

1 Richmond Planning Commission

2 Regular Meeting

3 Wednesday, February 4, 2015

4 Approved Minutes

---

5 **Members Present:** Brian Tellstone, Sean Foley, Bruce LaBounty (Vice-Chair), Lauck Parke, Marc  
6 Hughes

7 **Absent:** Ann Cousins, Mark Fausel (Chair)

8 **Others Present:** Clare Rock (Town Planner/Staff to the DRB); see attached list

9  
10 **7:05 PM LaBounty opened the meeting**

11  
12 **Public Comment** – no public comment

13  
14 **Administrative Items**

15  
16 Approve Meeting Minutes –January 7, 2014.

17 The PC was unable to approve the meetings as there was not a quorum of members present who  
18 were in attendance of the 1/7/2015 meeting. Marc Hughes arrived late, after this agenda item.

19  
20 Mail and staff updates

21 Rock announced an upcoming event titled “Community Forums of Efficiency Vermont’s Future  
22 Direction” one of these forums will take place in Richmond at the Middle School on 2/17/2015 at  
23 6pm.

24  
25 Rock also announced an upcoming Act 250 Hearing for a minor subdivision in Southview, the  
26 Hearing will take place on 2/12/2015 at 9am at the Town Center Building. The applicant proposes  
27 to carve out one new house site from a 40 +/- acre undeveloped property in Southview which has  
28 some identified deer yards. Because the original subdivision was subject to Act 250, this minor  
29 subdivision is also subject to state review. To date the applicant has not submitted a local  
30 subdivision application for this project.

31  
32 Gateway Commercial Zoning Update

33 Rock provided an overview of the changes the Selectboard is proposing for the Gateway. In  
34 addition to the changes the SB proposed at their Jan 20 meeting, which were summarized in the  
35 PC’s last meetings unofficial minutes, the SB made additionally changes at their Monday meeting.  
36 The following additional changes were proposed: to eliminate restaurant and retail use from the  
37 Gateway Commercial Zone. But include a provision which would allow for a smaller, 3,000sq retail  
38 use only if in conjunction with an on-site light-manufacturing operation. Rock understands that it is  
39 the SB’s intent to also allow for some type of restaurant use only in conjunction with the allowable  
40 tavern use (if only in conjunction with an on-site brewery, distillery, etc). The SB has not yet set a  
41 public hearing date for the changes.

42  
43 Discussion followed about the Selectboard changes, the role of the Planning Commission and the  
44 pro’s and con’s of setting aside zoning changes and focusing on the town plan, and downtown  
45 vibrancy and the local economy.

46  
47 **Fees and Technical Review Fees**

48  
49 The PC reviewed the changes made to the Development Permit Fees, as included on the document  
50 titled “Work in progress, Proposed changes Jan. 15 2015.” LaBounty noted that after checking the  
51 Fees in Jericho and Underhill neither town charges school impact fees yet their per sq ft cost for  
52 residential and commercial development is higher.

1 The PC continued discussions on the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) bylaw and the \$10 fee.  
2 Questions followed about what requires a CO and the process involved in issuing a CO. Basically  
3 most building projects require a CO, from a new house to a shed to a driveway. The current fee only  
4 covers the cost of recording the fee, even though the ZA undertakes a site visit as part of the  
5 process. It was noted that the Highway Department charges \$100 for a site visit as part of the  
6 issuance of a “Use of the Public ROW” approval. Discussion followed about the need to cover the  
7 towns cost of processing and issuing a CO but also keeping the fee low so people will agree to get a  
8 CO, even for projects which seem like they don’t or shouldn’t need one. The need to change the CO  
9 bylaw will be added to the list of “other zoning changes” for consideration by the PC. For now the  
10 \$10 will remain the same.

11  
12 The PC reviewed the “Draft Procedures and Standards for Technical Review Fees, 1/15/2015” and  
13 made a few minor changes. The PC agreed to add an additional bullet which would note the DRB  
14 may require technical review fees for other projects not specifically listed, if they are deemed  
15 necessary during the course of the public hearing. The PC also agreed to change the time in which  
16 funds could be reimbursed. Funds should be reimbursed upon the issuance of the final DRB  
17 decision as this signifies the end of the hearing process or if an application is withdrawn. If an  
18 appeal is filed by either the applicant or an interested party, technical review fees should not be held  
19 or used for the appeal process as this is not the purpose of the technical review fee.

20  
21 Rock has distributed the proposed changes-to-date to the DRB but the DRB has not had a chance to  
22 discuss at a meeting, but Rock has requested they provide input. Rock will re distribute to the DRB  
23 to see if there are any comments. If there are no comments then the changes can be forward to the  
24 SB for approval.

25  
26 Parke made a motion to approve the changes made tonight and forward to the Selectboard for  
27 approval, seconded by Foley, all in favor. So voted.

## 28 29 **Town Plan Rewrite**

30  
31 Rock distributed the list of people who would like to serve on the steering committee. PC members  
32 noted many names were familiar and quite a few are part of the local land trust. The steering  
33 committee will be tasked with helping to shape the public engagement aspect of the process and  
34 they will also review draft work products produced by the town planner and the consultant. Rock  
35 will serve as the chair/facilitator of the group and the steering committee will provide  
36 recommendations to the PC, which the PC will ultimately have to approve. The steering committee  
37 will meet prior to the PC, twice a month so each will have a chance to attend each other’s meetings.  
38 Rock requested the PC officially appoint the members.

39  
40 Parke made a motion to appoint the members of the steering committee, seconded by Tellstone, all  
41 in favor. So voted.

42  
43 Rock reported that the town received 2 responses to the RFP, one from Front Porch Community  
44 Planning and one from Community Workshop LLC. Front Porch has done work for the town before  
45 and is well respected in the VT planning field. Community Workshop is comprised of former Orton  
46 Foundation planners, which is nationally known for their “Heart & Soul” public participation and  
47 engagement strategies. LaBounty added the need to have a strong economic component of the town  
48 plan, as previous plans and initiatives have focuses on other aspects. Discussion followed about the  
49 proposals and some PC members expressed support for Community Workshop.

50

1 Parke made a motion for the town planner and town manager to select the consultant, seconded by  
2 Tellstone, all in favor. So voted.

3

4 **Other business**

5

6 **Special event & vendor permits**

7 Rock provided an overview of these types of permits. Currently Richmond doesn't have an  
8 ordinance or permit process for these type of activities. Some activities, such as food trucks would  
9 most likely be considered "fast food" and therefore prohibited under the zoning in some areas of  
10 town. Yet food trucks may provide a benefit or be a positive addition to Richmond, especially in the  
11 village. Other activities which may be similar are festivals similar to Waterbury's Art in the Alley  
12 event. The Farmers Market is allowed by the town because it's on Town-owned property,  
13 discussion followed about private property owners who would like to host similar temporary events.  
14 The PC agreed to discuss this further at the next meeting.

15

16 **Public Works Specifications**

17 The current Public Work Specifications are out dated and there is a new draft which has not been  
18 adopted by the town. The PC agreed to discuss the current status of these documents at their next  
19 meeting.

20

21 **Other zoning changes**

22 The town planner had compiled a list of zoning changes this past summer. The PC would like to add  
23 revising/eliminating the CO requirement to this list and review the list at the next meeting.

24

25

26 **Adjourn**

27

28 Tellstone made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Parke, all in favor. So voted.

29

30 The meeting ending at 9:00PM.

31

32 Respectfully submitted by Clare Rock, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB