

3.9 Jolina Court District (JC)

3.9.1 Purpose: ~~The purpose of this district is to provide diverse housing options in an area of Richmond that is supported by municipal water and sewer services and that promotes an energy-efficient and walkable community within the center of Richmond. The district will also allow compatible commercial businesses intermixed with the housing. in a traditional village mixed use pattern.~~ The district will contribute to a vibrant and dynamic town center where many residents can support local businesses and access community activities as pedestrians, an important “smart growth” goal. ~~is to support employment, light industry, commercial enterprises, community gathering spaces, dense and affordable housing, and other compatible uses that bring value to the community and maintain Richmond’s unique sense of place. It will also support the traditional village mixed use patterns with some street level commercial uses and upper floor residential uses. There are 3 primary goals for this district:~~

Commented [VC1]: This rewrite just alters the emphasis to reflect the shift towards more residential and less commercial – it also emphasizes the importance of walkability as a climate change goal

~~Help improve the economic vitality of Richmond by attracting desirable new businesses to the site, creating jobs, and increasing municipal water and wastewater utility use.~~

~~Attract residents and visitors to our village center for community and commercial activities.~~

~~Increase the housing density, affordability, and diversity in order to support a vibrant and diverse population of Richmond residents.~~

Any development in this district shall enhance the overall village area and shall be compatible with the surrounding mix of residential, non-residential, and municipal uses. ~~Any development proposal and~~ shall fit into the vision for Richmond as described in the Richmond Town Plan.

3.9.2 ~~1~~ Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Zoning Permit and Site Plan Approval

Permitted Uses - The following uses shall be allowed in the Jolina Court District upon issuance of a Zoning Permit by the Administrative Officer. Site Plan Review and approval by the DRB pursuant to Section 5.5 may be required.

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

- a) Artists/Crafts studio
- b) Bank
- c) Bed and Breakfast
- ~~d) Dwelling, single-family~~
- ~~e) Dwelling, two-family~~

- f) Dwelling, multi-family
- ge) Home Occupation as in Section 5.11
- he) Fitness facility
- if) Hotel
- ig) Inn or guesthouse
- kh) Laundromat
- li) Office, Professional
- mi) Office, Medical
- nk) Personal Services
- lt) Retail business

3.9.3.2 Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Conditional Use Approval Conditional Uses -

The following uses shall be allowed in the Jolina Court District upon issuance of conditional use approval by the DRB.

- a) Accessory structure
- b) Brewery
- c) Catering Service
- d) Center Based Child Care Facility
- e) ~~Commercial Multi-Use~~
- f) Educational Facility as provided in Section 5.10.4
- g) Food Processing Establishment
- h) Funeral Parlor
- i) Light Manufacturing
- j) Health Care Services
- k) Hospital
- l) multiple use building if all uses are permitted or conditional uses allowed within the Jolina Court District
- mi) Pharmacy
- nm) ~~Planned Unit Development or Residential PUD as provided in Section 5.12, if no subdivision of land is proposed (see Section 5.12.1).~~
- on) Residential Dwelling Units as part of a ~~Mixed Use~~ Planned Unit Development or Residential PUD.
- pe) Pub
- qf) Recreational facility
- qr) Research laboratory
- sr) Restaurant
- s) Religious use as provided in Section 5.10.4
- tu) State- or community-owned and operated institutions and facilities, as provided

in

Section 5.10.4

- vt) Tavern
- wv) Theater

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red

Formatted: Not Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red

Commented [VC2]: This term has been replaced by the newer term we used in the 2 R/C districts – see l) below

Commented [VC3]: I don't think we should rule out a fully residential PUD even tho' one is not planned at the moment. This is another example of the ambiguity of whether or not "Residential PUD" is a subset of "PUD" or its own category - we should fix this. Also - same issue with "if no subdivision is proposed" as in the I/C ZD

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

~~xv~~) Veterinary Clinics

~~yx~~) Wholesale trade

3.9.4.3 Residential Density and Requirements

a) Each residential dwelling unit shall require ~~1/18~~ ~~1/15~~ acre of developable land located on the same lot as the unit. This equals a **base** residential density of ~~18.15~~ units per developable acre.

