

Public Comments, PC Draft Plan Public Hearing, January 9, 2020

Comm. No.	Name	Chapter/Topic	Summary	Staff Response	PC Action
1	Sue Pitiger	General	Supportive & appreciative, think of the future	None	
2	Bob Haynes	Economic Development, Land Use, Housing	Supportive, we need growth, diversity, more housing stock to take advantage of Upper Valley economic engine	None	
3	Arline Rotman	Facilities and Services	Supportive, encouraged and pleased by thoughtful response to supporting access to childcare through scholarships	None	
4	Dean Siebert	Land Use, Housing	Critical, no expansion of senior housing contemplated, DC distorts rental market, mixed use and retail in Rte 5 S would be "dagger in the heart of village". Absence of muni wastewater "has saved us"	None	
5	Alyssa Close*	General, Land Use	Critical, densities should be specified in plan, anticipating the scale of development is hard because Norwich has no experience of serviced land. Need 'set asides' for open space	None	
6	Stuart Richards*	Land Use	Critical, development should be incremental, appropriate in scale (e.g. StarLake, Sen. Housing). Proposes amendment	See comments on written suggested amendment	
7	Linda Gray	Energy, Land Use	Supportive, nice job of integrating multiple themes into a coherent whole	None	
8	John Lawe	Land Use	The gravel eskar under the core of the village allows good drainage, question of expanding the village area has therefore always been a policy decision concerning commitment to more infrastructure	None	

9	Charlotte Metcalf	Land Use	Supportive. Concerned that we avoid developing Rte 5 S so it becomes like Rte 120 in Lebanon. TRORC Reg Plan does not give much guidance on conflict between ecological values and housing	None	
10	David Otto	Land Use/Housing	Supportive. Preserve rural by developing where appropriate/possible. Concerned Norwich isn't doing enough to accommodate housing demand	None	
11	Colin Calloway	Land Use	This plan 'targets' Rte 5 S as did the last plan, now the justification is Climate Change. But what about the wetlands?	Wetlands are mapped, not at risk from development, DEC permits are required	
12	Chipper Ashley	Land Use	Supportive. Plan is for the future, (not most of the people in the room). Young people seek compact living, walking/biking distance from work and services/retail. Can we get students to measure carbon sequestration?	None	
13	Nathan Margolis	Land Use/ Housing	ADUs are affordable housing option that is appropriate. Are they being tracked?	None	
14	Dean Siebert	Land Use	The whole planning paradigm is wrong, hamlets should receive more attention, consolidation is wrong, should be diversification	None	
15	David Otto	Land Use	Promoting compact development means ecological approach/ Promoting ADUs in remote locations is not a good climate crisis response	None	

\* see written comments

Public Comments, PC Draft Plan Public Hearing January 13, 2020

Comm. No.	Name	Chapter/Topic	Summary	Staff Response	PC Action
1	Jim Gold	Land Use/ Voting Process	Preserving the Village is important, inappropriate development in the village or along Rte 5 S could jeopardize Village. Concerned that just 1 vote on SB or even at town-wide vote could result in plan being adopted (or not). Recommends town-wide vote with 66% threshold or unanimous SB vote	No design controls for Village development now (new regs could remedy this). Statute sets procedures for voting (outside scope of plan).	No Action.
2	Alyssa Close*	General, Land Use	Critical. No vision, not enough info for new residents. Does not answer: Who are We? Equal space should be given to discussion of natural resources as housing and development	None	No Action.
3	Marcia Calloway*	Land Use/ Resilience	Critical. Concerned the plan lacks detail concerning sensitivity of Bloody Brook watershed, risk of flooding in the Rte 5 S area, and absence of River Corridor mapping.	PC and SB made decision last year to pursue Community Rating System (CRS) as a better alternative for Norwich to the River Corridor program	No Action.
4	David Otto	Land Use, Housing	Private septic systems are an expensive barrier to development, and community lacks control of them. Municipal wastewater is cost effective and provides better control. Vehicle trips in Norwich are reducing, takes this as a good sign that household behavior is changing. More multi-family and mixed use development including small-scale retail (similar to Hanover) could further reduce environmental impact.	None	No Action.
5	Tracey Hayes	Land Use, Housing	Encourages PC/ToN to pursue grant supported wastewater investigation ASAP (kids in school). Carpenter St has septic issues too. The wait list for Sen. Housing is 42, expansion constrained by septic availability	Grant lead times were explained to her in hearing.	No Action.
6	Sarah Reeves*	Land Use	Rte 5 is the CT River Scenic Byway. Norwich could be an enhanced 'green space' for surrounding more developed communities	Maybe include ID of Rte 5 as CT River Scenic Byway in Transportation and Land Use	No Action.

Comm. No.	Name	Chapter/Topic	Summary	Staff Response	PC Action
7	Alyssa Close*	Various	Dislikes the dedicatiion because it is selfih with regard to other species, doesn't include the 'commons' concept. Septic systems can be shared, co-located	PC should decide whether to keep or change dedication. Septics are privately held and sharing is already common	No Action.
8	Sarah Reeves	Dedication	We can broaden the dedication to make it more inclusive!	None	No Action.

\* see written comments

Written Comments, PC Draft Plan, 2020

Comm. No.	Name	Chapter/Topic		Staff Response	PC Action
1	Calli Guion	Land Use	Seeks answers to several questions on Act 250 jurisdiction, wastewater, and taxes	See written response to land use questions. No change recommended	No Action.
2	Elissa Close	Various	Critical. Would like to see more recommendations on protecting natural resources. Prefers co-located septic solutions to larger wastewater solution. Development in and around the Village should focus on housing, not Commercial. Emphasizes maintaining rural character. Objects to Dedication using text from the Brundtland Commission. Would like to include more about the history of Norwich and fewer maps. Provided feedback on items that relate to expected rewrite of zoning regs.	Consider deleting Brundtland quote and replacing with vision statement from the Introduction. "The Norwich Town Plan conveys a vision for thoughtful stewardship of rich cultural resources and natural resources, a commitment to address the climate crisis, and fostering housing development that is appropriate in scale and responsive to community needs."	Delete dedication. PC to agree on replacement text and/or (brief) inclusion of 'sustainability' in Introduction within the SB adoption public comment time frame.
3	Chris Katucki	Energy	Critical. Suggests that the energy siting standards for solar projects should be site specific and strike a better balance between competing interests	The PC worked closely with the EEWG and discussed these policies at length. It is an important commitment to encouraging rapid transition by Norwich. Siting standards imposed by the PUC take Chris's concerns into account. The likelihood of large scale projects in sensitive locations is extremely low for technical and permitting reasons. Numerous controls are in place. No change recommended.	No Action.
4	Alexa Manning	Housing	Supportive. Sees ADUs as a good solution for affordable housing. Looking for action around wastewater.	None.	No Action.

Written Comments, PC Draft Plan, 2020

Comm. No.	Name	Chapter/Topic		Staff Response	PC Action
5a	Marcia Calloway	Land Use, Resilience	Questions concerning flood hazard and Rte. 5 S.	See staff reply that responds to questions. No change recommended.	No Action.
5b	Marcia Calloway	Land Use, Resilience	Requests that the PC review Blood Brook Watershed Study, revise plan to avoid development in sensitive Blood Brook watershed, consider added development for Rte. 5 N, include recommendations to Town to proceed with River Corridor Protection.	The SFHA includes Blood Brook, nothing suggested or proposed in the draft plan poses a threat to the Blood Brook watershed. Rte. 5 N is also identified as an area worth exploring in land use regulation review. River Corridor has been rejected, CRS is being pursued which will give same ERAF benefit for less cost. No change recommended	No Action.
6	Stuart Richards	Land Use	Critical. Proposes amendment to prohibit any development and/or cumulative developments which impose an additional and/or related tax burden on Norwich taxpayers and requiring full advance disclosure. Maintain population at ~3400.	Text of suggested amendment should be reviewed by counsel, not sure a plan could impose such restrictions on private development. Not sure these requirements could be legally encoded in land use regulations. The sentiment could be read as hostile to newcomers. No change recommended.	No Action.
7	Sara Reeves	General	Supportive. Commends analysis and thoughtful work to create a Plan that's consistent with the town character, historical resources, topography, and place in the region. Suggests the designation of Route 5 as The CT River Scenic By-way be included.	Include mention that Route 5 is the CT River Scenic By-way in the Plan [Note: the entire length of Route 5 in VT is the CT River Scenic Byway].	Add "CT River Scenic Byway" to p8 Mixed Use Planning Area, and policy 6-2.c

			TRORC AGREED EDITS		
	PAGE			Y	N
1	37	5-1.e	Encourage the manufacture, marketing and use of agricultural ( <i>especially locally grown food</i> )* and forest products and industries (24 VSA § § 4302(c)(9), (A), (B), (C)).	X	
2	45	7-2.f	Support the provision of quality childcare (pre-K through grade six), education, <i>vocational training</i> and recreation services .	X	
3	46	7.4	<i>As of the writing of the plan there were no planned major capital improvements to municipal facilities [end of last para]</i>	X	
			LUBELL SUGGESTED EDITS		
1	31	4-3.l	Encourage broad-based participation in community conversations around housing, including low and moderate income households, <i>seniors</i> , younger residents and renters	X	
2	31	4-3.m	<i>Norwich will contribute to regional discussions of housing issues and work collaboratively with other municipalities to explore creative solutions.</i>	X	
3	36		<i>Additional dedicated affordable housing units would be useful to meet the demand for affordable housing in Norwich from seniors, families with children, low-wage workers and others. A range of housing options is also needed to help current Norwich residents, especially seniors, remain in the community</i>	X	
4	43	6-5	<i>Norwich will participate actively in discussions of regional transportation issues through a variety of forums</i>	X	

\**italics* = additional text