

Town of Richmond
Planning Commission Meeting
AGENDA

Wednesday July 1st, 2020, 7:00 PM

Due to restrictions in place for COVID-19, and in accordance Bill H.681 **this meeting will be held by login online and conference call 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 ID provided below to join by phone. 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

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88292425505?pwd=WGt2RnpTSENhTDFDdXhQcDl6bG9hZz09>

Join by phone: (929) 205-6099

Meeting ID: 882 9242 5505

Password: 183465

1. Welcome and troubleshooting
2. Adjustments to the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
 - June 3rd, 2020
 - June 17th, 2020
4. Public Comment for non-agenda items
5. Discussion on creation of Housing Advisory Committee
6. Discussion of Village Commercial and Residential Commercial Zoning Districts
7. Discussion of timeline and logistics of public outreach
8. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

Table of Contents

3. Approval of Minutes

- Page 3: June 3, 2020 Meeting Minutes
- Page 7: June 17, 2020 Meeting Minutes

6. Discussion on creation of Housing Advisory Committee

- Page 11: Draft charge for Housing Advisory Committee

7. Discussion of Village Commercial and Residential Commercial Zoning Districts

- Page 13: Zoning Revision Checklist (previously enclosed in the March 4, 2020 and June 3, 2020 meeting packets)
- Maps on *standalone documents*:
 - “CurrentZoningMap.pdf” – Current Zoning Map of Richmond Village with proposed extension of Village Downtown Zoning District
 - “DraftZoningMap.pdf” – Draft Zoning Map with Village Commercial District and Residential/Commercial District merged
 - “WaterSewerMap.pdf” – Map showing water and sewer lines
 - “DraftZoningMap_Acreage1.pdf” – Draft Zoning Map with Village Commercial District and Residential/Commercial District merged of Bridge Street/Route 2 intersection area with parcel acreage identified
 - “DraftZoningMap_Acreage2.pdf” - Draft Zoning Map with Village Commercial District and Residential/Commercial District merged of Town Center area with parcel acreage identified
 - “DraftZoningMap_Acreage3.pdf” - Draft Zoning Map with Village Commercial District and Residential/Commercial District merged of areas south of Winooski River with parcel acreage identified

1
2
3
4
5

Richmond Planning Commission
REGULAR Meeting
UNAPPROVED MINUTES FOR June 3, 2020 MEETING

Members Present: Chris Cole, Virginia Clarke, Mark Fausel, Scott Nickerson, Alison Anand,
Jake Kornfeld, Brian Tellstone, Joy Reap
Members Absent: Chris Granda
Others Present: Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff), Zachary Maia

6
7
8 Chris Cole opened the meeting at 7:04 pm.

9
10 **2. Adjustments to the Agenda**

11
12 Virginia Clarke requested five minutes to talk about parklets during other business. Joy Reap requested
13 discussion on commercial uses and restrictions, in light of COVID-19.

14
15 **3. Approval of Minutes**

16
17 Motion by Virginia Clarke, second by Alison Anand to approve the minutes of May 20, 2020 Planning
18 Commission meeting. Voting: 5-0. (Mark Fausel, Joy Reap, Jake Kornfeld abstain) Motion carried.

19
20 **4. Public Comment for non-agenda items**

21
22 Chris Cole welcomes Jake Kornfeld to the Planning Commission. Jake Kornfeld introduced himself to
23 the Planning Commission.

24
25 **5. Public Hearing: Amendments to the Village Downtown Zoning District regulations**

26
27 Brian Tellstone asked about the major changes between the current zoning regulations and the draft
28 regulations. Venkataraman and Clarke overviewed the main changes, stating that the main changes
29 were to the list of uses, the rounding rule, the compatibility section, and the traffic impacts section to
30 align the district regulations with the Jolina Court Zoning District regulations, as well as the inclusion of
31 two new parcels into the district.

32
33 Motion by Clarke, second by Anand to move to finalize the changes to Town Zoning Regulations
34 Sections 2.1, 3.10, 4.11.3c, 5.7.4, and 5.12.2 and direct staff to distribute copies of the amendment
35 proposal to the Selectboard. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

36
37 **6. Public Hearing: Addition of "Veterinary Clinic" and "Pub" uses to Zoning Regulations**

38
39 Venkataraman overviewed the changes made to the draft regulations since May 6, 2020. Clarke
40 clarified that "Veterinary Clinic" uses were proposed to be added because such uses were removed
41 from the Jolina Court Zoning District Regulations.

42
43 Motion by Mark Fausel, second by Scott Nickerson to move to finalize the changes to Town Zoning
44 Regulations Sections 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.2, 3.4.2, 3.5.2, 3.6.2, 3.7.2, 3.9.2, 3.10.2, and 7.2 and direct staff
45 to distribute copies of the amendment proposal to the Selectboard. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

46
47 **7. Discussion on creation of Housing Advisory Committee**

48

49 Cole provided a summary of discussions from past meetings about affordable housing density bonus
50 regulations, and a housing advisory committee. Cole said that this committee should be significantly
51 represented by Planning Commission members. Clarke asked if the Selectboard had any questions
52 about the Planning Commission's work plan for this matter. Venkataraman said no questions were
53 raised about this during the last Selectboard meeting. Cole invited any questions on the draft purpose
54 statement provided. Anand said long-term goals listed are good. Cole asked the board if it had any
55 questions or concerns regarding short-term goals. Fausel asked if this committee would be an
56 affordable housing committee or a general residential housing committee. Cole said this committee
57 would be general housing committee with the task of taking on Affordable housing as specified by
58 Selectboard. Fausel said the short-term goals were too focused on affordability, and could address
59 energy efficiency and other aspects of housing. Clarke said that certain other aspects are addressed in
60 long-term goals. Cole said that this housing committee should be responsible for putting together long-
61 term goals, and that they should include how other elements intersect with the subject of housing, such
62 as housing and energy efficiency, and housing and short-term rentals. Cole suggested revising the long-
63 term goals as initial and stating that other goals will be listed in consultation with the Planning
64 Commission and Selectboard at a later date. Clarke said the Town Plan should be referenced. Anand
65 asked about connecting affordable housing and density bonus. Cole overviewed the incentive program
66 discussed in previous meetings to entice developers to create affordable housing units by building on
67 top of base density. Clarke said that the charge should include the possibility of mandatory affordable
68 housing regulations. Cole recommended revising the short-term goals to state "developing affordable
69 housing regulations with a possible inclusion of a density bonus" to allow for full policy analysis. Anand
70 agrees with this revision. Clarke voiced concerns about the workload the short-term goals places, and
71 suggested revisions to the second and third bullet point. Cole asked for recommendation on committee
72 membership. Fausel recommended a larger committee, with one member from Selectboard.
73 Venkataraman asked if the commission if residency should be a requirement. Cole said no, and would
74 welcome expertise from other communities. Anand asked about public at-large membership. Fausel
75 said that perspective is needed. Clarke suggested reaching out to Western Slopes Business Association.
76 Joy Reap asked for more clarification on the plan and the culling of members. Nickerson asked about
77 the rights of non-residents on boards, and their effect on voting and quorum. Venkataraman said that
78 non-residents can vote and contribute to the quorum. He added that the main thing nonresidents cannot
79 do is enact laws on behalf of residents. Fausel recommended that the board consists of nine members.
80 Cole suggested reaching out to other boards with stakeholder interest, such as the conservation
81 commission, and energy Committee. Clarke clarified that the Climate Action Committee not a town-
82 affiliated committee. Cole recommended that the housing advisory committee should consist of up to
83 nine members, with five citizens, two Planning Commission members, and possibly members of the
84 Conservation Committee or any other town committee. Fausel expressed interest in participating on the
85 committee. Venkataraman asked if he should provide a draft description on membership qualifications
86 and responsibilities. Clarke suggested that such a description need not to be too detailed. Cole stated
87 that the proposal will be refined and further discussion will occur during the next meeting.

