.

Council Member Jarvis said she does feel it is appropriate for the city to be a partner in these efforts. Conservation is obviously on a larger scale something that everyone should be working towards. But if you rely on someone against whose self interests it is to achieve a goal it is not likely the goal will be met.

Ms. Hallsmith said there is a difference between total use and promoting additional users on the system and not having waste. Conservation is really about not wasting water unnecessarily, and if we were better at conservation arguably we would have more water to entice new users to be on the system that would be paying bills for that water as well. She thinks there is even something in our permit with the state where if the city gets better at not having leaking pipes so we waste less of the water that is coming down from the pond through pipe leakage, etc. we could get permitted for higher levels of usage. It helps to decouple legitimate paying water customers from people that are wasting water and cutting out the waste while still maintaining the revenue generated by the sale of water.

Mr. Bloch said that is tied to our inability because of the economic conditions we find ourselves not to generate new housing even though we have a goal of 40 units a year. If you were meeting that goal you would see the usage going up. You would still want to conserve but your usage would go up because there would be more people connected and paying fees for water.

Mr. Moorman asked if there was any different approach for getting paid for water service.

City Council Member Jarvis said it is through fees. As the city has raised rates they have seen a decrease in use, which has hurt the bottom line. There is excess capacity and the city would love to sell water.

Ms. Hallsmith said there is already a declining block rate structure which is appropriate for conservation.

Mr. Moorman said he is looking at Goal A – water resources, target 2. He has seen DPW on other stuff as well.

City Council Member Jarvis said under water resources where they are talking about floodplain management, there is nothing in the section which mentions the fact that the city is taking on a major project with the Army Corps of Engineers to deal with flooding of the river. She can't impose that on stakeholders of that being an important goal, but it is

something the city is going in and has spent tens of thousands of dollars and will probably spend millions of dollars on in the near future.

Mr. Moorman asked her to tell him a little about the project.

City Council Member Jarvis said they are in the midst of a \$300,000 three-year study with the Army Corps of Engineers, the goal of which is to try to figure out some kind of structure they can put into the river that will prevent future flooding. The city has expended a lot of funds in cooperation with the state and federal governments to engage in this multi year study, the goal of which is to come up with a plan and the plan will likely be a very expensive project to help us mitigate and prevent flooding in the downtown in the future.

Mr. Bloch asked if Council Member Jarvis could share with them how that might impact on our newest directive we have received from FEMA which is to declare what was formerly known as the Carr Lot as a floodway. Are we going to have a flood way once we put the multi million dollar obstacle in the river?

Council Member Jarvis said even if that is the case it is something that won't be implemented for another few years.

Ms. Hallsmith replied there are a couple of different kinds of floods they are talking about as well. The kind of floods they are talking about with the project are ice jam floods. They are structures that would help ameliorate ice jams. Ice jam floods are different than the kinds of floods that we get that floodway designation for. That is the flood coming down the river because of high flows, not water that is actually sometimes backing up the river because of ice jams. They have different flow dynamics and have different structures so she doubts very much it would affect that map.

Mr. Bloch said Montpelier is basically a city built around a river and a half.

Council Member Jarvis said in Goal B, land and soil, strategy 1(b) is about securing funding and resources to complete the cleanup of Brownfield sites. She would suggest that the Parks Department is not the appropriate department to clean this up.

Mr. Moorman said the Planning Commission is still discussing Infrastructure and Built Environment.

Bill Merrylees representing the Montpelier Bikes Group, which is a group that came about through the enVision process, and they received a Mazer grant to do a community survey of cyclists and look at some best practices in other cities. They are really pleased with the items that are included in the plan. On pages 131-135 they would like to ask for a couple of additions. The complete streets ordinance that is mentioned in here is really key. The complete streets policy is something that has been growing around the country where

