

Richmond Planning Commission

Special Meeting

July 10, 2012

Approved Minutes

Members Present: Gary Bressor (Chair), Lou Borie (Vice-Chair), Mark Fausel, Joe McHugh, Dan Renaud, Christy Witters

Members Absent: one vacancy

Others Present: Cathleen Gent (Town Planner/Staff to the DRB), Anne O'Brien, Melita DeBellis, Mary O'Neil, Catherine Coggio, Alison Anand

7:10 PM Call to order by the Chair.

Public Comment – No public comment.

Unified Land Use Bylaws Work Session

Creamery Parcel

As members of the Richmond Area Senior Center Planning Committee, O'Brien, DeBellis, O'Neil and Coggio addressed the Planning Commission regarding the proposed zoning that will apply to the creamery parcel. O'Brien stated that the creamery site is an ideal location for the new senior center due to its central location and the mixed use of the area. She said that there are a number of questions related to the draft zoning as it relates to the creamery parcel including residential density, building height, and the FEMA floodplain line. She said their committee supports DRB waiver provisions to allow for a greater height and to allow the floodplain land to be included in the density calculations. O'Brien added that the landowner has told the Senior Center Planning Committee that, if they can get the development model to work, they will provide the senior center with a building footprint at no cost. She said that any additional planning and fundraising for the senior center cannot continue until they settle on a building site. O'Brien said that the 35 foot height waiver is not critical to the senior center, but it is for the project to work.

Gent distributed copies of materials from LandWorks (David Raphael) that were received earlier today including a site buildout – layout plan, site buildout – massing model, and an estimated proforma for development options. Raphael had agreed to provide the Planning Commission with this information during the June 6th meeting.

O'Brien said the model the committee likes for the senior center is based on the Charlotte senior center, which is a stand-alone, one story building. They expect the senior center will be 5,000 to 6,000 square feet. She added that the new SiteWorks layout plan distributed tonight is based on a multi-use building with the senior center on the first floor, which they had not seen previously. O'Neil said that she thinks there has to be a balance in our bucolic village with creating economic opportunities. Richmond prides itself with creativity and she is looking for that type of vision from the Planning Commission. Bressor said that he and Gent have both talked with Fire Chief Tom Levesque and that the ISO insurance standard allows for up to five structures above 35 feet in the village hydrant district. At this point, three structures have been identified. If more than five are built, the town either has to buy a new pumper truck or fire insurance rates will increase town-wide. Gent added that having a sprinkler system for a particular building does not comply with the ISO program. DeBellis discussed the option of changing the ratio of residential and commercial within the new Village Mixed zoning district. Fausel said that the creamery parcel is the last large parcel in the village with developable land. He said the ratio is based on not wanting the area to be all residential. DeBellis also asked that the floodplain land be included in the density calculations. Renaud said that the Planning Commission has decided not to make that change due to the importance of protecting the floodplain and not wanting to increase the density on a given part of a parcel to a level that is too large for the neighborhood. DeBellis added that she thinks there were social benefits associated with the senior center and that the larger area will be served (Huntington, Bolton, and Richmond).

McHugh joined the meeting at 7:45 PM.

Bressor reviewed the buildout and proforma analysis materials, noting that they paint the bleakest possible picture of how development will occur on the creamery parcel, based on the new bylaws. DeBellis asked again about the potential for a DRB waiver for the building height. Gent will gather more information about the ISO standards for the Planning Commission to review. Coggio reiterated the need

1 for settling on a site for the senior center so they can take the next steps for public relations and
2 fundraising.

3
4 Witters questioned whether three-story condominiums fit the needs of seniors and whether the design is
5 right for senior housing. Bressor asked whether there have been specific studies regarding senior
6 housing in Richmond and O'Brien said there are not any, although the group has met with Amy Wright
7 from Champlain Housing Trust. O'Neil said that there is a potential for a museum to accompany the
8 senior center and Bressor said that the Richmond Historical Society decided not to do a stand-alone
9 museum and may, in the future, tie into the senior center.

10
11 The group left and the Planning Commission continued its discussion about the creamery parcel. The
12 Commission considered several ideas, including one to change the standard in the Village Mixed
13 zoning district to require 50% non-residential for every square foot of residential. The Planning
14 Commission will discuss this again. Also, Bressor noted that the Landworks layout plan excludes the
15 density bonus units from the residential/non-residential development standard (where between 1,000 to
16 3,000 square feet of non-residential gross floor area is required for each dwelling unit) in the Village
17 Mixed zoning district. He requested that Gent clarify that section of the bylaws to show it must be
18 included.

19
20 *Review zoning map*

21 Gent reported that she has spoken with Sid Miler, the owner of the Goodwin-Baker building parcel.
22 Miller said that he is supportive of having that parcel included as part of the new Village Business-2
23 zoning district. He does not think there is enough green space for pursuing any type of residential
24 development for that building and that the nearby residential uses are not always compatible with the
25 nature of the uses in the Goodwin-Baker building. The Planning Commission requested that Gent get
26 the map updated to include the Goodwin-Baker parcel, the Catholic church parcel, and the doctors
27 office parcel within the new Village Business-2 zoning district.

28
29 McHugh left the meeting at 9:10 PM.

30
31 *Review public comments*

32 The Planning Commission continued its review of public comments and made the following decisions or
33 clarifications:

34 1. Alison Anand comments and questions – February

35 - Planning Commission confirmed that an artist-craftsperson studio use could be permitted in addition to
36 a detached single family structure use. They did not think the example provided by Anand would qualify
37 as a home occupation or a home industry-class 1.

38 - For a swimming facility in the R-3 zoning district, the Planning Commission confirmed that the pool
39 would be considered as an outdoor recreational facility. Anand said that she is considering having
40 special events at the swimming pool. The Planning Commission asked Gent to explore how other towns
41 handle weddings or special events within zoning bylaws.

42 2. Fran Thomas comments – February 8 and February 10

43 - Artist-craftsperson studio – the Planning Commission confirmed that artist/craftsperson studio may be
44 attached to the principal structure. If it meets the standards for a home industry, it might be approved
45 under that provision.

46 - Business yard – The Planning Commission confirmed that, as it is a non-conforming use in the R-3
47 zoning district, it would not be allowed to resume if the use ceases for 12 months. Also an expansion up
48 to 25% may take place, subject to DRB approval.

49 3. Cara LaBounty question – February 10, 2012

50 - For smoke emissions – The Planning Commission confirmed that Section 3.4 (performance
51 standards) applies to any use of land, including the use of an outdoor boiler.

52 4. Section 3.6.5 – Modification of Dimensional Standards – The Planning Commission modified that
53 section to make it clear the DRB may not modify the setback requirements for structures and parking
54 from the perimeter of the PUD parcel.

55
56 **Adjournment**

57 Borie made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Witters. So voted. The meeting adjourned at 9:22 PM.

58
59 Respectfully submitted by Cathleen Gent, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB