

1 Richmond Planning Commission

2 Regular Meeting

3 Wednesday, October 5, 2016

4 Approved Minutes

5 **Members Present:** Sean Foley, Joy Reap, Brian Tellstone, Alex Brosam, Marc Hughes, Lauck
6 Parke, Clare Rock (Staff)

7 **Absent:**

8 **Others Present:** Heidi L Bormann, Bruce LaBounty, Joe McSherry, Dave Healy, G. Miller

9
10 Foley opened the meeting at 7:05pm

11
12 Public Comment

13 Foley asked the public to provide any comments now on any of the agenda items in the interest of
14 discussing the agenda items more efficiently.

15 Heidi Bormann spoke in favor of accessory apartment changes including the benefit of increasing
16 housing units on the existing sewer and water system, which may then lower overall rates.

17
18 Administrative Items & Updates

- 19 - Approve meeting minutes September 7 and sept 21

20 Fausel made a motion to approve the September 7 2016 minutes, seconded by
21 Tellstone, all in favor (for those who were present), so votes.

22 Fausel made a motion to approve September 21, 2016 minutes, seconded by
23 Tellstone seconded, all in favor (for those who were present), so voted.

- 24 - Staff Updates – Rock provided the following information:

25 ○ Creamery – the developer anticipates submitting an application to be
26 review by the Selectboard on November 7, 2016.

27 ○ Public Safety Building – the committee and Selectboard are now looking
28 at just a police station. Fausel added he hasn't attended the meetings since
29 June.

30 ○ Economic Development Committee – Rock meet with the committee to
31 talk about state designation programs. Reap added the growing interest in
32 expanding trails for mountain biking and the associated economic
33 benefits. Reap also added that it would be beneficial to invite a member
34 of the Cochran Ski Area organization to talk about their future plans,
35 similar to hearing from the VYCC to help inform the town plan.

36 ○ Zoning Administrator Position – the current ZA has taken another job and
37 the town is seeking a replacement.

38 ○ Front Porch Forum Postings – in light of a recent FPF posting, Reap
39 requested that PC members who post PC information on FPF clarify that
40 they are posting as a citizen with a personal perspective vs an official
41 posting from the PC. PC members agreed.

- 42 - Municipal Planning Grant Resolution – Rock described the upcoming MPG grant
43 application which will be submitted to request funds for a Phase I zoning update.
44 The Phase I will address housekeeping items and also include some incentives.
45 The reason for the phased approach is to implement small changes which
46 people will support vs large/big changes. Phase I will also be cheaper,
47 considering the current budget.

48
49 Parke made a motion to support the submission of the MPG application and have the chair sign the
50 MPG resolution, seconded by Tellstone, all in favor. So voted.

51
52
53

Zoning Changes

Review draft changes to Accessory Dwellings (Section 5.9) – Foley referenced the comments which we received from PC members and residents (letters from the following people were included in the PC packet: Parke, Healy, Wysockey-Johnson, and Carpenter.)

Rock distributed the letters from Christy Witters and David Healy which were received by staff after the PC packets were prepared.

Foley doesn't see a significant need with this zoning request as the person who made a request stated that they already had their permit and therefore didn't need the request zoning change. LaBounty responded by saying that he has an approval for a garage and will subsequently request approval for an apartment and therefore has partial approval for their project. They still support their initial request.

Fausel added he feels it is still a zoning change that is worth pursuing.

Parke suggested the PC develop a process for addressing zoning change requests. Rock handed out section 4441 (in regard to the process of reviewing and adopting zoning bylaws, including the need to provide a written report to how it is conformance with the town plan.)

Brosam added that the current time spent over multiple meetings discussing the changes was beneficial as it provided people the opportunity to submit comments and for the PC to discuss the potential changes.

Healy asked about the adoption process, Rock responded that it will require a PC and Selectboard public hearing.

Discussion followed about the process of accepting and reviewing subsequent zoning changes and creating a subcommittee to develop that process. Rock added it would be helpful if the committee could also identify zoning priorities to help the PC evaluate whether they would take up submitted zoning change requests.

Parke made a motion to develop the process for receiving zoning change requests, seconded by Fausel, all in favor. So voted.

The subcommittee will be comprised of Foley, Parke, Brosam. Foley will circulate a template and bring an update to the PC at the next meeting.

Accessory Apartments

Reap voiced her opinion that these changes are not a mechanism to increase density and more units, but that the changes are to help create certain types of housing units which are in need.

Tellstone added the changes will make the creation of these units more equitable across homes of all sizes.

Healy voiced his opposition to the proposed changes.

Parke proposed tabling the item, until the procedure gets drafted, others did not like the idea of retroactively.

The PC members went through the changes as outlined in the Option A and Option B handout:

Keep Familial relationship – most members agreed to keep this in, Parke disagrees. Rock added it's very hard to enforce. Reason: to communicate the intent of supporting owner-occupied properties.

Size requirement – increase allowable size to make accessory apartments viable in smaller square foot homes. Revise language to read "...75% or 1,000 sf or whichever is less; unless 30% of the total habitat-able square footage is greater

1 [than 1,000 sf] in which case that will be the maximum.” PC members agreed to
2 this change.

3 On option 2 – keep conditional use review for e) – because other residential uses
4 require conditional use, PC agreement.

5 On option 2 – remove conditional use review for f) – because adding an
6 accessory dwelling to an existing structure (within the existing footprint) and the
7 creation of a duplex do not require conditional use, nor does the building any
8 other accessory structure (i.e. a garage), PC agreement.

9 On option 2 – remove conditional use review for g) and h) – similar to the above,
10 increasing the height or floor area of an existing single family house in-of-itself,
11 or creating a duplex do not require conditional use nor does expanding the
12 parking areas for these aforementioned uses require conditional use review, PC
13 agreement.

14 Keep 5.9.6 – PC agreement.

15 Number of bedrooms – allow for up to two-bedrooms: use language from option
16 1 c) – so that an elderly person and their caregiver could live in an accessory
17 apartment, or a single parent and their child.

18
19 Rock added that there may be another zoning request by a Richmond resident. The
20 PC requested that Rock provides them with the statute language and ask them to
21 provide that information.

22
23

24 Future Agenda Items

- 25 - Regional Energy Plan (specifically maps) & Local Renewable Energy Standards-
- 26 continued discussion
- 27 - Capital Budget Review

28

29 Adjourn

30 *Tellstone made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Parke, all in favor, so voted.*

31

32 The meeting ending at 9:08pm

33 Respectfully submitted by Clare Rock, Town Planner