

Town of Richmond
Planning Commission Meeting
AGENDA
Wednesday, May 4th, 2022, 7:00 PM
Online via Zoom

PLEASE NOTE: In accordance with Act 78, this meeting will be held online and conference call via Zoom only. You do not need a computer to attend this meeting. You may use the "Join By Phone" number to call from a cell phone or landline. When prompted, enter the meeting information provided below to join by phone.

For additional information about this meeting, please contact Ravi Venkataraman at 802-434-2430 or at rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov.

The Zoom online meeting information is as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting:<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83503119719>

Meeting ID: 835 0311 9719

Join by phone: (929) 205-6099

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.

1. Welcome, sign in and troubleshooting
2. Review of the agenda and adjustments to the agenda
3. Public Comment for non-agenda items
4. Approval of Minutes
 - April 20, 2022
 - April 23, 2022
5. Debrief on the Gateway area site visit and discussion on next steps
6. Discussion on implementing the Richmond Housing Study
7. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment
 - Creation of subcommittee to review Buttermilk affordable housing proposal

Table of Contents

4. Approval of Minutes

- Page 3: April 20, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- Page 7: April 23, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

5. Debrief on the Gateway area site visit and discussion on next steps

- Page 8: Outline of draft Gateway Residential/Commercial District Zoning Regulations prepared by Virginia Clarke
- Page 11: Draft zoning regulations of Gateway Residential/Commercial District

6. Discussion on implementing the Richmond Housing Study

- Page 16: Brief Summary of Housing Study prepared by Virginia Clarke

7. Other Business, Correspondence and Adjournment

- Page 18: Proposal for affordable housing prepared by Buttermilk, LLC

Richmond Planning Commission
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FOR April 20, 2022

Members Present:	Virginia Clarke, Lisa Miller, Chris Granda, Dan Mullen, Chris Cole, Alison Anand,
Members Absent:	Joy Reap, Mark Fausel,
Others Present:	Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff), Erin Wagg (MMCTV), Jay Furr, Rod West, Brandy Saxton

1. Welcome and troubleshooting

Virginia Clarke called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

2. Review of the agenda and adjustments to the agenda

Clarke reviewed the meeting agenda.

3. Public Comment for non-agenda items

None

4. Approval of Minutes

No comments from commission members. The minutes were accepted into the record as written.

Clarke noted that during the April 6, 2022 meeting, attendees said that the commercial requirement in the Gateway District is 50 percent. Clarke said that after the meeting she fact-checked this statement and that the commercial requirement per the zoning regulations is actually 40 percent.

5. Discussion on the Gateway District

Clarke noted the scheduled site visit of the Gateway District on Saturday, April 23rd at 3 pm. Venkataraman said that the committee will be meeting at the Reaps' property.

Clarke said that the purpose of the discussion is to overview one possibility for rezoning the Gateway District section-by-section. Clarke said that the intent is to convert the Gateway area from a commercial district to a mixed use district. Clarke reviewed the draft purpose and features sections. Chris Granda said that the reference to "commercial strip development" in the features section is vague and more definition is needed. Clarke said that a definition for "commercial strip development" could be included.

Clarke reviewed the reference to limiting future curb cuts and requiring future development to use the existing curb cuts. Rod West asked if curb cuts are under the purview of the state, and whether the state would permit future curb cuts along Route 2. Clarke said that she was unsure if the state would approve future curb cuts, and that the commission's goal is to limit future curb cuts. Venkataraman said that he is not aware of the state's goal of not allowing future curb cuts on Route 2, that the state has their own

permitting process for new curb cuts in addition to the local permitting process for curb cuts, and that from his understanding the most restrictive rules apply to property owner, regardless of if those rules come from the state or from the town.

Miller said that the commission should spend time defining the details of the features. Clarke suggested placing such definitions in the definitions section. West suggested removing the reference to “Historic settlement pattern of the village” considering the context, and that a better sense of the context will be provided with the upcoming site visit.

Granda asked how the mechanics of limiting future curb cuts would work, and asked if the core concern was the number of curb cuts or the location of curb cuts or both. Clarke said that the goal is that all future development would use the curb cuts that already exist. Cole asked if the town issues a permit for curb cuts concurrently with VTrans. Venkataraman said that the town also issues an access permit with the town’s highway department and zoning administrator signing off on the permit, and that the town’s Public Works Specifications only allows for one curb cut per lot.

Clarke reviewed the feature describing landscaped front setbacks, noting that the historic settlement features of Richmond involve deep front yards. Clarke reviewed the feature describing a shared bike path.

