

R I C H M O N D S E L E C T B O A R D
P U B L I C H E A R I N G
I N T E R I M Z O N I N G
S e p t e m b e r 2 8 , 2 0 1 5 M I N U T E S

Members Present: David Sander; Ellen Kane; Bard Hill

Absent: Taylor Yeates; Lincoln Bressor

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Josi Kytile; Brendan O'Reilly; Kiersten Bourgois; John Lupien; Ian Bender; Paul Hauf; Joss Besse; Maureen Kangley; Jon Kart; and the meeting was not video taped.

David Sander called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

1. Welcome and Public Comment

Mr. Sander explained that this was the public hearing for the proposed amendments to the Interim Zoning for Jolina Court.

Ian Bender asked if these changes could be adopted tonight, or if they had to wait until the next regular meeting. The Manager said that these could be adopted following the public hearing.

Mr. Hill offered a motion to open the public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Jolina Court interim zoning, and was seconded by Ms. Kane. The motion carried 3-0.

The Manager reviewed the proposed changes.

This meeting meets the statutory requirements for a public hearing to amend Interim Zoning, which is in effect for three lots on Jolina Court. Some details on this area are provided in the first paragraphs of the Interim Zoning document, which has been in effect since May of 2014, and is set to expire in May of 2016.

The relevant amendments are located on pages 2, 3, and 6, and highlighted in yellow.

Section IV

B Residential Density:

Maximum Residential Density = 5 **15** units per acre

Residential Density Bonus:

~~Residential densities may be increased to 8 units per acre provided that at least 30% of the units are to be used for age-restricted housing. Age-restricted housing is defined as single family or multi-family dwelling which is occupied by persons who are age 62 or older.~~

Section V:

B Mixed use development is an allowable use. All mixed use proposals shall include uses which are compatible. All mixed use projects shall ~~provide at a minimum 50% non-residential gross floor area per the total residential gross floor area~~ a residential to commercial floor area ratio of 40% residential

1 to 60% commercial. In the case of a multi-structure development, this ration shall be calculated for
2 the development site as a whole rather than for each structure individually.

3
4 This embodies the review committee's suggestions, and reflects what was formally moved by the
5 Selectboard on September 8th.

6
7 As reported earlier, the requests for parking set-asides can be reviewed in an application and may be
8 granted under the existing language in the IZ document.

9
10 **BROWNFIELDS HEARING:**

11
12 Late last week, the State and Josi Kytle asked if they could piggy back their public comment session
13 with this hearing. The Manager also said this hearing would double for comments on their cleanup
14 proposal. The local posting has been revised to reflect this.

15
16 Josi Kytle also explained how the cleanup and demolition of the buildings would be accomplished,
17 and said there was an estimated cost of \$336,000.

18
19 Kiersten Bourgois of the State of Vermont Agency of Commerce Brownfields program explained a
20 little about how the Brownfields Economic Redevelopment Alliance program would work.

21
22 Following these explanations, Mr. Sander asked if there were any comments from the public.

23
24 Jon Kart asked if the residential density was tripling from 5 units per acre to 15 units per acre, but the
25 density bonus for senior housing was eliminated? There was discussion on the merits of this change.
26 Mr. Kart also asked how many spaces per apartment were being allowed, and Josi answered that they
27 estimated 2 spots per bedroom, but with a one-spot bonus at each 10-bedroom interval.

28
29 Maureen Kangley asked if there had any feedback on senior housing. Ms. Kane replied that the only
30 reason that section is being dropped is because there was no market research to support that level of
31 bonus.

32
33 After some additional discussion on bedrooms and parking, Ms. Kane offered a motion to close the
34 public hearing and was seconded by Mr. Hill. The motion carried 3-0.

35
36 The Manager reach the proposed changes aloud once again. Mr. Bressor had provided the Manager a
37 statement he wished read aloud as well:

38
39 The decision to look at Interim Zoning for these parcels continues the trend of changing zoning for a
40 specific developer. This is dangerous precedent for the Town to be setting and following, as zoning
41 should be changed as a part of a town-wide process and not on individual properties for the sake of a
42 developer. This increase in density is far too much and will lead to damaging outcomes. This change
43 will engender three-story buildings with third floor apartments that have nothing to do with the rest of
44 the village. This density will also lead to a large increase in traffic in the center of our village, which
45 will be potentially detrimental to businesses and certainly detrimental to residents. The traffic already
46 backs up beyond the Round Church in the morning; more traffic means more pollution, more noise,
47 less of a 'small town feel' and a lower quality of life for those living in the village. Our job on the
48 Selectboard is to protect the residents currently living in Richmond, not to serve out of town interests
49 that will be detrimental to the Town. I regret that I cannot be at the meeting, and if I was I would be,

1 without question, voting 'no' on this zoning change. I urge the rest of the Selectboard to think
2 rationally on this and not be afraid to say 'no' in order to protect the Town's future.

3
4 Mr. Hill said that it was hard to engage in this discussion without Mr. Bressor here. The interim
5 zoning principal was to generate interest after 20 years or so of inactivity on the site. There was the
6 Brownfields challenge also, along with traffic concerns. This developer has a proposal that may be
7 able to work.

8
9 Mr. Sander said that interim zoning did a good first hack at getting movement on the property. The
10 changes in this draft address some flaws and should lead to a productive result.

11
12 Ms. Kane said that they always wanted to attract development. This visioning of the site falls in line
13 with proposed plans and we were on the right track with this.

14
15 Mr. Hill asked if there were other three-story buildings in town and the Manager said the Masonic
16 block, in the village. Mr. Hill wondered what traffic was like back when the creamery employed 100
17 people. There was some discussion on traffic.

18
19 Mr. Hill noted many people want development focused here in town and not in the Gateway area.

20
21 There was some discussion over some edits in the final paragraph of the proposed regulations.

22
23 Ms. Kane offered a motion to adopt the proposed amendments to the interim zoning for Jolina Court,
24 as amended by edits, and was seconded by Mr. Hill. The motion carried 3-0.

25
26 Mr. Sander thanked the interim zoning committee for the proposal, and for all who shared their ideas.

27
28 **2. Adjourn**

29 Motion by Ms. Kane to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Hill. So voted.