

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

1. Should the zoning along Route 100 from Waterbury village to the Stowe town line...

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
15	26%	21	15%	36	18%	Be a continuous corridor where commercial or light industrial development is possible.
43	74%	117	85%	160	82%	Define nodes of commercial or light industrial development separated by rural land where commercial or light industrial development would not be allowed.
2		7		9		<i>Skipped</i>

2. Which of the following types of land uses would be appropriate along Route 100 from the interchange to Ben & Jerry's?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
16	28%	53	40%	69	36%	Farmland and forestland
18	32%	65	49%	83	43%	Recreation
31	54%	84	63%	105	55%	Residential and home businesses
40	70%	100	75%	140	73%	Retail shops and service businesses
35	61%	100	75%	135	71%	Dining and lodging
37	65%	92	69%	129	68%	Offices
30	53%	83	62%	113	59%	Food and beverage manufacturing
27	47%	73	54%	100	52%	Other types of light industry
3		11		14		<i>Skipped</i>

3. Are there other land uses that would be appropriate along Route 100 from the interchange to Ben & Jerry's?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC	
1. None		1. No	11. Public building (fire, police, etc.)
2. Undeveloped		2. Leave as is... too busy and congested	12. This area can be built up.
3. Scenic views and pull-offs		3. No additional uses, not much room left	13. This area should become more walkable and developed to its maximum potential especially with businesses that would interest our many visitors.
4. Isn't it crowded enough already?		4. Is there even developable land there?	14. Its already a hot mess; not much you can do now to limit
5. Too crowded already		5. Farm and forest only	15. Anything people want as long as doesn't cause harm
6. Already pretty dense with businesses		6. Bike and walking paths, public art	
7. Bike ped lane		7. Pedestrian / bike path [3 responses]	
8. Bike/rec path begins somewhere around here		8. Alternative routes for bikers and pedestrians	
		9. A co-housing development	
		10. Low to middle-income housing	

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

2. Which of the following types of land uses would be appropriate along Route 100 from Ben & Jerry's to the Cabot Annex Store?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
38	67%	96	72%	134	70%	Farmland and forestland
28	49%	86	64%	114	60%	Recreation
34	60%	70	52%	104	54%	Residential and home businesses
24	42%	52	39%	76	40%	Retail shops and service businesses
27	47%	52	39%	79	41%	Dining and lodging
23	40%	48	36%	71	37%	Offices
20	35%	46	34%	66	35%	Food and beverage manufacturing
16	28%	37	28%	53	28%	Other types of light industry
3		11		14		<i>Skipped</i>

3. Are there other land uses that would be appropriate along Route 100 from Ben & Jerry's to the Cabot Annex Store?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Undeveloped 3. Overlooks 4. Scenic views and pull-offs 5. Bike ped lane. Solar panels. 6. Bike/rec path continues from B & J's to the Annex store. 7. Open land/small farms/residential 8. Clear the mess at the Sayah farm. It is great for tourists to picture a Vermont farm but let's face it... it stinks!! 9. Visitor Center 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2. Conservation [2 responses] 3. Conserved open land or farmland 4. Farm and forest only 5. Minimal building, keep open space 6. Leave as is and add light or roundabout at Guptil or Howard Road to alleviate traffic congestion 7. We should maintain the fields and forests as much as possible in this stretch for wildlife and aesthetics. The area of Cabot Annex could likely expand, but the fields and forest should be maintained. 8. Sayer farm would be great rec land 9. Bike and walking paths, public art 10. Pedestrian / bike path [2 responses] 11. Additional road widths and lanes for bikers and pedestrians 12. Public building (fire, police, etc.) 13. Housing 14. Low to middle-income housing 15. Residential and home businesses, retail/service, dining/ lodging OK around Waterbury Center 16. Residential, home & business 17. Additional retail on the old Sayer farm property, but spaced out with open area in between 18. Restaurants 19. Restaurants are probably OK. Way its worded above seems like "dining and lodging" means it would be appropriate to have another large hotel in that section of Rt. 100... and it isn't appropriate 20. Industry requiring heavy trucking 21. Anything people want as long as doesn't cause harm

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

2. Which of the following types of land uses would be appropriate along Route 100 from the Cabot Annex Store to Cold Hollow Cider?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC	TOTAL	
37 65%	90 67%	127 66%	Farmland and forestland
29 51%	86 64%	115 60%	Recreation
40 70%	85 63%	125 65%	Residential and home businesses
32 56%	67 50%	99 52%	Retail shops and service businesses
32 56%	65 49%	97 51%	Dining and lodging
25 44%	55 41%	80 42%	Offices
18 32%	48 36%	66 35%	Food and beverage manufacturing
16 28%	38 28%	54 28%	Other types of light industry
3	11	14	<i>Skipped</i>

3. Are there other land uses that would be appropriate along Route 100 from the Cabot Annex Store to Cold Hollow Cider?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Undeveloped 3. Overlooks 4. Scenic views and pull-offs 5. Bike ped lane. Overpass / Underpass 6. ...and ends somewhere around the Cold Hollow Cider Mill 7. You can't 'do' anything on Vermont swamp lands so that pretty much takes out that section of highway..and by the way, Pete's green roof looks very smart thinking... gets your attention and the animals are great for children who have traveled a ways and need a break. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2. No 3. No much room for safe egress to Rt 100 other than existing properties 4. Some conserved open land 5. Conservation lands 6. Farm and forest only 7. We need to leave the areas near the reservoir as undeveloped as possible for wildlife. The Cold Hollow Cider Mill area should be a business district and new businesses be allowed there but not where there is current field and forest. 8. Keep open land. Not a larger strip of businesses. 9. Good area for the arts. Some already there. 10. Agri-tourism 11. Bike and walking paths, public art 12. Pedestrian / bike path [2 responses] 13. Traffic interchange for pedestrian access to Wtby Ctr state park 14. Public building (fire, police, etc.) 15. Low to middle-income housing 16. Residential and home businesses, retail/service, dining/ lodging OK around Waterbury Center 17. Cold Hollow area can be built up 18. Retail shopping 19. Industry that requires heavy trucking 20. You have to grandfather existing hot mess. Should have never done one zone that allows just about anything. 21. Anything people want as long as doesn't cause harm

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

2. Which of the following types of land uses would be appropriate along Route 100 from Cold Hollow Cider to the Stowe town line?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
45	79%	109	81%	154	81%	Farmland and forestland
34	60%	84	63%	118	62%	Recreation
39	68%	75	56%	114	60%	Residential and home businesses
21	37%	36	27%	57	30%	Retail shops and service businesses
27	47%	46	34%	73	38%	Dining and lodging
28	49%	31	23%	59	31%	Offices
23	40%	34	25%	57	30%	Food and beverage manufacturing
14	25%	38	28%	52	27%	Other types of light industry
3		11		14		<i>Skipped</i>