Miller asked if the sewer line could be located in a location that would place an impact on the frontage of the properties. Clarke said that the other possibility could route the sewer line to the schools. Jay Furr confirmed that the two possibilities for locating the sewer line—along Route 2 or to the school—are the only possibilities, and said that Water Quality Superintendent Kendall Chamberlin has a preference for placing the sewer line along Route 2 for engineering reasons. Furr said that issues include the placement of a possible water line due to the needed separation distance between water and sewer lines, and proper sizing for fire hydrants. Furr said that one possibility the Water and Sewer Commission is looking into is building out only to the Reaps. Clarke noted the importance of connecting the mobile home park with municipal water and sewer.

Clarke reviewed the intent of reorganizing the zoning regulations, and streamlining the permitting process by removing site plan review as a permit process and integrating site plan review standards and specifications into the administrative and DRB permitting processes. Alison Anand asked about the history of the site plan review permitting process. Clarke said she was unsure about the basis of the site plan review permitting process, and that historically the zoning was focused on allowing single-family homes and farms and requiring extra permitting for any other use. Anand said that the issue could be about the intent of the regulation or its interpretation in implementation. Clarke noted that the zoning regulations have many sections that are duplicated, such as the performance standards. Venkataraman said that site plan review standards are useful to have, that Richmond’s zoning regulations lack specificity in its site plan review standards in some parts which take away from the practicality of the standards, and that having more robust site plan review standards would be more effective. Venkataraman said that having a two tiers for permitting—one for high impact and high traffic uses, and one for low impact uses—would make a lot more sense for the town. Clarke clarified that the plan is not to remove site plan review itself but to integrate site plan review in all the permitting processes.

Clarke reviewed the possible dimensional requirements. Clarke suggested further investigating possible setbacks by measuring when the commission conducts its site visit. Dan Mullen asked about the larger

setbacks and the placement of parking. Clarke said that parking would not be allowed between Route 2 and the building. Mullen asked about how this would influence house site placements. Clarke said that the goal would be to place multifamily housing. Miller asked about the dimensions of the right-of-way and how it would factor into future development. Cole said that a fence delineates the I-89 right-of-way and private properties.

Clarke suggested that the commission review the possible dimensional standards before the site visit.

6. Presentation and Discussion on the Zoning for Affordable Housing Study

Brandy Saxton reviewed the nine recommendations she has for the town based on her study, highlighting the need for continuing education on housing issues in town, the need to clarify the permitting process to reduce the time of permitting, and the need to reevaluate housing density and allowances for housing types. Saxton presented her recommendations for zoning regulations, zoning districts, and properties with infill potential. Saxton overviewed the methods of regulating density—lot size, lot area, lot coverage. Saxton recommended allowing multiunit dwellings of up to four units as a permitted use within the water/sewer service area, as it lines up with state guidance, the Town Plan, and possible upcoming changes to statute. Saxton reviewed possible PUD regulations that would help create neighborhoods with different types of housing.

Miller asked about the capacity to build housing in the Gateway District. Saxton said that based on her review, the sites at the end of the Gateway District before the Route 2 approach into the village have the capacity for housing due to the setbacks. Saxton said that idealistically one would want 500 to 600 feet of lot depth in order to fully develop the site, and a lot depth of 300 feet would inhibit the full developability of a parcel. Saxton said that within the county are multifamily housing that appear ubiquitous with a set size and shape of 70 feet by 150 feet, of about 12,000 to 15,000 square feet, with 3 or 4 stories because of how many units the building can host, the location of the parking, the building code requirements, among other factors. Saxton said that this dimension could be used to test the capacity of lots and ask whether the community wants these types of buildings. Miller asked if these types of buildings were approved as PUDs. Saxton said she isn't entirely sure.

Miller asked about the possibility of a property owner assuming multiple properties for redevelopment. Saxton said that that is a rarity in Vermont.

Miller asked if a college dormitory counts as affordable housing. Saxton said that it typically does not, as dormitories for institutional use are typically not counted as dwelling units.

Granda asked if Saxton could speak about case studies that have adopted regulations like her suggestions. Saxton spoke about communities choosing to regulate density by lot coverage, in order to keep a low density in the rural areas of town. Clarke noted that the zoning regulations currently doesn't have a density number per se.

Clarke asked about multiple principle structures on lots. Saxton said that restricting lots to singular principle structures is an artifact from the origins of zoning and is a suburban model. Saxton said that many communities in Vermont are eliminating that limitation, and that it works well in the Vermont context. Saxton said there is a benefit to limit the number of single-family dwellings on a property, and suggested setting that limitation on the number of detached units in order to avoid unforeseen legal issues

when property is transferred.

