Pittsford Planning Commission Minutes - DRAFT October 23, 2025

Board Members Present: Kevin Blow, Chuck Charbonneau, Rick Conway, Robb Spensley, Donna Wilson, Nancy Gaudreau

Others Present: Jeff Biasuzzi, Ann Reed, Logan Solomon – RRPC

1. Meeting - Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 by Kevin Blow – Chair.

2. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Donna Wilson asked to add storage unit conversation and Enhanced Energy Plan Selectboard Decision to the agenda. The storage unit conversation is part of the zoning regulations review being done tonight. A motion was made by Donna Wilson and seconded by Rick Conway to approve the meeting agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Rick Conway and seconded by Donna Wilson to approve the minutes of the September 25, 2025 meeting. **The motion passed unanimously.**

4. Public Comments

None at this time.

5. Old Business

The zoning regulations were reviewed for any changes that members wanted to discuss or that had been flagged for review one more time. The members started on page 10 of the most current version of the zoning regulations from Logan Solomon. On page 10, table of uses, there was a discussion if primitive camp needed to be broken out on the table of uses. After discussion, it was decided to remove primitive camp, as it is very close to the same as a camp, seasonal use -residential/hunting.

The next section reviewed was page 56 Exemption #11 for the metal, connex or shipping containers. Donna Wilson wanted setbacks applied to connex containers. Jeff Biasuzzi clarified that connex containers are not the same as tractor trailer containers after Donna Wilson brought up a previous case with the tractor trailer container at the Route 3 end of Gorham Bridge Road and an issue the abutting landowner had with the tractor trailer container that was/is located on that parcel.

Rick Conway mentioned the connex container used for C&C Fireworks that went through the Zoning Board of Adjustment. This was done with no setback requirements. There was heavy debate on whether setbacks should be set/required or if a setback waiver should be used. Logan Solomon urged consistency on what is used with the setback waiver, as it is currently set at a five foot setback. If less is wanted for a connex container, then it may get messy. There was the question on if the connex container was over 160 feet, if a permit would be required. Jeff Biasuzzi stated he gets complaints about needing a permit for connex containers. Donna Wilson stated that she gets complaints from citizens about connex containers.

Robb Spensley stated he agreed connex containers should comply with setbacks. A motion on whether

connex boxes need to adhere to the setbacks that are set in village and rural was made by Robb Spensley. Jeff Biasuzzi asked for the size of the boxes to be set, as there are 20, 40 and 60 foot boxes. Rick Conway asked if they were going to be exempt or not. Ann Reed stated it is going to depend on the size and if the are 161 square feet or more or 160 square feet or less, like the sheds that were exempt. Rick Conway stated it does not say sizes for the connex/metal/shipping containers. It says they are exempt from permitting. This is what Rick Conway feels the vote should be. Ann Reed restated the motion is to have connex containers exempt from setbacks. Robb Spensley asked for it to be repeated and then said yes, in rural and village areas. Rick Conway further clarified that a yes vote is to exempt the connex containers and a no vote is to not exempt them. Rick Conway seconded the motion and it was put to vote. The vote was 3-3. Kevin Blow, Chuck Charbonneau, and Rick Conway voted yes. Donna Wilson, Robb Spensley, and Nancy Gaudreau voted no. It was decided this would be circled back at the next meeting, when a full board would hopefully be present.

Page 70: There was discussion on the definition of attic. West Rutland does not mention windows or skylights in the attic, as it is not usually usable space as a dwelling space. The group consensus was to leave the definition as it is currently in the zoning regulations.

Page 71: camp definitions – The group consensus was to leave the definitions as they were.

Page 73: household versus family for single-family, multi-family, and two-family. Ann Reed pointed out the definition for family had been changed to household and wanted to know about consistency through the document. It was decided to keep family for these definitions.

Page 111 (c): Waiver authority section 2: "forever remain undeveloped..." the word through was added to clarify how it would forever remain undeveloped.

Page 113: Under Supporting Information and Documentation, it was suggested for the first line to add what major roads were (ie US-7, VT-3, and Class 2 Town highways). This chang was kept for clarifying purposes.

Page 117: Cluster: took out the word objectives and changed it to goals for the definition.

This led to a discussion on subdivisions and why we need subdivision bylaws.

Page 118: Infrastructure: This new definition is good.

Page 118: Survey Marker: This new definition is good.