planners and governments state that when infrastructure for transportation is planned, designed, constructed and maintained these efforts will take place accounting for the needs of all users and not just motor vehicles but including cyclists, pedestrians and the disabled. That is in there twice. It is in under the goal of increasing the number of people traveling by foot and by bicycle. It is in there under the city will maintain safe roads and pathways. They would like to amend that to add under goal 1 to create a complete streets committee to take this vision into a little bit of implementation. The committee should be composed of the Director of Public Works, Director of Planning and Community Development, Chief of Police, a City Council Member and a member of the city's Safe Routes to School Committee, the Montpelier Bikes Committee and a general member of the public. This committee would solicit input and help Public Works and the city develop a comprehensive bicycle plan that would include all of the great stuff that is mentioned in the plan around paths and parking facilities but also shared road facilities and bike lanes. They would also propose that that committee be represented in the budget allocation process and serve on the capital improvement budget committee. They want to be sure a diverse amount of voices are heard from in that process. A third proposal would be something that is happening informally but they would like to see it in the plan. The City Council and the Public Works Department should pursue every funding source available to improve bicycle infrastructure and facilities in the city. The city often goes after transportation enhancements grants and they are usually for sidewalks. Sidewalks are very important but so are bicycle facilities. Last year there were 50 or more people in this room talking about bike lanes on River Street and going down Route 302. City Council were nodding heads saying yes we should get an enhancements grant for bike facilities but it just hasn't happened. This group would like to see it in this plan to help guide City Council.

Carl Etnier, a member of the Montpelier Bikes Committee, appeared to say they had been having a conversation over the last week, including Becca Wolfe. She would like to incorporate a bicycle parking policy statement or at least an endorsement of the idea that the city adopt a bicycle parking ordinance, and to recommend that the city use standard design manuals for the design of bicycle facilities. She points to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the Ashtow Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. She says that the Ashtow Guide which dates from 1999 that she is impressed with what it does. Finally, she says they should physically embrace the idea of uphill bike lanes and downhill shared lane markings. For example, when you go up Berlin Street to the hospital there should be a bike lane on the right going up and no particular bike lane coming down, and when you are coming down you are going as fast as the rest of the traffic. That should be coordinated and designed. This is a concept that would work on quite a few steep streets and the Ashtow Guide endorses that.

Harris Webster said he walked to the meeting tonight and is representing pedestrians. He took a leadership in forming the Sidewalk Stewards which is a group of about 20 people who have monitored the safety of sidewalks. He is a member of the Unitarian Vermont Interfaith Action and safety on sidewalks is one of their issues. He was also the founder of

the Montpelier Streetwalkers. On page 79 he said he wanted to complement the Planning Commission for these phrases: “In the last 50 years transportation engineering for street design is focused on the needs of automobiles to the detriment of other modes of transportation, most notably the pedestrian.” A-men. “In the walking core of Montpelier precedent should be given to pedestrians in considering improvements.” He has a question about the walking core. He walked about a mile and a half here tonight. Is that within the walking core? He thinks pedestrian could be defined a little bit and possibly expanded.

Mr. Moorman said that was his question at the last meeting.

Ms. Hallsmith said they added it on to a map and right now the map includes the designated downtown primarily, but it doesn't include adjacent areas. If he has areas he would suggest to be added they would like to hear about them.

Mr. Webster said he might go with the arteries or consider expansion. Eventually he thinks there needs to be a supplemental to include some complexity. In the third paragraph you specifically focus on schools, and that is very useful. In their committee they find that several other groups might be mentioned. Seniors is a group that walks proportionately more than non-seniors and considering sidewalks around senior locations where seniors reside. This is an equity issue. If you improve sidewalks technically you are going to make Montpelier less unequal. He would include sidewalks around affordable housing units and of course where the disabled reside. As you look at specific groups that need pedestrian or sidewalk concerns other groups besides students should be mentioned. On page 81 there is one phrase he objects to. “Montpelier's current capital improvement plan allocates \$6.1 million in pedestrian, multi-purpose paths and bridgework.” Those three things are lumped together, and bridge work is over \$5 million. He would point out that in years, 2011, 2013, 2014 and 2015 there is nothing set aside for pedestrian reconstruction. When it says the city is committed to improving its non-motorized transportation network he hopes it is real as well as in words.

Mr. Webster said they certainly support the complete street policy. From their research maintenance is especially important, especially for safety and for older people between 45 and 65 there are some studies that indicate safety on sidewalks is an important issue as well as maintenance. The only other thing he would like to note is that when it said 82 percent of Montpelier residents report that ease of walking in Montpelier is good or excellent – and Montpelier does a good job. Montpelier's sidewalks are often much better than other sidewalks. He is just curious of the 82 percent reported do a lot of walking. There is a contrast of 44 percent think that the maintenance is good. He would say it is fair as he has walked a lot of the streets, and the other 25 sidewalk stewards have noted. He thinks maintenance is extremely important in the plan, even perhaps more important than extension. All of this leads him to advocate for an additional supplementary plan that focuses on pedestrians and more thinking about seniors and the disabled. Overall, the plan really goes in the right direction.

Mr. Moorman said in terms of developing pedestrian facilities he asked Mr. Webster if he agreed it would be more important to focus on the arteries coming in and out of town and making sure they are safe pedestrian arteries as well as automobile arteries. Should we focus our efforts on another area in particular? He tends to think of pedestrian facilities as an alternative means to get to and from work, or to and from downtown to shop, much like people use a car otherwise.

Mr. Webster said he thinks pedestrians are important. He got down to a major Main Street area and a lot of streets don't have sidewalks and he feels safe, but when he gets to an artery he wants a sidewalk. He thinks it is an equity issue.

Council Member Tom Golonka said he wanted to thank the Planning Commission for putting this plan together. One thing he notices that is missing is the discussion on regionalization. He currently sits on three standing committees of regionalization for the schools with Union 32, water with Berlin and Montpelier and the shared services committee for Barre, Barre Town, Montpelier and Berlin. There is no mention of that in any of the discussions of the different departments within those four areas, and he thinks that is very important since the Council has listed that as one of their goals and objectives over the past couple of years. Their discussion on the fiber optic networks has changed. He doesn't think it is correct in this document in how it is listed. He notices they listed the School Board as the responsible party for a lot of different things throughout the document. For him on the Council he would really like input from the School Board in regards to what they are asking the Council to approve for a master plan for them before he would approve that. He would ask the Planning Commission to get the School Board's opinion on those responsibilities. Under the Community Justice Center he believes they have an overly aggressive goal of 100 percent of misdemeanors being referred to the Community Justice Center. He thinks that is unrealistic. That implies that would become in essence its own department so unless they were to merge it into the Police Department it would be very difficult to manage the creation of a whole new department in city government. He agrees with Sarah Jarvis in regards to the maps. He thinks it is a little bit premature and he would rather see planned parks or potential conserved lands than actual parks.

Mr. Borgendale said when Council Member was talking about regionalization, have they looked at the goals under governance, specifically Goal A(5)? That is on page 178. It is Goal 4 which states that by 2015 the City of Montpelier has cooperative support of a mutually beneficial working relationships with other governing bodies of the region.

Council Member Golonka said when they are talking more about the police, ambulance and emergency services from the earlier discussions that really doesn't really talk about potential collaboration with adjoining municipalities.

Mr. Borgendale said in his view he is saying that isn't sufficiently addressing that effectively for the city.

Council Member Golonka replied he didn't think so.

Ms. Hallsmith said what she took from Tom's comments is that we need to have more of a description of what is currently under way, which we don't have much of.