Clarke asked about the equity issue of placing housing units close to a highway with the Gateway District. Saxton noted the presence of house sites along I-89 and I-91, adding that the location of house sites are based on personal preference and the character of the community, and it wouldn't be wholly wrong to consider placing affordable housing in the Gateway area. Saxton added that the Gateway shouldn't be the only location the community allows for affordable housing. Saxton noted multiple context-based factors in house site placement next to highways that could or could not have an adverse impact. Cole expressed his preference to not place affordable housing next to highways and within floodplains and said he liked Saxton's suggestion to connect with a land trust to create more attractive affordable housing options. Saxton recommended looking into the possibilities at the mobile home parks, specifically possibly allowing alternative building types. Saxton noted that a large contingent of mobile home park residents are empty nesters and seniors, and that based on her conversation with the mobile home park owner, any expansion of the mobile home park would be a continuation of that trend. Saxton and Clarke noted the attractiveness for seniors of a smaller footprint of a mobile home and the less maintenance it needs compared to a single-family home. Granda asked about the capacity of the mobile home park. Saxton said that from her understanding, the land and septic system has the capacity for more units, and that typically mobile home parks at about 3 units per acre do not use land at the same intensity as downtown areas.

Granda noted climate change and shifting trends in transportation should be factored into regulating future development.

Clarke said that the Housing Committee will be discussing this report at their upcoming meeting, that Saxton will be presenting the report at an upcoming Selectboard meeting, and that the commission can start thinking about aspects in the report they want to focus on.

7. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

Venkataraman said that the public hearing on vehicle fueling station uses, nonconforming uses and structures, and wetlands is on April 25th Selectboard meeting agenda. Venkataraman said that during the last Selectboard meeting, questions were raised about the capacity of the grid to allow for DC fast charging stations. Venkataraman said that he and Selectboard member Jeff Forward are looking into this issue. Clarke and Granda discussed the fallacy of this issue, and ways to circumvent the issue by engaging with Green Mountain Power.

Motion by Granda, seconded by Cole, to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

Richmond Planning Commission
MEETING MINUTES FOR April 23, 2022
35 Willis Farm Road, Richmond, VT 05477

Members Present:	Virginia Clarke, Lisa Miller, Chris Granda, Dan Mullen, Alison Anand,
Members Absent:	Joy Reap, Mark Fausel, Chris Cole
Others Present:	Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff), Rod West, Kristen Hayden-West, Robert Reap, Rodney Wert, Mary Houle, Peggy Zugaro, Paul Zugaro, Jay Furr, Heidi Bormann, Matthew Tourville

1. Welcome, sign in and troubleshooting

Virginia Clarke opened the meeting at 3:07 pm.

2. Site Visit of the Gateway District area

Clarke reviewed the purpose of the site visit and the Gateway area rezoning discussions.

Mary Houle asked about Gary Bressor’s plan. Clarke and other commission members clarified that Bressor’s plan is one possibility for the Gateway, and that the commission’s intent is to comprehensively and holistically review all possibilities and constraints for the Gateway District before presenting draft zoning regulations for the Town to review.

Lisa Miller noted constraints on site. Rod West and Ravi Venkataraman identified suspected and mapped wetlands on site.

Clarke and Robert Reap led the commission and the public to the edge of Route 2. The commission and the public discuss existing setbacks, the feasibility of a secondary road, and the noise impacts.

Reap led the commission and the public about his properties (Willis Farm) and went over their plans for future development as well as the feasibility of a path connecting the properties to the schools.

The commission and the public looked at the back lots on the Reaps’ properties.

The commission and the public toured Rod West and Kristen Hayden-West’s property. All discussed the wetlands, the location of culverts, the noise impacts, and the distance between the house and the edge of I-89.

The commission and the public toured Peggy and Paul Zugaro’s property. All discussed the impacts of landscaping and screening, and the possible development feasibility of the property.

The commission and the public viewed the Stromme property, the property containing the Fieldstone Office, and the property containing The Crate Escape from the edge of Route 2.

3. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

The commission noted that the site visit will be discussed at the upcoming Planning Commission meeting.

Motion by Alison Anand, seconded by Chris Granda, to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm

5/4/22 Planning Commission Meeting Materials

Gateway Residential/Commercial District – (single district) FOR DISCUSSION ONLY 4.25.22

Area: NE side of Rt 2 from south of Mobil Station through (including) the cemetery (see map)

(Mobil Station added to I/C ZD)

(lots between the village and the cemetery added to the Village R/C ZD)

Purpose: This district is designed to allow for both residential and commercial uses in an area that has importance as a scenic entrance to the Town of Richmond. The historic settlement pattern of [Richmond](#) is maintained.

Features:

- The features of commercial strip development will be avoided. *(can add commercial strip development definition or as per state statute)*
- A range of commercial and residential uses, including multifamily housing, will be allowed at a density that the topographic challenges of the land allow.
- Curb cuts will be limited to the current number or less – these access points will serve any new development as shared driveways or private roads.
- Setbacks along Rt 2 will be vegetated and provide the rural greenspace appearance needed to maintain the scenic viewshed and historic settlement pattern of this area.
- Plans are being developed for a shared path for bike and pedestrian use to connect lots within the district and with the village center to the east and the Park and Ride to the west.
 - *(optional: Allowance for eventual public transit along the Rt 2 corridor will be provided.)*
- All lots will be served by municipal water and sewer service when available. Lot size may depend upon this availability.

Development that can be permitted by the Administrative Officer (“Permitted”):

(Under this division into “permitted” and “reviewed” categories, adjustments will have to be made to the following sections: site plan review, DRB review, PUD and possibly more)

- Accessory dwelling
- Accessory structure or use, except outdoor storage
- Arts/crafts studio
- Bank
- Bed and breakfast
- Catering service
- Cemetery
- Cottage industry
- Child care facility – family home
- Child care facility – large family home
- Child care facility – center-based
- Dwelling, single-family
- Dwelling, duplex
- Dwelling, multifamily with 3-4 units
- Educational Facility
- Funeral parlor
- Group home
- Home occupation
- Inn

- laundromat
- Mixed use building with up to 4 compatible permitted uses (*remove “multiple use building” from definitions and alter PUD section to allow*)
- Museum
- Office, business
- Office, medical
- Office, professional (*could be combined with “ office, business”? – would need to change in definitions section*)
- Personal services
- Religious facility
- State or municipal facility
- Supported housing facility

Development that requires review by the Development Review Board (“Reviewed”)

- Adaptive use (*including conversion of single-family to multifamily – changes in the adaptive use section 5.6.8 will be needed – this might also go in “permitted”*)
- Brewery
- Dwelling, multifamily with > 4 units
- Health care services
- Kennel
- Light manufacturing
- Mixed-use building with compatible permitted or conditional uses
- Recreational facility
- Restaurant (*not drive-through*)
- Retirement community
- Veterinary clinic
- Pub or tavern
- PUD or PRD (*changes will be needed to the PUD section*)

Dimensional Requirements:

- Minimum lot size: 1/4A
- Maximum residential density: 1/8A (5,500sf) /unit or 8 U/A (*duplex counts as 2U*)
- Maximum lot coverage: 60%
- Maximum building footprint: 10,000sf if within 200’ of Rt 2; 17,000sf if further than 200’ from Rt 2
- Maximum height: same as current
- Minimum lot shape: same as current
- Minimum setback for principal structure: 30’ from Rt 2 (*ROW edge*) for any structure ;
10’ for side and rear;
30’ from I-89 (*ROW edge*) for residential structures
and 10’ for non-residential structures
- Minimum setback for accessory dwelling or structure: 10’ behind front of principal structure;
10’ for side and rear
- Minimum setback for garage: 5’ behind front of principal structure

District Specific Development standards:

- There will be no new curb cuts beyond existing as of _____. All development will access Rt 2 by way of the existing curb cuts which will become shared driveways or private roads with permanent easements as further development occurs. Further sharing of driveways that will reduce the existing number of curb cuts will be encouraged.
- The setback from Rt 2 will be maintained in a vegetated state, which shall include some combination of trees, shrubs, perennials, groundcovers or gardens in addition to grass.
 - *(Optional: A 10' wide easement across all Rt 2 frontages for a shared path parallel to Rt 2 will be required.)*
- Parking between structures and Rt 2 shall not be permitted.
- Outside storage, parking and loading areas, utilities and mechanicals shall be screened from the Rt 2. Viewshed.
- Restoration or reuse of existing historic structures is encouraged.
- Multistory buildings, rather than single-story buildings, are encouraged.
- Traffic study will be required for _____.
- Buildings will be located and screened to protect the privacy of residents and neighbors, and will be oriented to allow for rooftop solar panels.
- Bulk storage, waste storage and mechanicals/utilities shall be within enclosed areas or otherwise screened from the Rt 2 viewshed.
- Shared parking will be allowed. *(will need to revise parking section)*
 - *(There shall be at least one parking space per principal structure within 12' of, and wired for, level 2 EVSE (see section -----))*

- *(There may be multiple structures on a lot).*

3.4 Gateway Residential/Commercial District (G)

3.4.1. Purpose - The standards of this district are designed to allow for commercial uses in an area that has importance as a scenic entrance to the Town of Richmond. The rural character of the northern approach to the Town will be enhanced by carefully planned commercial development, and urban strip development will be avoided. Accesses here will be carefully managed, curb cuts will be few, and internal circulation required to avoid impeding the flow of traffic on Route 2. Green space, landscaping to screen parking from both Route 2 and other "character of the neighborhood" criteria must be met in order to retain the flavor of an entranceway to a dynamic yet rural and historic small town.

Features of the Gateway Residential/Commercial District include:

- a) The features of commercial strip development will be avoided.
- b) A range of commercial and residential uses, including multifamily housing, will be allowed at a density that the topographic challenges of the land allow.
- c) Curb cuts will be limited to the current number or less – these access points will serve any new development as shared driveways or private roads.
- d) Setbacks along Rt 2 will be vegetated and provide the rural greenspace appearance needed to maintain the scenic viewshed and historic settlement pattern of this area.
- e) Plans are being developed for a shared path for bike and pedestrian use to connect lots within the district and with the village center to the east and the Park and Ride to the west.
- f) All lots will be served by municipal water and sewer service when available. Lot size may depend upon this availability.
- g) Restoration and reuse of existing historic structures is encouraged.
- h) Multistory buildings—rather than single-story buildings—are encouraged.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.56" + Indent
at: 0.81"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.56" + Indent
at: 0.81"

3.4.3-1 Allowable Uses on Issuance of Zoning Permits by Administrative Officer—The following uses shall be allowed for any lot in the G-District after issuance of a Zoning Permit by the Administrative Officer. Unless otherwise permitted, only one principal use shall be permitted on one lot: **Permitted uses**

- a) Accessory dwelling as provided in Section 5.9.
- b) Accessory uses or structures, to the uses in 3.4.1, except outdoor storage
- c) Arts/crafts studio
- ~~b~~d) Bank
- e) Bed and breakfast.
- f) Catering service
- g) Cemetery
- h) Cottage industry
- i) Child care facility – family home
- j) Child care facility – large family home
- k) Child care facility – center-based
- l) Dwelling, single-family
- m) Dwelling, duplex
- n) Dwelling, multifamily with 3-4 units
- o) Educational Facility
- p) Funeral parlor
- q) Group home
- r) Home occupation
- s) Inn
- t) laundromat
- u) Mixed use building with up to 4 compatible permitted uses
- v) Museum
- w) Office, medical

- x) Office, professional
- y) Personal services
- z) Religious facility
- aa) State and Community Operated Facility
- ~~e)bb) Supported housing facility~~

Comment [PA1]: The business office and professional office are synonymous

3.4.42 Allowable Conditional Uses Upon Issuance of Conditional Use Approval – The following uses, with accessory structures, may be allowed in the G-District after issuance of conditional use approval by the DRB.

- a) Adaptive use as provided in Section 5.6.8.
- ~~b) Amusement arcade.~~
- ~~c) Artist/Craft studio.~~
- ~~d) Bank.~~
- b) Brewery
- ~~e) Business yard.~~
- ~~f) Catering service.~~
- ~~g) Cemetery.~~
- ~~h) Cottage industry as provided in Section 5.6.7.~~
- ~~i) Day care center.~~
- ~~j) Dwelling, single-family attached to a principal structure approved for a permitted or conditional use.~~
- ~~k) Dwelling, two-family~~
- ~~l)c) Dwelling, multi-family with three or more than four dwelling units.~~
- ~~m) Educational or religious facility as provided in Section 5.10.4.~~
- ~~n) Extraction of earth resources as provided in Section 5.6.6.~~
- ~~o) Food processing establishment.~~
- ~~p) Funeral parlor.~~
- ~~q) d) Group home, as provided in Section 5.11.~~
- q)e) Health Care Services
- ~~r) Hotel or motel.~~
- ~~s) Inn or guest house.~~
- ~~t)f) Kennel~~
- ~~u)g) Light Manufacturing.~~
- ~~v)h) Multi-use commercial building with permitted or conditional uses from this section or 3.4.1.~~
- ~~w) Museum.~~
- ~~x) Offices, Business.~~
- ~~y) Offices, Professional.~~
- ~~z) Personal services.~~
- ~~aa) Planned Unit Development, which may be a Planned Residential Development, as provided in Section 5.12, if no subdivision of land is proposed (see Section 5.12.1).~~
- ~~bb) Powered Vehicle and/or Machinery Service~~
- ~~cc) Private club.~~
- ~~d)d)j) Recreation, indoor or outdoor facility or park.~~
- ~~ee) Research laboratory.~~
- i) Restaurant
- ~~k) Retail business associated with light manufacturing with a maximum size of 3,000 square feet. gg)~~
- ~~ff)l) Retirement community.~~
- ~~gg) State or community-owned and operated institutions and facilities, to the extent allowed by Section 5.10.4.~~
- ~~hh)m) Tavern, provided that it is associated with an onsite distillery, brewery, or winery.~~
- ~~ii) Agriculture, silviculture and horticulture, as provided in Section 2.4.5.~~
- ~~jj)n) Veterinary Clinics~~

3.4.53 Dimensional Requirements Applicable to Lots in the G District – No Zoning Permit shall be issued for Land Development in the G District unless the lot proposed meets the following dimensional and/or density requirements:

- a) **Minimum Lot Area Size** – Except as provided under Section 4.6.1, no lot served by municipal or community water and sewer systems shall be less than 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. If multiple uses are permitted in one or more buildings on a lot, the lot shall be of sufficient size to allow 1/3 acre per use with municipal or community water and sewer or 1 acre per use without municipal or community water and sewer. In the case of use of a lot for 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. One-fourth (1/4) acre (10,890 square feet)
- a)b) **Maximum residential density** – One-eighth acre (5,445 square feet) per dwelling unit
- b)c) **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)d) **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)e) **Maximum Lot Coverage** - The total ground area covered by all structures, parking areas, walkways, driveways and any other impervious surfaces shall not exceed forty percent (40%) of the total ground area of the lot. 60 percent

3.4.4 Dimensional Limitations for Structures on Lots in the G District – No Zoning Permit shall be issued for a structure in the G District unless the structure proposed for the lot meets the following dimensional requirements:

- a)f) **Height** - The height of any structure shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet, except as provided in Section 6.6.
- g) **Front Yard Setback** – All structures shall be set back at least fifty (50) feet from the edge of the Route 2 right-of-way and thirty (30) feet from the edge of all other right-of-ways.
 - i. Thirty (30) feet from the edge of the right-of-way for principal structures
 - ii. For accessory structures, ten (10) feet behind the front of the principal structure fronting all rights-of-way except I-89
 - iii. Thirty (30) feet from the edge of the I-89 right-of-way for residential primary structures and their associated accessory structures
 - b)iv. Ten (10) feet from the edge of the I-89 right-of-way for non-residential structures and their associated accessory structures
- e)h) **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. Ten (10) feet
- d)i) **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. Ten (10) feet
- e)j) **Maximum Building Size** - No building shall have a footprint exceeding 10,000 square feet, with the exception of buildings that are setback more than 200 feet from the edge of the Route 2 right-of-way and 30 feet from the edge of all other right-of-ways. Buildings set back more than 200 feet from the edge of the Route 2 right-of-way and 30 feet from the edge of all other right-of-ways shall not have a footprint exceeding 17,000 square feet.
- f) **Residential Mixed Use requirement** – In the Gateway Commercial District at least 40% of the gross floor area of new development must be in commercial use.

3.4.65 Other Additional Development Standards Requirements Applicable to Lots in the G District – No Zoning Permit shall be issued for Land Development in the G District unless the Land Development meets the following requirements:

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.56" + Indent at: 0.81"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 2 +
Numbering Style: i, ii, iii, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Right + Aligned at: 1.06" + Indent at: 1.31"

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.56" + Indent at: 0.81"

Comment [PA2]: This may be integrated into the overall development standards instead of on a district-by-district basis.

- a) Access. No new curb cuts along Route 2 shall be created after *[date zoning goes into effect]*. All new land development shall access Route 2 by way of existing curb cuts. Further sharing of driveways that will reduce the existing number of curb cuts is encouraged. Existing curb cuts shall be eliminated when possible.
- b) The front yard setback from Route 2 shall be maintained in a vegetated state, and shall include a combination of trees, shrubs, perennials, groundcovers or gardens in addition to grass.
- c) A five-foot vegetated strip of screening trees, such as arborvitae, holly and spruce, and/or a screening fence along the side and rear property lines must be installed for all new land development.
- d) Buildings shall be oriented to be solar ready, and to allow for rooftop solar panels.
- e) Outside storage—including bulk and waste storage—parking and loading areas, and utilities and mechanicals shall be screened.
- ~~a)f) Parking—Parking between structures and Route 2 shall not be permitted. shall be located to the side or rear of the building. For lots with no frontage on Route 2 parking may be located in the front of the building, if appropriately screened from Route 2. For properties with multiple buildings and multiple uses the project shall be reviewed under the PUD standards and flexible parking design and layout may be considered, however for properties with multiple buildings no parking may be located in front of the building front line that is located closest to Route 2. Parking areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual impact from neighboring roads and properties. Shared parking with neighboring properties shall be encouraged. Parking shall be otherwise regulated as provided in Section 6.1.~~
- ~~b) Loading Space Requirements—Off Road or Highway loading requirements shall be regulated as provided in Section 6.1.~~
- ~~c) Signs—Signs shall be regulated as provided in Section 5.7.~~
- ~~g) Traffic Impact —~~
 - ~~i. 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.~~
 - ~~ii. 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.~~
- ~~d) 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~~

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Comment [PA3]: Additional parking standards, like EV charging, may be included in the general parking standards section instead of in the district.

