

Town of Richmond
Planning Commission Meeting
AGENDA

Wednesday March 18th, 2020, 7:00 PM

Planning Commission to be held in the
Richmond Town Center Meeting Room, 203 Bridge Street, Richmond, VT

1. Adjustments to the Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes
 - September 12, 2019
 - October 16, 2019
 - October 30, 2019
 - March 4, 2020
3. Public comment for non-agenda items
4. Review Selectboard Public Hearing on Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations
5. Discussion on Affordable Housing Bonuses
6. Discussion on Signage regulations for commercial uses
7. Discussion on Village Commercial District regulations
8. Strategy for Public Outreach
9. Discuss prioritization strategy for revising the Town zoning regulations
10. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

The times listed for agenda items are estimations. For additional information and accommodations to improve the accessibility of this meeting, please contact Ravi Venkataraman at 802-434-2430 or at rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Table of Contents

1. Approval of Minutes
 - Page 3: September 12, 2019
 - Page 4: October 16, 2019
 - Page 5: October 30, 2019
 - Page 10: March 4, 2020
2. Review Selectboard Public Hearing on Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations
 - Page 16: Memorandum on the Selectboard hearing and Affordable Housing Density Bonuses
3. Discussion on Affordable Housing Bonuses
 - Page 18: Summary of FY2019 HUD Income Limits for the Burlington-South Burlington MSA
 - Page 20: Draft Regulations for Affordable Housing Density Bonuses
4. Discussion on Signage regulations for commercial uses
 - Page 23: Memorandum on Signage
 - Page 24: Draft Regulations for Section 5.7.4
5. Discussion on Village Commercial District regulations
 - Page 25: Memorandum on Suggested Changes to the Village Commercial District regulations
 - Page 26: Draft Regulations for Section 3.5
 - Page 31: Checklist for reviewing zoning district regulations
6. Strategy for Public Outreach
7. Discuss prioritization strategy for revising the Town zoning regulations
8. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

The times listed for agenda items are estimations. For additional information and accommodations to improve the accessibility of this meeting, please contact Ravi Venkataraman at 802-434-2430 or at rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Planning Commission Minutes 9-12-19

Present: Brian Tellstone, Scott Nickerson, Virginia Clarke, Lauck Parke, Chris Cole, Jessica Draper, Mark Fausel

Called to Order: 7:08pm

Public Comment: NA

Chairman Election: Tabled until 9/26 due to low attendance

Minutes: Jess will have the commission approve old minutes in batches

Municipal Planning Grant: Jessica explained the options for the MPG funds. Chris Cole gave an update about the new ad-hoc committee for Transportation. Jessica explained how the MPG can be used in conjunction with UPWP funds and that the commission needs to sign off on this particular application. It was decided to review the full application at the next meeting.

Conservation Planning: The commissioners expressed support for the proposed workshops from the state, and Jessica said she would coordinate the workshops.

DRB/ZA regulation Review: Jessica and Virginia discussed the benefits of having the DRB and ZA review the regulations prior to adoption.

Village Downtown District: Jessica explained that the Village Downtown District was adopted at the last selectboard meeting. Virginia explained what was changed to the document and other changes she would like to see made with the next round of adopting regulations. Virginia also discussed what concerns and questions were posed at the last selectboard meeting. Jessica discussed the question about having to go to the DRB repeatedly for differing commercial tenants. The commission reviewed conditional and allowed uses for both Village Downtown and Jolina Court zoning districts. Discussion ensued about definitions for the Jolina Court District. The commission then discussed the facets of the arguments surrounding the residential to commercial ratio for Jolina Court.

Scott moved to adjourn 9:09pm. Seconded by Chris. All were in favor, so moved.

Planning Commission Minutes 10-16-19

Called to Order: 7:10pm

Present: Virginia Clarke, Lauck Parke, Scott Nickerson, Jessica Draper, Josh Arneson, Alison Anand, Brian Tellstone

Public Comment: NA

Minutes: Brian moved to approve 5 sets of minutes (3/6/19, 3/20/19, 4/3/19, 4/17/19, 9/26/19). Seconded by Scott. All were in favor, so moved.

Transportation Committee: Virginia explained that the new transportation committee has been formed. She read from the selectboard minutes about the membership, currently Chris Cole, Cathleen Gent, Jon Kart, Erik Filkorn, and space for 3 other members.

Meeting with the DRB: Jess explained that the DRB would like to meet with the PC, Jessica suggested 10/30. Jess will follow up.

Transition: Virginia explained that Jessica is leaving to take a position with the Town of Plattsburgh, and the planning commission thanked her for time here. Virginia projected 6-8 weeks before a new hire is made. She explained that there will be some needs during that time, such as taking minutes, representation on regional committees, etc. Jess said she would forward the planning commission related tasks so that they can reference it for meetings. Jessica said the other item was to discuss what work should be included in the part time contract. Virginia said she would like Jess to review the RZR and two new districts for compatibility and holes. Virginia presented a draft letter regarding the planning commission's stance on hiring. The commission agreed to submit the letter as drafted. Discussion ensued about impending deadlines. Lauck requested that Jessica provide a history of the Buttermilk project including any pending issues.

Update Regarding Jolina Court Zoning: Virginia explained that at the last selectboard meeting the selectboard agreed to keep the lot coverage regulation to be for the full parcel acreage. Jessica explained the ecological concerns in the lower floodplain portion of the lot. Virginia explained that the commercial to residential ratio was also settled to be the same as what the planning commission had originally proposed. Virginia said that other than small compatibility issues, the uses are still needing to be reviewed. She reviewed what was discussed at the previous meeting, including sorting uses, striking uses, and amending the language about site plan approval. Jessica listed the uses she thought could be done through administrative approval alone. She also explained that Buttermilk has requested short term rental as a use for their district. Discussion ensued about the merits and issues with short term rentals.

Definitions: Jess explained the changes to the street-level floor definition. Virginia asked to add “or the street level” to the end of the definition. Virginia reviewed her list of definitions updated from the previous meeting. Jessica explained the issue with the timing of the adoption of the two districts and short term rental use.

Compatibility: It was discussed that we have to ensure that new districts are formally removed from their previous districts throughout the zoning ordinance.

Planning Ahead: Virginia discussed the potential plan to work outward from the districts that have been addressed. Jessica explained her zoning review flow chart.

Brian moved to adjourn, seconded by Scott. All were in favor, adjourned 8:51pm.

48 Planning Commission or Selectboard remained silent, or overlooked relevant issues in
49 the specific wording of the ordinances. Specifically, he noted that in the case of the
50 interim zoning for Jolina Court the DRB felt it had to make judgmental decisions that
51 they were not entirely comfortable making, especially as the developer was actively
52 building as the decisions were being made in the review process. Both Anand and Cole
53 indicated that all of us have been uncomfortable with the unusual nature of this special
54 interim zoning situation. Sunshine expressed his appreciation that our efforts to deliver
55 a clearly written zoning ordinance for Jolina Court would go a very long way in assisting
56 the DRB in discharging its responsibilities.

57
58 Cole: clearly in the future the Planning Commission would like to get our proposed
59 revisions to the DRB well before we entered the formal adoption phase so that the
60 Selectboard would have a clear understanding as to the preferred desires of both the
61 PC and the DRB.

62
63 Cole requested whether or not members of the DRB had any other specific examples of
64 where the PC could improve things for the DRB? Sunshine's immediate response was
65 to indicate that the DRB would like to streamline the approval hearing process in the
66 sub division regulations, moving from three hearings to two. Thus he envisions the
67 process as demanding the petitioner to participate in a "preliminary hearing" and then a
68 "final hearing." Not only would this simplify the process for petitioners, it would also
69 serve to put the applicants on notice that they MUST follow standard procedures. In
70 addition, it would serve to save the applicant time, fees, and frustration—and this is
71 currently a major source of frustration and complains from petitioners. Cole inquired if it
72 was section 5.4 of the current subdivision regulations that Sunshine was noting?
73 Sunshine: "yes."

74
75 In reference to this, Mantegna stated that Hinesburg currently has three meetings in its
76 zoning regulations: (1) Sketch; (2) Preliminary; and (3) Final. Petersen interjected that
77 the key is to have clarity in the regulations as to what the DRB requires in an application
78 so that petitioners know exactly what is required of them at the very start of the process.
79 Cole said that we clearly should examine and compare Hinesburg's regulations as we
80 seek to update ours. Clarke noted that section 5.4 needs to be refined and updated as
81 one of our first steps after Jolina Court draft is finished.

82
83 Sunshine then indicated that sooner than later a number of problematic issues and
84 areas need to be addressed, and that perhaps we could schedule another joint session
85 so we can think about and discuss the most pressing problem areas in the current
86 regulations. He also noted that most of the DRB problems arise in the most densely
87 populated areas of the town.

88
89 Cole, Clarke, and Petersen, all stated that definitions are very often one of the most
90 problematic aspects of the regulations. Fausel noted that we should turn more
91 frequently to the "Red Book" in order to streamline and standardize the definitions we
92 include in our revised regulations. As an examples Sunshine raised the definition of
93 "professional offices," asking if this is meant to mean only offices staffed by those
94 professional with official certification, or does it simply mean "all" offices? As another

95 definitional example, Moules raised the question of PUDs as another example in section
96 5.12 where applicants have flexibility, yet in section 5.2.12 there arises a confusing
97 conflict.

98

99 At this point, Parke suggested that the formation of a joint subcommittee might be very
100 useful in identifying and screening the most important and pressing topics or issues.
101 Cole immediately initiated such a subcommittee, with Parke, Fausel, and Anand
102 volunteering from the Planning Commission, member(s) from the DRB to be determined
103 at a later date.

104

105 Cole asked if there were any additional problematic areas:

106

107 -Moules: tall structures in section 6.0.6, What is the definition of “steeply pitched
108 roof?”

109 -Dyer: accessory dwellings in section 5.9.1d, there is much confusion in what the
110 regulations actually say and how we should interpret this section, i.e. for
111 example what should be the maximum percentage in relation to the state
112 regulations on this matter?

113 -Petersen and Dyer: Air b-n-b is also an issue (Cole noted that the PC plans to
114 engage the broader community in a discussion of this issue in the near
115 future).

116

117 Cole closed out the joint session by indicating that a detailed review of the current Jolina
118 Court draft and the compilation of a “red-hot” list of the DRB’s most pressing issues and
119 concerns would be a great place for the newly formed joint subcommittee to start its
120 efforts. Sunshine thanked the Planning Commission for organizing this session and
121 noted that Mantegna would distribute the most current draft of the Jolina Court proposal
122 to the DRB members

123

124 **3. Administrative Items:**

125

126 Cole asked for motions to approve the minutes from 5/1/19; 5/9/19; 5/15/19; 5/22/19;
127 6/5/19; and 10/16/19. Clarke suggested that we approve all in one motion, so moved,
128 Parke seconded, unanimous approval.

129

130 Cole indicated that he and town manager Josh Aronson were in the process of
131 negotiating a contract with Jessica Draper for part time support of the Planning
132 Commission until her replacement was hired. Interviews of candidates for the position
133 should begin shortly, Cole stated he would keep us updated as the process progressed.

134

135 Fausel encouraged members to re-read the 2012 proposed zoning changes as there
136 were many sound suggestion in that document that might be included in our current
137 efforts.

138

139 Parke raised the issue of our need to simultaneously engage in discussions about some
140 long-range planning issues such as future traffic flows and possible congestion from the
141 Jolina Court development necessitating a second exit from the site; the possibility of

142 creating a transportation hub at the town center complex with additional parking on
143 Jolina property; the possibility of securing purchase options on property abutting the
144 town center; and a review of new town plan in order to establish priorities for our
145 planning efforts.

146
147 Cole meetings of the newly formed transportation committee are open to the public-he
148 encouraged interested members to attend.

149
150 Cole—issues for the remaining 15 minutes?

151
152 **4. Jolina Court Zoning Amendment Update from Selectboard**

153
154 Clarke, we need to get this section done! Following is what the Selectboard seems
155 ready to adopt:

156
157 -Uses: three categories—allowable; allowable with site plan; conditional use
158 the selectboard seems ready to accept the revisions we recently made in each
159 of these categories.

160
161 -Residential density: 15 units/acre, above OR below the main floor (i.e. can be in
162 the basement provided relevant fire codes are met). Main floor reserved for
163 commercial use (i.e. NO residential dwellings).

164
165 -Lot coverage: maximum 80% of the entire 6 acre parcel.

166
167 -Building height: maximum 35 feet; 32 feet to window sill for fire code.

168
169 -Compatibility of all buildings on the site: (Cole noted we should highlight this to
170 the DRB).

171
172 -New definitions: main floor; residential use+ dwelling units and residential
173 services.

174
175 Cole-members should read the Selectboard's most recent draft of the Jolina Court
176 Zoning Regulations before our next meeting. In addition, hopefully we will fill the
177 planner position with a full time candidate soon.

178
179 Cole call for a motion to adjourn? Tellestone, so moved, Granda, second, unanimously
180 approved at 9:08 pm.

181
182 Respectfully submitted: Parke

183
184
185

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes 3/4/2020

Called to order: 7:06 pm

Members present: Mark Fausel, Brian Tellstone, Scott Nickerson, Virginia Clarke, Alison Anand, Lauck Parke (Chris Cole, Joy Reap, and Chris Granda were absent)

Staff present: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

Others present: Benjamin Bush, Nicole Dehne, David Sunshine

1. Adjustments to the Agenda

Virginia Clarke recommended adjusting the agenda move up Item #10a to under Item #4.

2. Approval of the minutes

Alison Anand said she would like page 2 of the February 19, 2020 meeting minutes to be corrected to reflect the Selectboard's concerns about the incremental increases to the building footprint allowance in the Jolina Court District draft regulations.

Motion by Brian Tellstone, second by Scott Nickerson to approve the minutes of the July 3, 2019, July 17, 2019, August 7, 2019, and February 19, 2020 Planning Commission Meetings as amended. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

3. Public comment for non-agenda items

4. Review meeting of Planning Commission and Selectboard members regarding the Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations

Ravi Venkataraman overviewed the memorandum enclosed in the packet summarizing the meeting. Venkataraman also outlined the proposed changes to the building height regulations, which would require all applicants seeking to file a Conditional Use or Site Plan Review application to consult the fire department prior to filing the application.

Clarke asked why the regulations for building height were changed. Venkataraman said the changes were brought upon in order to give the fire department more say in the review and approval of major developments. Venkataraman said the changes would also streamline the review process for planning and zoning staff and the applicants.

Lauck Parke said that the state would have requirements, such as sprinkler requirements, to promote fire safety, and, therefore, having the fire department review projects would be irrelevant. Parke said the bylaws would be giving power to the fire department. Venkataraman affirmed. Venkataraman said that nearby municipalities require fire department review letters for

large developments with an application, and that large commercial projects are under the jurisdiction of the Division of Fire Safety. Venkataraman said that the fire department made known that at times the Division of Fire Safety has superseded the fire department if a building can be sprinkled. Venkataraman said that the draft regulations facilitates communication between the fire department and the developer—especially in cases when the Division of Fire Safety supersedes the fire department.

Anand asked how many people in the fire department are paid employees and how many are volunteers. Venkataraman said volunteers staff the the entire fire department and are paid for their time working. Anand said that the commission should be aware of how much work the draft regulation would add to the fire department. Venkataraman affirmed. Venkataraman asked the fire department if they can take on the amount of work and the fire department said yes if the work needed to be done, and they said the review of major developments needs to be done.

David Sunshine said that the DRB often requests review letters from the fire department. Sunshine said that the DRB receives those letters in a timely manner. Clarke asked if the draft regulation would not add any new processes to the DRB, but that it formalizes an existing practice. Venkataraman said that the draft regulation would probably expedite the review process for the DRB, as it would receive all relevant materials at once instead of piecemeal.

Venkataraman said that the public hearing will focus on building footprints and traffic impacts. Venkataraman encouraged the Planning Commission to attend the Selectboard meeting. Clarke asked about the regulations for building footprint and how it aligns with the developer's intent. Venkataraman said he could not say for sure, because he does not know the developer's intentions.

Clarke asked about the traffic impact regulations. Venkataraman said the discussion was about whether to cap the amount of vehicle trip ends. Venkataraman explained the table enclosed in the packet. He said that the table identifies the number of vehicle trip ends a use generates per unit, and that it is based on a national average for a use, compiled by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Scott Nickerson asked if the Jolina Court development would generate less than 70 vehicle trip ends. Venkataraman said according to the traffic study, the consulting engineers concluded that the development would generate 53 to 57 vehicle trip ends. Clarke said she is unsure what the Planning Commission can provide to the Selectboard as rationale regarding traffic impacts. Venkataraman said Richmond is unique to have a cap on vehicle trip ends and that no other municipality he is aware of has a cap on vehicle trip ends.

Clarke asked if David Sunshine from the public had any comments. Sunshine said he was concerned about how traffic studies take into considerations land developments currently ongoing.

4a. Approval of amended report for the Jolina Court Zoning District per 24 V.S.A. §4442

Venkataraman said that any and all changes made to draft regulations after a public hearing has been opened requires a change to the municipal bylaw amendment report per statute.

Motion by Brian Tellstone, second by Alison Anand, to approve the amended report and forward said report to the Selectboard. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

5. Corrections and modifications to the Village Downtown Zoning District and other pertinent zoning regulations

Clarke explained that the changes to the Village Downtown Zoning District regulations are to align it with the Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations.

David Sunshine raised a question about the removal of business office uses. Venkataraman said he would look into it further. Clarke said the Planning Commission chose to consolidate business office and professional office uses in its creation of the Jolina Court Zoning District.

Lauck Parke said that pharmacy appeared twice on the uses list. Venkataraman acknowledged this typo.

Sunshine said that he is interested in discussing the “area” section. Sunshine said he is representing Northeast Organic Farming (NOFA). Venkataraman distributes a map of the Village Downtown Zoning District, and explains how to interpret the map. Sunshine said that the NOFA parcel should be integrated into the Village Downtown Zoning District, as it fits in terms of use and location.

Benjamin Bush, representing NOFA on behalf of Hillview Design, said that the NOFA parcel borders three commercial lots. Bush said that by being a part of the Village Downtown District, the NOFA parcel would have more developability, and therefore could accommodate all the parking needed to satisfy the zoning requirements for the use on said parcel. Nicole Dehne said that the inclusion of the NOFA parcel into the Village Downtown District would give NOFA more options as NOFA looks to possibly expand in the near future.

Clarke asked if the building on the parcel had an apartment. Dehne said that the entire building is office space for NOFA. Clarke asked what the current restrictions are for the NOFA parcel. Sunshine said 50 percent lot coverage. Sunshine said in the Village Downtown District, the limit is 80 percent lot coverage, plus more relaxed setback requirements compared to the Village Commercial District.

Clarke asked if a sidewalk could be installed. Bush said it could be on the Pleasant Street side, and further studies would be needed on the Bridge Street side. Clarke said she would like to preserve the aesthetic of the Pleasant Street neighborhood. Bush said there is a buffer between the NOFA building and the adjacent residential parcel.

Clarke said with this reevaluation of the Village Downtown District, the dentist's parcel across the street from the NOFA parcel could be added. Venkataraman said he provided the map to the commission to facilitate discussion on reevaluating the borders of the district.

Anand asked if NOFA created additional parking spaces, would NOFA use all the parking spaces and would patrons of nearby businesses be allowed to use the parking lot.

Clark said she was concerned about future pedestrian traffic from the Jolina Court development and the lack of a sidewalk on the eastern side of Bridge Street.

Parke said he was in favor including the NOFA parcel in the Village Downtown District. He said the Village Downtown District should be expanded to include parcels along Depot Street. Anand agrees with Parke on the inclusion of the NOFA parcel and the Dentist's parcel, and the reconsideration of other parcels. Anand said she was concerned about the feelings of the owner of adjoining residential parcel with the rezoning. Sunshine said this rezoning proposal would not change the usage or intensity of use on the parcel currently.

Parke asked staff if the commission could finish reviewing the Village Downtown District regulations with the inclusion of the NOFA and Dentist's parcels today, and review other parcels at a later date. Clarke said the commission should have a justification for the changes. Parke said the commission could justify the changes as corrections, of which additional parcels should have been added originally and were mistakenly not added at the time.

Sunshine, Bush, and Dehne depart.

Clarke said the draft includes the rounding rule and the traffic study language which were included in the Jolina Court District regulations.

Venkataraman explained the procedure for adopting the regulations. Anand said by holding the public hearing, people would be able voice input and concerns with the changes and addition of parcels into the Village Downtown District.

Nickerson asked about the process of adding additional parcels into the Village Downtown District at a later date. Venkataraman said the process would be the same as outlined.

Parke said that the addition of the Dentist's parcel into the Village Downtown District expands the property rights of the landowner, which does not raise any concerns for him. He said he would have concerns if the commission were adding a parcel that added restrictions to the parcel.

Motion by Lauck Parke, second by Scott Nickerson, to finalize the changes to the Town Zoning Regulations Section 3.10 with the amendment to add parcels PS0014 and the Dentist's Parcel (TBD), announce a public hearing on April 1, 2020 on said changes, and defer to staff to

produce and distribute copies of the Bylaw Change Report as mandated by statute. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

6. Regulatory language regarding “Veterinary Clinic” uses (7:40 PM to 7:45 PM)

Clarke provided an overview of the draft proposal for veterinary clinics, adding that a new classification was proposed since it had impacts different from a professional office use.

Clarke asked about process. Venkataraman said the process would be the same as stated, but with veterinary clinics treated as a standalone issue, with its own report and hearing.

Clarke asked about the 2500-square-foot limit for the use. Venkataraman said that limit was adapted from the limits for professional office uses in those respective districts. Parke said he could not imagine a 2500 square-foot veterinary clinic. Clarke said her veterinary office is 2500 square feet.

Clarke said the item should be tabled so that the commission can continue talking about the 2500 square foot limit.

7. Strategy for Public Outreach (7:45 PM to 8:15 PM)

a. Discussion of survey and Town Meeting Day briefing

Venkataraman said the commission should talk about the survey. Venkataraman sent a link to the survey to the commission.

Clarke said she had told the public during Town Meeting Day that the commission is preparing a survey.

Venkataraman said the maps in the survey are a work in progress. Nickerson said the divisions could be modified to reach better functional ends. Tellstone was confused about the map. Clarke suggested using a zoning map instead of an aerial map. Venkataraman said the main goal was to orient the public. Tellstone said a map with elements of what was produced for the survey and the zoning map is needed.

Tellstone said the survey is very similar to the survey conducted for the Town Plan. Clarke said an additional category of “depending on the location” is needed for the question on the last page.

Nickerson said that many of the items in the question on page 7 depends on context. Clarke said question 7 should be revised so that respondents could identify where they would like to see particular features instead of their sentiments on features.

8. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

Clarke said that for next meeting, the commission should focus on revisions to the survey, and the mapping exercise to identify where the commission would like to see particular features.

Clarke said that she had received an email from Town Manager Josh Arneson about the Selectboard's request for the commission to review signage requirements for commercial uses. Clarke said this item will be included in the next meeting's agenda.

Motion by Tellstone, second by Alison Anand, to adjourn. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 pm.

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: March 13, 2020

SUBJECT: The March 9, 2020 Selectboard Special Meeting and Affordable Housing

The following Planning Commission members attended the March 9, 2020 Selectboard public hearing on the Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations:

- Virginia Clarke
- Chris Granda
- Lauck Parke

The Planning Commission members and I addressed the Selectboard's concern regarding:

- Building height
- Traffic impacts
- Building footprint
- Floodplain impacts

Regarding floodplain impacts, the Selectboard suggested that the commission review the regulations for development within the floodplain as it reviews the entire zoning regulations.

