

# Richmond Planning Commission

## Special Meeting

May 30, 2012

### *Approved Minutes*

---

**Members Present:** Gary Bressor (Chair), Lou Borie (Vice-Chair), Mark Fausel, Dan Renaud

**Members Absent:** Joe McHugh, Christy Witters, one vacancy

**Others Present:** Cathleen Gent (Town Planner/Staff to the DRB), Alison Anand

**7:07 PM** Call to order by the Chair.

**Public Comment** – No public comment.

#### **Unified Land Use Bylaws Work Session**

*Review public comments submitted to date*

The Planning Commission reviewed comments made by Cara LaBounty (dated January 3, 2012) which were made during a meeting with Bressor and Gent early this year. The Commission made the following decisions.

1. Section 2.14 – The Planning Commission had already decided to ask FEMA to raise the limit for exemptions from permits to \$1,000

2. Provision for the appeal period for DRB and zoning permit decisions to run concurrently – Decided to make this change. Gent will come up with language in section 4.3.15 and 4.2.1.d), making it clear that the appeal period for a zoning permit begins on day 16 of the DRB appeal period.

3. Keep provision for administratively created lots – The Planning Commission has already decided to do so, following the Fairfax bylaws approach. This process will involve DRB approval.

4. Section 2.1.4 – Decided not to revise sentence, “If one or more of the criteria apply, that portion of the parcel shall be excluded as “nondevelopable” in the density calculations.”

5. Section 2.1.5 and Section 3.7.1 – Steep slopes -- decided to change the minimum required for review to 20%, not 15%, for moderate slopes. Decided not to add other language as suggested by LaBounty.

6. Jonesville Residential zoning district – decided not to add Class 1 Retail and Class 1 Personal or Business Services to the use table.

7. Village Residential South – decided not to reduce the front setbacks, as those are consistent with the Village Residential North setbacks.

8. Village Business, Village Mixed, Jonesville Mixed, Gateway – decided not to remove the minimum height requirements for two floors above grade.

9. Jonesville Mixed – Section 2.6.1.a)i. – decided not to remove the term “village scale”

10. Jonesville Residential – Section 2.7.b)i. – decided to delete “...that make people feel comfortable” and keep “Be compact and walkable with a human scale.”

11. Jonesville Residential – Section 2.7.b)iii. – decided not to change that section.

12. Jonesville Residential - Section 2.7.3.a) – decided not to change the section because accessory dwellings are permitted for single family principal dwellings.

13. Jonesville Residential - Section 2.7.3.d) – Decided not to raise the lot coverage level.

14. Jonesville Residential – Section 2.7.4.a) and all other relevant sections – decided to change to “Parking is encouraged to be located to the rear and/or side of principal structures.”

15. Section 2.14 – Definition of recreational vehicle – decided to change the definition in Article 5, using the definition in Section 2.14.

16. Section 2.14.6 – Jurisdictional Determinations – decided not to change to require that jurisdictional determinations to be done within 24/48 hours.

17. Section 2.14.6.c)ii.3.B. – Engineering reports requirement by zoning administrative officer - decided not to change because the provision goes away when the new DFIRM maps are in place.

18. Section 2.14.6.e) – Appeals for jurisdictional determinations – decided not to change process because we have to follow state statute.

19. Section 2.14 – Substantial improvement definition – Gent will look at the ANR state model and see whether the three-year time frame for substantial improvements has been adopted.

20. Section 2.14.10.b)vi. – At grade parking – decided not to change, i.e., will allow at-grade parking.

21. Section 2.14.11.a) – Reference to Flood Hazard Overlay District – based on Section 2.14.5.a)i. and ii., decided not to change this.

22. Section 2.14.12 – “under” versus “less than” – decided to use “less than” there and other places where “under” is used.

23. Section 3.1.1 – Removal of structures – decided that this should apply to structures in the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area.

- 1 24. Add a definition for abandonment – decided not to add abandonment definition because of the
- 2 multiple ways the term is used.
- 3 25. Section 2.14.15 – because this appears to mirror the FEMA standards, decided not to change. Gent
- 4 will confirm that is the case.
- 5 26. Section 2.14.15.e) – based on Section 3.8.13 (temporary structures), decided not to change since
- 6 there is no conflict.
- 7 27. Section 2.14.15.k) – parking areas – decided not to change to “new parking areas” because the
- 8 section pertains to land development.
- 9 28. Section 2.14.15.f), g) and h) – decided not to change, so as to make it easier for owners to follow
- 10 the standards.
- 11 29. Section 2.14.15.p) – Cantilevered buildings - decided not to change this provision, as it would not
- 12 meet the intent and purpose of FEMA requirements.
- 13 30. Section 2.14.17 – not require certificate of occupancy – decided not to change, but to add reference
- 14 to Section 4.2.2 in that section.
- 15 31. General comment about Certificates of Occupancy – Gent will see how other towns handle
- 16 temporary COs. Also the Planning Commission recommended changing the fee to \$10 for recording or
- 17 getting the recording fee for the CO at the time the zoning permit is issued.
- 18 32. Section 3.2.4.e) – Parking of junk vehicles – decided to change to “...for one personally owned junk
- 19 vehicle which is totally screened from view”.
- 20 33. Section 3.2.4.f) – This applies to RV campers – The change in the definition for recreational vehicle
- 21 (see above discussion) will eliminate the issue of trailers for other purposes.
- 22 34. Section 3.2.5.c)xv. – Signs for Farmers Markets – decided not to change because farmers markets
- 23 are different from seasonal farm sales because the signs are placed only on days when the market
- 24 meets.

25  
26 Section 2.1.4 – Discussed moving the Maximum Lot sub-section to the subdivision section. The  
27 commission will discuss this again.

28  
29 Bressor said that he has asked a couple volunteers to read sections of the document to see if there are  
30 any issues or concerns that might be raised from an independent reading. The Commission briefly  
31 discussed the schedule for reviewing public comments and Bressor asked Gent to produce a “track  
32 changes” version as soon as possible.

33  
34  
35 **Adjournment**

36 **Borie made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Fausel. So voted. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.**

37  
38  
39 Respectfully submitted by Cathleen Gent, Town Planner/Staff to the DRB