Comment [PA4]: From Jolina Court District regulations

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.68" + Indent at: 1.93"

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 if a use contains unique characteristics that cause it to differ from national traffic estimates.

e) ~~h) Access~~—Any curb cuts created in addition to the ones already existing as of the date of these Zoning Regulations, shall be no closer than 250 feet to any other existing or new curb cut for Route 2. An access shall otherwise be regulated as provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.4. ~~Existing curb cuts shall be eliminated when possible.~~

f) ~~Character of the Neighborhood~~—In addition to the specific standards listed in Section 5.6.2 for conditional use approval, any use in the Gateway District shall also meet the following standards prior to the issuance of conditional use approval:

- i—A single principal structure must have an entrance or windows facing toward Route 2. Multiple grouped buildings may have their entrances in whatever direction is appropriate to their access. Within a group, the building closest to Route 2 must have an entrance or windows facing Route 2.
- ii—Principal structures must have a steeply pitched roof (4:12) or greater. The roof pitch requirement may be waived for buildings with footprints that exceed 10,000 square feet and rooftop equipment shall be shielded from view from Route 2.
- iii—There must be landscaping between the building and Route 2 of 50’.
- iv—Structures shall have an appearance of wood or brick.

3.4.7. Development Review Standards. All permitted and conditional uses are subject to the applicable Development Standards listed in Part X.

Formatted: Font: Bold

3.4.8. Planned Unit Developments. Planned Unit Developments that meet the regulations listed under Section 5.12 are allowed in the Gateway Residential/Commercial District.

Formatted: Font: Bold

In 2021 the Housing Committee hired consultant Brandy Saxton of PlaceSense to examine the barriers to housing, and in particular affordable housing, in Richmond. Her report was finalized in March of 2022 and incorporated the Housing Needs Assessment that had previously been conducted by the Housing Committee. The PlaceSense report consists of the following information:

1. **Summary of findings for town government and committees**
2. **Technical assessment of zoning and recommendations for zoning changes**
3. **Reports and data**
 - **Housing Needs Assessment**
 - **Surveys of residents and non-residents**
 - **Focus groups and interviews**

This memo is a brief summary of the recommendations. More details can be found in the appropriate sections. The **Table of Contents** and the **Executive Summary**, each 1 page, give an excellent overview. Pages 15 – 18 summarize the data from the Housing Needs Assessment.

1. **Summary of recommended strategies for town government and committees:** *(pages 2-5)*

Suggested Roles For Housing Committee:

- Engagement and education of residents on housing issues and their relationship to other issues of concern in order to shift the community to a more pro-housing stance
- Advocacy – bringing pro-housing voices into the conversation and to public hearings on projects and zoning changes, and discussing potential consequences of a lack of residential growth
- Developing talking points about the negative consequences of a lack of residential growth
- Producing an annual report tracking metrics related to housing
- Outreach to the development community (for profit and not for profit) in order to understand how more housing could be created
- Arranging training and continuing education opportunities for PC and DRB members (especially new)
- Coordinate with Racial Equity, RLT and RCAC to assess condition and efficiency of housing stock and recommend pathways to housing increase with co-benefits for equity, conservation and energy

Suggested Roles for Planning Commission: *(see more specifics below)*

- Streamline development review process
 1. Less CU, more ZA approvals
 2. Create clear and specific application requirements and zoning standards
 3. Coordinate better with state permitting processes
- Support development of full range of housing options
 1. Neighborhood-scale multi-family housing
 2. cottage clusters (> 1 structure/lot)
 3. assisted care and residential care facilities
 4. adaptive re-use of commercial or older residential buildings
 5. allow co-housing, condos, rentals
 6. allow for more density, square footage and/or lot coverage

Suggested Role for Selectboard:

- Establish a formal process for training new PC and DRB members to create more continuity and expediency in the policy formulation and development review processes

2. General recommendations for zoning policies

- Engage public with education/advocacy work prior to making significant zoning changes
- Recognize that there is little readily developable land in W&S service area (village) – modest amount of infill possible (*see below for strategies to allow for infill*)
- Strong demand for single-family housing reduces motivation to convert to multifamily
- Areas with potential for higher density development within or near W&S lines
 - Jolina Ct. -- could have more density
 - Farr Farm – new neighborhood possible
 - Riverview Commons--- space for more units (owner has mentioned) or possibly multihousing
 - 3A of land at the end of Railroad St – new neighborhood possible
 - Willis Farm --limited potential elsewhere in Gateway
- Zoning District Standards do not appear to be a barrier to housing in the rural areas (*report did not consider competing goals of preserving farm and forest land – VC*)

