

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Exclusions

1. What additional commercial projects should require approval?
2. What commercial projects currently excluded in the Draft from approval should require approval instead?
3. If so, which commercial projects should we remove from the list of exclusions?

Many responders chose to answer the above three questions as one question. The survey results returned **12 No Answers** (4G, 1E, 7P) which includes blank answers, agree with current draft, and irrelevant answers.

From the remaining answers that were responsive, many suggested making sure the below commercial activities should be excluded from approval:

- Professional services/home online (**2 – 2G**)
- Commercial activity by resident living on property (**1 – 1G**)
- Lumber/Agriculture (**1 – 1G**)
- Cottage Industry (**1 – 1P**)
- Fund Raiser (**1 – 1P**)
- Hobby Shop/Dance Studio (**1 – 1P**)

One (**1 – 1P**) response wanted all commercial projects to require approval.

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Commercial Multi-Family Residences (“MFR”)

1	Question	Require Approval	Not Require Approval	No Answer
	Should MFR require approval?	16 (5G, 1E, 10P)	1 (1G)	3 (1E, 2P)

2	Do you think the 5-Family Limit is too high or too low?	Too High	Too Low	Agree with Current Draft	No Answer
		12 (3G, 1E, 8P)	1 (1G)	1 (1P)	6 (2G, 1E, 3P)

3	What benchmark preferred?	2-Family	3-Family	4-Family	5-Family	No Answer
		8 (2G, 1E, 5P)	4 (2G, 2P)	2 (2P)	1 (1G)	5 (1G, 1E, 3P)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Large Commercial Structure – size & visibility

1	Question	Support	Not Support	No Answer
	Support to require LCS be NOT VISIBLE from “outside the property?”	15 (5G,9P, 1E)	1 (1G)	4 (3P, 1E)

Size of LCS in Current Draft:

- **Project Structure – 3,000 ft²; and**
- **Project Site – 10,000 ft²; or**
- **Project Structure Height – 75 ft**

2	Do you think size requirement for LSC to not be visible is too big or too small?	Too Big	Too Small	No Answer	Agree with Current Draft Size	No Commercial Structure
		3 (2G, 1P)	3 (1G, 2P)	10 (3G, 6P, 1E)	7 (*3P, 1E,*3G) *includes answers to size suggestion question	1 (1P)

3. What Size would you prefer the LCS to be, if required to not be visible from outside the property?

- “Larger than average house” (G5)
- “2 stories in height & footprint but not exceed 5,000 ft²”(P6)
- 5,000 ft²/20,000 ft² (P5)
- “size should be cut by 1/3” (P1)
- “Nothing larger than Skoolhouse, concerned about condos, storage sheds” (P12)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

4	Do you think LCS should have more requirements?	Yes	No	No Answer
		10 (4G, 6P)	3 (2G,1E)	7 (6P, 1E)

5. If so, what different/additional requirements do you prefer?
- Regulate limit noise pollution (G3)
 - Very detailed long term impact study (G5)
 - Estimated water consumption, aquifers go dry each Summer (P9)
 - Signage requirements, no lighted signs (P3, P6)
 - Structure should be blended in with Community, Lot should not be all empty space (P1)
 - Lot shouldn't be used for take-off/landing of aircrafts (P1)
 - Watershed plans showing disposal and flow disruption effects would be minimal/mitigated. (P5)
 - Paving limits (P5)
 - Hours of operation (P6)
 - Excessive large vehicle traffic (P6: nuisance)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Solar Farm

1	Question	Support	Not Support	No Answer	No Solar Farms
	Do you support Solar Farms having additional requirements to a commercial structure for approval?	10 (5G, 1E, 4P)	1 (1G)	6 (1E, 5P)	3 (3P)

Solar Farm Size in Current Draft: total airspace overground 3,000 ft²

2	Do you think the size of Solar Farm in Current Draft is too big or too small?	Too big	Too Small	No Answer	Agree with Current Draft Size	No Solar Farms
		5 (4G, 1P)	1 (1G)	10 (1G, 1E, 8P)	1 (1E)	3 (3P)

3. What **size** would you prefer for definition of **Solar Farm**?

- No solar farm (8 answers = 5G, 3P)
- Larger than 50 acres or apx. 7 MW maximum output (G6)
- 1 acre (P5)

4	Do you think Solar Farms should have more requirements?	Yes	No	No Answer	No Solar Farm
		7 (4G, 1E, 2P)	4 (2G, 2P)	6 (1E, 5P)	3 (3P)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

5. If so, what different/additional requirements do you prefer?

- No ordinance against Solar Farms because the benefit outweighs the cost(G2)
- That they not be in Weld (G3)
- No Solar Farms! (P3, P12, P6)
- Must contribute to the Town's energy supply (G5)
- Any waive of application requirements that Planning Board is considering must be presented through the Select Committee with proper prior notice to residences so they can attend this meeting to inquire of reasoning. (E2)
- The Town and residents receive financial or electric compensation (P1)
- Robust fire prevention plan (P5)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Community Impact

1.	Do you think Community Impact should be considered when granting approval?	Yes	No	No Answer
		19 (6G, 2E, 11P)	0	1 (1P)

2	Do you think the list of Community Impact should be altered (add/delete/modify)?	Yes	No	No Answer
		13 (5G, 1E, 7P)	5 (1E, 4P)	2 (1G, 1P)

3. What additions/deletions would you prefer? (**11 No Answers**)
- Environmental impact and long term overall impact. Please learn from the tower mistake. (G5)
 - I believe community impacts should be considered, but the standards clearly defined and quantifiable as opposed to subjective. "excessive" light, noise, and odors are all reasonable, but excessive to be clearly defined and quantifiable. (G6)
 - Be a good neighbor (P3)
 - Airspace consider unmanned/manned aircraft (P1)
 - Traffic patterns (P8)
 - Signage policy (P12)
 - "eye sore law" needed to prevent yards becoming "dumps", devalues neighboring property (P12, P6)
 - Permits required for all aspects of building, no lighting signage, paving, for "keeping with harmonious surroundings," town dump-sign, speed limit signs (P6)
 - The Draft list is reasonable in excessive lighting, noise, odor but appearance, blocking views seem subjective, difficult to enforce, and problematic (P5)
 - Water extraction facilities such as Poland Springs should be added to the list (E1)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Additional Comments

- Take care not to let Weld grow too fast; concerned about empty houses/inn in disrepair (G1)
- More concerned with subdivisions than LCS or Solar Farms (G2)
- Before commercial properties, Town should address numerous abandoned, dilapidated, eyesore nuisance properties that are plaguing our community. These properties are a burden to the town and residents, and are contributing to the stagnation of the town. (G5)
- Agree regulation in development is necessary and applaud efforts; but very concerned about drastically limiting opportunities for development and transforming Weld into a community of wealthy retirees. I am deeply concerned when Ordinance Committee members suggest the overall intent of the effort is to "eliminate eyesores". (G6)
- It doesn't cover zoning for large commercial projects, For example, Walmart/Amazon could put a distribution center anywhere in Weld. (P1)
- Building Ordinance needs to be revised, many concerns and questions about existing residential/commercial structures and whether they are in compliance with law and/or current building ordinance/shoreland zoning ordinance is adequate. (P8)
- Webb Corner and ByPass Rd – areas conducive for flower grant? (P6)
- If a residence/community space's electric/gas service shut off by provider for a number of days, building permit should be pulled & full inspection completed to ensure that structure is sound to receive full service again. (P6)
- Site Plan Application should not require evidence determining the applicant's financial capabilities as that would be impossible to enforce, determine, amongst many other problems. (P5)

SUMMARY OF SITE-PLAN REVIEW ORDINANCE SURVEY RESPONSES

20 Survey Results

(12 Paper, 2 Email, 6 Google)

05/02/25

Level of Support for Current Draft

No.	Question	Support	Not Support	No Answer
1	Support current Draft Ordinance?	7 (3G, 4P)	8 (3G, 1E, 4P)	5 (4P, 1E)
2	Support current Draft Ordinance if <i>some</i> suggestions adopted?	14 (4G, 10P)	3 (2G, 1E)	3 (1E, 2P)
3	NOT support Draft Ordinance unless <i>all</i> suggestions adopted?	8 (2G, 1E, 5P)	6 (4G, 2P)	6 (5P, 1E)