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Commented [VC4]: This would give Buttermilk an additional 9 units, which seems to be just about the right amount to fill the ground floor from which most of the commercial is removed, keeping the 31 units from just getting bigger and more expensive. For simplicity, Buttermilk could just elect to stick with this, instead of going for density bonus units (see below). That seems fine to me. What would Richmond get? Nine additional units of relatively affordable housing. (Removal of the commercial requirement would be in the PUD section (5.12.2[f] - last sentence would be removed)

Developable land excludes those lands that are outlined in section 2.5.2. The maximum number of units that may be permitted shall be calculated by multiplying the residential density by the total developable acreage of the lot. When this calculation results in a number with a fractional component, the fraction will be rounded according to conventional rounding rules as follows, in which X is a whole number:

X.0 – X.49 units shall be rounded DOWN to X units

X.5 – X.99 units shall be rounded UP to X+1 units

Examples: 15 units/acre x 1.22 developable acres = 18.30 units rounds down to 18 units

15 units/acre x 2.97 developable acres = 44.55 units rounds up to 45 units

b) Residential dwelling units may only be approved as part of a ~~mixed-use~~ Planned Unit Development or Residential Planned Unit Development. All residential dwelling units are required to meet Vermont Fire and Building Safety Code

~~c) Residential density bonus units that meet the requirements of Section 6. 15 shall be allowed in addition to base density units up to a maximum total residential density of 24 units per developable acre.~~

Commented [VC5]: This would allow Buttermilk to have additional units if they made them "senior" or "workforce" which we have said would bring additional benefits to Richmond. (as well as more housing)

3.9.5.4 Dimensional Requirement for Lots ~~in the J/C District~~-No Zoning Permit may be issued for Land Development in the J/C District unless the lot proposed for such Land Development meets the following dimensional requirements:

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

a) **Lot Area** - No lot shall be less than ~~1/5 or 0.2 A. one-fourth (1/4) or 0.25~~ acre. The purchase of additional land by the owner of a lot from an adjacent lot owner will be permitted, provided such purchase does not create a lot of less than the minimum area required in the Zoning District on the part of the seller.

Commented [VC6]: Required by Act 47. Not in the current Buttermilk plan.

b) **Lot Dimensions** - Each lot must contain a point from which a circle with a radius of twenty five (25) feet can be inscribed within the boundary of the lot.

c) **Lot Frontage** - No lot having frontage on a public or private road shall have less than seventy-five (75) feet of continuous uninterrupted length of said frontage or the lot

must have access to a public or private road with approval by the DRB pursuant to Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

d) **Lot Coverage** - The total ground area covered by all structures, parking areas, walkways, driveway and areas covered by impervious materials shall not exceed ~~90%~~ **eighty percent (80%)** of the ~~developable total~~ ground area of the lot.

3.9.6.5 Dimensional ~~Limitations~~ **Requirements for Structures on Lots in the JC District**

a) **Height of Buildings and Structures** - shall be as in Section 4.12 of these regulations.

b) **Setbacks for the Periphery of the Zoning District** - Refer to Appendix D for the map and text of the setback requirements for periphery of the zoning district. If a lot line demarcating the periphery of the zoning district conflicts or overlaps with any lot lines created after May 12, 2020, principal and accessory structures must follow the setback requirements for the periphery of the zoning district with respect to the lot line that also serves as a boundary line for the Jolina Court Zoning District.

c) **Setbacks within the Zoning District** - The following regulations apply to structures with respect to lot lines created after (date regulations are adopted - ?) and are wholly within the zoning district:

d) **Front-yard setback** - A principal structure shall be set back at least ten (10) feet from the front lot line. An accessory structure shall be set back at least five (5) feet from the front lot line.

e) **Side-yard setback** - A principal structure shall be set back at least ten (10) feet from each side lot line. An accessory structure shall be set back at least five (5) feet from each side lot line

f) **Rear-yard setback** - A principal structure shall be set back at least ten (10) feet from the rear lot line. An accessory structure shall be set back at least five (5) feet from the rear lot line. For Planned Unit Developments, the setback requirements for lot lines within the PUD may be waived by the DRB if the design and layout of the PUD conforms with the Town Plan.

g) **Parking Setbacks** - Parking spaces on all properties in the Jolina Court Zoning District shall meet the setback standards for the Jolina Court Zoning District, except for properties bordering the Village Commercial Zoning District. On such properties, the setback for parking spaces from property lines that separate the Jolina Court Zoning District from Village Commercial Zoning District is zero (0) feet. However, for all other property lines that do not serve as boundary lines for the Jolina Court Zoning District on properties bordering the Village Commercial Zoning District, parking spaces must meet the setback standards for the Jolina Court Zoning District.

h) **Footprints of Principal Structures** - No principal structure shall have a footprint area that exceeds 10,000 square feet.

