

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Monday, December 4, 2023

3
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. Chair B. Buermann called the meeting to
5 order at 6:00 PM.

6
7 ATTENDANCE:

8 Commission: Scholten, Marietta ; Demars, Howard ; Buermann, Robert ; Irwin, William ; Garrett,
9 Harold

10
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12
13 Guests: Brian Dubie, Jason Day, Peggy Howrigan. David Howrigan

14
15 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

16 None.

17
18
19 **Public Comment**

20 None.

21
22
23 **Project Reviews:**

24
25
26 **Section 248- Peggy and David Howrigan/100 kW small wind in Fairfield**

27 *Project Details:* 100 kW wind system with four turbines, each with a tower of 100’.

28
29 E. Klofft reviewed the draft project review sheet for the project. The project is on the edge of a base wind area
30 but does not appear to be within it. No environmental justice impacts are expected. There is a confirmed
31 vernal pond on the site, which will be protected with a 600’ buffer. There will be aesthetic impacts as the
32 project is located on a hilltop at an elevation of 800’. There will be some visibility of the project along the west
33 side of Fairfield Pond. The flicker map shows possible impacts of up to 20 hours per year. E. Klofft noted the
34 Town submitted a letter opposing the project, while both letters for and against the project had been sent by
35 residents.

36
37 J. Day clarified that the flicker impact map was modelled assuming no intervening trees and that intervening
38 trees would reduce flicker impacts.

39
40 B. Irwin stated that the energy planning process was designed to allow municipalities to identify community
41 resources to be preserved. He stated that Fairfield Pond is a key element of the community and should be
42 protected.

43
44 J. Day presented on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the applicant’s point of view is that the project has
45 a limited visual impact as it is a small wind project. He stated that the visual impact completed by the
46 applicant and the 170 letters of support gathered by the applicant were evidence that the sensibility of the

1 average person would not be offended by the project. J. Day stated that an attorney hired by the applicant
2 believes the Fairfield Town Plan does not contain a clear enough written standard regarding visibility of wind
3 turbines from Fairfield Pond to receive substantial deference.
4

5 B. Dubie stated that the Town had hired an attorney who believed the plan did support the Town's position
6 that the plan has a clearly written standard to protect Fairfield Pond from impacts of development. He stated
7 that the project would be above 90' above the treeline and visible from public roads along the pond.
8

9 E. Klofft noted that there were two decisions the Committee could make, one to determine the plan's
10 conformance with the Regional Plan and second, if the Committee would like the letter to comment on the
11 town's position on the project.
12

13 B. Irwin stated that he felt there was no disagreement between the Town and the Committee on this project.
14

15 *B. Irwin motioned to find that the project is not in conformance with the Regional Plan and that it does*
16 *constitute a substantial regional impact. H. Garrett seconded. The motion carried.*
17

18 *H. Garrett motioned to intervene in the project. M. Scholten seconded. The motion carried.*
19

20 H. Garrett stated that he was not against renewable energy, but was trying to protect a sensitive area. D.
21 Howrigan stated he felt there was not a clearly written standard and that windmills are part of the farm
22 landscape.
23

24 **Updates**

25 The Committee discussed whether a further December meeting should be held. E. Klofft stated at this time
26 there were no major projects proposed.
27

28 **Commissioner Announcements**

29 None.
30

31 **Adjourn**

32 *M. Scholten motioned to adjourn. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at 6:58 PM.*
33
34
35
36