August 4, 2018

Re: Conditional Use Checklist

Dear Michael,

I was glad to see on the August 8 PB agenda that the PB will take up revising the CU Checklist. We are fortunate that our recently retired Professor of Communication Joshua Meyrowitz has turned more of his attention toward town matters and has noticed some small but important discrepancies between our ZO and in the current checklist. The two items he raised (the use of the words "excessive" and "inappropriate" which do not appear in the Eight Criteria for CU but do appear in the current CU checklist) are important to correct because they significantly alter the meaning of the CU Criteria.

That said, I was a bit taken aback as to how the existing CU Checklist has now dramatically morphed in your revised checklist into a document that I believe will not serve the PB well. While I do think it is a good idea that the proposed checklist reflect the precise language and meaning of our ZO's Eight Criteria, keep in mind that the *ZO is not a checklist itself*. The existing checklist format, with each item broken out for the PB to thoughtfully consider, deliberate on, and vote YES or NO on is, in my opinion, much more sensible and should remain. Keep in mind that often when PB goes through the Eight Criteria, it is at the end of a long evening of deliberation. Members are tired by then, and even in the current itemized checklist format, these items tend to be rushed through. With individual items lumped together as is the case in your proposed checklist, this will not encourage thoughtful, item-by-item deliberation.

The proposed format for the revising checklist does a disservice to both PB members and the community.

Possible Solution: Should the PB feel it is useful to include the exact ZO language in the review process, I suggest each of the ZO's Eight Criteria be written out as it is in the ZO and the proposed checklist, *followed by the item-by-item checklist that exists in the current checklist (making sure the issues raised by Joshua Meyrowitz have been corrected).* In essence, I am suggesting merging the existing and the proposed checklists so as to encourage thoughtful deliberation of each

item. This part of the approval process should not be streamlined, but rather should be taken to heart and seriously deliberated.

I would also like to note my concern about the existing language in Item #8 Fiscal Impacts on the proposed checklist. I realize that this is the precise language of the ZO, yet the first sentence is very poorly crafted and makes little sense. Item #13 Fiscal Impacts on the *existing checklist* is much more clearly written and does make sense. Thus, here again, if the PB does feel it is important to include the precise ZO language in the checklist, including the ZO Fiscal Impacts language followed by the existing checklist clarification would be extremely useful.

Finally, I think it is important the Conditions of Approval appear on the same document as the checklist, but since they are not part of the Eight Criteria, they should be listed separately. This can be accomplished by removing the # in front of them and placing them in a separate section with a bolded heading: **Conditions of Approval.** That part of the process is extremely important in terms of mitigating potential negative impacts and should remain front and center, handed out to the PB members with the Checklist.

Thank you for your ongoing efforts to improve the CU review process.

Beth Olshansky

PS Should the PB decide that merging the two checklists becomes too cumbersome or wordy, I personally am in favor of maintaining the current checklist with the exception of correcting the two words "excessive" and "inappropriate" that do not belong in the current checklist.