The Selectboard did have one specific request to be included in the Jolina Court Zoning District draft regulations:

- Provisions for an optional affordable housing density bonus

Per 24 V.S.A. §4303, "Affordable Housing" is defined as either:

- (A) Owner-occupied housing for which the total annual cost of ownership, including principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and condominium association fees, does not exceed 30 percent of the gross annual income of a household at 120 percent of the highest of the following:
 - i. the county median income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development;
 - ii. the standard metropolitan statistical area median income if the municipality is located in such an area, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; or
 - iii. the statewide median income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- (B) Rental housing for which the total annual cost of renting, including rent, utilities, and condominium association fees, does not exceed 30 percent of the gross annual income of a household at 80 percent of the highest of the following:
 - i. the county median income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development;
 - ii. the standard metropolitan statistical area median income if the municipality is located in such an area, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; or
 - iii. the statewide median income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Specifically, the Selectboard was looking for the following qualities in the regulations for the optional affordable housing bonus:

- A density bonus provision of five to 10 percent – In the Jolina Court PUD, this would be a potential addition of two to five affordable housing units
- The affordable housing units would be locked at 50 percent of the area median income – To get a better sense of the numbers, I have enclosed a summary of the FY2019 HUD Income Limits for the Burlington-South Burlington Metropolitan Statistical Area (Richmond is in this MSA). This table is used to determine income limits for HUD programs, such as Public Housing, Section 8 housing, and vouchers, and is based on the U.S. Census American Community Survey data.
- The developer would be responsible for establishing and maintaining the affordable housing units

To facilitate discussion, I have enclosed draft regulations for affordable housing density bonuses. I encourage you to edit and comment on this document. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.



FY 2019 INCOME LIMITS DOCUMENTATION SYSTEM

HUD.gov [HUD User Home](#) [Data Sets](#) [Fair Market Rents](#) [Section 8 Income Limits](#) [MTSP Income Limits](#) [HUD LIHTC Database](#)

FY 2019 Income Limits Summary

Selecting any of the buttons labeled "Explanation" will display detailed calculation steps for each of the various parameters.

FY 2019 Income Limit Area	Median Family Income <input type="button" value="Explanation"/>	FY 2019 Income Limit Category	Persons in Family							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Burlington-South Burlington, VT MSA	\$91,600	Very Low (50%) Income Limits (\$) <input type="button" value="Explanation"/>	32,100	36,650	41,250	45,800	49,500	53,150	56,800	60,500
		Extremely Low Income Limits (\$)* <input type="button" value="Explanation"/>	19,250	22,000	24,750	27,500	30,170	34,590	39,010	43,430
		Low (80%) Income Limits (\$) <input type="button" value="Explanation"/>	51,350	58,650	66,000	73,300	79,200	85,050	90,900	96,800

The **Burlington-South Burlington, VT MSA** contains the following areas:

CHITTENDEN COUNTY, VT TOWNS OF Bolton town, VT; Buels gore, VT; Burlington city, VT; Charlotte town, VT; Colchester town, VT; Essex town, VT; Hinesburg town, VT; Huntington town, VT; Jericho town, VT; Milton town, VT; Richmond town, VT; St. George town, VT; Shelburne town, VT; South Burlington city, VT; Underhill town, VT; Westford town, VT; Williston town, VT; Winooski city, VT;

FRANKLIN COUNTY, VT TOWNS OF Bakersfield town, VT; Berkshire town, VT; Enosburgh town, VT; Fairfax town, VT; Fairfield town, VT; Fletcher town, VT; Franklin town, VT; Georgia town, VT; Highgate town, VT; Montgomery town, VT; Richford town, VT; St. Albans city, VT; St. Albans town, VT; Sheldon town, VT; Swanton town, VT;

GRAND ISLE COUNTY, VT TOWNS OF Alburgh town, VT; Grand Isle town, VT; Isle La Motte town, VT; North Hero town, VT; South Hero town, VT; and South Hero town, VT.

* The FY 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act changed the definition of extremely low-income to be the greater of 30/50ths (60 percent) of the Section 8 very low-income limit or the poverty guideline as [established by the Department of Health and Human Services \(HHS\)](#), provided that this amount is not

greater than the Section 8 50% very low-income limit. Consequently, the extremely low income limits may equal the very low (50%) income limits.

Income Limit areas are based on FY 2019 Fair Market Rent (FMR) areas. For information on FMRs, please see our associated FY 2019 [Fair Market Rent documentation system](#).

For last year's Median Family Income and Income Limits, please see here:

[FY2018 Median Family Income and Income Limits for Burlington-South Burlington, VT MSA](#)

Select any FY2019 HUD Metropolitan FMR Area's
Income Limits:

Or press below to start over and select a different
state:

Burlington-South Burlington, VT MSA



Select a new state

Select HMFA Income Limits Area

Update URL For bookmarking or E-Mailing

Prepared by the [Program Parameters and Research Division](#), HUD.

6.13 Affordable Housing Density Bonus

6.13.1 Purpose – Pursuant to one of the Town Plan goals, the objective of this section is to increase the supply the affordable housing in the Town, and housing opportunities for a variety of income groups. The following provisions are to ensure a supply of standard housing available at below-market rate purchase prices or rents by providing an incentive bonus to applicants who choose to provide affordable housing dwelling units in their respective development.

6.13.2 Applicability – Affordable Housing Density Bonuses may only be granted to Planned Unit Developments and Residential Planned Unit Developments in the following districts: JC, VD, V/C.

6.13.3 Administration and Compliance

a) Application Requirements. In addition to other applicable submission requirements to proposed projects as specified within the Richmond Zoning Regulations, applications under Section 6.13 shall include the following:

- 1) An Affordable Housing Density Bonus application;
- 2) A site plan which identifies the number, locations, types, and sizes of affordable housing dwelling units in relation to market-rate dwelling units;
- 3) Documentation supporting the allocation of inclusionary and market-rate units, including affordable housing dwelling unit allocation calculations;
- 4) Descriptions of each unit's type, floor area, number of bedrooms, estimated housing costs, and other data necessary to determine unit affordability;
- 5) Floor plans of the all the housing units (both affordable housing and market-rate dwelling units) in the development;
- 6) Documentation regarding household income eligibility;
- 7) Information regarding the long-term management of inclusionary units, including the responsible party or parties, as required to ensure continued affordability;
- 8) Draft legal documents required under this section to ensure continued affordability;
- 9) Construction timeline for the entire development, and/or phasing plan;
- 10) Other information as requested by the Zoning Administrator to determine project compliance with Section 6.13

b) The Zoning Administrator and the Affordable Housing Committee is responsible for certifying in writing whether a development application is in compliance with Section 6.13 prior to the issuance of any zoning permits or approvals from the Development Review Board.

c) Continued Affordability. An affordable housing dwelling unit shall remain affordable in perpetuity commencing from the date of initial occupancy, through a deed restriction, restrictive covenant, or through purchase by or a contractual agreement with a local, state or federal housing authority or nonprofit housing agency, to be reviewed by the Town Attorney and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to the recording in the Town of Richmond Land Records and the issuance of any zoning permits associated with the respective unit. Any deed restriction, covenant, or other instrument or agreement ensuring the continued affordability of affordable housing dwelling units shall include:

- 1) Resale Restrictions. Provisions to ensure the affordability of affordable housing dwelling units offered for sale shall include a formula for limiting equity appreciation to an amount not to exceed 25 percent of the increase in the unit's value, as determined by the difference between fair market appraisals of the unit at the time of purchase and the time of resale, with adjustments for improvements made by the seller and the necessary costs of sale, as may be approved by the Affordable Housing Committee;

2) Rent Increases. Provisions to ensure the affordability of rental units shall limit annual rent increases to the percentage increase in the median household income within the Burlington-South Burlington MSA, except to the extent that further increases are made necessary by documented hardship or other unusual conditions, and shall provide that no rent increase may take effect until it has received the written approval of the Affordable Housing Committee.

3) Sublet Restrictions. Provisions for affordable housing dwelling units shall prohibit the subletting of units at rental rates that exceed affordability limits established pursuant to this section.

d) Administration. The Affordable Housing Committee, or any bona fide qualified non-profit organization shall be responsible for the on-going administration of the affordable housing dwelling units as well as for the promulgation of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to implement this program. The Affordable Housing Committee or non-profit organization will determine and implement eligibility priorities, continuing eligibility standards and enforcement, and rental and sales procedures.

e) Density Increase – Based on the Zoning Administrator and Affordable Housing Committee’s determinations on a case-by-case basis, the Development Review Board may grant an increase in residential density over the base zoning density in order to create below market rate housing. The density increases shall be approved on the following criteria and standards:

1) For Planned Unit Developments and Residential Planned Unit Developments with both market rate and affordable housing dwelling units. Based on the Zoning Administrator and Affordable Housing Committee’s determinations, the Development Review Board may grant a density increase of no more than 10 percent of the total number of dwelling units allowed under the base zoning density. All of the units gained as a result of a density increase shall be affordable housing dwelling units. Refer to Figure 6.13-1 for additional information.

Figure 6.13-1. Example calculation of affordable housing dwelling units

	PUDs with both market rate and affordable housing dwelling units
Acreage	3
Base Density	15 units per acre
Base Units	45 units
Bonus Units	4.5 units
Total Units	50 units
Net Density	16.67 units per acre
Affordable Units	5 units
Market Rate Units	45 units

f) Development Standards

1) Distribution. The affordable housing dwelling units shall be physically integrated into the design of the development, and shall be distributed among the housing types in the proposed housing development in the same proportion as all other units in the development, unless a different proportion is approved by the Affordable Housing Committee and the Development Review Board as being better related to the current or projected housing needs of the Town.

2) Minimum Floor Area. The minimum gross floor area per affordable dwelling unit shall not be less than comparable market-rate units in the PUD

3) Housing Types. At the discretion of the Affordable Housing Committee and the Development Review Board, the dwelling units may be of varied types including one-family, two-family, or multi-family dwelling uses, as well as efficiency, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, and four-bedroom dwelling units within multi-family dwelling uses.

6.13.4 Housing Replacement Requirement

- a) If at any point in time an affordable housing dwelling unit is to be removed, demolished, or converted into a different use, including market-rate residential uses, the parties responsible for changing the status of the affordable housing dwelling unit must establish a replacement affordable housing dwelling unit.
- b) Requirements for Replacement Affordable Housing. All replacement affordable housing dwelling units must meet the following requirements:
- 1) Each replacement affordable housing dwelling unit shall have at least the same number of bedrooms as the dwelling unit being replaced;
 - 2) Each replacement affordable housing dwelling unit must be located within the Town of Richmond;
 - 3) Each affordable housing dwelling unit replacement must be established pursuant to Section 6.13.3.
- c) Exemptions. This section shall not be applicable to:
- 1) Any dwelling unit ordered demolished or declared unfit for habitation because of damage caused by natural disaster, fire, flood, or other causes beyond the owner's control;
 - 2) The removal of accessory dwelling units.

Section 7 – Definitions

Affordable Housing Dwelling Unit *[add]* – This shall mean either of the following:

- A dwelling unit that is owned by its inhabitants, whose gross annual household income does not exceed eighty percent (80%) of the median income for the Burlington-South Burlington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), as defined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the total annual cost of the housing, including principal, interest, taxes and insurance, is not more than thirty percent (30%) of the household's gross annual income; or
- A dwelling unit that is rented by its inhabitants whose gross annual household income does not exceed eighty percent (80%) of the median income for the Burlington-South Burlington Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), as defined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the total annual cost of the housing, including rent, utilities, and condominium association fees, is not more than thirty percent (30%) of the household's gross annual income

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: March 13, 2020

SUBJECT: Commercial Signage

In response to the Selectboard's request, I have enclosed for you draft regulations of Section 5.7.4 (Signage in the Commercial, Gateway, Village Commercial, Jolina Court, Village Downtown, and Industrial Commercial Zoning Districts). This document assumes the passage of the Jolina Court District draft regulations and the amended Village Downtown District draft regulations.