88

89 **8. Discussion of timeline and logistics of public outreach**

90

91 Clarke discussed methods of distribution, including Front Porch Forum postings, hard copies at the
92 Town Office, and email distribution to community groups. Fausel said all were good ideas, and that
93 flyers at public places for the survey should be considered.

94

95 **9. Discussion of Village Commercial Zoning District**

96

97 Venkataraman provided an overview of the items enclosed in the packet. Clarke raised a number of
98 questions to the commission, including: incorporation of the Village Commercial District into
99 Residential/Commercial District, review of the Residential/Commercial District, upzoning the Village
100 Commercial District, and extending the Residential/Commercial District. Brian Tellstone asked about

101 the presence of septic and wells in the sewer service area. Clarke clarified that properties in the sewer
102 service area are not necessarily connected to town water and sewer. Clarke asked about combining
103 zoning districts into a Village Mixed Residential District, creating a Historic District, and increasing
104 allowable density. Anand asked about records for septic systems. Venkataraman said that septic
105 connections depend on the property, and that he would have to look at each property in the district to
106 determine if it has a septic system. Clarke suggested specifying density allowances based on
107 water/sewer connection. Cole asked about the density allowances for the High Density Residential
108 District. Clarke said that in that district, 1.3 units/acre is allowed. Cole asked about the impact of
109 upzoning on the character of the neighborhood. Clarke suggested upzoning E. Main St. from three units
110 per acre to six units per acre. Cole asked Venkataraman if he is able to display the impacts of density.
111 Venkataraman said he does not with the software he has at his disposal. Cole suggested asking the
112 regional planning commission. Cole said he likes linking density allowances to connections to town
113 water and sewer. Fausel said more work is necessary in order to consider combining districts. Fausel
114 said that the committee will need input from the landowners, and recommended that the housing
115 committee could research this issue further. Clarke laid out a variety of permutations to combine
116 districts. Cole asked the committee their view of the village 20 years from now, and where they envision
117 commercial sectors to be located. Clarke said she would like to provide a variety of options, including
118 options for mixed use. Cole said the committee should consider developing different maps to organize
119 different options. Fausel asked the committee was focused on the Village Commercial District and if any
120 property owners had requests. Cole said that the Village Commercial District revisions and revisions of
121 the Richmond Village zoning districts were driven by Clarke. Cole said he had received a request from
122 the Reaps on revising the Gateway District. Joy Reap said her request stems from COVID as tenants
123 were leaving her commercial property. Reap said she wants residential development to be an option as
124 she has difficulties finding commercial tenants. Reap said that having a sewer connection helps the
125 developability and marketability of her parcel. She said her parcel has no major traffic issues. Clarke
126 asked if Reap explored creating a PUD. Reap said her properties are within a PUD, but still are
127 restricted by the Gateway District Regulations. Reap said that the Planning Commission must address
128 that commercial development will be changed forever due to COVID. Cole agrees with Joy that COVID
129 has forever changed commercial real estate. Anand said that landowners may lose more if the Gateway
130 District has a higher density and leads to the widening of the road. Reap said the opportunity for growth
131 could outweigh the costs. Fausel said that widening the road could change the character of the district
132 Cole said that the town could take control of roadway within village. Clarke said that the commission
133 could put forth green space requirements. Cole said that the commission could put forth lot coverage
134 requirements. Reap said that her property is unique, and thus the regulations places unequal
135 restrictions on her property. Fausel said when the district was last reviewed in 2015, the commission at
136 the time was concerned about maintaining commercial properties and commercial growth for tax
137 reasons. Fausel said that COVID raises questions on how to gain alternative revenue sources. Cole
138 said he sees an overlap between Gateway and Village Commercial Districts topics. Cole suggested that
139 every committee members must develop goals ten-year and twenty-year goals, and reconvene to
140 discuss responses during the next meeting. Reap requested the Town Plan Committee survey
141 responses in the next meeting packet. Fausel requested maps of the south part of Richmond and the
142 entire Gateway District in the next meeting packet. Venkataraman recommended enclosing respective
143 member's goals in next meeting's packet. Cole said this zoning conversation will be included in the next
144 meeting agenda

