

CERTIFICATE OF HIGHWAY MILEAGE
YEAR ENDING FEBRUARY 10, 2004

Fill out form, make and file copy with the Town Clerk, and mail ORIGINAL, before February 20, 2004
to: VT Agency of Transportation, Program Development Division, Drawer 33, Montpelier, VT 05633.

We, the Selectmen or Aldermen or Trustees of PLAINFIELD in WASHINGTON County
on an oath state that the mileage of highways, according to Title 19, V.S.A, Sec #305, added 1985, is as follows

PART I - CHANGES TOTALS - Please fill in and calculate totals.

Table with 6 columns: Town Highways, Previous Mileage, Added Mileage, Subtracted Mileage, Total, Scenic Highways. Rows include Class 1, Class 1 Lane, Class 2, Class 3, State Highway, Class 4, and Total.

* Class 1 Lane Mileage and Class 4 is NOT included in total.

PART II - INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES SHOWN ABOVE.

1. NEW HIGHWAYS: Please attach Selectmen's "Certificate of Completion and Opening".

2. DISCONTINUED: Please attach SIGNED copy of proceedings (minutes of meeting).

3. RECLASSIFIED/REMEASURED: Please attach SIGNED copy of proceedings (minutes of meeting).

At the January 12, 2004 meeting of the Plainfield Selectboard, they approved reclassifying .16 miles of Gonyeau Road from Class IV to Class III.

4. SCENIC HIGHWAYS: Please attach a copy of order designating/discontinuing Scenic Highways.

TH 26 from end of existing class 3 on west side

IF THERE ARE NO CHANGES IN MILEAGE: Check box and sign below. []

PART III - SIGNATURES - PLEASE SIGN.

Selectmen/ Aldermen/ Trustees Signatures:

Handwritten signature: Karl A. Bossany - Chairman

Clerk Signature:

Handwritten signature: Linda B. Wells

Date Filed:

Handwritten date: 2/13/04

Please sign ORIGINAL and return it for Transportation signature.

AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION APPROVAL:

Signed copy will be returned to T/C/V Clerk.

APPROVED:

Handwritten signature: M. Ebing

Representative, Agency of Transportation

DATE:

Handwritten date: 3/1/04

Plainfield Selectboard January 12, 2004. 6pm

Karl Bissex, Liz Perreault, Brian Sherman. Liz moved to enter executive session to discuss personnel, Karl seconded. All in favor.

Liz moved to close executive session and enter open meeting at 7pm, Karl seconded. All in favor.

Gonyeau Road hearing. Attending were Lori Barg, Linda Wells, Gerry Cormier, Bill and Melanie Benko, Sarah Albert, Meg Davis, Melinda Vieux, Sam Seideman, Patrick Tibbets, Tom Mancini Sr., Tom Mancini Jr., Allan Farnham, Will Colgan, Diane Tetreault, Mike Nolan, Frank Mitchell, George Springston, Joe Klein, David Strong, and Karen Storey.

Tom Mancini stated that he wanted Gonyeau Road upgraded from a Class IV to a Class III to the old cellar hole on his property. His son wants to build a home and needs better access. There was question about the procedure of reclassifying roads as per statute. It was clarified that the hearing was within the statute requirements. There was much discussion about the road being changed to Class III some time ago. The VT AOT shows the road as Class IV and that is what the towns funding is based on. The board stated that an upgrade might have been done without the prior selectboards knowledge. It was also stated that there were no classifications of roads until 1974.

The cost of maintenance of roads in the town is approximately \$10,000 per mile before state aid reimbursement. We have about 43 miles of which 36 is gravel. Mike had measured the road to be upgraded. From the Seideman home to the Mancini drive is 826', or .16 miles, from the Mancini drive to the steel gate, (cellar hole), is 1390', or .27 mile, and from the steel gate to the Edson property another 500', or .10 miles. The Mancinis are requesting the board upgrade .43 miles. There was discussion about the town upgrade policy. The board stated that a new upgrade policy has been adopted that requires a landowner to pay the full cost of an upgrade. The Mancini request was submitted prior to adopting the new policy, therefore the cost to them would be a 50/50 split with the town to upgrade the road if approved. The Mancini's have not submitted a cost, and the town needs to make a decision on the total cost. There were concerns about upgrading beyond the Mancini driveway, the additional .27 miles. Sam Seideman raised concerns about young people being in the area and getting stuck in the mud and snow. He does not want to encourage more of this with an upgraded road. It is a unique area that will be lost. He is agreeable to have the upgrade to the Mancini drive. There have been emails received by the board against any upgrading. Mike stated that he could turnaround at the driveway rather than up above where they currently turnaround. The Mancini's request the board upgrade to the gate so they do not have to go through this process again. They also stated the road is pretty much upgraded to that point and do not want the road to deteriorate. The board stated the road will be kept at its present state. There were concerns about opening access to undeveloped land. There were questions about the maintenance of Class IV roads. The board will look into the requirements. All present at the meeting were in favor of the upgrade to the Mancini driveway. The road will need some work but at a minimal cost to the town given the condition of the road already. Liz moved to upgrade the Gonyeau Road to Tom Mancini Jrs. Driveway, .16 miles, Lori seconded. All were in favor. The town and Tom Mancini Jr will share the upgrade cost 50/50. There was mention of recouping the section already upgraded. That would not be an option. Mike is to get cost figures to Linda to bill to Mr. Mancini.

