

Bethel Planning Survey January 2006. Response Results and All Comments. [Each individual's comment(s) are followed by a semi colon (;). Comments are clustered in groups of ten only to increase the ease of reading through them.]

4 . “Should more development than current zoning permits be granted on a piece of property if soils and slopes allow?”

Yes: 240 – 47.8%

No: 199 – 39.6%

No Response: 63 – 12.5%

Not a lot at this time – too many areas where 20 acres are required for a house to be build; *Keep lots large for Building*; May be; *Too much development, would lose the Vt. Beauty*; Maybe. Depends where it is; *Case by case*; Again... I can't really comment specifically. In general I think that development in the village should be encouraged so long as it's well done / good construction, etc; *I don't know enough about the current zoning*; For single home only; *Possibly*;

People come to Vermont for its beauty – in time they will make the same conditions as they have in Conn. Mass. RI, etc. Much traffic, housing, dev, crime – all the wrong things for such a beautiful state; *I don't know*; There are a lot of restrictions now; *You should focus on revitalizing the downtown, perhaps tourism development – concentration on the White River, mountain biking on logging roads, fun events like the Forward Festival*; It depends on a common sense approach and on the owner's discretion; *If someone wants to build on their land and it doesn't harm anyone they should be allowed*; Generally this may not be fair to neighboring landowners, but some exceptions may be possible; *Provided there is already existing structures/development on the property + there would be little or no environmental impact*; It should be fine for an individual to create a home business, or for a property's use to change upon new ownership; *We should be careful to maintain the rural character of roads other than Rts 12 + 107 which already have development*;

Perhaps on a case by case basis; *I don't know what is currently permitted (doesn't it vary?) so I cannot answer this question*; With variance and proper planning only; *This would increase the town's tax revenue i.e. buildings and improvements*; Does not pertain to me based on my knowledge; *More taxes will not permit business to come to town, we have lost enough in taxes*; Because we need growth; *Definitely – some of our 'rules' are too confining*; Yes anyone willing to move to town if they have money enough to should be welcomed with open arms. *Don't have enough information to answer properly*;

Maybe, but the question is too open; *Taking into consideration the neighbors, i.e. keep away from a negative effect on others*; Other factors plus soils/slopes info must be considered, zoning restrictions are in place for a reason(s); *It depends on what + where*; Let Bethel grow; *Answer would depend on type of development*; As a resident (+ Taxpayer) it does not seem Bethel is doing all it can to attract appropriate (or retain existing businesses like Clifford, ARA, CFM, Ultramotive,

etc.) business; *Don't allow 1 woman's bias destroy the town*; With proper research and case by case; *I think so, but need more information*;

Zoning was created for specific reasons and should be followed; *Possibly – if the development doesn't infringe on neighbors' enjoyment of their land*; We should thoughtfully set standards and then stick to them; *If the taxpayer wants to*; Depends on the resulting outcome; *Especially rural areas – but limits*; I think it would be a per situation response. Depends on surrounding factors as well; *Change zoning regulations, don't grant exemptions*; Don't understand the question; *It is important that we do not destroy the character of our town*;

More tax money – if it is the same as what is there ... only if the roads can support the traffic; *Again, since I don't know the current zoning (can't answer that)*. *Should be case by case decision*; Seems to be working well now, so why change; *Depending what it is*; With careful consideration... having a town wide plan with an eye toward eventual ambiance would be good; *20 acre zoning is a little too restrictive*; Depending on type of development; *Some*; On a case by case basis; *Within reason – don't allow over development*;

Decide on a case by case basis; *Depends on size of building lots*; Growth of horseback riding may create a need for better manure storage, etc.; *People should be able to build what they want*; With housing shortage property should be utilized where it permits; *I spent 1 ½ years in the subdivision process. The board approved my first proposal which was best for soils, topography + fit the current neighborhood properties. They reneged that decision at their next meeting. After 8,000 in surveys (to go before board) + hiring a lawyer I was "forced" to sell all my road front + land lock 64 acres of Prime white pine forest land, which by the way is in current use and has been under active forest management since 1971. Responsible growth + development starts by doing what is best for the land. They are not making more land ya know!!*; We need many more home lots of about ¼ acre in size. It is a great waste of land to force people to buy larger parcels which younger families cannot afford; *One never knows if weather could cause land falls, then what for the homes?*; Yes, if commercial development in town, but no for more residential development on the roads; *Focus instead on the schools*;

If the neighbors are ok with it; *Cluster development w/ land in common. Example (10 houses on 10 acres – 90 acres in common)*; No, assuming there is a process for variance; *Unsure of current zoning*; Not educated n this issue; *Absolutely – planned development including PUDX and industrial/commercial zone*; Only if the development is inevitable. Clustering development in order to preserve open land is good; *Absolutely not*; Variances reviewed on a case by case basis; *Over sized building + pavement will change the town's character*;

Not a big fan of zoning... Too much government (Town, state, etc.) is a bad thing; *Only if the soils and slopes are up to standards (no exceptions)*; People pay taxes, not trees; *Not sure what current zoning permits*; There needs to be some limits on development, to ensure that we don't get too commercialized;

After further inspection of the land or site. And knowing what their true intent for this land or site truly is; As needed; Some zones should be reviewed for possible change in lot size. Example: 20 acre resource conservation zone; Be careful of over-develop-ment; Not sure, need to be more informed; Within reason and if it passes inspections and neighborhood approval; Only through a variance given by the planning commission;

As much as people want. I favor development – any conflicts would be settled, privately, legally, equitably but not administratively; *Yes but this is a oddly worded question. Why are we focused on soils and slopes? Engineers can usually solve most soil and slope issues. Are you trying to make these issues an artificial hurdle to prevent development? I've seen these criteria struck down in another town because they had no merit; Depends on location; Change zoning to allow more development. We need a broader tax base in Bethel; You can't change the zoning on a piece of property in use; Not if it would be dangerous; If not town should compensate landowner for loss of value; Focus on the center of town; Land in conservation districts could change by such an allowance and that isn't desirable.*