3. Are there other land uses that would be appropriate along Route 100 from Cold Hollow Cider to the Stowe town line?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None 2. Overlooks 3. Scenic views and pull-offs 4. The views are terrific but the access to 'looking' at the dam should be opened up in the dip from Zimkies to the road to Howard Avenue. 5. Undeveloped 6. Bike ped lane 7. It would be great if we could have one that continues into Stowe but that's a long shot 8. Golf course 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2. This is a major corridor for wildlife called Shutesville. It should be protected from future development as much as possible. Its importance is critical in the large animal migration from Canada throughout the northeast US. 3. Protect Shutesville Hill wildlife corridor [3 responses] 4. No additional retail or light industrial here. Limited due to wildlife crossings. 5. Conserved wildlife corridor. 6. Conservation [3 responses] 7. Some conserved open land or farmland. 8. Minimal building. Keep open space. 9. Keep open land. Not a strip mall of businesses. 10. It is residential essentially. Leave it alone. 11. Home & forest & agriculture 12. Farm and forest only. 13. Nice to have variety there. Break up businesses with open land. 14. Keeping a restriction on build height (as measured from the road) could be good here as there are very pretty views and it would be a shame to disrupt them. 15. Pedestrian / bike path [2 responses] 16. Bike and walking paths, public art 17. Agri-tourism 18. Tiny house development. Additional service businesses. 19. Low to middle-income housing 20. Anything people want as long as it doesn't cause harm 21. Solar panel installations

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

4. Any other comments about the land use regulations along the Route 100 corridor?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All land use decisions need to keep the traffic issue on Rt 100 in mind 2. Desperate need for light at Guptil/Rte100 intersection 3. If building is allowed in these areas, a traffic light will be ABSOLUTELY necessary at Guptil Road. As the traffic is right now, it's a dangerous intersection that most people, turning south on 100 from Guptil Road, don't even stop at. And traffic on 100: people go WAY TOO FAST from Ben and Jerry's up to Cold Hollow. They like to go 50 the entire way. 4. Light at Guptil Road 5. Not land use but traffic light at Guptil Road would be advisable 6. Traffic has become a bigger and bigger issue. Need to consider not creating too many places for tourist stops that impedes traffic and potential accidents 7. Please don't design in a way that would require more traffic lights. There are too many now that aren't timed properly. Consider space for roundabouts to control traffic if needed in the future. The one in the village is wonderful. 8. I'd like to see little/no more development along the corridor. Traffic is too crowded w/ commuters and tourists. More development will create the need for more traffic lights and there are too many between the rotary and Shaw's, w/ Guptil Rd in the near future. The rotary was to lessen congestion and the lights have caused it. 9. Moratorium on any commercial development including multi-family or apartments until infrastructure has been improved. Specifically upgrading road system to handle these type developments. Currently this should be the #1 priority for Rt. 100 in the Waterbury corridor no matter what changes to zoning are implemented. 10. We have enough businesses and light industry along Route 100 now. The traffic is so bad that sometimes you have to wait 5 to 7 min to get on Route 100 off Guptil Road and we heard a light was going up. That was 10 years ago. Someone is not doing his or her job or maybe they are waiting for someone to be killed at that intersection. That is why I don't believe we need any more businesses along Route 100. 11. I am worried about talk of extending sewer up Route 100. Zoning by-laws are a weak tool to prevent the kind of sprawl that would invite. At the very least the number of curb cuts needs to be really limited to avoid a mess like Shelburne Road or Williston Road. We also should discourage big box, chain retail. 12. I would like this corridor to remain scenic and limit congestion. 13. We need to protect the wildlife corridors and limit development in areas along Route 100. 14. It would be nice to keep green spaces. 15. Less solar panels and more cows for tourists and natives to gaze. 16. I like the idea of rural farmland between Cold Hollow and Stowe to act as a buffer between communities. 17. Current land uses in these identified segments should not define future land use there. There are parts where NO MORE of those current uses should be permitted. 18. Development should be consistent with existing natural setting and local architecture. 19. It's more about managing the quantity of businesses and the impacts to the land. Having enough green space in-between, and making sure locations have visual continuity with a "Vermont" look and feel 20. It would be nice not to have route 100 between the interchange and the Stowe line look like Shelburne Road. 21. NO NATIONAL RETAILERS - NONE 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If more development was allowed, the road could be widened with bike paths to decrease the congestion on Route 100. 2. A bike lane along Rt 100 would be great and/or sidewalks. Need traffic light at Guptil Road 3. A separate bike lane should be included 4. Any development proposals should also include pedestrian and bicycle lanes/links to and from existing and the future development projects. 5. Bike path or bike lanes. 6. It is essential for large animals, traffic and aesthetics that we do not over develop the 100 corridor. A recreation path along route 100 would encourage bikes and walkers to explore this corridor. 7. DO something about the traffic. Stowe generates a high percentage of this traffic. They should provide help with the traffic on 100!! It has increased many times over. 8. Solve the traffic issue. 9. The land along route 100 should be used to make more lanes, since our current infrastructure can't efficiently handle the number of drivers. At the very least, we need slow traffic lanes pullout lanes every couple of miles. Or have police pull people over for going under 40 in the 50 mph zones. 10. There is a ton of traffic. Let's keep the building down as a whole. 11. This very much needs to be coordinated with transportation planning and good access management. 12. Transportation impacts and planning (including access management) need to be considered in the evaluation of zoning this corridor 13. While allowing uses in this area, traffic needs to be addressed, as well as the existing traffic light sequence. 14. Why do we have to keep building? The roads cannot handle the traffic we have now, has anyone thought about this? 15. Patch up the road itself as well. 16. Wetlands & soil (clay) should be determinate. 17. Mandatory: Protect the Shutesville Hill wildlife corridor! 18. Please protect the wildlife corridor 19. Please sustain Shutesville Hill Wildlife corridor! 20. Cold Hollow to Stowe line should be left open and rural. 21. Try to keep open important view sheds 22. I would hate to see Route 100 become like the Mountain Road in Stowe. We need to preserve some open land along the corridor. 23. I would like to see as much land as possible remain undeveloped along the Route 100 corridor from Ben & Jerry's, north to Stowe. I think it would be a shame to see the Sayer farm property between Guptil Road and the Cabot Annex developed, as well as any further development from the Cider Mill to the Stowe town line. 24. I think it important, in order to maintain Waterbury's rural nature, that a certain percentage of land in the Route 100 corridor stay open. 25. Please zone for open spaces as no one wants to look at a stream of buildings along the whole 100 corridor.

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

4. Any other comments about the land use regulations along the Route 100 corridor?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<p>22. It is certainly one of the more scenic bits of Rt 100 with many lovely views of ranges on both sides. It would be nice to develop so that development compliments somehow.</p> <p>23. I would like to see the scenic views and areas maintained with smart development that would restrict the height of structures to a single level. We should NOT allow commercial conex boxes, dumpsters and similar commercial items within the views from Route 100 corridor.</p> <p>24. Commercial signage should be regulated - no neon!</p> <p>25. Plans to link future development to existing with pedestrian & bicycle access is very important. we want people to park their cars & wander around, not get in their car to go down the street.</p> <p>26. Since there is no sidewalk it's not safe for foot traffic, and a bike path would promote tourism and commercialism for younger folks who don't drive but want something to do when they're here with their families on vacation. Along the path are the businesses that will run adjacent to it. It's not a long stretch so lighting will not be a hindrance.</p> <p>27. With all of the commerce along Route 100, bike-friendly lanes, along with sidewalks along certain segments, would be helpful.</p> <p>28. There is limited space for much of anything. There is no way Stowe will let another restaurant around from the interstate to the village... keeping income to themselves. By Gregg Hill and evergreen gardens would be nice if Michaels on the Hill would allow the competition.</p> <p>29. We don't need any more unaffordable housing or businesses in Waterbury. The scenery is disappearing, getting blotted up with giant houses. The crime is rising. The traffic is terrible at certain times of the day. It's turning into a congested Stowe and it's not welcome here.</p> <p>30. It is important to keep forest in this area and protect from higher density development. I think zoning is currently set at 5 acres for new development - we should keep it at that to prevent sprawl up the 100 corridor.</p> <p>31. Need to provide preemptive regulation for new businesses such as marijuana, pubs, breweries. Need regulation to limit where dumpsters can be placed and to provide proper screening. We need to provide additional follow ups and enforcement. The rules should provide greater enforcement powers and accountability.</p> <p>32. We should provide regulations to limit or allow greater over sight for certain development such as marijuana, micro breweries, distilleries, etc. Some regulations should be more specific to allow regulation of aesthetics, fire protection, etc. I don't feel that there are specific enough regulation to limit certain growth and to ensure open space, forest, agricultural use. The scenic views should also be a regulation/requirement. Aesthetics may be listed as something to consider but is not specific enough to ensure it is adequately reviewed to maintain the beauty of Waterbury.</p> <p>33. My answers to # 2 reflects current types of land use. The assumption is, if left unchecked there is a possibility those types of land use could be removed. Which would have a negative impact on current proprietes. Ex: if 'retail shops and service businesses has Cabot Annex Store to Cold Hollow Cider Mill unchecked would all existing retail shops in that segment be asked to find another location?</p> <p>34. Open it up from the interchange to Cabot Annex</p>	<p>26. Residents and visitors alike choose Waterbury in part for its natural and scenic characteristics, qualities, and aesthetics. It is critical to maintain this and land use regulations are an important tool for doing so. In the absence of regulation these features could quickly be lost. Growth, but smart growth that does not degrade the plethora of values (both human and ecological) inherent with keeping open space.</p> <p>27. We should encourage development where there is already water and sewer service and maintain open space pockets between B&Js and Cabot and between Cold Hollow and the Stowe TL.</p> <p>28. It seems that it would be appropriate/ necessary to put some land along the Waterbury Route 100 corridor into conservation/preservation through a land trust or easement or we will see it become the next Williston or South Burlington with development all along the entire length of it.</p> <p>29. If water/sewer were to be extended north, no further than Cabot annex. Development should lessen as you get closer to the Stowe town line to maintain wildlife corridor.</p> <p>30. Keep it rural, beautiful. Don't let it become like what happened to Williston and Exit 12.</p> <p>31. No more curb cuts! no strip development!</p> <p>32. No strip malls!</p> <p>33. Enforced variation in land use is essential to preventing Route 100 from becoming a strip mall.</p> <p>34. Keep it to a minimum leaving ample space in between.</p> <p>35. Keep Rt. 100 as open and rural as possible. NO more industry!!!</p> <p>36. Nothing allowed other than residential and home businesses</p> <p>37. Leave it as is. That is a scenic stretch of mountain views. You are ruining that for the locals and for the tourists. You are ruining the quaintness and character of the area that draws tourists in. The area is overdeveloped as is.</p> <p>38. Route 100 should not be any more commercial than it is already.</p> <p>39. The zoning regulations should be revised to remove drive-throughs as an allowed use. Drive through businesses are not appropriate on Rt. 100 or in Waterbury Center</p> <p>40. I wouldn't want to see any of the land entirely developed into endless parking lots and housing tracts. It would be nice to have development that includes green spaces, wooded areas, farms, wetlands and something that builds community. Pete's greens and Evergreen nursery- these are pleasant businesses to have in the area.</p> <p>41. As a resident of Waterbury Center and a transplant from both rural (Upstate NY) and large urban areas (SF, CA), I would like to see smart development of this area to reduce congestion, preserve the rural and agricultural history and avoid overcrowding/commercialism and congestion.</p> <p>42. Concentrate development in the Waterbury Center area around current development (e.g., Cold Hollow)</p> <p>43. Concentric circles of development. Emphasize maximizing use of existing infrastructure. Current zoning along Route 100 is, literally, stupid. Puts homeowners against business development and vice versa.</p> <p>44. Developing existing lots should be encouraged. New construction should be severely limited. Development needs to be planned and clustered for single curb cut access, and very few new curb cuts.</p> <p>45. Development needs to be responsible if it happens. Waterbury benefits greatly from its rural aesthetic and should look to preserve lands that support ecological biodiversity.</p>