Mayor Hooper told the Planning Commission thanks for the work that has gone into this. It is a pretty extraordinary effort that an awful lot of folks in Montpelier have engaged in and she thinks they have gotten kind of casual about the sort of citizen participation we have in these sort of processes, and in fact we are on the verge of a pretty extraordinary change we are making about how we think about our community. In the Built Environment section is where her pieces all come together, particularly given the importance of neighborhoods in the development of our future standards for how we are going to evolve as a community. It is really important to look at the neighborhood concept. This is brand new to us so she would suggest they spend a little more time working on our neighborhood descriptions. For example, the description of the downtown says that it is principally commercial, but if you go to the downtown group's early plan documents you will find really good comprehensive statements of the sorts of things we are trying to create within our downtown. For example, we are looking very much for mixed uses for residential uses in the downtown because that is what helps make a 24/7 viable downtown and not one of these commercial cores that empties out after workers go home or after the bars are closed. The description of the North Street neighborhood she is up at one end and the description of her part of the neighborhood doesn't really fit the description that is in the plan, which wouldn't matter but the descriptions are part of how you are going to be making decisions around neighborhood planning, design, development, etc. We really need to look at the neighborhood descriptions. She doesn't think there is a description of the other side of the river neighborhood, Memorial Drive, River Street, Barre/Montpelier Road. We haven't given that commercial area of our community as a thoughtful and careful and nurturing sort of attention as we have of the intersection of State and Main, and she thinks it creates very interesting opportunities. Some more work needs to be done there. The plan acknowledges two gateways, an eastern entrance and a western entrance. Some of our older plans talked about other entrances to the city. She needs they need to be thoughtful about some of the transportation networks that are coming in. An old plan acknowledged that North Street was one of the entrances to the city for everybody coming down from East Montpelier, and she can tell you that by 7:30 in the morning the traffic count that a lot of folks come in that way. We need to be really thoughtful about some of those corridors because they change how we experience our communities. All of the folks who live on Berlin Street, and who lived there 30 and 40 years ago, remember Berlin Street as a serious neighborhood that had a relationship across the street, and with the construction of the hospital it changed things. Having not recognized that was going to be the traffic pattern, and at that point in time they could have probably to encourage traffic flows in a different way but we didn't, and as a result a really viable and interesting neighborhood got split in half. It is something different today, but let's be intentional about that. The streets we need to pay attention to and deserve some attention to in the plan are Terrace, Towne Hill, Upper Main Street and North

Street just because of what could be happening out in East Montpelier. Associated with how we come in is the general notion of how we experience the community. She loves the beginning section that talks about Montpelier's magic because there really is something magical about our community, but if you break it down you can figure out what makes the magic. It is how we experience the community. We talk about our neighborhoods, the natural assets and all of the different components. Views and vistas are part of that. Her favorite neighborhood in North Street, everyone loves that view down of the city of this little village that is nestled in the valleys. Let's make sure we are careful about how we experience the community and that we preserve that ring of green we can see and can walk through that makes our life her magic.

Mayor Hooper said the Parks Commission does have a plan that says the next place we should put a park is in Sabin's Pasture so the Planning Commission may want to communicate with them about what their intentions are. They see that as the next place where a park should go. Figure 10 talks about working farms and it indicates three. She isn't sure what the definition is, but she can think of one other place up off of Towne Hill she didn't see listed. They might even want to include her home as a working farm. They do have cows. They may want to look at that definition and make sure the map is correct.

Mayor Hooper said there was a comment about following the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and there are instances where that is a really good idea and then there are instances where she wanted to beat her head on the wall because it said we had to do it way. One of the reasons we have the thicket of signs on Main Street between here and going into the rotary is because the MUTCD says you will put signs up every 2 1/2 feet. Be careful about an absolute endorsement of the use of that, and that gets weird because when you have federal and state highway money you got to do what they say.

Mr. Moorman asked how that was implemented specifically.

Mayor Hooper said the city's fabulous Public Works Department picks up the master plan and/or other documents and if it says so they will do it. Also, when we get federal and state highway money we pay attention to this. In the designated downtown there is Vermont statute which says we are allowed to adopt a different sign standard for the transportation network signs.

Ms. Hallsmith said the comment on the MUTCD, was that in response to Becca?

Mayor Hooper replied yes. We should have some sort of controlling design standard.

Tina Ruth said she would like to add to Mayor Hooper's list of entry ways and gateways to the city Elm Street and Northfield Street.

Mayor Hooper said they are sort of a secondary artery so we need to be very thoughtful and make sure they are creating community and neighborhoods rather than dividing them.

