## Richmond Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 4th, 2018

Unapproved Minutes

Members Present: Mark Fausel, Alison Anand, Scott Nickerson, Joy Reap, Brian Tellstone

Others Present: Jessica Draper, Town Planner; Virginia Clarke; Jon Kart; Gary Bressor; Judy Rosovsky

Called to Order: 7:07pm

Public Comment

 None

Administrative Items & Updates

 Minutes: Mark mentioned 2 corrections to the 3/21 minutes. Brian moved to accept with corrections, Alison seconded, all in favor, so moved.

 Jessica Draper asked the planning commission to schedule an extra meeting of the commission as well as a public informational meeting. It was decided to have an extra meeting of the commission on April 12th location TBD, and to have an informational meeting on May 2nd in lieu of a full commission meeting.

Town Plan

 For the community development section, changes since the last review were minimal. There was discussion of where to put the fire and police information, the commission decided to put it in the utilities and facilities section. It was mentioned that trails could be a component of economic development. Jon Kart expressed that a needs assessment for trails should be conducted to determine what is needed and where. Emergency Resilience had no changes. For the education plan, two lines were reworded. Alison requested a change to add in the word “few” where the word “several” was deleted on the first page, and requested that an action about local food production be added to goal 2. The commission decided to reexamine Economic Development at the next meeting. Transportation had 3 small changes since the last commission review. Community Development, Emergency Resilience, Education, and Transportation were approved with edits.

 Brian asked those present if the line 18 pg. 2 and pg. 5 goal 3 language of the natural resources section was amenable. Everyone agreed that the language meets the needs for those who had submitted commentary on that subject. Joy expressed concern that the language may be too strong, even if our intention is not to be. Brian said that it is good to at least include it and it gets community members on board. Judy asked if our language on line 1 pg. 16 also included streams, the commission agreed that they do consider streams included. Joy asked whether the commission was comfortable regarding the language on pg. 3 under LAND, goal 6. She said this language was similar to the previous language and was concerned about conveying the wrong message. The commission decided to consider slightly different language if those two sections become a point of contention. Virginia asked that the description of CHUs be clarified to better define was a CHU is, because they are not simply forest blocks. Mark asked that the introductory sentence to the table be reworded.

Alison asked if Goal 4 action 2 covered Jon’s concerns about trails. Jon explained that he understood there was a current effort by VMBA to increase the trails in Richmond to increase economic opportunity of trail systems. Joy said that she is associated with VMBA, and that she is not aware of an economic push for trails, but that economic benefit is an added bonus of trails. Jon suggested that either way we should have stronger town leadership in the development of trails and trail networks to make sure their construction is done as needed and mitigates negative effects on the environment. Virginia pointed out that trails are in multiple technical plans. Jon said that all he would like to see is an action about collaboration with the town and commissions to conduct a needs assessment for trails. The commission decided to mention economic benefits of recreation in the economic development section, and include an action about a needs assessment.

Mark asked Judy if she thought that the Natural Resources section had any egregious omissions. Joy said that she thought Jess did a good job on this draft. Judy said that she thinks the relationship between the planning and conservation commissions is better and that there is a mutual understanding of roles and intentions for each. Virginia mentioned a comment from Brad Elliot that the line about farms struggling sounded too dire, and that we should make more discussion of Ag in general. Historic Resources was briefly reviewed, the commission asked Jessica to rework some of the longer worded actions.

Mark asked the planning commission to briefly discuss future land use and formatting. Joy said we have a very narrative heavy plan, so it’s fine to be consistent as long as the meaning is clearly communicated. Brian said that the boxes themselves aren’t necessarily improving the section. Virginia passed out a “chart” that could summarize future land uses in a different fashion, and asked about the naming convention we should use for each land use area. Mark said we will decide that at a later time.

Adjourn

Brian made the motion to adjourn

Scott seconded the motion

All in favor,

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm

Respectfully submitted, Jessica Draper, Town Planner