To facilitate action by the Planning Commission, I have prepared for you the following draft motions:

Motion to Warn a Public Hearing

*I, _____, move to warn a public hearing on **April 15, 2020** to amend Richmond Zoning Regulations Section 5.7.4, and to distribute copies of the Proposed Bylaw Amendment Report as required under 24 V.S.A. §4441.*

- 5.7.4 Signs - C, G, V/C, JC, VD, and I/C Zoning Districts** - In the Gateway, Village/Commercial, Commercial, Jolina Court, Village Downtown, and Industrial/Commercial Zoning Districts, ~~one~~two signs (either free-standing, wall, and/or projecting) per lot shall be permitted upon issuance of a Zoning Permit by the Administrative Officer, provided such signs meet the following requirements:
- a) **Free-Standing signs** - The free-standing sign shall be located outside of any public or private Road or Highway right-of-way and shall not exceed 24 square feet on each of two faces. If the sign does not utilize one or more of the following geometric forms; circle, square, rectangle or ellipse, then the DRB shall review the request as a conditional use review.
 - b) **Wall Signs** - The wall sign shall be attached horizontally to, and not extending perpendicularly from, the wall of a principal structure, and shall not exceed the following size limitations:
 - i) Signs with a total surface area not to exceed one (1) square foot of sign for each linear foot of the side of the structure in which the use is contained; however, the total surface area of any sign/s shall not exceed fifty (50) square feet.
 - c) **Projecting Signs** - The projecting sign shall be attached to and extending perpendicularly from a wall of a principal structure and shall not project out more than five (5) feet from the front wall of the building. The maximum square footage of a projecting sign shall be no greater than twenty-five percent (25%) of the linear footage of the front width of the structure on which the sign shall be attached with a maximum of twenty (20) square feet.
 - d) **Locator Signs for Multiple Uses** - For a lot comprising two (2) or more uses and in addition to the sign allowed under this subsection, 5.7.4, each individual use shall be allowed one sign, not exceeding ten (10) square feet which is either a wall sign or projecting sign. Except for maximum square footage, these signs shall meet the above design requirements. The wall or projecting sign must be attached to the exterior wall of the side of the structure in which the use is contained.

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: March 13, 2020

SUBJECT: Changes to the Village Commercial Zoning District

To facilitate discussion, I have enclosed recommended changes to the Village Commercial Zoning District regulations as well as the checklist Virginia and I developed for reviewing zoning district regulations. I suggested modifications to:

- List of uses added
- Residential density requirements
- Other Requirements

For the March 18, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, items worth discussing include:

- Lots to include in the Village Commercial District
- Dimensional requirements
- Dimensional limitations
- Parking requirements

In the draft regulations, I have provided comments to better explain rationale and identify topics of discussion. Feel free to let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

3.5 Village Commercial District (V/C)

Purpose - The standards of this district are designed to retain and provide areas for the sale of retail or wholesale of those types of goods and services required by the residents of the community. Strip development with multiple curb cuts is discouraged. An attractive, pedestrian friendly, compact area of retail operations is encouraged. Parking and traffic flow shall be considered as part of the site plan review process for any Land Development in this district. Residential uses that are compatible with a village commercial district will be permitted after conditional use approval and site plan review.

3.5.1 Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Zoning Permit by Administrative Officer - The following uses shall be allowed uses in the V/C District upon issuance of a Zoning Permit by the Administrative Officer. Site Plan Review and approval by the DRB shall also be required. ~~Unless otherwise provided, only one principal use may be approved on any one lot:~~

- a) Accessory dwelling as provided in Section 5.9.
- b) Accessory uses or structures, except outdoor storage, to the uses in 3.5.1.
- c) Artist/Craft studio.
- d) Day care center.
- e) Inn or guest house.
- f) Laundromat
- g) Museum.
- h) Office, Medical
- i) Office, ~~business or~~ professional.
- j) Personal services ~~business~~.
- k) Pharmacy
- l) Religious use as provided in Section 5.10.4
- m) Restaurant, standard.
- n) Retail business.
- o) Theater, indoor.
- p) Two-family Dwelling

3.5.2 Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Conditional Use Approval - The following uses may be allowed in the V/C District after issuance of conditional use approval by the DRB. Unless otherwise provided, only one principal use, with its accessory structures, may be approved on one lot.

- a) Adaptive use as provided in Section 5.6.8.
- b) Bank.
- c) Brewery
- d) Catering service.
- e) Commercial multi-use building.
- f) Center-based child care facility
- g) Communication Use
- h) Business yard.
- i) Educational facility as provided in Section 5.10.4 .
- j) Equipment supply and/or rental.
- k) Food Processing Establishment
- l) Funeral parlor.
- m) Garage, vehicle repairs and service Garage, Repair
- n) Group home.
- o) Health Care Services
- p) Hospital
- q) Hotel or motel.
- r) Light manufacturing
- s) Lumber yard ~~/ Building supply business.~~

Commented [PA1]: Encourage mixed use

Commented [PA2]: Remove "Business Office" from definitions to remove redundancy

Commented [PA3]: MMCTV may be considered this use

Commented [PA4]: If Light Manufacturing is allowed, Food Processing should be too

Commented [PA5]: Minor Correction

- t) Multi-family Dwelling, as part of a Planned Unity Development as provided in Section
- u) Planned Unit Development as provided in Section 5.12, if no subdivision of land is proposed (see Section 5.12.1);
- v) Private club.
- w) Recreation, indoor or outdoor, facility or park.—Recreation Facility
- x) Research laboratory.
- y) Restaurant
- z) Restaurant, fast food or take-out.—Fast-Food Restaurant
- aa) Retirement community.
- bb) Rooming or boarding house.
- cc) State- or community-owned and operated institutions and facilities, to the extent allowed by Section 5.10.4.
- dd) Storage, outdoor as an accessory use to any permitted or conditional use.
- ee) Tavern.
- ff) Wholesale trade.
- gg) Dwelling Units as part of a Planned Unit Development.
- hh) Agriculture, silviculture and horticulture as provided in Section 2.4.5 .

Commented [PA6]: We shouldn't control subdivision rights under zoning regulations if we have a separate ordinance specifically controlling subdivision rights. If the town wants to curtail subdivision rights in the Village Commercial District, it should do so in the Subdivision Ordinance.

3.5.3 Residential Density and Requirements

- a) Each residential dwelling unit shall require 1/24 acre of developable land located on the same lot as the unit. This equals a residential density of 24 units per acre. 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 of units with a fractional component, the fraction will be rounded according to conventional rounding rules as follows, where X is a whole number:

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

X.50 – X.99 units shall be rounded UP to X+1 units.

Examples: 24 units/acre x 0.22 developable acres = 5.28 units rounds DOWN to 5 units.