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

4. Any other comments about the land use regulations along the Route 100 corridor?

PUBLIC

46. Need to keep as much green, forested areas as possible. There should be nodes of development that have single way in/out and the development in the node should have a consistent architectural theme and height should not block views of the mountain ranges.
47. We need to be very careful to guard against strip development. Waterbury Center should be recognized for its historical importance and encourage concentrated development in this area while discouraging commercial development to the north and in between the Cabot place and the Center.
48. I think it is very important That any kind of housing or business must blend in with the natural surroundings. low impact to the view and sky line.
49. Structures/businesses should be set back from the road with landscaping to camouflage them.
50. The existing rundown farmhouse should not be allowed to continue to exist in the corridor.
51. I want Waterbury to succeed. To have the economic drivers to do that. I also value the VT working landscape and the ecosystem benefits that non-paved over land provides. Would love rules about permeability of developed surfaces commercial/industrial businesses that embrace VT strengths. Please at all costs don't allow strip development.
52. It is very hard to comment on what should be limited or where some uses should be permitted and others not as it's currently a full mix of all the uses you have identified above.
53. Limit high density development, especially beyond Ben & Jerry's. Office/retail/manufacturing in Village.
54. Due to the fact that regulations regarding setbacks, screening, etc... are already strict in Route 100 zone, a variety of uses should be allowed.
55. Route 100 development is relatively well guarded within the current regulations. 100-foot setback, open space and frontage requirements create good control for multiple types of development.
56. Along Route 100 is a good place for infill housing developments and PUDs
57. Let's get the sewer extended up route 100, possibly coinciding with the rt. 100 paving project. If we build it they will come and with the zoning regs in place they will be self-selected.
58. Water and sewer should be extended up there or an additional pump station so development can occur outside the village of Waterbury. Waterbury Center needs to be rejuvenated. There is not even a market along that route or a minimart where people in the center can buy a carton of milk.
59. This has been identified previously as the preferred development area for Waterbury, right? Assuming so, it should be zoned with wide possibilities and the Village sewer/water should be extended north.
60. We should zone it so that potential business can take full advantage of the traffic count and not divert additional traffic into the Village area. Keeping traffic between the interchange and the business to the north will be a benefit. Try to keep additional heavy truck traffic out of Village.
61. Bring better grocery store to area, move business to around Waterbury as it is over congested now
62. Note that "Farm and Forest land" differ vastly and you shouldn't have included them as a single land use. This survey is flawed. Discard and attempt once more.
63. To qualify each category is difficult in this survey the way it is written, but I will try. It may be easier or more direct to ask if there are land uses that would NOT be appropriate, but these surveys are difficult to compose. I understand that we can't say certain kinds of businesses can't be allowed if the zoning states they can, but I am concerned that it can quickly and easily go down the slippery slope of the highest bidder. For example, I do not agree with huge or franchised hotels, restaurants, or industry going into any part of the Route 100 corridor, but smaller entrepreneurial enterprises I can completely support and is in keeping with the culture of our area and our business strengths. It also supports the tourism that we rely so heavily upon. It's a shame for most of the community that the Alchemist was not given the opportunity to keep their business in Waterbury, but I think we can learn from that experience to ask what benefits the company supply the whole community vs the agenda of one party. I would suggest, that whatever is allowed, there is a solid system of incentives (i.e.: tax abatement, for the smaller, innovative, LOCAL companies vs. the more common practice of offering larger, out-of-area corporate companies these incentives to court their bottom line). These smaller businesses are those that have proven to provide Waterbury with its strongest, diverse, and most resilient economic base. Also, the people who have made this town a desirable place to be should not be priced out of doing business here because they don't have the massive corporate dollars that come from other places--let's create a local growth incentive for those people who have a vested interest to stay here. Let's keep the small-town culture intact. And PLEASE let's consider incentives for design, historical character and PUBLIC ART all along the way! Thanks for listening.
64. You should separate retail shops and service businesses like you separate food manufacturing from them. They are very different and have very different impacts. For instance you might not want a retail store somewhere with all its traffic and parking demands but an excavating company could be fine as everyone goes off site during the day.
65. Rural land between nodes of development is a nice idea and I'm sure lots of people will check it but it seems a little unfair to current landowners who may have been paying taxes for years (based on development value?) to suddenly have that value taken away. It seems to me that if you want to encourage certain kinds of development (or undevelopment) you should do just that: encourage. Property tax abatement, revolving loan funds, land trusts,etc rather than disallowing with regulations.
66. Zoning regulations should: 1- be a matter of safety, 2- no restrict people/families of all incomes an opportunity at owning a home 3- less is more.
67. The Waterbury community should not restrict present landowners from selling their land for commercial purposes.
68. Having Waterbury remain an Act 250 Town has created a situation where Waterbury is not business friendly and even the simplest of project are costing thousands of dollars more for this rare and usual situation.
69. Stop so much regulation.
70. Anything is good as long as they pay taxes

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

5. Do you agree that all three districts (MDR, LDR and CNS) should be merged into a single zoning district?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	17	100	0	17	100	0	17	100
<i>10 Skipped</i>			<i>39 Skipped</i>			<i>49 Skipped</i>		

6. If the districts were merged, how many acres should be required for each home?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC	TOTAL
5.2 (average)	5.2 (average)	5.2 (average)
<i>38 Skipped</i>	<i>90 Skipped</i>	<i>128 Skipped</i>

7. Do you agree that the MDR and LDR districts should be merged into a single zoning district?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	37	100	0	50	100	0	29	100
<i>10 Skipped</i>			<i>45 Skipped</i>			<i>55 Skipped</i>		

8. If the districts were merged, how many acres should be required for each home?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC	TOTAL
4.6 (average)	4.2 (average)	4.3 (average)
<i>33 Skipped</i>	<i>88 Skipped</i>	<i>121 Skipped</i>

9. Do you agree that all three zoning districts should be kept but the boundary lines of the districts should be revised to follow property lines?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	66	100	0	57	100	0	60	100
<i>11 Skipped</i>			<i>47 Skipped</i>			<i>58 Skipped</i>		

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

10. Do you agree that the land use regulations should protect Waterbury's working lands (farms and forest lands managed for timber, sugaring, etc.)?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL					
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree			
0		94	100	0		91	100	0		92	100
<i>8 Skipped</i>			<i>38 Skipped</i>			<i>46 Skipped</i>					

11. Do you agree that the land use regulations should protect natural resources (ex. wetlands, wildlife habitat and corridors, streams and riparian buffers, etc.)?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL					
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree			
0		92	100	0		91	100	0		91	100
<i>8 Skipped</i>			<i>38 Skipped</i>			<i>46 Skipped</i>					

12. Should the following types of subdivisions in the rural areas of town have to set aside at least 50% of the land as conserved open space (that cannot be developed in the future) and cluster the homes on the remaining land?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC	TOTAL	
7 14%	11 10%	18 11%	Should not be required for any subdivision
9 18%	10 9%	19 12%	Should be required for subdivisions with 10 or more lots
6 12%	16 15%	22 14%	Should be required for subdivisions with 4 or more lots
4 8%	8 7%	12 8%	Should be required for subdivisions on land above 1,500 feet in elevation
21 42%	46 42%	67 42%	Should be required for all subdivisions
3 6%	19 17%	22 14%	Other
10	35	45	<i>Skipped</i>

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

12. Other

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I don't feel comfortable answering this question. I would like to know the impacts of this decision. 2. Should be required for subdivisions of 10 or so lots, and should be required for subdivisions above 1000 ft and even more conserved open space for elevations higher than that. 3. Two of them should be required: 10-unit subdivisions and 4-unit subdivisions above 1,500 feet. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No development above 1500 ft. 2. Moratorium on builds over 1300' in the Worcester range. Also better planning for all properties East of Sweet Rd. / Ripley / Perry Hill down to Owls head. High elevation vanity homes with walls of solar reflecting glass (and the fragmentation they introduce to the view-shed) is not a community asset. Especially on steep slopes that yield flash flooding road issues. Setting aside 50% (and limiting fencing manipulations of wildlife corridors thereon) is desirable with any size multi-unit subdivision. And qualifier to Q2/4: size of acres depends on wildlife corridor overlay and natural resource consumption/demand (water/wastewater pressures). And will lands with multiple zoning be given the higher or lower threshold? Historical grandfathering? Just looking at the map, it's hard not seeing Lotspeich speaking out of both sides of his mouth to many different neighbors over the last 2.5 decades. 3. Should be required for all subdivisions with 4 or more lots. Also for subdivisions above 1,500 feet. 4. Should be required for subdivisions with 4 or more lots AND all subdivisions on land above 1500 feet in elevation 5. Should be required for subdivisions with ten or more lots and for subdivisions above 1500 feet. 6. It should be considered for large subdivisions of 10 lots or greater and above 1500'. Clustering in the upper elevations can be challenging due to topography, but attempt to cluster makes a lot of sense because less hillside gets developed. Large lots with large setbacks spreads development further, inevitably interrupting more habitat etc., which is an issue. 7. All but subdivisions less than 4 lots 8. It's important to keep open land. 9. I agree that all subdivisions must conserve at least 50% of the land, and that development be concentrated in a way that preserves the largest possible tracts of contiguous forest and pasture lands. I agree that clustering houses should occur on any lot, not just a subdivision to preserve open space. For example, you can cluster new homes on adjacent lots, not associated with a subdivision, but simply required to site a house close to an existing house if it reduces fragmentation of open space. Conserved Open Space requires a legal vehicle, which I support. 10. Case by case 11. Again, one size doesn't fit all. Perhaps I would go with subdivisions with 4 or more lots but requiring 50 % set aside seems a bit intrusive. Perhaps a sliding scale approach. We want to encourage thoughtful, efficient development that maximizes existing resources and encourages stewardship of our natural resources.....NOT make it impossible to do any development whatsoever 12. Agree with requiring cluster development in general but should be specific based on the qualities and properties of each parcel. Depends on soil, ag land, water, wildlife. 13. Clustering is the important part... but requiring a 50% conservation is unethical. 14. Is 50% is a bit much...30% maybe? If there's a limit assigned (10 or 4) will developers will simply do one less to get out of the requirement? 15. Doesn't Act 250 address this? I think if a large development is going in (10 or more) open land would be a really good thing to include. But: Some of these people have been paying taxes for decades, with this as their retirement. Should we change the rules on them and take away their investment, possibly leaving them without the benefit when they have held off developing? 16. This survey is pretty difficult to understand...

13. Do you agree that the additional review is effective at protecting the character and quality of Waterbury's ridgeline, hillsides and steep slopes?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	75	100	0	73	100	0	74	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>39 Skipped</i>			<i>48 Skipped</i>		

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

14. Do you agree that Waterbury's zoning should allow dining, entertainment or recreational activities on a farm (farm dinners, snack bar, restaurant, petting zoo, corn maze, musical performances, etc.)?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	<input type="checkbox"/> 76 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 76 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 76 <input type="checkbox"/>	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>35 Skipped</i>			<i>44 Skipped</i>		

15. Do you agree that Waterbury's zoning should allow events to be held on farms (parties, reunions, weddings, conferences, etc.)?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	<input type="checkbox"/> 82 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 86 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 85 <input type="checkbox"/>	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>34 Skipped</i>			<i>43 Skipped</i>		

16. Do you agree that Waterbury's zoning should allow retail sales of agricultural products on a farm if the more than 50% of the products being sold are not produced on the farm?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	<input type="checkbox"/> 63 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 56 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 59 <input type="checkbox"/>	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>36 Skipped</i>			<i>45 Skipped</i>		

17. Do you agree that Waterbury's zoning should allow processing of agricultural products on a farm if more than 50% of the products being processed are not produced on the farm?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	<input type="checkbox"/> 60 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 62 <input type="checkbox"/>	100	0	<input type="checkbox"/> 61 <input type="checkbox"/>	100
<i>10 Skipped</i>			<i>39 Skipped</i>			<i>49 Skipped</i>		

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

18. Do you agree that Waterbury's zoning should allow existing farm structures to be rented out for storage space?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	64	100	0	67	100	0	66	100
<i>10 Skipped</i>			<i>37 Skipped</i>			<i>47 Skipped</i>		

19. Any other comments about the land use regulations in the rural areas of town?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anything that encourages any aspect of farming (and preserves large chunks of farmland) is good 2. Expanding what farms can do is desirable. The reason I did not agree with the questions above is because unless the definition of a farm is carefully devised, allowing these uses on farms could easily allow for the creation of so-called farms that are really excuses to establish uses that otherwise would be light industrial in the most rural areas of our town. 3. Farmers should be allowed to do what they want with their farms. 4. We need to help farmer to be economically viable. That means making it possible for them to supplement revenue streams. Without this, they may be forced to sell off and develop land. 5. We have to make it easier for farmers to stay on their land and not develop it. However, I would object to large commercial ventures of any type. 6. Farms, just like any other business should be subjected to the same rules & regulations. The above questions regarding the regulation of what a farm can sell is silly. Does the town regulate the products sold in any other business? 7. If zoning allows such business/activities on farms, the farms should be subject to the same laws/requirements as for "commercial" or "light industrial" use. 8. Land use regulations obviously should be consistent with existing road infrastructure. Expansion of agricultural land use presupposes adequate roadways, parking etc. 9. We need to provide additional follow ups and enforcement. The rules should provide greater enforcement powers and accountability. I am somewhat okay with offices, small restaurants, recreational activities such as hiking trails but strongly disagree with the use for assembly type purposes such as weddings or large events. 10. Rural areas should be kept as open space. They should not be allowed to build a new building for Ag-use and then decide to not use it after it's built and then rent it out. Too many people are trying to skirt the rules. Too many people know the loop holes and the original intent of the project is not followed up with or enforced. Example: Someone built a new home and was required to keep 50% of the trees untouched. They built the house and a year later completely cleared the lot of all its trees. This appears to be happening more and more. 11. While farm activities must be encouraged, zoning regulations must apply. Businesses must not evade regulation by claiming to be agricultural 12. Would like to hear expert testimony about which percentages encourage or discourage sprawl. Is 50% really too strict or about right. What examples can be shared? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cherish the remaining rural areas! 2. Keep the town as rural/ag as possible 3. The character of this area has been drastically changed for the worse. Nobody wants to visit a suburb. The reason we are successful is because it is rural and beautiful. No more development at all. People don't drive from NJ to go to NJ. 4. Avoid fragmentation of forest and pastures. Protect the Shutesville Hill wildlife corridor. 5. Zoning questions are wrong. Need to take into account the quality of the ecosystem service in any given place. Even 10-acre zoning screws habitat. So you have to understand where it matters. For example, Shutesville hill wildlife corridor. 6. "More than 50%" does not preclude 100%, 90%, 80%,70%. #9 - I agree that development above 1200 ft SHOULD require approval as a conditional use, I do not agree that the additional review has been effective enough in protecting our ridgeline, hillsides, and steep slopes. 7. I do not believe that the DRB and tools allow adequate review of development above 1,500 feet. These areas serve as valuable wildlife habitat and are within the view shed of many Waterbury roads, homes and visitors. Small or negligible wildlife corridors are permitted and buildings and lights are not adequately screened. 8. Strongly urge the re-visitation of the development above 1200 feet. Waterbury has already been marred by this gross allowance. 9. We need to keep our farm land. keep development away from ridge lines, minimize development of 2,5,10 acres zones. 10. Land use regulations should help support keeping rural areas rural. Allowing innovative activities by rural landowners to help support their businesses and keep them viable is a good idea. 11. Farmers need options to survive 12. Any and all efforts to support working lands should be encouraged 13. I support encourage creative economic use of ag resources that will help them survive and not sell off to development 14. It is essential to give our farm owners options to create revenue as long as they keep the land preserved for wildlife and beauty. 15. With limited farm opportunities and the effective cost of farming should allow for more diversified uses and the amount of product physically produced there should not be overly restrictive. 16. I think it's important to keep farms in business. If that requires them being creative I think that's fine. 17. We should be as flexible as possible to allow owners to keep their property and make a living and not interfere with neighbors.

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

19. Any other comments about the land use regulations in the rural areas of town?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<p>13. Preserving what's left of Waterbury's rural character is crucial. Much of what was agricultural/wild on the outskirts of the village has been densely developed (Mill Village, Pery Hill, etc). It would be very detrimental to expand this type of development into the LDR or CNS areas of Waterbury Town. I choose to live in Waterbury because it is not Essex or Colchester. I think expanding higher density development and/or collapsing the zoning districts is popular to developers (which will no doubt be disproportionately represented in this survey) but not to the average homeowner.</p> <p>14. Some regulations should be more specific to allow regulation of aesthetics, fire protection etc. I don't feel that there are specific enough regulation to limit certain growth and to ensure open space, forest, agricultural use. The scenic views should also be a regulation/requirement. Aesthetics may be listed as something to consider but is not specific enough to ensure it is adequately reviewed to maintain the beauty of Waterbury. The review board doesn't vote based on scenic views, aesthetics, fire protection, etc. even though they are part of the regulations because they are not well defined or specific enough to be considered. Greater emphasis should be provided for these.</p>	<p>18. Some products that are made have several ingredients like blends. Grandmas apple pie is more or at least 50% flour. So I would be concerned if I was not able to produce at product if I could not grow or mill it. Or a bad crop year. What if my tomato crop caught a bad fungi and I had to import tomatoes to make my salsa, just saying. Or growing tea and making blends. I guess using an old barn for people's stuff could be an issue if it is not regulated but the barn is being used not falling down. I haven't seen a real barn without something in the corner.</p> <p>19. Re: Q12, the argument being that they may be selling their own maple syrup but augmenting income with local VT cheeses or meats or other products that are still helping the local economy but not necessarily made on that farm. Re: Q13, as long as it's legal and not destroying the environment or bothering neighbors or community, why does if what they process is more than 50%? What if it's an agreement with a local orchard to press apple but the apples don't come from the farm? Why should be prohibited?</p> <p>20. To make an informed decision on this, I would love to hear from farmers as to how this would benefit/hinder or impact their sustainability. Agri-tourism seems like a great idea, but more information and feedback from actual farmers is important.</p> <p>21. Activities on farms should be encouraged to sustain and enhance farming. Need to be consistent with non-nuisance requirements.</p> <p>22. I do think farms should be able to hold farm dinners with local products and the farms products used. But not petting zoos, restaurants, snack bars etc. Holding events unrelated to agriculture is not really agriculture related anymore and needs a different classification of land use.</p> <p>23. I think diversification of "farm" activities should be allowed, but within parameters.</p> <p>24. Protect farms but don't create loopholes that can be exploited</p> <p>25. If the town is going to expand the acceptable uses that are related to agriculture it must be done in a thoughtful and thorough manner. If an activity has nothing to do with farming then it isn't appropriate to regulate it as an accessory or ancillary farm use. For instance, as soon as farmer converts his barn to off-site storage, it isn't agriculture anymore and should be regulated like any other business. Farmers get special treatment for a reason and we should do everything reasonably possible to let farmers expand their potential revenue streams so long as they relate to agriculture or agribusiness. You need to better define agribusiness and allow those uses as farming or ancillary to farming rather than characterizing them as light industry or commercial. Like all things zoning, the devil is in the details.</p> <p>26. For answers 2 & 4, it required me to put in a number. I strongly feel that the districts should not be merged. 2 acres/parcel for that amount of space is far too dense and ruins the character of our town.</p> <p>27. If merged all districts should adhere to strictest requirements in acreage not lessened.</p> <p>28. It doesn't make sense that Sweet Rd is medium density and Ripley Rd is low density. Ripley is denser than Sweet Rd. already and Sweet Rd. and surrounds should all be low density, especially to preserve the beautiful hayfields and forests and area around the Hunger Mt. trail.</p> <p>29. Merging zoning districts and treating them in a One-Size-Fits-All manner seems like an answer searching for a problem. I don't think they should all be treated the same, given they have different attributes to consider. Maybe there needs to be adjustments, but lumping them together is not the answer in my opinion.</p> <p>30. Regarding #5, the decision as to which zone a split property should be moved into should be the current landowner's not the town's. Regarding 6-14, these are all good ideas in general principle and I support the sentiments, but without the details of how these resources will be protected without negative effects on current landowners and how these uses will be allowed without negative effects on neighbors I can't agree 100%.</p> <p>31. Regarding Q. 2 and 4; I don't like simplifying this, without the context of the landscape. For example, you can consolidate homes into small amount of acreages and still preserve tenants of MDR or CNS (larger acreages per lot). Without considering landscape contexts, acreage thresholds don't really do what we want them to do.</p> <p>32. Zoning in rural areas needs to address pre-existing non-conforming small lots within zones. It is not fair that a person cannot have a shed or garage because they need a waiver of setback that may not be granted if the neighbor complains. The owners of these pre-existing lots did not create the situation, therefore they should not be held responsible for the ramifications of large setbacks intended for larger lots being applied on their small lots.</p> <p>33. Outbuildings should be allowed as needed with minimal setbacks required. The current setbacks are very prohibitive of outbuildings and greenhouses on 5 acre lots. The only place I could put one without a variance is right by my house, not near my gardens where I need it.</p> <p>34. Require "mother in law" residences be affixed to the main structure and not be allowed as stand alone structures.</p> <p>35. Bike path, sidewalks, NO more big box stores like the size of Shaw's (70,000sq ft). Let's not become Williston.</p> <p>36. Racketeering of water resources by Town officials is a major concern with significant liabilities. Boxing out some residents from engaging in traditional uses of their lands while zoning others into increased profits because of a valley location that sits downstream of a for-profit water corporation developed by the Town / Village is a very slippery slope at this junction... Just being honest. Too much is at stake if the Town does not walk this razor's edge correctly. Mountain town gentrification typically impacts the upper elevations of ranges and having seen our own impact, shifted course to a more sustainable methodology. The corporate entities in this Town / Village need to do the same.</p>

