Richmond Planning Commission REGULAR Meeting UNAPPROVED MINUTES FOR June 3, 2020 MEETING	
Members Present:	Chris Cole, Virginia Clarke, Mark Fausel, Scott Nickerson, Alison Anand,
Members Absent:	Jake Kornfeld, Brian Tellstone, Joy Reap Chris Granda
Others Present:	Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff), Zachary Maia
Chris Cole opened the	e meeting at 7:04 pm.
2. Adjustments to th	ie Agenda
•	sted five minutes to talk about parklets during other business. Joy Reap requested ercial uses and restrictions, in light of COVID-19.
3. Approval of Minut	tes
• •	arke, second by Alison Anand to approve the minutes of May 20, 2020 Planning . Voting: 5-0. (Mark Fausel, Joy Reap, Jake Kornfeld abstain) Motion carried.
4. Public Comment	for non-agenda items
Chris Cole welcomes the Planning Commis	Jake Kornfeld to the Planning Commission. Jake Kornfeld introduced himself to sion.
5. Public Hearing: A	mendments to the Village Downtown Zoning District regulations
regulations. Venkata were to the list of us	d about the major changes between the current zoning regulations and the draft raman and Clarke overviewed the main changes, stating that the main changes ses, the rounding rule, the compatibility section, and the traffic impacts section to lations with the Jolina Court Zoning District regulations, as well as the inclusion of the district.
Sections 2.1, 3.10, 4.	cond by Anand to move to finalize the changes to Town Zoning Regulations 11.3c, 5.7.4, and 5.12.2 and direct staff to distribute copies of the amendment tboard. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.
	ddition of "Veterinary Clinic" and "Pub" uses to Zoning Regulations
o. i ubile fleating. A	dution of veterinary onnie and 1 up uses to zoning Regulations
clarified that "Veterin	riewed the changes made to the draft regulations since May 6, 2020. Clarke ary Clinic" uses were proposed to be added because such uses were removed Zoning District Regulations.
Regulations Sections	sel, second by Scott Nickerson to move to finalize the changes to Town Zoning 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 the amendment proposal to the Selectboard. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.
7. Discussion on cre	eation of Housing Advisory Committee

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

88

48

## 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 05

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

96

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

Richmond Unapproved Planning Commission Minutes June 3, 2020

the presence of septic and wells in the sewer service area. Clarke clarified that properties in the sewer 101 102 service area are not necessarily connected to town water and sewer. Clarke asked about combining zoning districts into a Village Mixed Residential District, creating a Historic District, and increasing 103 104 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. Venkataraman said he does not with the software he has at his disposal. Cole suggested asking the 111 112 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 commercial sectors to be located. Clarke said she would like to provide a variety of options, including 117 118 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 could outweigh the costs. Fausel said that widening the road could change the character of the district 131 Cole said that the town could take control of roadway within village. Clarke said that the commission 132 133 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 Transporation. 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**

- 154155 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