Mr. Moorman said there is a portion in the plan that talks about waiting times at certain intersections. Is that an area where they have talked about arteries? Is there a spot we have identified some arteries?

Ms. Hallsmith replied in the transportation section. It looks like a lot of the arteries are described as neighborhood connectors.

Melissa Moon said she was thinking about what Harris Webster said about the walking paths in downtown. She notices that the historical designation area now goes all the way out Elm Street to just about the pedestrian bridge. In thinking about walking winter came to mind and our snowplowing. The snowplowing on the sidewalks seems to cut off at Spring Street during the heavy snowfalls and leaves the Elm Street corridor as a second path. If we are designating that as a historic area we probably need to concentrate on that as well. Some thoughts she has probably refer to earlier sections. First, she wants to complement the GIS department; the maps are fabulous. The work that went into that is amazing and the level of detail. On page 33, when it is looking at the contaminants in the municipal water system it is looking at our potable water system. Much has been released about phosphorous which we think of more in the sewage treatment system, and that is how it is treated as a sewage contaminant rather than a potable contaminant. In the Master Plan there is a detailed breakdown of what our potable water is, but she didn't see anything that reports what is the quality of the water we are putting back into the Winooski because we do share a responsibility of what is going into the Champlain basin.

Ms. Moon said what Council Member Jarvis was saying before about how we are becoming better at conserving. It talks about reducing our water use by 9 percent in the past three years and that has caused us to raise water rates. Then, we are seeing that the Central Vermont Solid Waste Management District's revenues have gone down because we have reduced the amount. So, we are in this positive feedback group of reducing and the rates go up, and how do we come to a balancing point? In terms of waste management, she notices there is no mention of Montpelier taking a lead by not purchasing bottled waters for meetings, events, etc. because bottled water and the petroleum that goes into the bottle is such a major contaminant. Because we are such a forward looking community she feels it is important that we choose to have our municipal events support our city's tap water.

Barry McPhee said he is the Safe Routes to Schools Coordinator for Union Elementary School. Back in the fall one thing he learned was the parents' primary concern right now is the safety of the routes to school before they begin to increase the number of kids walking. He was pushing walking programs and he met a lot of resistance because a lot of parents are very nervous about sending their kids walking, biking, scootering, etc. to school.

Mr. Moorman asked if he could be more particular about their concerns. Is it traffic?

Mr. McPhee said Union Elementary is downtown and it is in a fairly compact area where there are no wide streets and it is very hilly as well, mostly downhill towards the school. The committee he is putting together is in the first stages of itemizing all of the barriers that they see on their particular walks to school. He just put out a general call to the parents that they need more parents involved so in the coming year they should be putting together a detailed itemization of all the walking and biking barriers from the perspective of parents of Union Elementary School children. It is going to be covering the whole downtown area, and a bit outside it.

Mr. McPhee said his next comment is about open space. This is back to when he was chair of the Open Space Advisory Committee which ended in 2005. The recommendations they made at the end of 2005 mostly overlapped the garden variety open space recommendations. One he wants to mention is they found what they thought was a bit of lack of pocket parks in the most underserved areas, but they were just making good guesses at what was most underserved. They defined it as the highest population density/greatest distance from any open space. They recommended an additional GIS layer that would by counting housing units identify precisely what are the highest density population centers and then do a quarter mile, half mile, mile radius of them to see where the first pocket park is, and find out where you have the combination of highest population density, greatest distance to something and then you have an additional planning tool towards that.

Mr. Moorman asked if that ever materialized. He mentioned 2005.

Mr. McPhee said he left the country for a few years and he left a set of recommendations with Geoff Beyer.

Mr. Moorman said they have included land use in the Master Plan and a goal or strategy about pocket parks. He would appreciate him looking at that to see if it is consistent with the 2005 initiative that seems to be stalled at the moment.