24 units/acre x 0.16 developable acres = 3.84 units rounds UP to 4 units.

If the number of permissible units is less than one (1) it shall be rounded UP to 1 unit.

Example: 24 units/acre x 0.02 developable acres = 0.48 units rounds UP to 1 unit.

Commented [PA7]: Topic of discussion: Acceptable residential density?

- b) Residential dwelling units shall be restricted to the second story/floor and above of any building and shall not be allowed on the street/ground level. These units may be approved as part of a mixed-use Planned Unit Development.

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

- a) **Lot Area** - Except as provided under Section 4.6.1, no lot served by a municipal or community water and sewer system shall be less than one-third (1/3) acre. This minimum lot area requirement shall be increased to one (1) acre for any lot not served by municipal or community water and sewer systems. 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. In the case of a lot for three (3) or more dwelling units served by municipal or community water and sewer systems, one-third (1/3) acre of land per dwelling unit shall be required and one (1) acre of land per dwelling unit shall be required for lots not served by municipal or community water and sewer systems.

Commented [PA8]: Topic of discussion: Acceptable lot size?

- 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 fifty percent (50%) of the total ground area of the lot.

3.5.4 Dimensional Limitations for Structures on Lots in the V/C District - No Zoning Permit may be issued for a structure in the V/C District unless the structure proposed for the lot meets the following dimensional requirements:

- a) **Building Height** - The height of any structure shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet, except as provided in Section 6.6.
- b) **Front Yard Setback** - All structures shall be set back at least twenty (20) feet from the front lot line.
- c) **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 the side lot line.
- d) **Rear Yard Setback** - A principal structure shall be set back at least fifteen (15) feet from the rear lot line. An accessory structure shall be set back at least ten (10) feet from the rear lot.

Commented [PA9]: Topic of discussion

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

- a) **Water Resources**-all lots in this district shall be served by the Richmond municipal water and sewer system.

~~a) **Parking Requirements** - New land development is exempt from meeting the required number of parking spaces, per Section 6.1.2, for the following parcels: 10 East Main Street (EM0010); 26 Bridge Street (BR0026); 30 Bridge Street (BR0030); 38 Bridge Street (BR0038); 39 Bridge Street (BR0039); 48 Bridge Street (BR0048); 52 Bridge Street (BR0052).~~

~~With the exception of the number of required parking spaces for those parcels, Section 6.1.2 shall apply to the V/C District. In all other respects, Required parking shall be regulated as provided in Section 6.1 within the V/C district.~~

Commented [PA10]: All of these parcels are now in the VDZD or JC.

However, topic of discussion – exempt parcels from parking requirements.

- b) **Loading** - Off-Road or Highway loading requirements shall be regulated as provided in Section
- c) **Signs** - Signs shall be regulated as provided in Section 5.7.
- d) **Traffic Impact** - ~~No permit or approval shall be issued for a use which generates more than 70 vehicle trip ends during the P.M. peak hour for the first 40,000 square feet of lot area or fraction thereof, plus 1 vehicle trip end for each additional 1,000 square feet of lot area. In making the determination of traffic impact, the Administrative Officer or DRB shall utilize "Trip generation - Seventh Edition - 2003", 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.~~

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.

- a) 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.
- b) 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.
- e) **Access** - Access shall be regulated as provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.4.
- f) **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. The goal of this requirement is to ensure public ability to review the visual rendering, and the opportunity to 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 facade, 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. The following shall be considered when reviewing the application:
- 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, is 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.
- g) **Residential Use** - Residential dwelling units shall be restricted to the second story/floor or higher of any building and shall only be approved and permitted via Planned Unit Development.
- h) **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 circulation

- Landscaping
- Demonstration of the ability to properly develop, operate, and maintain development roads, utilities, driveways, parking, sidewalks, landscaping, and other conditions or standards imposed

Checklist – Revising Zoning Districts

1. Is the purpose the same?
 - a. Has the district changed in nature, character, and built environment?
 - b. How does this district align with the Transect (urban-rural continuum)? Therefore, what kind of urban form should we anticipate?
2. What is the district called now? Do we want to keep the same name?
 - a. Does the name match the intent and purpose of the district?
3. Do we want the same allowable and conditional uses?
 - a. What uses detract from the character of the district?
4. Do we want to add any uses, including ones from our “new uses” list?
 - a. What uses would contribute to the purpose of the district?
5. Are current uses compatible with new definitions?
 - a. Do the definitions match statutory requirements, as well as the nature of the use today?
6. Do we want to keep the same residential/commercial density?
 - a. Density measured in number of units per acre, and minimum lot sizes
7. Are the dimensional requirements and limitations still useful?
 - a. Are the standards for setbacks, lot coverage, building coverage (if included), and building footprint limitations still valid?
8. Do we want to keep the same boundaries? Add more area? Divide into 2 or more districts?
 - a. For certain districts, what is the extent of growth we want to promote?
 - b. Are additional requirements for Conditional Use Review and Site Plan Review needed?
9. Do we need design standards in this district?
 - a. This is a larger question of whether to have form-based elements in a district, or a design review district.
10. How can we advance our Town Plan goals in this district for the following?
 - a. More housing of all types, including affordable housing and accessory dwellings
 - b. Less fossil fuel use and more efficient energy usage (Act 174)
 - c. More economic and employment opportunities, including indoor and outdoor recreational businesses
 - d. Protection and expansion of our iconic industries, including farming and forestry through value-added and accessory uses among other methods, and of traditional outdoor recreational activities
 - e. Concentration of growth in the downtown areas
 - f. Exploration of form- and density-based zoning
 - g. Support for historic resources
 - h. Preservation of forest blocks (Act 171)
 - i. Minimization of developmental impacts on land and water
 - j. Support for community building
 - k. Protection of flood hazard area
11. How will PUDs fit into this district?
 - a. Should there be specific PUD and/or PRD standards in order to advance the goals of the Town Plan?
12. Is this district compatible with changes made by JCZD?
13. Have we reviewed the 2012 zoning effort for any new ideas that could be incorporated?
14. Have we considered information we have received through our outreach efforts?
15. Have we consulted Suzanne and the DRB for any red flags of difficulty for them?