Page 118: Subdivision: Logan Solomon explained court precedent for this definition. It was decided to keep the definition.

Page 73: Household: The last portion that stated "no such single housekeeping unit shall contain more than five members" was struck from the definition.

Rick Conway brought up a few small things he wanted to go over on the zoning regulations. He stated that the page 2 map needs to be rotated, as it is currently cut off. Rick Conway would also like to have the village map included with page 6.

Page 22: Rick Conway wanted to verify the State Statute was stated, which it is.

Page 23: Section 505 F: There was discussion on the parking requirements, as page 28 with Section 702 has the State mandate for minimum parking spaces. It was suggested and agreed that F should state see Section 702 for parking space requirements.

Page 17: Commercial Setbacks: All other uses the front setback is currently 50 and 2 acres. The residential uses has 40 feet of front setback and is one acre. It was decided by the members to change this to one acre and forty feet of front setback to be like all residential uses for all other uses.

Ann Reed mentioned the timeline put together for Logan Solomon to have these zoning regulations approved in time for the grant deadline. It was decided by the members to hold a special Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday October 28, 2025 at 7:00pm to go over the zoning regulations one more time before reviewing Logan Solomon's drafts of the reporting form for municipal bylaw amendment and the Notice of Planning Commission Public Hearing.

6. New Business

Donna Wilson let the Planning Commission members know that the Selectboard had voted 2-3 to not approve the current Enhanced Energy Plan at their meeting on October 1, 2025. She went to the selectboard meeting on October 15, 2025 to discuss the equity portion with the selectboard. Donna Wilson reminded Planning Commission members about the number of people that had been attending selectboard and planning commission meetings asking for the Enhanced Energy Plan. Chuck Charbonneau stated that Mark Winslow had attended some of the planning commission meetings when they were starting the enhanced energy plan. Mark had stated if equity was in there he would not vote for it then. Chuck Charbonneau also pointed out that no one from the community attended any of the three hearings on the Enhanced Energy Plan. Donna Wilson discussed 30 VSA 202a and Devon's Statement 10 that discuss the equity portion of the plan. Equity is the issue with the plan. Mark Winslow was the only one to return Donna's email to the selectboard and planning commission regarding the equity. Donna Wilson expressed her shock that it did not pass the selectboard.

Rick Conway stated that Mark Winslow and Alicia Malay were both there for the first meeting with Jeremy Gildrian from RRPC. Jeremy had brought one document then, the next meeting Jeremy brought a completely different document due to changes in the law since the first one had been adopted by another town. Rick Conway discussed the way the enhanced energy plan came to be. Robb Spensley had sent an introduction to Jeremy that was then removed later in the process. Frustrations were verbalized about the enhanced energy plan, the amount of energy put into the plan, and the outcome so far. Ann Reed did mention that this will be back on the selectboard's agenda on November 5, 2025 at the request of Alicia Malay. Rick Conway mentioned that the Enhanced Energy Plan was done for substantial deference with the PUC, which we will not have without the enhanced energy plan. The PUC can hear concerns either way and let the Town know their decisions. This led to another discussion about the Enhanced Energy Plan and the use of natural gas, solar, and not liking taking options off the table for growth in the Town.

Ann Reed discussed the new Community Housing Infrastructure Program (CHIP) that will be available starting January 1, 2026. This program allows for small TIF like projects to occur using one parcel at a time or one developer. There was discussion on how this could look in Pittsford, what projects could be and what developers may benefit from this in the very near future. This included the discussion on expansion of water and wastewater lines both North and South on Route 7. North only until Kendall Hill for a potential development with Elnicki Family and South as far as Sangamon Road. There are already requests for water beyond where it goes south. The sewer sleeve was put in the bridge, so there is potential for sewer expansion on Route 7 South as well. The CHIP program uses assessed values before and after the project to have the property tax difference help pay for the CHIP funding for up to 20 years for both education and municipal taxes. After 20 years, the education taxes need to start being paid to the State.

Chuck Charbonneau stated he would like it if the Town would look at tax stabilization as an option for up to five years for properties. This would give the developer cash flow to develop the property.

8. Next Meeting

The next two meetings will be October 28, 2025 at 7:00pm and November 13, 2025 at 7:00pm.

9. Adjournment

The motion passed unanimously.
Respectfully submitted,
Ann Reed Recording Secretary
Approved by,
The Pittsford Planning Commission