

Town of Richmond
Planning Commission Meeting
AGENDA

Wednesday August 5th, 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/86491790820?](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86491790820?pwd=MkRsRGY4RVBqdUJ1clhSbjFndkd2QT09)

[pwd=MkRsRGY4RVBqdUJ1clhSbjFndkd2QT09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86491790820?pwd=MkRsRGY4RVBqdUJ1clhSbjFndkd2QT09)

Join by phone: (929) 205-6099

Meeting ID: 864 9179 0820

Password: 713366

1. Welcome and troubleshooting
2. Adjustments to the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
 - June 3rd, 2020
 - June 20th, 2020
 - July 15th, 2020
4. Public Comment for non-agenda items
5. Discussion of possible new zoning districts within the Richmond Village
6. Review of Housing Committee membership applications
7. Discussion on creating requirements for property owners claiming exemption per 24 V.S.A. §4413
8. Discussion of received requests for zoning changes
9. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

Table of Contents

3. Approval of Minutes

- Page 3: July 15th, 2020
- Page 7: June 17th, 2020
- Page 11: June 3rd, 2020

4. Public Comment

- Page 15: Email from Erin Wagg in response to discussions about the driveway grade standards during the July 15, 2020 Planning Commission meeting

5. Discussion of possible new zoning districts within the Richmond Village

- Page 16: Summary of Goals for the Richmond Village zoning, prepared by Virginia Clarke
- Page 17: Draft zoning regulations for the Village Mixed District, prepared by Virginia Clarke
- Page 22: The Revising Zoning Districts Checklist
- Draft Zoning Maps (on standalone documents)
 - “8-5DraftZoningMap.pdf” – Draft zoning map prepared for the August 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Also available as a webapp on ArcGIS Online here: <https://arcg.is/1mrSab>
 - “CurrentZoningMap.pdf” – Zoning map currently in effect. This was included in the July 1, 2020 Planning Commission meeting packet
 - “WaterSewerMap.pdf” – Map showing water and sewer lines. This is also available online here: <https://diamondmaps.com/map.ashx?key=9668200727140500729>

6. Review of Housing Committee membership applications

- Page 23: Memorandum on Housing Committee Membership applicants
- Page 24: Letter of interest from Wright Cronin
- Page 25: Letter of interest from Connie van Eeghen
- Page 26: Letter of interest from Carole Furr
- Page 27: Letter of interest and Resume from Sarah Heim
- Page 29: Letter of interest from Miranda Lescaze
- Page 30: Letter of interest from Zachary Maia
- Page 32: Letter of interest from Andrew Mannix
- Page 33: Letter of interest from Ruth Miller
- Page 35: Letter of interest from Jackie Pichette
- Page 36: Letter of interest from Virginia Clarke
- Page 37: Letter of interest from Mark Fausel

7. Discussion on creating requirements for property owners claiming exemption per 24 V.S.A. §4413

- Page 38: Draft language prepared by Virginia Clarke

8. Discussion of received requests for zoning changes

- Page 40: Memorandum regarding received requests for zoning changes
- Page 41: Meeting minutes from 10-30-19 Planning Commission and DRB joint meeting
- Page 44: List of Future Priorities

10. Other Business

- Page 46: Table differentiating Historic Preservation Design Review and Form-Based Code

Richmond Planning Commission
REGULAR Meeting
UNAPPROVED MINUTES FOR July 15, 2020 MEETING

Members Present: Chris Cole, Scott Nickerson, Brian Tellstone, Mark Fausel, Joy Reap, Virginia Clarke, Alison Anand (joined at 7:57 pm)
Members Absent: Chris Granda, Jake Kornfeld,
Others Present: Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff)

Chris Cole opened the meeting at 7:02 pm.

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

Ravi Venkataraman requested time to talk about the Housing Committee during Other Business.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Virginia Clarke, seconded by Brian Tellstone, to approve the July 1st, 2020 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Voting: 5-1 (Clarke abstained). Motion carried

Virginia Clarke asked about procedure, and how the minutes were passed in the last meeting without a quorum to approve the meeting minutes. Venkataraman said that according to the Planning Commission Rules of Procedure, a quorum was not needed to approve items, only a simple majority. Clarke said that that should be further discussed because it does not follow Robert's Rules of Order and may be problematic.

4. Public Comment for non-agenda items

Joy Reap discussed an issue she recently had with her driveway—that she had to change the configuration of the driveway to meet the town's zoning regulations, but in return makes the driveway more dangerous. Clarke cited town Zoning Regulations Section 6.2 regarding driveway standards. Cole asked Venkataraman if a discussion of driveway standards could be included in the next meeting agenda. Reap said that this was an issue recently brought up by other property owners as well. Cole asked Venkataraman for driveway standards in nearby municipalities. Clarke added more information about previous discussions on driveway standards, stating that the current set of regulations was a compromise. Cole said that this issue is not only an emergency access issue but also an erosion issue.

5. Resolution to pursue Municipal Planning Grant

Venkataraman provided an overview to the Planning Commission, stating that the Selectboard voted to approve the enclosed resolution, and that the grant would support the housing committee to create affordable housing regulations.

Motion by Mark Fausel, seconded by Scott Nickerson, to adopt the resolution for the FY21 Planning Grant. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

6. Discussion on creating requirements for property owners claiming exemption per 24 V.S.A. §4413

Venkataraman provided a brief overview about the court order from January 2017, which specifies this requirement by the town to change its regulations regarding uses listed as exceptions under 24 V.S.A. 4413. Clarke asked about how the new regulations clarify requirements for farm structures. Venkataraman pointed to sections of the zoning regulations that may be construed as misleading, and referred to zoning regulations from other towns that specify the parameters of applicability in the applicability section. Cole asked about the court case. Venkataraman said the plaintiff erected a farm structure without notifying the town, the town discovered this and encouraged compliance, the plaintiff did not comply, the town issued a zoning violation, and the town and the plaintiff settled before the court could hear the appeal. Cole asked for further clarification about the nature of the violation. Clarke said that the proposed regulations would require landowners building farm structures to supply written notification and a sketch. Venkataraman said that under 24 V.S.A. 4413, landowners are required to provide the town written notification and a sketch, but do not need a zoning permit prior to construction. Clarke said that the zoning regulations should then include the state's requirements. Fausel asked about inserting the entire reference to 24 V.S.A. 4413 in the zoning regulations. Cole said that the proposal as presented specifies the requirements without requiring the landowner to reference 24 V.S.A. 4413 separately. Clarke asked if the proposed zoning regulations solves the issue at hand, and recommended the removal of the term "exempted". Cole concurred. Cole and Clarke recommended the revision to include the following language "In accordance with 24 V.S.A. 4413, the following uses do not require a Zoning Permit prior to land development". Nickerson noted that the proposal has two subsection "c"s. Clarke recommended making the sentence structure parallel. Cole recommended the following language: "In accordance with 24 V.S.A. 4413, the following uses are partially exempted from the local zoning regulations". Clarke asked about clarification about "partially exempted uses". Venkataraman said that those uses require permits. Clarke recommended removal of the term "partially exempted" from the proposed zoning regulations. Clarke recommended revisions and review of a revised document during the next meeting. Nickerson asked about the term "exempted", since it is not used in 24 V.S.A. 4413. Venkataraman said he used that term to categorize different uses, as other towns have in their zoning regulations. Cole asked about the difference between uses under subsections b and c. Venkataraman said that the uses under subsection c are subject to Flood Hazard Overlay District regulations. Nickerson recommended moving the second subsection c up, so that readers would understand the overall permit requirements for all "partially exempted" uses. Cole agreed. Fausel recommended keeping the sections listed for removal in the proposed zoning regulations.

7. Discussion of possible new zoning districts within the Richmond Village

Cole provided a summary of discussions from the previous Planning Commission meeting. Clarke asked about the creation of the conceptual neighborhoods residential district. Fausel said that the neighborhoods district would address concerns specific to residents in the village—who have concerns different from residents in other parts of the high-density residential district. Fausel said that the neighborhoods district would not include portions of Depot Street and Railroad Street, which already have mixed and commercial uses. Fausel said that the character of the residential areas in the village is different from the character of the high-density residential district north of I-89, and that residential development in areas north of I-89 is still feasible. Fausel said that parcels along Jericho Road have the possibility of mixed use and a higher density. Clarke asked if the key difference in the distinction between high-density residential and village neighborhoods is density allowances. Fausel affirmed. Clarke asked about density allowances. Cole said the commission have not discussed that yet and were still determining what to include in the districts. Clarke asked if the village commercial areas should be called "mixed" and include a residential component. Fausel said that that is the intent of areas along major roadways. Nickerson said that the current term is a placeholder, with uses being further defined at a later date. Fausel suggested extending the commercial district up Jericho Road to include existing commercial uses in the area. Clarke recommended a discussion with property owners on the changes to the district. Reap asked if mixed use implies additional density and commercial uses on the same lot. Fausel affirmed. Clarke suggested incremental upzoning. Fausel said the mixed use district should emphasize dynamic commercial uses and form-based zoning to ensure compatibility. Clarke said she

would like more input from the DRB on ensuring neighborhood compatibility. Reap asked about conversions from residences to office uses in the agricultural/residential district. Venkataraman said that converting a residence to an office use of less than 2,500 in the district is allowed, as long as the property owner has Conditional Use and Site Plan Review approval. Clarke said the office uses would be allowed in the High Density Residential District. Fausel talked about discussions about areas south of Winooski River during the previous Planning Commission meeting. Venkataraman asked for clarification on which areas the Planning Commission wanted to categorize as mixed use. Fausel said that the commission wanted to make sure protections were in place for the four corners area but allowances for mixed uses across from the existing commercial district and up Thompson Road and Cochran Road. Clarke mentioned Gary Bressor's approved land development. Nickerson asked if PUDs are allowed more units than the base density. Fausel said duplexes are an allowed use in the agricultural/residential district. Fausel said that Thompson Road and Cochran Road appears ideal for increased density because of the availability of water and sewer connections, and its proximity to the village. Clarke asked about including portions of the Farr's property in the mixed use area. Cole said this was discussed during the last meeting, and the commissioners agreed with that idea. Reap asked to include a property on East Main Street into consideration for higher density. Clarke said that further discussions are necessary to determine a reasonable density for upzoning. Clarke asked about the extent of the sewer service area. Nickerson said that the sewer and water service area map was included in the packet for the previous meeting. Nickerson asked about ways to protect the historic Round Church area and historic overlay districts. Venkataraman said that establishing a historic district is the best way to maintain historic structures or a historic district, but if the commission does not want to establish a historic overlay district at this point, leaving it in the agricultural/residential district would be the best option to preserve the structure. Clarke asked if the sewer serves the town highway garage and if the sewer could serve portions of the Farr property. Cole said that extending the sewer line would be feasible. Cole said further discussions with property owners are needed. Cole asked about converting sections of Cochran Road into mixed use. Fausel affirmed, because of its walkability. Reap said a sidewalk would need to be installed. Clarke said that sidewalks should be made a requirement for development in this mixed use district. Nickerson asked if the commission was satisfied with the proposed maps. Cole identified Jericho Road as a discussion point. Clarke said that the commission should finalize the map and numbers for density allowances, and invite property owners for discussion of the proposed zoning. Reap asked about floor-based use restrictions. Cole and Clarke said further discussion on that is needed. Clarke said that allowances for multi-family dwellings will need to be added. Reap agreed. Fausel asked how the Planning Commission is going to reach out to property owners. Cole said that should be discussed after the next meeting. Cole asked about finalizing the northern portion of the village, suggesting that Jericho Road should remain in the neighborhoods residential district. Fausel said that the property owners should be given more options, via the mixed use district designation. Clarke recommended creating three proposed maps to share with village residents. Venkataraman said that when the commission is ready, he would send out a mailing to property owners with the proposed maps, qualities of the districts, and meeting information. Cole suggested include all properties fronting Jericho Road in the village mixed district. Fausel requested from Venkataraman a current zoning map. Nickerson said all the maps from previous meetings are on the Town of Richmond website. Nickerson said that in the Town Plan maps, Jonesville had a unique designation with higher density. Venkataraman said that unique designation as a node is also mentioned in the failed zoning. Reap said that consideration should be made for the Gateway District, where water and sewer will be available in the near future.

8. Other Business

Venkataraman talked about the Housing Committee and that he will be collecting letters of interest until July 29th. Cole said that having Planning Commission members on the Housing Committee will be critical because the Housing Committee is working on zoning regulations, and maintaining lines of communication will be key. Clarke said she will be sending Venkataraman a letter of interest. Reap asked about how frequently the committee would meet. Venkataraman said he expects the committee

to meet once a month for the time being, but expects more meetings depending on if the town receives the Municipal Planning Grant and the availability of the future members.

9. Review List of Future Priorities

Cole had requested Venkataraman to include the list of future priorities for this meeting. Cole asked the commission members to send Venkataraman their respective top three list of priorities. Cole overviewed the Downtown Designation program and its potential financial benefits for the town. Fausel said that certain costs to the Downtown Designation program gave the Planning Commission reservations about the designation in the past. Cole asked Venkataraman for an overview of the designation program when he has done the needed research.

Correspondence, and Adjournment

Clarke asked Venkataraman when the next meeting will be. Venkataraman said the next meeting will be on August 5th. Clark requested that Venkataraman send out draft zoning maps for the Planning Commission to consider in the meantime.

Motion by Reap, seconded by Tellstone to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:08 pm.

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

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



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

PC Meeting July 15 Driveway Grade Discussion

Erin Wagg <wagge4216@gmail.com>
To: rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 10:00 PM

Hello Ravi and Planning Commission Board Members,

I am watching the meeting on YouTube tonight and have this input to share with you about driveway grade. (Joy asked about this at the beginning of the meeting.)