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

19. Any other comments about the land use regulations in the rural areas of town?

PUBLIC

37. I am unable to answer these questions. Educating the public of the benefits/impacts would be helpful. Higher density with open space is better. there is a huge cost to maintain infrastructure in Waterbury Center.
38. These questions are somewhat tricky to respond to and a little misleading. For example, Q14 could mean that someone could build a huge structure on their "farm" and this structure could be rented out like any typical storage facility. Q10 what prevents someone building a bar on their "farm" that can have a direct negative impact on a neighbor?
39. This is really something that needs to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
40. Thank you for asking our opinion
41. This whole survey is poorly written. Too many variables to pick just yes and no. Not enough info either to have an informed opinion.
42. ugh, this survey...

20. Do you agree that similar districts within and outside the village should be consolidated?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	68	100	0	66	100	0	67	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>39 Skipped</i>			<i>48 Skipped</i>		

21. Do you agree that multi-family housing should be allowed as a permitted use in more residential zoning districts (including the Village Residential district)?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	57	100	0	64	100	0	62	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>37 Skipped</i>			<i>46 Skipped</i>		

22. Do you agree that the density of housing (number of units per acre) allowed in areas served by municipal water and sewer should be increased?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	44	100	0	46	100	0	45	100
<i>11 Skipped</i>			<i>39 Skipped</i>			<i>50 Skipped</i>		

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

23. Do you agree that the cap on the maximum number of units allowed in a building should be removed from the zoning?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	26	100	0	29	100	0	28	100
11 Skipped			45 Skipped			56 Skipped		

24. Do you agree that the additional review is necessary to protect the character of the area from the off-site impacts of businesses like traffic, noise or light?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	87	100	0	84	100	0	85	100
9 Skipped			37 Skipped			46 Skipped		

25. Do you think that Waterbury's review and permitting process for commercial and/or light industrial uses should be more or less rigorous than it is now or should be remain the same as it is now?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Less	Same	More	Less	Same	More	Less	Same	More
0	64	100	0	64	100	0	64	100
11 Skipped			43 Skipped			54 Skipped		

26. Do you agree that design review should be extended to all five historic districts?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	81	100	0	73	100	0	76	100
10 Skipped			37 Skipped			47 Skipped		

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

27. Do you agree that design review should be extended to all listed historic structures in town whether or not they are located in a historic district?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	82	100	0	69	100	0	73	100
<i>9 Skipped</i>			<i>38 Skipped</i>			<i>47 Skipped</i>		

28. Do you agree that demolition of historic structures within the historic districts should require review?

SAMPLE			PUBLIC			TOTAL		
Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree
0	82	100	0	80	100	0	81	100
<i>10 Skipped</i>			<i>36 Skipped</i>			<i>46 Skipped</i>		

29. Any other comments about the land use regulations in Waterbury Village the developed areas of town?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> "Multi-family" duplexes only. Think of TBPS. The apartment buildings at the end of north main street are a strong reason for control of housing being built in Waterbury. Multi-family housing drastically changes the nature of a place. This type of development should go through scrutiny and review, as should development in historic districts. Recent multi-family development has been permitted without requiring necessary infrastructure improvements (eg roads) Also concerned that excessive development may result in long term drainage issues. I think people should be made to build smaller homes to fit the size of the family. We somehow need to figure out how to retain the character of a village where families live and work, and allow for more affordable dwelling options. Simply allowing historic homes to be turned into apartments, solves some housing needs, but at the cost of ruining cohesiveness in neighborhoods. More structures like the Downstreet housing development make sense to me. In general, Waterbury needs to increase the density of development in the village and close to infrastructure, and strictly limit development farther from the central. No more development should be permitted on steep slopes or on elevations above 12,000 ft. No more development should be permitted in areas not adjacent to current infrastructure. Protecting the character of Waterbury from thoughtless development is worth having an extra layer of review. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stop the development by Viens! The area is overdeveloped now and quickly being ruined. Development should be heavily restricted I would hate to see historic structures demolished especially if it means that something like a dollar store would go up in its place. UGH!! While it's sad to see historical structures destroyed, it's the property owner's and not the town's decision. If a property is not historic but in an historic district, it should not have as much review as an historic structure. Preserving our history is important. However, regulations should be reviewed and edited to consider the private land owners rights. If no State or Federal money is being used, the private land owner should have more freedom. Also, if the structure is not listed on the State or Federal register as a contributing structure, the Town should not have the right to consider it listed or contributing. Especially, if the project has no State jurisdiction. Design review should be leveled on new construction in a historical district, within reason. Design review should not be leveled on a non-historical building in a historical district. Design review should only remain on those structures inside the historical districts. Recommendations can certainly be made. Perhaps an incentive to do so would be more reasonable, then the property owner has a choice, rather than being strong-armed into something or forced not to make improvements and/or neglecting the building.

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

29. Any other comments about the land use regulations in Waterbury Village the developed areas of town?

SAMPLE	PUBLIC
<p>9. I'm not sure what the zoning regulations are on Main St in the village, but I hope you fix them so that something like Henders won't happen again. Main St will lose its charm. I also wish something could be done about noise. The jake brake noise occurs all hours during the day and even in the wee hours of the night. Such a lack of respect for those living in the village (and anywhere for that matter).</p> <p>10. . Need to provide preemptive regulation for new businesses such as marijuana, pubs, breweries. Need regulation to limit where dumpsters can be placed and to provide proper screening. We need to provide additional follow ups and enforcement. The rules should provide greater enforcement powers and accountability. Additional regulation should be provided to make sure green space and open lands are kept. Again, this means that once a permit comes in, there is follow up a year down the road to make sure they don't clear cut the remaining trees and accountability and enforcement should be provided at that stage.</p> <p>11. Some regulations should be more specific to allow regulation of aesthetics, fire protection etc. I don't feel that there are specific enough regulations to limit certain growth and to ensure open space, forest, agricultural use. The scenic views should also be a regulation/requirement. Aesthetics may be listed as something to consider but is not specific enough to ensure it is adequately reviewed to maintain the beauty of Waterbury. The review board doesn't vote based on scenic views, aesthetics, fire protection, etc. even though they are part of the regulations because they are not well defined or specific enough to be considered. Greater emphasis should be provided for these.</p> <p>12. Waterbury has a small town feel and is what attracts tourism. We should have more reviews to ensure the small town feel is maintained. There should be additional regulations that are more specific and allow greater oversight on what is built.</p> <p>13. Why are you singling out Waterbury 'village' when you are canceling the distinction?? Like beating a dead horse for nothing. YOU want the merger yet you are wasting time agreeing for the 'dead'. Waste of time and tax dollars!!</p>	<p>8. More thorough review of designs is necessary in town. Also, we should require chain stores/businesses to adhere to a stronger design requirement, not allow cookie cutter designed structures.</p> <p>9. The Planning Commission should review the signage requirements and eliminate internally illuminated signs from the Rt. 100 corridor outside of the 100/89 interchange area. The PC should consider requiring general access and driveway design standards to protect residents and emergency equipment (i.e. adopt engineer standards for driveways, curb cuts, and development roads). Design review should be required for commercial development along Rt. 100 and for Waterbury Center.</p> <p>10. Signage should be limited in size, not have internal lighting. Lighting in general should be limited and be directed downward. Light pollution has vastly increased over the recent past.</p> <p>11. Light pollution is becoming a problem with businesses with way too many lights.</p> <p>12. Adopt a noise control ordinance similar to Stowe or Waterbury.</p> <p>13. Traffic and parking need to be considered when allowing multi-use sites. I fear over development in the village.</p> <p>14. I would like more information on what design review entails (costs/administrative processing) and how this currently impacts residents/business owners within the existing historic district.</p> <p>15. Once development has occurred it is there for good. I support a comprehensive review process. But that also must be buttressed by a clear rule set. Our rules need comprehensive attention.</p> <p>16. Consider esthetics! How did we get that incredibly ugly gas station across from the Mobil?</p> <p>17. No strip malls. All development should be an attractive addition to the town with architectural designs that look like they are part of the community. My husband and I call the hotel on route 100 the Waterbury eyesore. Why bother making them keep part of the Thatcher Brook Inn when the hotel is clearly not of similar design.</p> <p>18. Again, tricky questions. For example, having more multi-family homes (apartments) in the Village is acceptable but doing this in the Center is not. Keep the high-density housing in the Village where it makes sense keeping the other land outside the Village more in character of Vermont. Oh... when I say keep the high concentration of apartments in the Village I do not mean up Route 100.</p> <p>19. The max # units in a bldg is not a black/white decision, but variable to take into account. Demo of historical buildings should be based on condition/cost to renovate.</p> <p>20. I think multi-family housing should not be allowed in low or maybe even medium density zones.</p> <p>21. Please do not encourage the development of multi-family units within the village. It is the single-family residences which define/create/exemplify the unique character of our neighborhoods. Multi-family housing detracts from the neighborhood character and primarily serves to benefit one person (the owner) instead of the entire neighborhood. If you want to encourage density (which you should) please consider revisiting the setbacks, minimum lot size, and building footprint per lot size ratio to encourage single-family infill. This will bolster and revive the neighborhoods and make re-development of non-conforming lots easier.</p> <p>22. There needs to be more non-rental properties in the village.</p> <p>23. Mother-in-law apartments/dwellings on the same property should be allowed to help with extended family care.</p> <p>24. I think the zoning regulations should not allow industrial land adjacent to historical residences. Let the railroad track be the dividing line.</p> <p>25. I believe new development should be limited to areas of town that are already heavily developed in order to protect as much open land and forest as possible.</p> <p>26. Promote development where we have it and where there is water and sewer services</p> <p>27. My knowledge of design review requirements is insufficient. If the review requirements are currently too onerous for the town to administer, then we should defer to the state regulations and state administration of regulations. (Act 250, etc.) I feel strongly that increased density in currently densely developed areas should be in direct exchange for decreased development in less developed areas, including strategic planning toward a moratorium on development beyond current existing infrastructure.</p> <p>28. These were a little hard for me to answer because I'm not that familiar with the existing process. I hope my answers convey that I think the town should encourage higher density housing in the downtown area and generally try to preserve historic structures throughout the town.</p> <p>29. I would like zoning to support cluster housing in order to keep open land in as many places as possible. I would hate to see our town divided up every bit of land that used to be used for agriculture into a house every acre or two. I would also like to see zoning prevent housing development on upper reaches of hills and mountainsides that will be eye pollution to locals and visitors alike.</p>

Waterbury 2017 Zoning Community Survey Report

205 responses total. An invitation to take the survey was mailed to a sample of 360 Waterbury voters of which 60 completed the survey. A link to the online survey was advertised to the general public through the town's website and Front Porch Forum and generated an additional 145 responses.

29. Any other comments about the land use regulations in Waterbury Village the developed areas of town?

PUBLIC

30. I believe the DRB team needs to take more time understanding each individual case that is brought to the team. There are rules in place that are not fair to the land owner, i.e. setbacks, road water run-off and rights-of-way.
31. I only think if it's public property the public, represented by the review board, should have say over what happens to a property unless it's harmful in some way (reducing value of surrounding properties, polluting water, etc.) otherwise- zoning should have few restrictions.
32. If a commercial change of use is proposed, and the uses are permitted for the zone, and the applicant can prove the basics of parking and water/sewer are met, there is no need to go to the DRB. If basic requirements are met, change of use should be handled administratively. it is not fair to make a building owner wait 60+ days for DRB process just to move a new tenant in when it's a permitted use and basic requirements are proved out with the administrator.
33. Waterbury is not friendly to reasonable development because of the rare Act 250 requirement (keeping Waterbury a 1 acre town)
34. How can I answer about density regarding water and sewer if I don't know the capacity of our water and sewer system?
35. RE: Q6 for anyone that hasn't gone through it, this is an unfair question to ask as people won't know what the process is. RE: Q9 what are the review guidelines? What must the owner demonstrate before being allowed to demolish - disrepair, usage change, length of ownership?
36. Comments about the survey in general: Too vague, not enough option for real, substantive feedback.

30. Do you...?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
52	100%	104	95%	156	97%	Live in Waterbury
15	29%	42	39%	57	35%	Work in Waterbury
7	13%	32	29%	39	24%	Own a business or rental property in Waterbury
2	4%	9	8%	11	7%	Represent property owners seeking permits or development approvals in Waterbury
8		36		44		Skipped

31. If you live in Waterbury, where do you live...?

SAMPLE		PUBLIC		TOTAL		
13	25%	28	26%	41	26%	Waterbury Village
19	37%	50	46%	69	43%	Waterbury Center
3	6%	3	3%	6	4%	Colbyville
1	2%	0	0%	1	1%	Mill Village
7	13%	6	6%	13	8%	Route 100 corridor
5	10%	12	11%	17	11%	Rural areas east of Route 100
2	4%	3	3%	5	3%	Rural areas west of Route 100
2	4%	6	6%	8	5%	Other
8		37		45		Skipped