145

146 10. Other Business

147

148 Clarke reflected upon a webinar she watched on tactical urbanism standards held by Vermont
149 Department of Transportation. Venkataraman said that the town internally has had these conversations
150 for the past few weeks and interested businesses can apply for temporary outdoor seating via a right-of-
151 way permit.

152

153

11 Adjournment

154

155 Motion by Tellstone, seconded by Fausel to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

156

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 pm.

157

158

Respectfully submitted by Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

Richmond Planning Commission
REGULAR Meeting
UNAPPROVED MINUTES FOR June 17, 2020 MEETING

Members Present: Chris Cole, Virginia Clarke, Scott Nickerson, Alison Anand, Jake Kornfeld, Brian Tellstone, Chris Granda
Members Absent: Joy Reap, Mark Fausel,
Others Present: Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff)

Chris Cole opened the meeting at 7:03 pm.

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

Ravi Venkataraman notified the Planning Commission that the next scheduled meeting is on July 1st and asked commission members if they will be available. Venkataraman said that the Selectboard public meetings for the Village Downtown Zoning District and uses amendments will be on July 20th. He also apologized for not including the June 3rd meeting minutes in the packet, the meeting minutes are available online, and will be available for the commission to review.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chris Cole said that review and approval of the June 3rd Planning Commission meeting minutes will occur during the next scheduled meeting, when the minutes are included in the packet.

4. Public Comment for non-agenda items

None

5. Reorganization and Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Brian Tellstone asked the Planning Commission, especially the current Chair and Vice Chair, if the current status is fine. Cole thanked Clarke for her service, and her assistance as Vice Chair. Cole said that he would accept the chair position again, so long as Clarke serves as vice chair and the Planning Commission wants to see them as Chair and Vice Chair

Motion by Tellstone, seconded by Scott Nickerson to nominate Chris Cole as Chair, Voting: unanimous. Motion passed. Chris Cole is elected Chair of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Tellstone, seconded by Nickerson to nominate Virginia Clarke as Vice Chair. Voting: unanimous, Motion passed. Virginia Clarke is elected Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

6. Discussion on creation of Housing Advisory Committee

Venkataraman overviewed the changes to the document and the process going forward. Clarke said she found the draft charge as presented to be great. Cole concurred with Clarke.

Motion by Clarke, seconded by Anand to forward to the Selectboard the charge as a recommendation to the creation of the housing committee. Cole asked the committee if it had any points for further discussion. Clarke identified a minor typo. Jake Kornfeld said that the intent to create a housing committee is to create more affordable housing, and yet affordable housing is referred to only once in the charge. Kornfeld said that the commission may want to consider highlighting affordable housing more in the charge. Cole said that the charge is a combination of short-term and long-term goals, and that the mission needs to be broad in order to address housing in general for the long term. Cole added that although affordable housing spurred the creation of the housing committee, the charge needs to be broad for long-term impacts. Clarke said that the first bullet of long-term goals on affordable housing speaks directly to the first bullet of short-term goals. Nickerson said that revising the draft affordable housing regulations will be the first and foremost task of the housing committee. Cole said that the creation of the housing committee is in response to the Selectboard's and Planning Commission's task of creating affordable housing regulations--which happens to coincide with one of the goals of the Town Plan. Clarke said that racial disparity should be addressed in the charge. Alison Anand concurred with Clarke. Venkataraman suggested adding a statement in the statement of purpose similar to one in Essex's housing committee charge, which identifies all protected classes. Cole said that the core issue is equity in housing. Clarke recommended the addition of a statement addressing racial and gender-related or any other bias. Cole said that the charge should not insinuate exclusionary practices against particular protected classes, Kornfeld said that such a statement should be included in the purpose statement and focused on creating equity in Richmond housing. Cole agreed that the statement should belong in purpose statement. Clarke asked if the statement belongs in the purpose statement or under long-term goals. Cole said such broad language belongs in the purpose statement and should be along the lines of "equity among protected classes". Clarke requested to Venkataraman that such a statement be added to the purpose statement. Cole decided to table approval of the draft charge until the next meeting. Clarke asked if the "interest in or expertise" statement at the end of the charge was off-putting and how members read "Two members may be from other town boards and commissions". Cole suggested inserting "Richmond" before "town" to indicate that other board members means other Richmond town board members, instead of board members of any town. Cole asked if a DRB member served also as a housing committee member, would that person have a conflict of interest in administering the regulations. Venkataraman said not necessarily, adding that conflict of interest generally applies to monetary interest. Clarke added that such a problem could occur presently, as many board members serve on multiple town boards.