Subdivision Hearing

The Planning Commission submitted refined subdivision regulations to the Selectboard for review. The Planning commission has worked to bring the regulations in line with the town plan.

Another issue of petitioned items submitted to the Planning Commission was brought up. That is a separate issue to be discussed after presented to the Selectboard. The Planning commission took testimony on the petition at their meeting on January 5, 2003 and submitted the petition to the board for their review at this meeting. The Planning commission is a technical advisor to the SB to recommend changes. The timeframe was such that the petitioned items are not going to be voted on at town meeting. Sarah Albert read from the statute the requirements on a petition, VT Statute Title 24, Chapter 17, Section 4403-4404. The petitioned items are reviewed by the PC, they hold a hearing, and submit to the SB. The SB holds a hearing in no less than 30 days or more than 120 days. Sarah will verify this with Atty Paul Gillies. There is not enough time before town meeting to do this. This hearing is to discuss the subdivision regulations.

Two public hearings were held by the PC. They made some changes as requested. For example, they made an exempt lot, the first lot subdivided is free. But, Atty Paul Gillies advised that these exemptions are not allowed. This was stricken by the SB at the last SB meeting. Another change was ridgeline zoning. There were undercurrents of criticism as being too open to interpretation. Not treating everyone the same. The goal is simple, to have the ridgeline set at 1500' for review. They took the advice from hearings to change. So, 50 acres all above 1500' will go before the PC for review process.

The PC tried to be more clear and have less misinterpretation. These regulations allow creativity being more adaptable to the terrain of Plainfield. Subdividing is allowed but not easy. The work was done with a sample regulations used from the Town of Wheybridge as well as input from hearings, the townspeople that responded to their surveys, and research from other surrounding communities.

Frank Mitchell stated that the town is trying to solve the rapid development problems. He recommends that the town change the zoning to allow for maximum number of lots. This would make the process easier. These regulations are vague, language is too open to interpretation. The PC stated that Regional Planning recommends that the town have their own regulations. Towns are better served by local regulations rather than Act 250. Some spoke in favor of the subdivision. The general structure is a good thing to control and regulate growth. Two specific changes were given by George Springston: page 9, section 310, Final Plat for Major and Minor Subdivision, #1 is not well written and is too stringent. The language needs to be changed. Page 11, H- Lot Shape and Density, #2 the description is too vague, need to be more specific. Give width and length requirements. Other discussion about how times have changed. We need to consider the impact on the land, community, and also impact on the town roads. Discussed the impact of the high traffic on the Lower Road. If there are 500-600 cars per day, it would need to be considered to the town to pave at some point due to the maintenance costs from the high amount of traffic. This subdivision overlaps some of Act 250. We lose local control without having our own regulations. We don't need the state making decisions for us. PC stated that the zoning regulations cause more problems than the subdivision. The appeal process is to go to the PC first, then to Environmental Court. The applicant and /or neighbors can appeal, see Section 540. The PC hopes for this to be voted on at town

meeting. The petitioned items are good ideas and the PC is working on them. It would be difficult to have both issues voted on at town meeting. They hope to have a revised zoning regulation for a vote in November. If this is voted at town meeting, the SB can adopt permit fees following the vote. The SB approved adding Section 170 Exempt Subdivisions A landowner may subdivide one lot from a parcel existing on the date of these regulations exempt from subdivision review; however, the parcel must comply with town zoning requirements for the district in which it is located and all applicable state requirements. Any subsequent subdivision of any of the resulting parcels must follow these subdivision regulations. This would be a minor change as this has been discussed before. Lori requested the PC to submit fees from neighboring towns to the SB for comparison. After discussion it was decided that the PC will hold another hearing on Jan 26, 2004, which is already warned, make the changes discussed at this hearing and if no other major changes are made they will submit the subdivision regulations to the SB to approve to be voted on at town meeting. This will be an Australian ballot vote. The vote will allow the voters to decide. If major changes are made, the hearing process will start again, and the regulations will need to be voted on at a later time. Hearing closed at 9:15pm

Selectboard business

Lori called to respond to the letter received regarding local dams. They will inspect the town dam in the spring.

The Selectboard reviewed and signed the loan application for the Water and Wastewater Department to apply for money for a waterline study to be done.

The board discussed an email from Griffin Intl, regarding the sidewalk project. See attached to the minutes.

The SB signed the warrants.

Lori will talk to Sue Remington about a revised delinquent tax list for the town report.

Linda gave the board final budget numbers for them to review.

Lori moved to adjourn at 10:20, Liz seconded. All were in favor.

Linda B. Wells, Town Clerk

Minutes approved February 9, 2004