Jack McCullough, a resident of Towne Street, and he and Jim Libby are the co-chairs of the Montpelier Housing Task Force, and he is also chair of the Montpelier Housing Authority which hasn't really taken a position on the Master Plan. He thinks there is a lot of good work in the proposed Master Plan. He has lived in Montpelier since 1983 and he thinks Montpelier is the best place to live in the whole state. One of the things that is really good in the proposed plan, and he is primarily interested in the housing infrastructure area, is the discussion of our infrastructure capacity and land capability and the idea we are recognizing that Montpelier is and can become even more so a really vital place and good place for centralized development for the whole region and that we can provide good housing and good community for more people than we have here now without detrimentally affecting any of the values we have in Montpelier. We are not going to erode any of our

infrastructure. We are not going to turn the city of Montpelier into something we don't recognize and we are still going to be able to maintain the city on a scale that we all still recognize as Montpelier and still be able to keep track of each other as members of the community as we have now. The Montpelier Housing Task Force established a subcommittee to work on the housing goals. They are very pleased to see that many, if not all, of the ideas they proposed have made it into the draft Master Plan. This is really a good thing. It's no secret that one of the thornier issues in development in the city of Montpelier in the last several years has been what to do with Sabin's Pasture. Are we micro managing the Master Plan to the zoning? Are we micro managing the zoning in the Master Plan to one specific parcel? When we look at some of the maps in the proposed Master Plan, and take them with the news we have just seen recently that despite the work of a lot well meaning people over several years nothing is happening and going anywhere in Sabin's Pasture, he thinks that is not a good thing because Sabin's Pasture is a potential resource for real housing and real growth in the city. Figure 5, which is the steep slopes map, and Figure 29, which is the future land use map, on page 114 in the same section there are a couple of mentions of the build out potential of the growth center. It's not clear from looking at the map how the growth center interacts with any of these other labeled categories of land in the map.

Ms. Hallsmith said the designated growth center constitutes the entirety of the purple area. They have submitted a grant application to the state, however, to revisit the boundaries of the growth center and the zoning districts because the growth center in turn was based on our existing zoning districts for higher density areas. Yet, as you know, during that process there was a lot of discussion about whether those boundaries were appropriate. The first thing they are going to do moving into the rezoning is to look at those boundaries again and make sure they are right and make sure they reflect the city's view of where growth should be concentrated.

Mr. McCullough said as an observation for ease of use of the maps if that could be clearly indicated that maybe another outlining for a growth center so that anyone picking this up can see when they talk about the growth centers this is what they mean. He thinks that would be useful.

Ms. Hallsmith said the other part of the growth center is the center district; the historic district is completely within it.

Mr. Moorman said perhaps that could be added in the description of the smart growth district, also.

Mr. McCullough said what he wants to say about Sabin's Pasture, which is something that is certainly unpopular with certain segments of the city, is that over the years people and even the Montpelier Housing Task Force has really accepted the idea that what we should do is with Sabin's Pasture is to save the upper part of the pasture for open space for recreation,

designate the bottom of the pasture for housing and other development, but what they see by looking at the steep slopes map is that the part that everyone says should be housing is the part that is the hardest to build on. When developers and potential developers have looked at the property what they have seen is it is so hard and so expensive to build there that is one of the reasons that nothing has happened and no housing is being developed there. If we want to have more housing, and he doesn't doubt there is a capacity for 700 new units in the smart growth area, but whatever the capacity is he doesn't think they will ever reach that capacity. We probably need to look at outside of that area, including allowing the owners of Sabin's Pasture to open it up for housing where that people who live in the perimeters of Sabin's Pasture might have to look out their backyard and see somebody else's house. He knows for many years that is not what people have wanted. When you think about what needs to be done, Sabin's Pasture is still an issue that is not adequately addressed here. Overall, this is an excellent start on a Master Plan.

Steve Roth working with enVision Montpelier said a project he has been designing called Central Vermont Eco Village. Tonight he is hearing Sabin's Pasture over and over again. When he came here three years ago he thought it was a perfect place for a Central Vermont Eco Village and discovered it was a bit of a can of worms. Now he hears over and over again three years later that we don't know what we are doing about Sabin's Pasture. He and a group of architects have put a lot of effort into that property and sort of let it go. Now with somewhat indecision about the property he would like to reintroduce the Eco Village and would ask the Planning Commission how to do that.