3.9.7.6 **Other Requirements Applicable to Lots in the JC District** - No Zoning Permit may be issued for Land Development in the J/C District unless the Land Development meets the following requirements:

Commented [VC7]: The way it is currently, Buttermilk could cover the entire 3 developable acres with impervious. Wouldn't we like to have some green space around the planned buildings?

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red

Commented [VC8]: We need to think about this. In other districts setbacks do not apply to parking areas. Do we want them to here? Does any part of the JC ZD border the VC ZD?

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

Formatted: Font color: Dark Red, Strikethrough

a) **Parking Requirements - Parking Supply** - In this district, t

i. The residential parking requirement shall be 1 parking space per dwelling unit based on the number of bedrooms per dwelling unit. The spaces required shall only serve to calculate overall supply and shall not be assigned to specific dwellings.

~~Bedrooms: parking spaces required~~

~~Efficiency (0) 1~~

~~1 Bedroom 1.5~~

~~2 Bedroom 2~~

~~3 Bedroom 2.5~~

~~4 Bedroom 3~~

~~Spaces shall increase by 0.5 spaces per additional bedroom.~~

ii. All ~~commercial other~~ parking ~~supply~~ requirements shall follow the requirements as set forth in section 6.1. ~~Bicycle parking racks shall be required within the parking areas, and lots shall be required to provide safe and convenient bicycle access as per section 6.1.6~~

iii. In addition to the required commercial parking spaces, 10 parking spaces shall be provided for "public parking," and so marked, which spaces may be used by tenant overflow or tenant guest vehicles, customers of lot JC0013, or for any other short term parking needs.

iv. Bicycle parking racks shall be required within the parking areas, and lots shall be required to provide safe and convenient bicycle access as per section 6.1.6.

Commented [VC9]: Required by Act 47. Would this apply to building 1 as well under a revised MDP?

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: No Spacing, Indent: First line: 0.5"

Commented [VC10]: I'm not sure how I feel about this. Does it counter the intent of Act 47? Also, Buttermilk is really not required to provide parking for RCK. How would this be allowed?

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0.5"

b) **Loading Space Requirements** – Off-Road or Highway loading requirements shall be regulated as provided in Section 6.1.

c) **Signs** – Signs shall be regulated as provided in Section 5.7.

d) **Traffic Impact** – The purpose of this requirement is to foster the general welfare of the public through the minimization of traffic congestion, air pollution, and the risk of motor vehicle and pedestrian accidents.

i) A transportation impact study shall be required for uses which generate more than 70 vehicle trip ends on adjacent roads during the P.M. peak hour for the first 40,000 square feet of land development area or fraction thereof, plus 1 vehicle trip end for each additional 1,000 square feet of land development area. In making the determination of traffic impact, the Administrative Officer or DRB shall utilize "Trip generation – Tenth Edition", Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), or its equivalent, or any subsequent and most recent publication thereof, and may use estimates from other sources, including local traffic counts, if the above publication does not contain data for a specific use or if a use contains unique characteristics that cause it to differ from national traffic estimates.

ii) For establishments that generate more than 70 vehicle trip ends during the P.M. peak hour, the Development Review Board shall review the level of service of adjacent roads. Based on its review as well as consultation with the Road Foreman,

the DRB may put forth permit conditions to mitigate adverse traffic impacts. Permit conditions may include:

- a. Site improvements to improve access management, such as the creation of secondary access points, the reduction of the width of curb cuts, or the like;
- b. Improvements to internal circulation, including the creation of narrower roadway widths, pedestrian pathways, and the like;
- c. Improvements with connections with adjacent properties, such as, but not limited to, the creation of additional vehicle or pedestrian access points, the installation of signage and traffic lights, and adjustments to intersections to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and to slow traffic.

d. adequate improvements for wheelchair access to senior ageing-in-place dwelling units, disabled parking spaces and connecting routes to town sidewalks

Commented [VC11]: Will be needed if Senior density bonus units are elected.

e) **Access** – Access shall be regulated as provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.4.

f) **Sidewalks**- Sidewalks that connect all buildings on Jolina Court with the sidewalks and pedestrian crossings on Bridge Street shall be required. They may be connected individually or in series. The purpose of this is to ensure walkability of any new development and ensure connection to the downtown area.