7. Discussion of goals of zoning regulations and the Richmond Village

Venkataraman said that after the packets were distributed, he received statements from Kornfeld and Joy Reap, and recommended that time should be given to them to speak on their statements. Kornfeld said his statement called for a more robust, densely populated village. He added that respect should be given to prime agricultural soils. Kornfeld said he reiterates other points made in conversation from the previous meeting, regarding focusing commercial traffic on higher trafficked streets, and the influence of COVID-19 on commercial uses. Anand said that COVID could deeply influence the village, but she cannot foresee the degree of the impacts. Anand added that anecdotally, people are happy working from home and working from home is working for certain businesses. Anand said she was concerned about people within the village, that maybe they do not want additional development. Chris Granda said in order to maintain open space, the focus of development should be towards the town center. Granda said that the nature and look of businesses are going to continually change, and he now foresees access to a retail center as necessary. Cole overviewed the goals on Clarke's document. Cole said in response to Clarke's document that the Planning Commission should emphasize protecting

existing neighborhood enclaves. Clarke recommended protecting neighborhood enclaves by classifying them as high-density residential districts or another district. Anand said she likes Virginia's document, and likes the statement on sensitivity to outdoor gathering spaces because that aspect is what makes a rural town charming. Cole said further discussion per bullet point is necessary, starting with the first bullet point. Nickerson and Anand concur with the first bullet point. Cole asked about the bullet point calling for a mixture of different districts to protect neighborhood enclaves. Clarke asked the commission for clarification on what is moderate and high density, as different densities already exist in the village. Clarke suggested that maybe six to eight units per acre as moderate for the Village Commercial District. Cole asked if E. Main Street would be suitable for mixed use development, or mixed use development with a ground-floor commercial requirement. Clarke said that developments now may not be able to market ground-floor commercial spaces and that adaptation of existing buildings could mean any kind of mixed use. Cole asked clarification on the long term, twenty-year outlook. Clarke said that we don't know what commercial is going to look like in the future and that flexibility to redevelop is necessary. Cole concurs that flexibility for developments to be all residential, or to be mixed-use should be provided. Granda said that the commission needs to differentiate between retail establishments, as coffee shops, markets, and personal service are necessary physical establishments compared to semi-durable retails, of which a lot of business is going online. Anand said that the 100-year old buildings in town are still there, but owners are adapting the properties to the uses the town needs, and there needs to be flexibility to enable these buildings to serve the town. Granda said that in other parts of the country, developers tearing down structures and building new in other parts of the country, and that, although Vermont is not experiencing that, if the state does, there will be extreme impacts as seen in other parts of the country. Anand said that her own house from 1861 changed function over the years but still remains, as people may find buildings to have sentimental or aesthetic value. Clarke said many old houses on E. Main Street have not been converted into businesses, some of the buildings are not viable on the market, and the opportunity to do different things is needed. Cole cited a house on Cochran Road as an example which maintains historic integrity on the street level and still provides an opportunity for additional density. Anand cited the Pavilion Building in Montpelier as an example of tasteful rehabilitation of a historic structure. Clarke called for design and compatibility standards to maintain the character of Richmond Village. Venkataraman said that the best route for administering and enforcing design standards would be through a historic preservation committee, and the DRB would not be able to enforce design standards effectively. Clarke said design standards are in the Jolina Court District regulations. Cole said that the standards in the Jolina Court District regulations are more like form-based code. Nickerson asked for clarification about form-based code. Venkataraman said that form-based code is a method to bring buildings and uses closer to transportation corridors, making a streetscape more approachable to all transportation users, with specific dimensions for buildings, unlike aesthetic standards that would maintain the existing quality of the district. Cole cited a form-based code project he reviewed as a Planning Commissioner in South Burlington. Clarke said that design standards are already included in Jolina Court District regulations and the DRB will need to address it. Cole asked the commission about the Smart growth goals statement in Clarke's document. Cole asked about clustering density in already-trafficked corridors and how to negotiate density with sprawl. Clarke said that the town had few, easily identifiable density clusters. Cole asked the commission about the statement regarding maximum flexibility for residential conversions and live/work spaces. Granda said that the zoning regulations could call for buildings built to code to allow for easy conversions. Clarke asked about the statement calling for a variety of housing types. Cole said that going forward, the commission must provide methods to retain existing architectural features in the village while offering property owners the flexibility to build out as people would support such methodical ways if done in the right way. Clarke suggested investigating various ways to retain design standards, such as via form-based zoning or a design review district. Cole concurred, stating that the commission

