

1 Richmond Planning Commission
2 Regular Meeting
3 Wednesday, January 7, 2015
4 Approved Minutes

5 **Members Present:** Brian Tellstone, Sean Foley, Ann Cousins, Mark Fausel (Chair), Bruce
6 LaBounty (Vice-Chair), Marc Hughes

7 **Absent:** Lauck Parke,

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

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

11
12 **Public Comment**

13 Ann Cousins raised the topic of Interim Zoning for the Gateway Commercial District. Based upon a
14 communication with a Selectboard member, it seems the SB may not put the proposed Gateway
15 Zoning changes forward to a vote at town meeting. If this is the case, Cousins asked the PC if the
16 PC would be willing to draft Interim Zoning for Gateway so the SB may have another proposal to
17 consider. Discussion followed about the current proposal and the status of the sewer and water
18 extension. The SB will discuss the Gateway Proposal on Tuesday Jan. 20.

19
20 The PC agreed to wait to hear the outcomes of the Jan 20 meeting before further discussing Interim
21 Zoning. Fausel encouraged PC members to attend the Jan 20 meeting as both the Gateway
22 Discussion will be important and the SB will be holding the Public Hearing for the forwarded
23 FHOD Regulations.

24
25 **Administrative Items**

26
27 Approve Meeting Minutes of Dec 3, 2014.

28 *LaBounty made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Tellstone, all in favor. So voted.*

29
30 Rock mentioned the PC annual report, which is due to the Town Clerk by Friday for inclusion in the
31 Town Report. Rock has drafted the PC report and circulated it to members via email. If you have
32 any changes please let Rock know by tomorrow morning. Rock also noted that the DRB annual
33 report was completed and in 2014 the DRB heard about half the number of applications compared
34 to the previous year. The PC mentioned that many applications from 2013 were most likely flood or
35 floodplain related applications which would explain the reason for the increased number.

36
37 Rock reported the Town received the 248a Petition for the Cochran Road cell town. Both the
38 Cochran Road and Jericho Road projects are moving forward but there has been no movement on
39 the Johnny Brook project.

40
41 As previously mentioned the SB will holding their Hearing on the proposed FHOD Regulation on
42 Jan 20. This is a Tuesday as their regular meeting day (Monday) is MLK Day and the offices are
43 closed.

44
45 Rock mentioned a meeting scheduled for tomorrow with Peg Elmer, who is proposing to help
46 coordinate the launch of a Community Resiliency Organization (CRO) in Richmond. Mark Fausel
47 suggested Marie Thomas be contacted as she previously worked with FEMA.

48

1 Lastly, Rock reported the Town will be submitting a funding request to CCRPC's Unified Planning
2 Work Program (UPWP). Specifically the Town will be requesting the CCRPC rewrite the Towns
3 Transportation Element for inclusion in the new town plan. The request is due later this month.
4

5 **Statewide River Corridor Map**

6 Rock logged onto the Vermont FloodReady website to show PC members the recently released
7 Statewide River Corridor Map and zoomed into the Town of Richmond. The River Corridor is
8 basically what had been referred to as the Fluvial Erosion Hazard (FEH) Zone, a hazard area which
9 identifies the area in which the river will swing or meander back and forth as it tries to establish
10 equilibrium. Many people recognize the river moves as demonstrated by the evidence of eroded
11 banks and the formation of islands, oxbows and gravel bars. Rivers in Vermont are known to cause
12 bank erosion but erosion damages caused by flooding are not covered by flood insurance as the
13 NFIP only regulates flood damages from inundation not flood damages cause by erosion. In some
14 areas the floodplain and the river corridor may mirror each other, but there may be cases where the
15 corridor is wider as it would take in a sand or gravel plateau, which would otherwise be above the
16 floodplain elevation.
17

18 The Statewide map is the State's "version" of the Federal FIRM maps but Towns are not required to
19 regulate the areas depicted on the statewide map. The maps was created to show where hazard areas
20 exist and to help provide information to towns. If Richmond does decide to regulate the river
21 corridor the localized map would need to be refined.
22

23 The PC reviewed the Statewide map and compared it to the 2013 FEH map which was created by
24 the CCRPC. The statewide map shows a greater corridor, especially through the Village and it
25 appears the Statewide map doesn't take into consideration the bedrock which is on the southside of
26 the bridge.
27

28 Towns can submit comments to the State if there are obvious errors in the map. The PC agreed that
29 Rock may submit comments, such as the bedrock, but felt it's not a huge property as it's not a
30 regulatory map. This topic may come up during the town plan process over the next year, and can
31 be further discussed then.
32

33 **Fees and Technical Review Fees**

34 The PC continued the review of the proposed fee changes.

35 Regarding the School impact fees – the PC agreed these to be removed. The change need to be
36 reflected on the "Work in Progress" Development Permit Fee handout. Discussion followed about
37 Impact Fee's, how they are assessed and the pros and cons of having them. The PC discussed
38 whether to recommend a highway impact fee and whether property taxes do indeed cover the
39 increased costs associated with new development. Rock mentioned a consultant was hired to
40 analyze the financial impacts and present recommended impact fee dollar amounts. That study was
41 undertaken in the early- mid- 2000 when population and growth forecasts indicated increasing
42 population growth for Richmond. The study included the recommendation that the study be
43 revisited in 5 years and that past population forecast may not be truly accurate as Richmond's
44 population has slightly declined.

45 Regarding Sewer and Water fees – add this line item to the fee schedule but don't include an actual
46 rate, as they are subject to change, instead include a reference to what types of projects may be
47 subject to the fee.

48 Regarding adding recording fees as specified within #9 of page 2 of the memo, the PC agreed to add
49 these.

1 Regarding Draft Procedures and Standards for Technical Review Fee’s, the PC reviewed the draft
2 Procedure as included in the packet. The PC agreed that Technical Review Fee’s should be returned
3 to the applicant once a application has been approved by the DRB as the technical fee only applies
4 to the review and is not intended to be a post construction inspection fee. The PC recommend the
5 last sentence of paragraph 4 be moved to the first sentence and within the last paragraph it should
6 specify to whom the applicant should direct the reimbursement request.
7

8 Rock will make the changes to the proposed Fee schedule and the Draft Procedure provide to the
9 PC for another review.
10

11 **Town Plan Rewrite**

12 Limited time remained for a full discussion. Rock report the interest in the steering committee
13 received to date. Rock anticipates holding the first committee meeting in February. Tellstone
14 suggested Gary Bressor join and LaBounty suggested Dan or Chris Noyes be invited. The PC
15 requested a list of the interested people for the next meeting and suggested posting another invite on
16 FPF.
17

18 **Adjourn**

19
20 Hughes made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Tellstone, all in favor. So voted.
21

22 The meeting ending at 9:10PM.
23

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