

1 Richmond Planning Commission

2 Regular Meeting

3 Wednesday, June 18, 2014

4 Approved Minutes

---

5 **Members Present:** Brian Tellstone, Ann Cousins, Bruce LaBounty (Vice-Chair), Marc Hughes

6 **Absent:** Mark Fausel (Chair), Lauck Parke, Sean Foley,

7 **Others Present:** Joy and Robert Reap, Rod West, Clare Rock (Town Planner/Staff to the DRB)

8  
9 **7:00 PM LaBounty called the meeting to order**

10  
11 Public Comments – n/a

12  
13 Administrative Items

14  
15 Mail –

16  
17 Rock provided an overview of the following items:

18  
19 Memo from VT DHCD, dated June 9, 2014 RE: 2014 Legislative Revisions to  
20 Vermont's Planning and Development Act, the Downtown Development Act and  
21 Act 250. Rock briefly mentioned some of the items contained within the memo and  
22 highlighted some recent changes to the Open Meeting Law, which includes the  
23 requirement for municipalities to post draft meeting minutes on the municipal  
24 website within 5 days of a meeting. The current law states that the draft meeting  
25 simple to available for viewing upon request. Cousin's requested a copy a memo via  
26 email.

27  
28 The Town of Richmond will be hosting two flood information sessions, on 6/26 and  
29 7/16. Rock passed around the copy of the poster advertizing the events. Letters  
30 where sent directly to property owners who are and will be located within the new  
31 2014 floodplain. The purpose of the meetings are to provide people the opportunity  
32 to view the new maps, provide information about Elevation Certificates, share  
33 mitigation ideas and gauge interest in the HMPG program, a grant funding source  
34 which could provide homeowners funding to cover up to 75% of the cost of  
35 structural elevation for the purpose of reducing flood damages and insurance costs.

36  
37 Discussion followed about the changes in flood insurance. LaBounty mentioned that  
38 Bank of America has been charging customers too much for flood insurance and  
39 there is currently a law suit pending. Cousins voiced concern about the future of the  
40 Village considering the changes in insurance.

41  
42  
43 Meeting Minutes –June 4, 2014

44  
45 There was no quorum in attendance from the June 4, 2014 meeting to vote on the minutes.

46  
47 Discussion with guests Joy and Robert Reap regarding changes to the gateway Zoning District

48  
49 Joy Reap handed out a letter dated 6/18/2014. The letter outlined 5 proposed changes the Reaps are  
50 requesting.

51  
52 Discussion followed regarding the 5 proposed changes:

1 The PC was in support of removing the 5,000 sq ft maximum on a single use, especially for offices  
2 and research lab. The PC was divided on whether the 5,000 sq ft maximum should also be removed  
3 from retail and restaurant uses.

4  
5 The PC was in favor of increasing the 10,000 sq ft building footprint maximum. The Reaps would  
6 like 20,000 sq ft, the PC felt that 15,000 sq ft would be acceptable, maybe 17,000 sq ft could be a  
7 compromise.

8  
9 The PC was in favor of relaxing the parking location standards for buildings which do not front RT  
10 2 as requested. And removing the roof pitch requirement for buildings which do not front on RT 2.  
11 The PC discussed potential draft language such as “parking is required to be in the side of rear of  
12 buildings within 200 ft of RT 2, parking can be in front of buildings further back than 200 ft from  
13 RT 2.”

14  
15 The Reaps also requested that business yard be an allowed use within the Gateway District. The PC  
16 discussed whether changing the allowable uses should be part of this revision.

17  
18 Rod West was in support of the Reaps proposal and suggested the PC consider allowing automotive  
19 repair in other districts as Mann and Machine is going to be moving to the old Washburn’s location  
20 and that the other auto repair business will be closing. Discussion also included whether to remove  
21 the traffic impact standards. PC members favored keeping in the traffic standards for now.

22  
23 The Reaps have a potential developer who would like confirmation on the zoning changes as soon  
24 as possible. Rock outlined the adoption process for changing the regulations. Once draft language  
25 has been written and reviewed by the PC, a public hearing needs to be warned. Following the PC  
26 public hearing on the changes the proposal is sent to the Select Board for another public hearing.  
27 The hearing process takes approx 3 months considering the statutory timeframes and procedures.

28  
29 The PC would like a draft with the proposed changes as soon as possible and ready for PC review at  
30 their next meeting. The PC also recognizes the need to be able to apply the proposed changes to the  
31 entire Gateway District and will need to ensure the changes do not present any unintended  
32 consequences to other property owners or future development in the District. Rock suggested the  
33 PC outline the parameters of changes they will be considering as this will help guide the process  
34 and help focus the extent of changes the PC will consider. And also suggested a GIS analysis of the  
35 Gateway District would help the PC visualize the potential changes to other properties within the  
36 District.

37  
38 Discussion also followed about staff capacity to draft the changes within the next week considering  
39 preparations for the upcoming flood meetings.

40  
41 For the next meeting:

42 LaBounty will draft language to address the changes to parking, roof pitch and max building  
43 footprints.

44 Cousins will draft language on allowable uses and maximum sq ft per use requirements.

45 Rock will prepare a GIS map of the District and additional visualization materials to assist the PC in  
46 the decision making process.

#### 47 **PC Work plan for 2014-2015**

48  
49 The PC briefly discussed the workplan and the handout from the packets titled “Draft list of  
50 technical zoning changes - June 12, 2014”. Rock mentioned the bylaw amendment adoption  
51 process again and asked whether the PC would want to have 3 different adoption processes later this

1 summer/fall for 1) the Gateway District zoning changes, 2) the Prong II changes and 3) for other  
2 changes outlined in the list dated June 12, 2014. The adoption process requires both the PC and  
3 Select Board to hold warned Public Hearings which need to be advertized in the Burlington Free  
4 Press. The PC will consider the process and timelines at the next meeting.

5 **Discussion on broader changes (Prong II) to the Flood Hazard Overlay District**

6 Rock provided a brief overview of the latest draft and mentioned a couple more additional edits  
7 which need to be done. On the use table the PC agreed to separate additions to Principle structures,  
8 additions to accessory structures, and additions to minor structures.

9

10 The Table will include the following:

11	<i>additions to Principle structures</i>	<i>CU</i>	<i>X</i>
12	<i>additions to accessory structures</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>X</i>
13	<i>additions to minor structures</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>X</i>

14 also the following was added to the table:

15	<i>Outdoor Storage</i>	<i>CU</i>	<i>X</i>
----	------------------------	-----------	----------

16

17 A brief discussion followed about Improvements and the work notification concept. LaBounty  
18 stated his support of a lesser permit process for work which otherwise would not require a permit.  
19 Rock referenced the definition of land development from the zoning regulations. One additional  
20 permit requirement for properties in the floodplain would be that remodeling would need a permit.  
21 Considering the addition of the new definitions for *insignificant repairs* and *insignificant* activities,  
22 and *maintenance*, the new regulations will lessen the permit requirements for people in the  
23 floodplain compared to the current regulations. PC members were in favor of moving forward with  
24 the draft as written and to not incorporate the work notification concept. Therefore an additional  
25 change to the use table is:

26	<i>Improvements</i>	<i>(still need to define approval process)</i>
----	---------------------	--

27

28 The additional edits are not substantive and predominately formatting.

29

30 *LaBounty made a motion to accepted the changes, seconded by Cousins. So voted.*

31

32 **Adjournment**

33

34 *Tellstone made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Cousins. So voted.*

35

36 The meeting adjourned at 9:00PM.

37

38 Respectfully submitted by Clare Rock, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB