

CORNWALL PLANNING COMMISSION (CPC)
Regular Meeting
Cornwall Town Hall and via Teleconference
May 18, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Conor Stinson, Don Burns, Drew Kervick, Katherine Branch, AJ Vasil-
iou

ALSO PRESENT: Ben Marks

Recording of the meeting announced.

CALL TO ORDER—the meeting was called to order at 7:03 pm.

QUORUM—established

AGENDA—Drew K. MOVED / Katherine B.. SECONDED to approve the agenda as posted.
Motion passed—5 in favor, 0 opposed.

MINUTES—**April 13, 2022**—Katherine B. MOVED / Drew K. SECONDED to approve the min-
utes as posted. *Motion passed*—5 in favor, 0 opposed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS—none

CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW—none

PUBLIC COMMENTS—Ben Marks Select Board update:

- On May 17, Cornwall and Salisbury held a joint Select Board meeting at the Cornwall Town Hall to discuss the expressed preferences of the voters and to jointly make a final decision.
- The primary areas of concern centered on the maintenance, vandalism, and fire protection of the covered bridge option. Voters had selected the covered bridge (52%) over the other 2 options (48% combined). The Boards decided to move forward with the covered bridge option (7 affirmative, 1 opposed).
- John Roberts and Brian Kemp remain the SB's contacts with the VAOT.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Grant**—Conor spoke to the issue of the timeline for the pending grant deadline. He noted that a general consensus should be reached tonight regarding everyone's comfort level with the draft as it stands (pending several updates to be completed, particularly the Implementation section).
 - **Should the draft be updated as needed and submitted prior to finalization?** The State expects a draft not a fully completed document. If the draft is submitted, it can be refined and finalized for submission later as a final document. Following discussion the PC members agreed that all were comfortable submitting the draft (with comment deadline of Sunday, May 23) and continuing to refine it over the summer, moving toward a final version to be submitted later in the year.
 - **The grant submission deadline is Tuesday, May 31.** The documents to be submitted with the draft include:
 - A narrative for the grant close-out—Conor will do this and submit to the PC for all to review.
 - A summary ledger regarding transactions between the town and the RPC—Don B. volunteered to help with this.
- **RPC's latest update from Katie Raycroft-Meyer**—Conor is incorporating the updates into the CPC's main draft. He noted that there are difficulties that arise when having to incorporate others' versions of a document into the main document and careful review is necessary.

- **Town Plan: Education Section**—*Drew K.* had had limited time to focus on the Education section. There are no outstanding comments although *Sue J.* may have some after she returns and reviews the section.
- **Town Plan: Economy Section**—*Conor S.* noted that all comments appear to have been incorporated into the latest drafts of both sections. Most comments received were fairly broad. There was one regarding to number of households receiving retirement income. Another comment that is worth reconsidering and further discussion had to do with how Agriculture fits in.
- **Town Plan: Goals and Policies**—*Don B.* indicated the Goals section has been reviewed, comments integrated. The initial review was cursory, with the intent of flagging issues that should be discussed. Most of the PC members have had a chance to review and submit input and through that and the workshops a consensus has been reached as to what direct to take. Katherine noted that new goals have been added, old goals tweaked, some goals were removed. The bulk of the document was gone through in the first workshop, the second focused on the Nature and Environment section. Separate goals set for maintaining the integrity of the forest blocks and for flood resilience.
- **Town Plan: Implementation Section**—Lengthy discussion on the Implementation section, which is not yet fully updated, brought up several directional issues for discussion, primarily whether to focus the section priorities by means of “rank order” or by following the “chapter order”. The Implementation section was reviewed and edited as being a selection of what might be the most important goal objectives from the Goals and Policies section. As others began commenting during the discussion, consensus grew regarding the direction to be taken in terms of ordering the statements.
 - **Two new statements**—Don and Katherine noted they had added 2 statements to the Implementation section: *renewable energy* and *childcare*.
 - **Order by “implied priority,” “rank order,” or “chapter order”:**
 - List is currently organized in what could be interpreted as an implied priority.
 - Prioritizing may not really be necessary as all the statements are recognized as having importance or they would not be in this section.
 - Rank order would be an editorial decision by the PC, as opposed to a composite of the feelings of all groups/persons, on which topics to prioritize over others.
 - Rank order would entail significant time to get input from all residents so that none were felt ignored or left out.
 - Implementation statements listed without regard to their priority provides leeway for whatever group is tasked with evaluating a goal or goals for other purposes (e.g. budget setting, taking advantage of grants that arise, etc).
 - The objective is to get the draft done, the prioritization of the Implementation statements is of lesser importance.
 - Ranking statements according to Plan chapters makes them easier to follow.
 - **Decision made** that statements should be ordered to follow the chapters as laid out in the Plan.
 - **Questions raised about flood resiliency.**
 - Is it a priority goal? Flood resiliency is not an issue as a priority objective, more risk management.
 - Does it warrant an Implementation statement? Should be left out of the Implementation section. Is important but not in need of specific implementation.
 - Does it belong in the Conservation section or under Emergency Management? Remove it from the Conservation section, keep the forestry integrity portion intact. Emergency Management issue unresolved.
 - **Question: Should the Implementation section be part of the Plan or a separate document?**
 - If Implementation is a separate document it would be easier to evaluate progress and update the document than if it is part of the Plan.
 - If a separate document, it would not have the authority of the Plan, but could be used more effectively used/usable as an ongoing check-list. The PC could set it up with a

different name such as “*Practical Working Implementation List*” with running annotations.

- Some statements may be met, some not. A progress report done outside the Plan has benefits. The Plan section could indicate tentative report dates.
- Consensus leaned toward keeping it in the Plan.
- **Question: Completion dates**—Are they mandated? Where does that come from
 - Possibly came from the planning manual.
 - Having a completion date encourages completion of the goal; manage the progress as a project would be managed.
 - Date provides a structure for the PC’s work and assessment. The annual review and assessment of the Plan is aided by completion dates.
 - In terms of establishing accountability, a date is a help. Perhaps rather than a definitive date something along the lines of a “*report back by ...*” date.
 - Could include a caveat at the beginning or end of the section regarding progress and completion dates being affected by internal and external factors, “Projected Dates” or Estimated date,” etc. Some statements may include an estimated date, others not.
 - Possibly a long-term projected timeline included with each statement or just one for the section: e.g. “*By Town Meeting, 20XX*” would tie all goals to a local date and time-frame.
- **Decision made** to use estimated dates or use TBD for now where appropriate, with a caveat for the section regarding date flexibility at the top. As far as the draft goes TBD for the 8 statements would be fine. The dates could be addressed, with public input, over the summer as the draft is worked on and finalized.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Public Information Meeting: Status of Town Plan**—Tentative date for a public informational meeting on the Education, Economic, and Goals sections was set for July 27. This will precede a hearing on the full plan tentatively set for September 28. This is expected to give sufficient time for incorporating last changes/revisions and to plan how the meeting will be conducted.
 - Education being a hot topic these days, it will be good for the public to have an opportunity for input.
 - Handling details for the meeting and hearing can be worked on at the June meeting.
- The recording of the final training on the Implementation of the Town Plan is expected, but has yet to be received, from Katie Raycroft-Meyer.
- **Next regular meeting**—June 15; Conor will probably not be available.
- Regional Planning’s mapper is leaving, no replacement found yet.

ADJOURNMENT

Katherine B MOVED / Drew K. SECONDED to adjourn the meeting.

Motion passed—5 affirmative, 0 opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 pm.

Submitted by Robin Conway, Substitute Minute-Taker