

Town of Winchester
Planning Board
Minutes
11-20-23

Meeting opened: 7:02 pm

Members present: Rich Pratt (Chair), Jordan Sharra (V. Chair), Dean Beaman, Jack Marsh, Robert Browne.

Ben Kilanski (SR), Colby Ebbighausen, Jenny Rhodes, and Neal Stetson are absent.

Evan O'Connor is the LUA.

Public: Todd Kilanski, Margaret Sharra, Michael Mastaler (Building Inspector), Penny Seaver, Carol Oglivie, Ivy Vann, Bob Sillman.

Via Zoom: Housing Navigator Rik Ekstrom

First order of business: The board reviews the minutes of 11-6-23. **D. Beaman moves to approve, J. Sharra seconds. All in Favor.**

Second order of business: The board will review an application for site plan submitted by Todd Kilanski to allow outdoor storage on his property at 28 Gunn Mountain Road, Map 19 Lot 20.

The LUA confirms that notices were sent and received.

D. Beaman moves to accept the application as complete, J. Sharra seconds. All in favor.

T. Kilanski addresses the board. The goal of this application is to allow outdoor storage at his property at 28 Gunn Mountain road, this would mean storage of campers, vehicles, etc. The storage would be taking place to the right and behind the building pushed up against the bushes.

T. Kilanski states that the ZBA had indicated that the planning board was to enforce a fencing/screening/buffer plan to be implemented on the property in the case of approval.

T. Kilanski states that he spoke to the water department to discern where the water main goes through his property. The water main is about 5 feet from the road line, on the ledge where a fence would have to go, water dept. is not in favor of fence posts being driven there. T. Kilanski also spoke to the highway department, which said that any fencing would have to be 8 feet or more from the road line due to plowing, also stated was that if trees were planted as a natural buffer, at that proximity they would be killed by the salt from plowing.

D. Beaman asks if fencing/screening was a condition of approval from the ZBA.

T. Kilanski answers in the affirmative.

The LUA presents the ZBA decision letter to the board.

The board notes that the decision letter clearly states that approval was contingent on a plan for screening being brought to the planning board.

J. Marsh states that natural fencing has been approved before, and could be a solution.

T. Kilanski restates that the highway dept indicated that trees in that location would be killed by salt via plowing. T. Kilanski also states that his neighbor would prefer not to have a fence put up.

D. Beaman states that the board will not be able to always appease neighbors wishes, restating that the historic covered bridge is in close proximity to the property and screening would be desired in order to keep the appealing view from the covered bridge.

T. Kilanski States that he has cleaned up all the junk and the area will not become a junkyard.

D Beaman asks if anything will be placed in the front yard area.

T. Kilanski responds that storage will only be after the shrubs in the side yard and not in the front area of the driveway triangle.

D Beaman asks if anything could be seen from the historic Covered Bridge.

T Kilanski responds that potentially there may be items able to be seen from the bridge but he will not allow junk to be parked there.

R. Pratt asks if there will be a limit to the amount of vehicles placed in the property.

T Kilanski asks if he needs a definite number right now he is thinking around 20.

J. Sharra responds that the board likes to set a maximum number of vehicles for purpose of enforcement.

R. Pratt states that he does not want to see a lot of vehicles on this property.

D Beaman reinforces the fact that the board does not want to see a junkyard on this property. T Kilanski states that he builds container houses the containers stored on the property would only be new containers they would not be any old storage containers or bad looking storage containers, he would only have nice looking things on this property.

R. Pratt states that it is wanted to keep the covered bridge area looking nice.

D. Beaman states that natural screening seems like a better option than a large fence.

J. Sharra asks if there will be a gate on the property.

T Kilanski responds that no there is no gate but there is 24/7 surveillance.

J. Marsh asks if there will be screening needed to the left of the property.

T Kilanski responds that the neighbor is not in favor of that happening.

J. Marsh states that the zba said that fencing plan was needed for approval.

M. Sharra addresses the board and states that 'screening' was more leaning towards natural screening, something like hemlocks or another tree on the bank.

T Kilanski restates that the salt will kill them.

The board discusses where the property line is and asks Mr. Kilanski to confirm where his property line is.

Beaman asks how tight the asphalt is on the border of the property.

T Kilanski responds that he is unsure of the actual property line and will have to go look for the pins.

D Beaman states that he wants to find out what the property line is before he makes a decision.

R. Browne asks the board if the zba decision enforced that new fencing had to happen, or if the board was able to approve with the current natural shrub screening.

D. Beaman states that T. Kilanski did not bring a sufficient screening plan to the board.

J. Marsh asks what the timeline is on the project.

T. Kilanski responds that the timeline is as soon as possible.

The board deliberates with the applicant about the location of the property lines. It is suggested to have trees on the property line. It is agreed that the applicant must have the defined property line for approval.

M. Sharra states that the applicant can consult the property record file.

R. Pratt states that it is not clear where the property boundary is.

The board deliberates with the applicant on possibly continuing the hearing.

J. Sharra moves to continue the hearing to the next Planning Board meeting. D. Beaman Seconds, All in favor. 7:46 PM

Third order of business: The board hears housing review and audit from consultants Ivy Vann and Carol Oglivie.

The LUA hands copies of the prepared code audit and housing needs assessment to the board.

Ivy Vann addresses the board, goes through the Housing Needs Assessment with the board.

62 % of housing in winchester is single family homes, the most expensive form of housing.

66% of residences in winchester are households of 2 or less people.

D. Beaman asks if there is a reason behind this

- I. Vann responds that single family housing has been a privileged form of development in most of the country, the easiest kind of housing to get approved. I. Vann continues going through the housing needs assessment with the board(ATTACHED TO MINUTES). I. Vann introduces the Code Audit to the board. The first issue brought up is that of ADUs, I. Vann reports that only one ADU is currently permitted, and that best practice would be to allow at least 2 ADUs per property. Additionally, it is stated that manufactured housing should be considered to be allowed as an ADU. I. Vann continues and introduces the idea of reducing minimum housing size requirements. I. Vann brings up parking requirements, states that 2 parking spots for each unit is unneeded, and allowing on street parking is best practice.

The board deliberates on the issue of parking. R. Browne states that there are no roads in winchester that would accommodate on street parking.

The board deliberates on the idea of manufactured housing, on the matter of depreciation.

- I. Vann brings up further issues: reducing lot sizes, setback lengths, workforce housing, senior housing.

The board discusses the implications of all of the suggestions I. Vann has brought forward.

Carol Oglivie addresses the board with her masterplan review.

C. Oglivie brings up points in her masterplan review, population and housing rates in winchester, as well mentioned that she will have a more up to date version soon, as she was initially working off an old version of the masterplan.

The board discusses the points brought up in the masterplan review.

LUA O'Connor addresses the board, recommends that the dates for meetings in January be adjusted to the 2nd and 4th monday, as the typical meeting dates both fall on holidays.

The board discusses the matter of a possible work session to be held on an upcoming date to discuss ordinances.

D. Beaman moves to adjourn, J. Sharra seconds. All in favor. 8:51 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:
Evan O'Connor , LUA

Minutes approved by the board on:

Minutes signed by:

Rich Pratt, Chair