Council Member Jarvis said there is one thing that scares her about the document, which is the picture of the railroad truss bridge. It has got to be removed from the document, for liability and legal reasons absolutely, take it out.

Mr. Moorman said since they are on the topic of the future land use map he is uncomfortable with the designation of the Sabin's lot as "planned park" for the reasons that Sarah said. It is private property with no particular plan in place as per the article in *The Times Argus*. His uncomfortable feeling with the designation does not mean he is disagreeable to a park on this property. Frankly, he agrees with Jack McCullough that it is pretty prime space for good housing development, but as zoned properly it could be a good candidate as the recent proposal was for a cluster development or something that allows for housing to be developed and also set aside open space in the process. As opposed to the other planned park on this map which is down along the Winooski near the Coop and state land that the city leases.

Ms. Hallsmith said that is the planned Turntable Park, and they are actually hoping to get it under construction this year.

Mr. Borgendale said there is one other little parcel that is planned park as well.

Ms. Hallsmith said there is this Confluence Park that has always been planned as part of the Carr Lot project and that remains on the plan. The Turntable Park and the Confluence Park are still on the plan.

Mr. Moorman said they publish this when they finalize the plan and everybody knows because this project for Sabin's Pasture had to go through an Act 250 process, how does an Act 250 process for this project work with this plan right now? Jack said some other proposal might have to come in and put houses at the top. He doesn't know the property that well and doesn't have any clue to the history but just it is contentious and has been ongoing for a long time. He just wants to make sure we don't foreclose other sensible proposals that come down the road to develop this property in a way that meets our needs.

Ms. Aloisi said her one concern about this is Stone Cutters Way when that was up for development. There was supposed to be housing associated with that and it got axed because of parking requirements. A long time ago there was supposed to be housing and mixed use there on Stone Cutters Way and developers proposed a plan and the housing ended up getting axed because of the parking requirements. She would be careful in the language in how you designate an area because you want open space and pocket park space in development but clearly state it in how you open it up for development. It's a great place to do housing, but she also thinks they have to be clear about open space, too.

Mayor Hooper said she thinks the interesting question for the Planning Commission and for the Master Plan is where do we need parks and what sort of parks do we need? She urged them to talk with the Parks Commission because they have had this conversation. They have looked at the city and as a city we are extremely well served by whatever the national standards are. The Parks Commission has considered the distance that people need to walk or how they get to parks and they have said there is a part of the town that doesn't enjoy the same sort of amenities that the rest of us do. Therefore, we ought to look for parks in those four parts of the town. Are there under served or less well served portions of the community and where logically do we put those sorts of facilities? A particular issue for her is that where we are well served also happens to be the more affluent parts of our community in many ways. She is troubled by the statement that makes. It is also very interesting that when you put housing near parks the value of the housing goes up. The fundamental question is where should we have parks, and she thinks that part of the city is not as well served.

Mr. Bloch said according to Mary's logic which is very well constructed, then you should have the park at the bottom of Sabin's Pasture to get the greatest bang for those less well endowed economically and the distance they have to go to get to it – not at the top. The rich are living at the top.

Mr. Moorman said he doesn't endeavor for the Planning Commission to figure this out tonight. He just wants to make sure their plan allows them to continue discussions just like this.

Geoff Beyer, Director of Parks in Montpelier, said there is a brief point he would like to make being on the Open Space Committee and watching this process for quite a number of years. One thing he has noticed developers say if they knew this was going to be a park ahead of time they would have approached it much differently. In his mind you have to plan as a city what it is you need. What is it that best serves the city? As far as the top is concerned it is a south facing hill and with the new technology of fossil fuel built into a south facing hill would be really ideal five years out.

Nat Frothingham said he would like to know what the next several steps are in this process. For example, people have made recommendations. Do they get to see another draft of this plan? Do they meet again?