needs to find the sweet spot to allow change over time that is agreeable and respects the historic nature of town. Cole overviewed the goal statements regarding pedestrian facilities, bus stops, green space and street trees. Cole suggested the idea of a town map. Cole said that South Burlington has a town map and within the town map, future bike paths identified in order to force the development of bike paths when a property with an identified future bike path is developed. Cole asked Venkataraman if a town map could be a tool used for purchasing rights-of-way or green spaces. Venkataraman affirmed that an official map can be used for this purpose, as it has in South Burlington and Williston. Cole clarified that official maps can be used as a tool for implementation. Cole said that official maps take time to develop, but could protect the town's infrastructure interests. Clarke said that such a project would need to be done carefully. Cole asked if any other commission members have goals they would like to incorporate into the document. Nickerson asked about the minimum size for a residential unit and if a 500-750 square-foot accessory apartment allowance would be possible to incorporate more density while keeping the historic nature of the village. Clarke said that such an allowance would be worth including and considering. Cole said that the commission should work on bullet points incrementally, and doubling the density allowance for parts of the village is a good approach for now. Other commissioners agreed. Cole recommended developing methods to retain the historic features and aesthetic qualities of particular iconic buildings in town while allowing the flexibility to increase density for these buildings. Granda asked about inserting goals about resilience and energy efficiency. Cole said that the commission should recognize the difference between building codes and zoning regulations, and focus on crafting zoning regulations. Granda suggested that the goals take into account resiliency planning for neighborhood energy infrastructure, which would include solar access. Clarke cited the climate change goal in the document. Cole discussed further allowances for offsite development of solar panels, citing Vermont Energy Coop's community energy project. Cole asked Venkataraman what the next step would be. Venkataraman recommended clarifying the zoning map based on the recommendations put forth. Cole requested one map depicting the current zoning designations in the village, and studying the area further. Clarke recommended combining the Village Commercial and Residential Commercial Districts first. Nickerson said that the High Density Residential District is not as dense as it could be, and supports combining the Village Commercial and Residential Commercial Districts. Clarke said this was worth consideration. Nickerson also asked if areas south of Winooski River would be included in the review of the zoning districts. Cole said consideration should be included to these areas due to the commercial nature, with the possibility of expanding the existing commercial enclave. Clarke said that that property would be to accommodate increased commercial and residential development allowances. Cole requested from Venkataraman a larger zoning map that includes the Round Church and the Farr property. Nickerson requested clarification on the location of the water and sewer lines. Clarke asked Venkataraman for additional information about town water and sewer service to the Farr property. Granda said that the Farr property is served by town water but not sewer and the brewery is on town water and sewer.