The house I built and used to live in at 480 Greystone Drive has a long steep driveway that meets and exceeds the town guidelines for grade. Additionally we built a wide flat driveway space next the house to allow very large vehicles to park and turn around as well.

When I had an emergency call one night (suspected gas leak) I was very saddened to see that when several emergency vehicles showed up (Richmond and Bolton) they could not use the driveway. They all parked along Greystone Drive and every volunteer firefighter wearing full heavy personal gear (and some carrying additional equipment as well) walked the steep 750+ foot driveway to get to us. It was as fast as they could manage but it was not fast. Eventually they allowed an ambulance to come right up to the house to monitor my family's breathing etc. If we had a more serious issue (like a fire) we would have had real problems - no water truck, no ladders. Hoses cannot stretch far enough to help.

Simply put - large fire trucks need to be able to get reasonable access to homes for proper safety - both to protect all of our citizens and the volunteer fire and rescue staff. The grade of driveways - and maybe the review of new property driveway designs from the fire chief - is key to ensuring that future emergencies can be appropriately managed.

When we built that house I thought the codes we were restricted to use were already designed to allow access for emergency equipment. Over the years I lived there I witnessed several large moving trucks and other massive vehicles managing the driveway with no trouble. I was surprised to find that what I thought was quite sizable and gently sloped was not good enough for emergency vehicles. Why? I honestly don't know. I bet Richmond Fire could enlighten you about why their needs are unique.

I understand that when folks build new homes they might feel that cutting corners on meeting flatter driveway grades helps their budget or makes their home site prettier but we can't allow any properties to be left unreachable for these reasons. All properties will eventually be sold and the expectation from new property owners is that our town codes have ensured that local rescue services can fully reach all modern development. Lives depend on this, we have to stay tough on this point.

Thanks for hearing me out.

Warm regards,

Erin Wagg

Village Mixed-Use District – Virg Proposal to PC 7.27.20

1. Basic premise: combine res/com and remainder of village com districts
2. Goals:
 - Increase density of housing and businesses in central area surrounding downtown core
 - Increase allowed uses for businesses and multifamily housing
 - Increase housing overall and provide varied options including more affordable units
 - Increase flexibility of structure uses for future live / work arrangements, and allow for transitions from residential to commercial and vice-versa
 - Allow for multiple uses, dwellings, structures and ownership arrangements on a single lot without needing PUD process
 - Provide commercial opportunities along the main arteries into downtown
 - Maintain the village-look and compatibility of residential and commercial structures
 - Preserve village residential neighborhoods
 - Maintain low density around the Round Church
3. Map: VMZD includes
 - East Main St 4-corners to I89 overpass both sides
 - West Main St 4-corners to “Entering Richmond” sign both sides
 - Jericho Rd 4-corners to School St both sides
 - Depot St both sides
 - Railroad St both sides (except Borden St neighborhood)
 - Bridge St from Pleasant St to the bridge on the east side, from Depot St to the park on the west side
 - Bridge St/Huntington Rd intersection south on Huntington Rd to the S-curve, east side only, including all of Farr’s farm on that side of the road
 - Farr Rd both sides
 - Thompson Rd both sides (Kilpeck house?)
4. Village neighborhoods: leave them in the HDR district – might increase density slightly when this district considered
 - Tilden/Baker Sts
 - Church St
 - Esplanade St
 - Pleasant St
 - Lemroy Ct (could this be connected with Pleasant St?)
 - Borden St
5. Round Church : leave in Ag/Res for now, which should protect with a lower density – this could be changed if we make the Ag/Res district somehow unsuitable in later considerations (create a historic district for Round Church?)
 - Bridge St from bridge to Huntington Rd/Bridge St intersection both sides
 - Farr Rd
 - Cochran Rd both sides
 - Area across from Round Church Corners Complex – (NW side)
 - Old Brooklyn Court
 - Kilpeck House?

3.5 Village Mixed (VM)

Purpose: The purpose of this district is to maintain the historic settlement pattern of a central village area of residential and residential-compatible commercial enterprises and to provide flexibility for the development of new business models that may combine working and dwelling. Development is clustered along the main travel corridors which provide visibility and ease of access for economic activity, but residences may be interspersed. The district aims to promote the increased density and walkability of the village center that fulfills the goals of smart growth planning.

The character of the district will include:

- multifamily housing as well as single- and 2-family dwellings;
- commercial enterprises that share architectural features with historic buildings and are compatible with existing buildings;
- proximity of residents to services, institutions, public gathering places, schools and child care;
- pedestrian sidewalks and pathways;
- potential public transit options, and
- interspersed residential neighborhoods.
- Green spaces, street trees and other plantings will provide a connection to nature for urban residents and visitors.

3.5.1 Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Zoning Permit and Site Plan Approval

The following uses shall be allowed in the Village Mixed-Use District upon issuance of a Zoning Permit by the Administrative Officer and Site Plan Approval as in Section 5.5. Multiple uses, structures, and ownership arrangements are allowed in this district.

- Accessory dwelling
- Accessory uses or structures
- Artist/craft studio
- Dwelling-- Single-, two- and multifamily
- Family child care home
- Group home
- Home occupation
- Inn or guest house
- Office, professional
- Office, medical
- Personal services
- (Restaurant?)
- (Retail business?)

3.5.2 Allowable Uses Upon Issuance of Conditional Use Approval

The following uses may be allowed in the Village Mixed-Use District upon issuance of a conditional use approval by the Development Review Board as in section 5.6. Multiple uses, structures and ownership arrangements may be allowed in this district.

- Adaptive use as in 5.6.8
- Brewery
- Catering service
- Cemetery
- Center-based child care facility
- Cottage industry
- Educational facility as in section 5.10.4
- Funeral parlor
- Health care services
- Hospital
- Museum
- Pharmacy
- Planned unit development as in section 5.12
- Pub
- Recreational facility
- Religious use as in section 5.10.4
- Restaurant
- Retail business
- State- or community-owned and operated institution or facility as in section 5.10.4
- Tavern
- Theater
- Veterinary clinic

3.5.3 Residential Density and Requirements

- Each residential dwelling unit shall require 1/6 acre of developable land located on the same lot as the unit, subject to the rounding rule as described below. This equals a residential density of approximately 6 units per developable acre. Developable land excludes those lands that are outlined in section 2.5.2.
- The maximum number of dwelling units that may be permitted shall be calculated by multiplying the residential density by the total developable acreage of the lot. When this calculation results in a number with a fractional component, the fraction will be rounded according to conventional rounding rules as follows, in which X is a whole number:

X.0 -- X.49 units shall be rounded DOWN to X units

X.5 – X.99 units shall be rounded UP to X+1 units

Examples: 6 units/acre x 0.24 developable acres = 1.44 units rounds DOWN to 1 unit

6 units/acre x 0.3 developable acres = 1.8 units rounds UP to 2 units

If the number of permissible units is less than one (1) it shall be rounded UP to 1 unit.

Example: 6 units/acre x 0.12 developable acres = 0.72 units rounds UP to 1 unit

- All dwelling units are required to meet the Vermont Fire and Building Safety Code.

3.5.4 Dimensional Requirements for Lots in the VM District

No Zoning Permit may be issued for development in the Village Mixed District unless the proposed lot meets the following requirements:

- **Lot Area** – No lot shall be less than one-fourth (1/4) or 0.25 acre. The purchase of additional land by the owner of a lot from the owner of an adjacent lot shall be permitted, provided such purchase does not create a lot of less than the minimum area on the part of the seller.
- **Lot Dimensions** – Each lot must contain a point from which a circle with a radius of twenty-five (25) feet can be inscribed within the boundary of the lot.
- **Lot Frontage** – Each lot must have a minimum of fifty feet of continuous frontage on a public or private road OR have access to a public or private road by a permanent easement or right-of-way as approved by the DRB pursuant to sections 4.2 and 4.3.
- **Lot Coverage** – The total ground covered by all structures, parking areas, walkways, driveways, and all other areas consisting of impervious surfaces shall not exceed eighty per cent (80%) of the total ground area of the lot.

3.5.5 Dimensional Limitations for Structures on Lots in the VM District

- **Height of Buildings and Structures** – shall be as in section 4.12.
- **Setbacks** –
 - Front-yard setback -
 - Side-yard setback --
 - Rear-yard setback
- **Footprints of Principle Structures** – No principal structure shall have a footprint that Exceeds 10,000 square feet.

3.5.6 Other Requirements Applicable to Lots in the VM District

No Zoning Permit shall be issued for land development in the Village Mixed District unless the development meets the following requirements:

- **Water Resources** – All lots in this district shall be served by the Richmond Municipal Water System.
- **Parking**
 - Residential
In this district the residential parking requirement shall be based on the number of bedrooms per dwelling unit. The spaces required shall only serve to calculate overall supply and may or may not be assigned to specific dwelling units.
Efficiency – 1 space
1-bedroom – 1.5 spaces
2-bedroom – 2 spaces
3-bedroom – 2.5 spaces

Each additional bedroom beyond 3 shall require an additional 0.5 spaces per Bedroom

- Non-residential
Parking supply requirements shall be as in section 6.1.
- Bicycle parking racks and safe, convenient bicycle access shall be required in parking areas with ten (10) or more parking spaces.

- **Loading --**

Off-road or highway loading requirements shall be as provided by section 6.1.

- **Signs –**

Signs shall be regulated as provided by section 5.7.

- **Traffic Impact –**

- A transportation impact study shall be required for uses which generate more than 70 vehicle trip ends on adjacent roads during the PM peak hour for the first 40,000 square feet of land development or fraction thereof, plus 1 vehicle trip end for each additional 1,000 square feet of land development. In making the determination of traffic impact, the Administrative Officer or DRB shall utilize “Trip Generation – Tenth Edition,” Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) or its equivalent, or any subsequent and most recent publication thereof, and may use estimates from other sources, including local traffic counts, if the above publication does not contain data for a specific use or if a use contains unique characteristics that cause it to differ from national traffic estimates.
- For establishments that generate more than 70 vehicle trip ends during the PM peak hour, the DRB shall review the level of service of adjacent roads. Based on its review as well as consultation with the Road Foreman, the DRB may put forth permit conditions to mitigate adverse traffic impacts. Permit conditions may include:
 - Site improvements to improve access management, such as the creation of secondary access points, the reduction of the width of the curb cuts, or the like;
 - Improvements to internal circulation, including the creation of narrower roadway widths, pedestrian paths, and the like;
 - Improvements with connections with adjacent properties, such as, but not limited to, the creation of additional vehicle or pedestrian access points, the installation of signage and traffic lights, and adjustments to intersections to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and to slow traffic.

Access – Access shall be regulated as provided by section 4.1 through 4.4.

Sidewalks – All new development in this district shall be required to install and maintain sidewalks along the street frontage.

Compatibility – The purpose of this section is to maintain an attractive streetscape and a village-look to the village center while allowing a variety of building types.

A visual rendering of any new construction or remodeled exterior shall be required as part of a site plan and/or conditional use application to allow the Development Review Board and the public to review the visual aspects of new construction, or new or remodeled exterior, and to provide input about its compatibility with a traditional village center. Once approved, any changes to the façade, size or scale that are made as the project progresses, shall require a new visual rendering and an amendment to the DRB's approval. Publicly displayed visual renderings must be in accordance with section 5.3.3(b). The following shall be considered when reviewing the application:

- Compatibility of size, scale, materials, dimensions and construction types shall be required. Applicants may demonstrate compatibility through examples, research, architectural consultation or other means.
- Design features that provide all structures with an attractive and human-scale appearance when viewed from a public or private road or by neighboring properties shall be required. These features shall include:
 1. Building facades of 50' or more shall be broken down into a series of smaller facades that incorporate changes in color, texture or materials; architectural projections or recesses; varying setbacks or roof treatments, or other structural or decorative variations.
 2. Street-facing facades shall include windows and doors.
 3. All sides facing a street or a neighboring property shall have windows.
- Landscaping, screening and green space may be required to achieve the following goals:
 1. To provide screening of development to increase privacy, reduce noise and glare, contribute to the scenic qualities of the property, or to otherwise lessen the visual impact of the development on neighboring properties.
 2. To provide green space amenities for the occupants of the development.
 3. If landscaping is required, provisions must be made for the care and maintenance of the plantings, including the removal and replacement of dead or diseased shrubs or trees.

Additional Possible Conditions –

Amendments to other parts of the regulations that would be required:

Section 4.5 – remove or rewrite

Section 5.9 – accessory dwelling

Section 5.12 -- PUDs

Parts of the subdivision regs

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?

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: July 30, 2020

SUBJECT: Consideration of Applicants to the Town Housing Commission

Enclosed are letters of interest from applicants looking to serve on the Town of Richmond Housing Committee.

The following applicants would be considered Housing Committee members from the public at-large:

- Wright Cronin
- Connie van Eeghen
- Carole Furr
- Sarah Heim
- Miranda Lescaze
- Zachary Maia
- Andrew Mannix
- Ruth Miller
- Jackie Pichette

The following applicants would be considered Housing Committee members from the Planning Commission:

- Virginia Clarke
- Mark Fausel

Per the Housing Committee charge, under the “membership” section:

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.

To summarize:

- At least five members must be from the public at-large
- The other four members may come from other boards and committees

To facilitate action by the Planning Commission, I have created the following draft motions

I, _____, move to recommend the appointment of [insert applicants' respective names] to serve on the Town of Richmond Housing Committee as members from the public at-large; and I move to recommend [insert applicants' respective names] to serve on the Town of Richmond Housing Committee as members from the Planning Commission.



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Letter of Interest for Housing Committee

Wright Cronin <wrightcronin@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 9:30 AM

To: Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

To Whom it May Concern,

I wish to directly express my interest in participating on the Housing Committee in Richmond.

I am a born and raised Vermonter and have lived in Richmond since 2014. During that time I have come to adore this town and have developed an intention to give back to the community in some way.