Ms. Hallsmith said the Planning Commission is required to hold a hearing on the plan and the City Council is required to hold two hearings. The Planning Commission could continue the hearing tonight if there are other people that need to be heard and in continuing the hearing make some of the changes that are recommended and present at the next hearing. That is one option. Another option is to pass it on to City Council as amended, but there are some things that weren't made as suggestions for clear amendments so that would be a little more difficult to do.

Mr. Bloch said Council Member Golonka's suggestion was very instructive and clear, to check in with the schools before you commit them.

Ms. Hallsmith said from what they have heard it would make sense to either post another hearing with a new draft. A new hearing would require 30 days notice; continuing this hearing might be another way to approach it. Once the Planning Commission votes to adopt the Master Plan and present it to City Council, then it goes to them and they post two hearings. Their hearings do not have to be both warned with 30 days notice, but they have to have 30 days notice for their two hearings. There are going to be at least three more opportunities to come and see new iterations of the plan.

Mr. Bloch moved for a continuance of this hearing to May 24<sup>th</sup>, with Mr. Moorman seconding the motion. The motion was passed on a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Moorman said the next Planning Commission meeting will be a continuance of the public hearing on May 24<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Hallsmith said all of the changes that we make to the plan as a result of the comments will be made available as of May 21<sup>st</sup>. If there are more specific recommendations anyone

would like to make that would be helpful. She would like clear direction from the Planning Commission on the proposed park in Sabin's Pasture. Right now this is the one little bit that isn't in the designated Growth Center. The park is not. The part that is in the Growth Center is the higher density area for the lower part of the pasture. The option was to leave it white, which is low density residential and the way it is currently zoned, or to throw it into the Growth Center with the proposed park overlaid on top of it.

Mr. Bloch said he is concerned about the message that is sent. He thinks it sends a mixed message. We don't have any appropriations and we don't have any plans. Therefore, he doesn't think it can be characterized as a planned park. Mr. Bloch moved they cross hatch the Growth Center proposal for the next five years to distinguished it from the 10, 15 and 20 years.

Ms. Hallsmith said all she is asking for is this part of Sabin's Pasture for now.

Mr. Bloch said it should be white.

Ms. Hallsmith asked what is the sense of the Planning Commission for how they should characterize the part of Sabin's Pasture that is now both green dots and purple when some people think it should be neither. Should we just go back to white, which would put it in low density rural? Or, should we keep it in the Growth Center area, or keep it in the Growth Center area as a proposed park?

Mr. Borgendale asked if it was in the growth area.

Ms. Hallsmith replied that currently it is not.

Mr. Moorman said he asked to have it put in the growth area because that allows for the cluster development and other options.

Ms. Hallsmith and potentially TIFs. The motion is to put it in low density rural and have it white.

Mr. Moorman said he likes it in the Growth Center designation because it allows for density bonuses, etc. Let's identify where we can put some nice housing on this parcel, but it is also a prime candidate for preserving some open space. Ultimately, he would like to see this land use map designate this area some way we are clear that those are the two aims. He doesn't like the term "Planned Park." His thought right now is to take the planned park out of it and leave it in the growth center. That alone under the growth center and the regulations they envision creating following this would allow for the clustered type development which necessarily creates the open space we are after.

Ms. Hallsmith said she wants to mention the fact that Sabin's Pasture is in the conservation lands designation and does make it a candidate for clustered development with land conserved. It might be adequate to put it into the Growth Center and take away the planned park designation because of the other designation.

Mr. Bloch said he would like to incorporate Jesse's idea because it provides Gwen with more options when you get around making some decisions instead of being locked in a strait jacket. The motion as he would envision it is that it be designated in the growth area. That way you have the option for the clustered development and/or open space preservation. Remove the planned park dotting. Mr. Moorman seconded the motion. The motion passed on a vote of 4 to 1 with Ms. Aloisi voting no.

Ms. Hallsmith said she wanted to express her appreciation for all of the City Councilors who attended tonight because that makes the whole process a lot easier.

Respectfully submitted,

Gwen Hallsmith, Director  
Planning and Community Development

Transcribed by: Joan Clack