3.9.8 District Specific Design Standards ~~g) Compatibility~~ The purpose of this requirement is to allow the Development Review Board to review and approve the visual aspects of new construction, or new or remodeled exteriors. This ensures public ability to review the visual rendering and provide input. A visual rendering of any new construction or remodeled exterior shall be required as part of a site plan and/or conditional use application. Any changes to the façade, size, or scale of new construction or a remodeled exterior shall require a new visual rendering that portrays the proposed changes and shall require an amendment to the Development Review Board’s original site plan and/or conditional use approval which contains the most recent iteration of the visual rendering. Publicly displayed visual renderings must be in accordance with section 5.3.3 (b). The following shall be considered when reviewing the application:

Commented [VC12]: This section could be relabeled as “District Specific Design Standards” to match the R/C districts

- i) Compatibility of size, scale, color, materials, and character of the district, and construction utilizing materials similar or the same to the existing buildings of the district, shall be required for all new construction and all new or remodeled exterior facades. Applicants shall be required to demonstrate compatibility through examples, research, architectural consultation, or other means. This compatibility requirement shall not prohibit artistic expression, ability to landscape, commercial viability, creativity, or individuality.
- ii) Design features that provide all structures with an attractive and human-scale appearance when viewed from a public or private road or by neighboring properties shall be required. These features shall include the following:
 - a. Building façades of 50 feet or more shall be broken down into a series of smaller facades that incorporate changes in color, texture or materials; architectural projections or recesses; varying setbacks or roof treatments, or other structural or decorative variations.

- b. Primary building facades of any length shall include windows and doors.
- c. All sides of buildings must have windows
- d. Accessory structures shall also satisfy compatibility criteria as described above.
- e. Landscaping, screening and green space shall be required to achieve the following goals:
 - i. To provide screening of development to increase privacy, reduce noise and glare, contribute to the attractiveness and scenic qualities of the property, and to otherwise lessen the visual impact of the development on neighboring properties.
 - ii. To provide green space amenities for the occupants of the development
 - iii. Provisions for the care and maintenance of plantings, including the removal and replacement of dead or diseased shrubs or trees.

h) Additional Multifamily Housing Standards – Any structure that contains three or more dwelling units (also called a “multifamily dwelling”) shall adhere to the Multi-family Housing Development Standards in Section 6.13 of these regulations.

h) **Fire Protection**- Any building using engineered lumber shall have the appropriate placard as deemed necessary by ISO standards. This placard shall be placed at the primary ingress/egress of the main floor of said building.

i) **Environmental Concerns** – The development should prioritize the protection of wetlands, riparian areas and surface waters to maintain the health and function of those areas and their ecosystem services. These ecosystem services include, but are not limited to, protection of water quality; stormwater management; floodwater storage; limitation of soil erosion; stream channel stabilization; preservation of existing plant and animal communities, including identified rare and sensitive species; preservation of habitat connectivity, and the maintenance of Richmond's rural character and scenic beauty. For specific standards regarding land development within the Floodway and the Special Flood Hazard Area, see Section 6.8.

j) **Additional Possible Conditions** - The following site standards also may be required as a condition of Development Review Board approval

- Greater setback or screening requirements along the perimeter of the property
- Adequate pedestrian facilities
- Demonstration of the ability to properly develop, operate, and maintain development roads, utilities, driveways, parking, sidewalks, landscaping, and other conditions or standards imposed

Commented [VC13]: I don't see much in these standards that would be a problem for Buttermilk, but we should review the parameters. Especially whether the section is about a "lot" or a "building" containing more than 2 dwelling units.

Commented [VC14]: The word "housing" definitely needs to be clarified to lot or building. We are suggesting "building."

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

In addition there will need to be a change to 5.12 (PUD section) to the effect that the only case in which there is a ground floor commercial requirement shall be any building with a Bridge St frontage.