I have worked as a licensed psychotherapist for the past ten years with a private practice in downtown Burlington. During this time I have also been focused on being an advocate for housing justice in Vermont through volunteering with Pathways Vermont. I am currently the vice chair of the board and am actively working with leadership to encourage the state invest more in affordable housing and the housing first model for battling chronic homelessness.

It's very important to me to support the creation of more affordable housing in this area in smart ways and I would be very honored to be able to serve on the housing committee for the town of Richmond.

Sincerely,

Wright Cronin
(802) 777-8537

Connie van Eeghen
255 Mary Drive
Richmond, Vermont 05477

July 21, 2020

Ravi Venkataraman
Town Planner
Town of Richmond
203 Bridge St.
Richmond, VT 05477

Re: Interest in Housing Committee Position

Dear Mr. Venkataraman,

Thank you for talking with me last week about the Housing Committee and the position available for a community member. After some thought, I would like to put forward my name for consideration.

I believe access to housing is a root issue that enables or prevents newly arriving or young adult residents of Vermont to join our community in Richmond. I feel strongly that perspectives that represent these needs are extremely important. I have been a resident of Richmond since 1992 and, with my husband, raised three children here. All three are now young adults who moved away to other states, believing that their needs would be better met elsewhere. There are many reasons that go into choice of residence but housing options are part of that equation.

I have a 20+ year past career in hospital administration, having worked at the University Health Center in Burlington VT, Fletcher Allen Health Care (now UVM Medical Center), and Copley Hospital in Morrisville VT. For the past eight years I have worked at the Larner College of Medicine at the University of Vermont as an assistant professor, doing research and educating health care providers on redesigning health care systems from the front line. In addition, I am currently a board member of Our Community Cares Camp, a summer camp program that provides free breakfast and lunches (in previous years) and a supportive social and recreational camp environment past and current years) for children in the Chittenden East school district with food insecurity.

This does not mean I can speak for all the consumers of these organizations, past and present. But I will do my best to think of and listen for these perspectives, and add my voice to theirs.

Thank you for considering my application,



Connie van Eeghen
802-373-6286



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Re: Affordable Housing Committee

Carole Elaine Furr <carole@furrs.org>
To: Josh Arneson <jarneson@richmondvt.gov>
Cc: Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Tue, Jul 7, 2020 at 2:27 PM

Dear Ravi,

I understand that you are collecting letters of interest regarding the Affordable Housing Committee.

I would be interested in serving on the Committee, as affordable and low-income housing is, and has been for a long time, a particular interest of mine. Many social ills have at their heart homelessness or the lack of a stable housing situation.

I am employed (as an accountant) for the Burlington Housing Authority, which as you probably know is the quasi-non-governmental agency responsible for administering much of Burlington's low-income and Section 8 housing. I am very familiar with the financial aspects of affordable housing programs.

I am a resident of Richmond (since 2002). I am, for what it's worth, one of the two Town Fence Viewers (really!). I am a graduate of Harvard University (1992, AB in Physics). I am also married to a Virginia Tech graduate (Jay Furr, MPA 1990); I understand that this automatically gives me a bunch of "cool" points.

Is there anything more you'd need to know from me?

Thanks,

Carole E. Furr

carole@furrs.org
802.434.4601 (home)
802.373.5819 (cell)

[Quoted text hidden]

July 29, 2020

Dear Mr. Venkataraman,

I am writing to express my interest in serving on the Town of Richmond Housing Committee. My family and I moved to Richmond this past spring. My interest in the Housing Committee stems from my desire to be more involved in my local community, as well as my interest in creating more housing for low-income individuals. As an attorney, I have represented several tenants in eviction proceedings and feel that I have developed an understanding of many of the challenges faced by people who are housing insecure. I also previously worked as an AmeriCorps VISTA volunteer in Burlington, VT, focused primarily on increasing food access in the community. I believe that food access and housing issues are largely interconnected and would welcome the opportunity to lend my voice to a committee that is working to meet the housing needs in the community of Richmond.

For further background information, I have included a copy of my resume.

With kind regards,

Sarah Heim

SARAH J. HEIM

358 Westall Dr., Richmond, VT 05477 • (610) 533-6749 • heim.sarah@gmail.com

LEGAL EXPERIENCE

SHEEHEY FURLONG & BEHM PC

Litigation Associate

Drafted motions for complex civil litigation matter in Vermont state court. Defended healthcare provider before professional conduct board.

Burlington, Vermont

June 2020 – Present

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

Litigation Associate

Prepared direct and cross-examination outlines and assisted with witness preparation for two criminal trials in the Southern District of New York. Defended clients in DOJ and SEC investigations. Drafted motions in civil and criminal proceedings and assisted in preparation for oral arguments.