3. More specific recommendations for zoning changes

- Alter Zoning Districts -- (*recommended districts appear very similar to existing --VC*)
- Strategies to allow for infill
 - ◆ Increase maximum residential densities -- consider 4U/A or higher
 - ◆ Alternatively, could remove density caps and allow lot coverage and building size to control density
 - ◆ Could regulate density by number of bedrooms instead of number of units
 - ◆ Could replace ADU and duplex allowances with simply allowing 2 separate units on a lot
 - ◆ Decrease minimum lot sizes
 - ◆ Increase amount of lot coverage allowed
 - ◆ Reduce parking requirements per residential unit
- Strategies to provide a greater diversity of housing types
 - ◆ Allow multifamily housing with up to 3-4U buildings permitted in W&S service area – recent state Act 179 signals that “character of neighborhood” should no longer be used to discriminate against small-scale multi-unit housing (3-4U buildings).
 - ◆ Allow multifamily housing >4U buildings with DRB review in some areas
 - ◆ Allow senior housing, assisted living and residential care buildings in more areas
 - ◆ Allow for easier conversion of single family or other uses to multifamily housing
 - ◆ Make more housing types “permitted” rather than “conditional”
 - ◆ Consider allowing “cottage clusters” (multiple buildings per lot)
- Develop standards to reduce concern for QOL impacts of multifamily housing in village (consider doors and windows, fire escapes, garages, driveways and parking areas, privacy, outdoor living space, landscaping, outdoor storage, utilities and mechanicals, waste management, laundry)

- Replace residential PUD development standards with TND (Traditional Neighborhood Development) standards for larger projects and use TND standards to inform existing ZD's

Background

- **We, the owners of the Creamery, are committed to supporting the housing crisis in Vermont.** Since the start of this project in 2015, we have been advocating for increased residential density to ensure we are able to provide cost effective, smaller units. The 45 units - the residential density cap - was established in 2015 and is the largest barrier to our ability to support the goal of increasing housing in Richmond with provide units that are affordable.
- **Cost of construction has skyrocketed in recent years.** Our forecast for future buildings budget is nearly 40% increased from previous building. Those costs must be financed and our monthly cash flow is required to service that loan. Our ability to offer affordable housing is now more challenging then ever.
- **Commercial property market continues to be weak.** Rental rates do not justify the costs of construction. Therefore, the shortfall in income for commercial means additional burden on the residential units to improve or justify the cash flow of any building.
- **Without external funding (grants or organizations), the income and profit from ‘at market’ units are required to offset the lost income of affordable units.** Based on current projections, we would need roughly two ‘at market’ units to offset the loss of income from providing one ‘affordable’ unit.
- **After our next building (#2), we will have no more residential units left for our development according to current zoning.** To cash flow and finance the construction of our next building, we will use the remainder of our residential units (31 of our 45 units). All these units will be rentals ‘at market’ rates at various sizes as required by the cost of construction and financing.
- **Timeline is URGENT** – We are actively planning and engineering Building #2 for permits and construction later in 2022-2023. If there is interest in providing affordable units in Richmond at the Creamery, a decision must be quick and certain. Soon, it will be too late to influence Building #2 without significant increased costs that would be impractical. Decisions made too late would only impact future buildings scheduled for construction in 2025 or beyond.

Proposal

1. Increase residential density of Jolina Court District. Our current density is capped at 45 units. We would like to recommend increasing to 85 - 95 units of which we can provide either 15 or 20 affordable units to for 10 years at least 80% of AMI for Chittenden County. The additional ‘at market’ units will help us cash flow and finance the affordable units. Also, it will enable us to provide a wide variety of units to support long term tenancy of individuals and a more diverse community.

<i>Existing Units</i>	45	45
Total New Affordable Units	15	20
Total New 'At Market' Units	25	30
Total Creamery Units	85	95

2. Remove the ‘street front commercial requirement’ on the non-main street located or accessible buildings in the development (e.g. those directly located on Bridge Street). The regulation

requiring non-main street commercial use is a burden to development and un-necessary. Many of the buildings proposed for the Creamery development are not visible to the main street (e.g. Bridge street). They are exclusively accessible via our private road and visible within our private development only.

3. Reduce Parking Burden or Requirement.
4. Decision required by July 1st. Due to our current construction timeline, we would require approval and agreement of this increased density by July 1st to enable us to include affordable units in Building #2. If a decision is not possible by then, we will have to look for future phases of construction (e.g. 2025 and beyond).