8. Adjournment

Motion by Granda, seconded by Tellstone to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 8:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: June 25, 2020

SUBJECT: Updated Draft Charge for Housing Committee

Following the discussion during the June 17, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, I have revised the draft housing charge. My revision is below. New language added since the June 17, 2020 meeting is in red, underlined.

Draft motion

To facilitate action by the Planning Commission, I have prepared the following draft motion:

I, _____, move to recommend to the Selectboard the creation of the Town of Richmond Housing Committee with the charge as outlined in the enclosure.

Draft language for a statement of purpose

Based on other municipalities and the intent of the Planning Commission from prior discussion, provided is a draft statement of purpose:

The Housing Committee advises the Selectboard, the Planning Commission, the Development Review Board, and Town Staff on the housing needs of the Town of Richmond. The Housing Committee is responsible for gathering the community's demographic information and housing data, generating housing-policy related ideas and concepts, ensuring that housing is made available for all protected classes—including race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability, family status, marital status, age, gender identity, sexual orientation, receipt of public assistance, as well as abuse, sexual assault, or stalking victims—and educating the community on housing-related issues. This committee provides recommendations to the Planning Commission Selectboard, Development Review Board, and Town Staff on methods to alleviate housing-related issues and advance the Housing goals of the Town Plan.

Draft language on short-term and long-term goals

Below is a draft list of goals for the 2020 fiscal year (July 2020 to July 2021):

- Develop legible and effective Affordable Housing Density Bonus regulations developing affordable housing regulations with a possible inclusion of a density bonus, in collaboration with the Selectboard, the Planning Commission, and housing partners
- Collect and maintain data on the community's demographics, housing stock (current and projected), and livability; and identify housing issues within the town
- Study the Planning and Zoning ordinances and the Town Plan, and provide policy recommendations to municipal boards to alleviate housing issues in town and advance the Housing goals in the Town Plan

Below are a draft list of initial long-term general goals. Other goals that reflect the goals of the Town Plan will be listed in consultation with the Planning Commission and Selectboard at a later date.

- Improve the availability of affordable housing
- Advance Smart Growth goals by fostering:
 - sustainable growth;
 - the creation of residential neighborhoods that are accessible via multi-modal means, including

- via public transit, walking, and biking;
- policies that meets residents' special needs, such as ADA-accessibility, recovery housing, and housing for people experiencing homelessness;
- the preservation of open spaces within town;
- Investigate the relationship between housing and other town-wide issues and providing solutions to housing-correlated issues in terms of housing
- Promote methods to advance renewable energy usage and energy efficiency in housing
- Identify locations within town that can support additional housing and growth
- Identify opportunities and secure funding to:
 - Further study the housing needs and housing policies of the town; and
 - Revitalize and adapt older areas into viable housing options.
- Work with housing partners to bolster the livability of the Richmond community, and to create inclusive housing options.

Recommendations on Membership

The Housing Committee consists of up to nine people. At least five of its members will be from the public at-large. Such members do not necessarily need to be Town of Richmond residents. However, non-residents interested in serving on the Housing Committee must express an interest in town housing issues, and display expertise in housing-related matters. At least two of the members may be from the Planning Commission. At least two of the members may be from other [Richmond](#) town boards and commissions, including the Selectboard, Development Review Board, and Conservation Committee.

All Housing Committee members shall serve two-year terms.

The Town Planner shall assist the Housing Committee upon request

All members shall hold interest and/or expertise in housing and housing-related matters. Members shall attend all monthly meetings and/or meetings at other arranged times. Members may be expected to undertake periodic work outside committee meetings, such as external research, interviews of subject matter experts, site visits, or training opportunities.

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?