



**TOWN OF STOWE
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
June 6, 2022**

The Town of Stowe Planning Commission held a meeting on **Monday June 6, 2022**, starting at 5:30 p.m. with remote participation available via Zoom. There was no public meeting space. The meeting began at 5:30 pm.

Members present included Mila Lonetto- Chair, Robert Davison, Chuck Baraw, Hope Sullivan, Brian Hamor, and Chuck Ebel. Neil Percy was absent. Staff Sarah McShane was present. Others present included Bruce Nourjian and Dave Lachtrupp.

Chair Lonetto called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Review Prior [Meeting Minutes \[05/16/2022\]](#)

On a motion by H.Sullivan, seconded by C.Baraw, the meeting minutes from the prior meeting were approved as submitted. The motion passed.

Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items

Adjustments to the agenda- none.

D.Lachtrupp was in attendance and provided public comments. He provided a proposed definition of lot area which, as proposed, would include the land area beneath a private or public easement/road right-of-way. He highlighted an example from Baird Road. Chair Lonetto explained that the Commission could review the specific request at a later date and encouraged him to stay in communication with staff.

Cannabis Establishment Discussion

Staff McShane provided an update on developing zoning regulations pertaining to cannabis establishments. She explained that she had recently attended a VLCT webinar with the State Cannabis Control Board and there are differences of opinion on what municipalities can/cannot regulate through local zoning regulations. Members reviewed recent updates made to the draft following the Commission's last discussion. Staff explained that following the last meeting, she incorporated the Commission's recommendations on which zoning districts different types of cannabis establishments should be located. The Commission previously discussed all cannabis establishments except for cultivation. Members agreed that indoor cultivation and outdoor cultivation might best be separated into two definitions/uses since indoor cultivation and outdoor cultivation are likely appropriate in different zoning districts. Staff reported that it is largely unknown to what extent municipalities can regulate cannabis establishments through zoning; she noted that it is unclear whether zoning regulations could further restrict buffers and odors. B.Davison added that any proposed zoning amendments should be further supported by a public nuisance ordinance and the Selectboard should also create a local cannabis control board to regulate and enforce licenses locally. Members each shared their broad feelings on the issue and how cannabis establishments might best fit into the community. It was generally agreed that cannabis establishments should be restricted to specific zoning districts where the Commission finds they may best be situated to avoid conflicts (odor, traffic, etc.) and they should be carefully

presented in the community. M.Lonetto suggested that maybe an overlay district could be created since cultivation might not align or be appropriate in an entire zoning district (for example, outdoor cultivation may be appropriate in low density areas such as RR2 in Nebraska Valley but not low-density residential areas of RR2 along Pucker Street). Members will consider further. Members discussed the possible secondary aesthetic and odor impacts of outdoor cultivation (barbed wire fencing, cameras, signs, lights, etc.). M.Lonetto suggested gathering public input on where outdoor cultivation might be best located within the community. Members agreed indoor cultivation might best be situated in the WBCS district and were undecided about outdoor cultivation. Members agreed outdoor cultivation should be in low density areas. Members briefly discussed the [rooms and meals tax](#) and whether the tax applied to cannabis sales. Staff will incorporate the suggested changes and recirculate an updated draft. This item will be discussed again on an upcoming agenda.

Other Business

Members briefly discussed Moscow Village, DPW's capital project, and gathering community input on the vision of Moscow and extending water and sewer service. Staff will reach out to Monique Lajeunesse for input on how to best engage the Moscow community.

S.McShane provided recently received correspondence regarding Section 248a review and the replacement of a utility pole on the corner of Pond & Depot Streets. She noted both the Selectboard and the Planning Commission have statutory roles in the 248a process. Members reviewed the submitted plans and agreed the first consideration should be to remove the underutilized utility pole and find an alternate location for the antennas. Members reviewed language in the town plan and agreed that should this investment on the existing pole be completed, it would create additional redevelopment challenges for the underdeveloped site within the village core. Members agreed for staff to work with Chair Lonetto in drafting comments on behalf of the Commission.

M.Lonetto provided a brief update on last Friday's housing summit. The five regional priorities were as follows:

1. Expand Public Transit
2. Coordinated PR/Education Campaign
3. Support Act 250 Modernization
4. Expand Growth Centers
5. More Federal/State Aid for Water/Sewer Expansions

M.Lonetto also reported that the Selectboard recently approved the proposed zoning amendments following two public hearings. She thanked members for their work in developing the amendments and attending the public hearings.

Review Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Next PC meeting is June 20th. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah McShane, Planning & Zoning Director