

Zoning Advisory Committee

11/2 Minutes

Committee Members Present: Mat Ercoline, Marilyn Stephenson, Pete Martin, Margaret Danison, Kamran Parwana, Jared Iacolucci, Rory O'Connor, John Menzie, Darvin Bowie, Mike Coffey

Others: Mayor Frank Rossi, Trustee Liz Kormos, Trustee Ben Baskin, Inspector Dave Lafountain

Started proceedings at 7 PM

Mike Coffey will be late; Anna Stanko not in attendance

Anything we want added to agenda, can be added to agenda.

1st order of business

Need to formalize meeting agenda. Do Thursdays work for everyone? No voiced concern on Thursdays, but Jennifer is having difficulty finding a spot at 7 PM on Thursdays. As we seek out locations for scheduled meetings, can still use the Village Hall space as needed. Will continue to use Zoom for meetings.

Using 1st and 3rd Thursdays, next meeting would be 11/16. Moving forward, first and third Thursdays of every month.

Jared makes motion to establish meetings on 1st and 3rd Thursdays. Margaret seconds. Unanimous.

Mat will work with Jen to find a permanent space and communicate via email.

2nd order of business

How to handle the RFPs

We have 2 RFPs running in tandem thus far. Mat has spoken with Rory (Planning Board) and Lisa Nagle (discussing BOA).

There is a nomination study that happens with BOA. This is a finding study through which recommendations can then be transformed into zoning law. Recommendation from Lisa is to stagger the RFPs—BOA first with Zoning to follow after 3 months. Would we need to redo the RFP entirely? Or would we need to select one of the two candidates now and adjust timeline? Regardless of when we pick one, recommendation is to extend the zoning proposal by 3 months.

Marilyn notes that the responses to the zoning RFP have come in, but we don't yet have responses on the BOA. Mat notes that we can continue down current path is fine, but need to

be mindful of timeline regarding BOA. Discussion around when we need to have responses reviewed.

Mat asks if we have an update on BOA responses. Mayor Rossi notes that we have three responses back now and date can be pushed back further.

Mat notes that we are dependent on BOA selection in order to get our timeline squared. Question posed around why is this a dependency and whether or not the ZAC is responsible for bringing the deliverables regarding BOA.

Discussion back and forth regarding dependencies between BOA and Zoning. Specifically, whatever comes from the BOA must be included in the final zoning, even if we begin working through zoning first.

Month 3 of BOA timeline is the first public hearing regarding BOA input. Between Month 3 and month 8 in BOA is when proposals for BOA are delivered. During that time, ZAC will be informed of work on BOA.

Mat asks should we continue to vet the existing ZAC RFPs now or pause and shift timeline back? Question posed of if the committee should push back the selection date by ~3 months or if the committee should select a consultant with the intention of engaging them in ~3 months.

Margaret and Jared in favor of vetting RFP now then using 3 months before consultant engagement to address background. Rory in favor of addressing the background before vetting a consultant. Concerned about our inability to address the issues with the consultant. Get the key problems understood and then engage with the consultant. Margaret agrees on importance of background but doesn't want to lose the opportunity to utilize a consultant by pushing the selection back further.

Rory identifies that an issue exists between resolving BOA grant vs zoning. At this stage, the ZAC is unclear what exactly the issue is and should be explored. BOA grants can bring a lot of money and investment. Marilyn agrees that there is a lot of value that can be brought from BOA, but we can't guarantee reception. During Comp plan, there was time to renegotiate the timeline with the consultant. ZAC can negotiate not engaging with consultant in month 1 or even month 2, affording us the time to do our diligence. Mat notes that there is likely not an issue to negotiate on timing.

John is concerned about speed to properly vet and select the consultant. Rory asks if we can correspond directly with the two respondents and note that we need a little more time to make a determination. We would need to communicate this to both existing and any other candidates.

Darvin agrees that we need a little more time in order to do our diligence and make a decision. Mat asks how much time do we need? Rory states a minimum of three months using the ad hoc committee's experience

Kamran shifts conversation to ask if rather than making a choice on a consultant now by choosing a random date, we can discuss what needs to happen to better understand how much time would be needed. Margaret notes that by delaying our timeline, we could have an issue regarding dependencies with the BOA grant.

Rory notes that at the end of three months, we should have an idea of what we want to ask the potential consultants. Marilyn states that choosing by 11/8 would not provide enough time for interviews, only to determine if the needs outlined in the RFP are met through the proposals

Mat adds that we have two options: either select a candidate within 6 days or push this out some amount of time. Mike clarifies that the actual date for decision was pushed back to 11/26 and we could potentially push that back an additional week or two as well.

Based on this timeline, Mat suggests that we can use this time ahead of 11/26 to also have conversations with the consultants about potentially extending this further. Discuss when they would be willing to engage with us in the future (potentially 3 or more months after selection). Between now and the 26th, ZAC needs to read both proposals, get questions together and find time to interview. In Comp plan, we had a subcommittee to address the consultants. ZAC agrees on appointing a subcommittee. Decided to select the subcommittee members tonight and proceed with all committee members reviewing the proposals. Have all committee members provide feedback by meeting on 11/16. Subcommittee will then engage the respondents to set up interviews during the week of 11/27. Decision made by the committee as a whole at meeting on 11/30. Final selection by 12/1.

Agenda Item 3

Mat has created a google drive to store all of our existing material and documentation. In that is a shared spreadsheet where we can store and consolidate our questions. Additional materials include copies of the comp plan and other related documents. The spreadsheet has 2 tabs. One tab is issues with the current code. Second tab is general issues to address. Second tab may be more applicable to our abilities. For example, "what do we do with buildings out of compliance" or "what do we do about ADUs" or "what do we do about short term rentals". Rory adds that he has a copy of the code with mark up by attorney Ferradino at the time of the ad hoc committee's review of zoning.

Mat notes that upon selection, the consultant should be able to help by completing some of the more boilerplate topics and allow us to address the more specific needs for us (ie. Setbacks, use, etc). This can help direct our questions to the consultant and within our committee discussion.

Final item is subcommittee selection. Rory, Margaret, and John volunteer to form subcommittee.

Deadline set for questions to be submitted in google drive by next meeting on 11/16.

Next steps for Committee

- Review proposals and existing code
- Add questions or thoughts to the documents on google drive

Subcommittee Tasks (Rory, Margaret, John)

- Reach out to the consultants with the extended timeline of selection by 12/1
- Collect and distill questions
- Ultimately set up and follow through on interviews

End at 7:58