

Mendon Planning Commission Minutes (DRAFT)

June 2, 2025

Present: Justin Lindholm, Dick Howe, Sarah Buxton and Teri Corsones were present in person. Dennis O’Connell was present via the GoToMeeting platform. Zoning Administrator Greg Smith was also present in person. The draft May 19, 2025 minutes were approved as written.

Sachdev Update: Neither Anil Sachdev nor his attorney Frank Urso were present to provide updated information regarding the Econolodge property.

At the November 13, 2024 MPC meeting Mr. Sachdev had indicated that he had an extension until December 9, 2024 to resolve the safety deficiencies identified in the Agency of Natural Resources sanitation letter detailed in prior minutes. He was to report on the status of the deficiencies at the December 2 MPC meeting. He did not attend the December 2 MPC meeting and the matter was continued until the January 6 MPC meeting. Given Mr. Sachdev’s absence at the January 6 MPC meeting, the matter was continued again until the February 3 MPC meeting. Given his absence at the February 3 MPC meeting, the matter was continued again until the March 11 MPC meeting. Given his absence at the March 11 MPC meeting, the matter was continued again until the April 7 MPC meeting. Given his absence at the April 7 MPC meeting, the matter was continued again until the May 5 MPC meeting. Given his absence at the May 5 MPC meeting, the matter was continued again until the June 2 MPC meeting. Given his absence at the June 2, 2025 meeting, the matter will be continued again until the July 7, 2025 MPC meeting.

Zoning Regulations Update: Rutland Regional Planning Commission consultant Logan Solomon was not able to attend the meeting to provide an update on the work he has done on the Mendon Zoning Regulations. Members had the following comments or questions regarding the following sections of the regulations starting with Section 302, working from the April 17, 2025 draft:

Section 302: Subsection 302(d) was added to provide that “No zoning permit in any zoning district shall be required for the activities in Section 111”. Members noted that additional discussion is needed regarding Section 111, particularly regarding solar arrays.

Section 303: Further detail has been added to describe the boundaries of the Village District. A new permitted use was added regarding food trucks. Members noted that there are two subparts (a) and the subparts are incorrectly identified thereafter. They also had questions about the distinction between “high density” and “low density” recreational facilities. It appears that all “high density” recreational facilities are prohibited. They also noted that the State Department of Education should be identified as the State Agency of Education. They also suggested that “animal day care” be expanded to “animal day care/boarding”. Members questioned whether definitions should dictate that certain activities are considered high density or low density and will ask Logan to address whether it would be advisable to eliminate the distinction.

Greg suggested listing “residential one and two family dwellings” first in the list of uses since that is the use most commonly researched. The rest of the list is alphabetical. He also suggested having a definition of “unit” since it’s unclear what the term denotes.

Members questioned whether the description of the Village District should be modified given the RRPC efforts to update the regional map and to expand the Village District in the process. Public input should be sought. Members will ask Logan if the properties impacted by the expansion can be identified so that their input is sought in particular. Members also had questions regarding what ability the Town will have to contest certain activities or uses going forward.

Regarding “dimensional requirements”, Greg noted that “maximum building height” doesn’t put a limit on the peak of a structure and suggested asking Logan for more specific language and clarity.

Regarding “miscellaneous requirements”, members will ask Logan the rationale for adding part 4.

There’s a reference to Section 303(g)(4) under the dimensional requirements but there is no Section 303(g)(4). It appears that the reference should be to Section 303(f)(4).

Section 304: More details regarding a description of the Commercial District were added. Other additions mirror the additions in Section 303. Members noted that not all new additions are underlined, and not all deleted matter has a strike-through. Members will ask Logan to indicate wherever new text is added and to indicate wherever text has been removed in all the sections. Members will also ask

for more clarity regarding “maximum impervious surface” as well as more clarity regarding the 500’ boundary.

Section 305: More details regarding a description of the Residential District I were added. It includes Robinwood. Members suggested moving “Recreational Facility – Low Density” from a permitted use with the Zoning Administrator’s approval to a conditional use requiring ZBA approval.

Section 306: Greg suggested deleting “the land served directly off Route 4 and below 2,000 feet in elevation.” He believes that this would include land in the Commercial District from the added detail describing the district boundaries. He suggests revising the beginning phrase to read” The Residential District II contains land served by Meadowlake Drive, etc.”. There are parts of the dimensional requirements that are underlined even though they currently exist.

Section 307: This district combines the current Rural District and the Wheelerville District. Members suggest moving accessory dwelling units from conditional uses to permitted uses. More discussion is needed regarding the maximum dwelling units per acre.

Section 308: Members had many questions regarding the permitted uses listing; it doesn’t appear that dwellings are permitted yet accessory structures, home occupations and household scale windmills are. There are no uses specified in the conditional uses section. It appears that the dimensional requirements are the same as in the Rural District, even though permitted uses are quite different.

Logan is expected to attend the next zoning regulation update meeting on June 16, 2025; members were asked to review Article IV for that meeting. The Flood Hazard Overlay District and the Ridgeline Overlay District sections will be reviewed at a later time.

Public Comment: Carol Gates objected to having been identified by name when she joined the meeting remotely. Teri indicated that it is her usual practice to acknowledge a person when they join a meeting.

The next regular meeting of the Mendon Planning Commission is scheduled for Monday, July 7, 2025 at 5:15 p.m. at the Mendon Town Office. The next meeting of the Mendon Planning Commission dedicated to the zoning review work is scheduled for Monday, June 16, 2025 at 5:15 pm at the Mendon Town Office.

Respectfully submitted,
Teri Corsones