New York, New York

October 2016 – March 2020

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Term Law Clerk for Magistrate Judge Sarah Netburn

Researched and drafted orders and opinions responding to parties' motion practice, including dispositive motions. Assisted with bench trials discovery conferences, hearings, and settlement conferences.

New York, New York

September 2015 – September 2016

CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

Litigation Associate

Summer Associate

Engaged in general commercial litigation practice, with a concentration in regulatory investigations. Represented clients in response to investigations by the DOJ, CFTC, FCA (United Kingdom), and HKMA (Hong Kong).

New York, New York

September 2013 – September 2015

Summer 2012

EDUCATION

CORNELL LAW SCHOOL

Juris Doctor, *cum laude*, GPA: 3.729

Journal: CORNELL INTERNATIONAL LAW JOURNAL, Executive Editor

Note: *The Applicability of the Duress Defense to the Killing of Innocent Persons by Civilians*,
46 CORNELL INT'L L.J. 165 (2013) (Received the Morris P. Glushien Prize for Best Student Note)

Ithaca, New York

May 2013

DICKINSON COLLEGE

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science & German, *summa cum laude*, GPA: 3.86

Honors: Phi Beta Kappa; Dean's List; German Department Honors; Pi Sigma Alpha

Carlisle, Pennsylvania

May 2007

OTHER RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

HISCOCK LEGAL AID SOCIETY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROJECT

Law Clerk (3L Year, 2nd Semester)

Syracuse, New York

January – May 2013

U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Law Clerk (3L Year, 1st Semester)

Syracuse, New York

August – December 2012

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Law Clerk (1L Summer)

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

May – August 2011

VERMONT CAMPUS COMPACT/UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

AmeriCorps VISTA member for Leadership and Civic Engagement Programs

Burlington, Vermont

August 2008 – August 2010

ACTION RECONCILIATION SERVICES FOR PEACE

Researcher and Tour Guide

Dachau, Germany

September 2007 – August 2008

ADMISSIONS

Admitted to New York State (December 2014) and Southern District of New York

Ravi Venkataraman
Town Planner
Town of Richmond
203 Bridge Street
Richmond, VT 05477
rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

July 17, 2020

Dear Ravi,

I am writing to express my interest in serving on the Town of Richmond's Housing Committee. I was thrilled to hear of the Selectboard's recent decision to form a committee focused on the housing needs of our town.

I have lived in Richmond for eleven years with my husband Padraic, and two children Adrien and Leila, both students at Mount Mansfield Union High School. My professional experience is in community development, including ten years as an environmental scientist and manager, and the past eight years as an affordable housing developer for the nonprofit Cathedral Square. Cathedral Square creates and maintains quality, affordable, service-enriched housing for older adults and people with special needs. We collaborate with partners in housing, health care and aging services to build capacity, and we design and deliver cost-effective programs and homes that promote residents' health and well-being, foster vibrant and compassionate communities, and meet residents' diverse needs. You may be familiar with one of our 27 affordable independent senior communities, Richmond Terrace, on Thompson Road in Richmond.

In my professional role I work with Vermont communities to identify housing needs, and work with funding agencies, consultants, and communities to address them. I am well versed in state and local housing policy, analysis of demographic and housing data, housing finance, and effective goals and strategies for addressing communities' housing goals. I recently served on the technical advisory committee for the Agency of Commerce and Community Development's project "Zoning for Great Neighborhoods," whose resulting tools and recommendations may be helpful to Richmond as we identify barriers to addressing housing needs and plan for the future.

I believe that a town is healthy and vibrant when all people, regardless of ability to pay, are able to live and thrive in safe, quality housing, with access to the support and services they need. I am committed to advancing goals of smart growth, multi-modal transportation, and sustainable community development.

I would be grateful to be able to offer my time and experience to my own town through serving on the Richmond Housing Committee. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Miranda Lescaze
290 Robbins Mountain Road
Richmond, VT 05477
mlescaze@gmail.com
802-777-1775

July 24, 2020

Ravi Venkataraman
Town Planner
Town of Richmond
203 Bridge St.
Richmond, VT 05477

Re: Richmond Housing Committee Letter of Interest

Dear Mr. Venkataraman,

My name is Zachary Maia, and I am writing this letter to express my interest in joining the Richmond Housing Committee. I currently reside in a rental unit at 2618 Dugway Road, Richmond VT 05477, where I moved to in January of 2020. I believe that my professional experience and skills in Town Plan implementation, meeting facilitation, and stakeholder coordination will lend well to the task of the Richmond Housing Committee.

I originally moved to Vermont to study at UVM, where I received a B.S. in Environmental Policy & Development. I interned at the Town of Colchester's Planning and Zoning Department and became determined to stay in Vermont after I graduated. My partner and I soon found jobs outside of Burlington, and sought to relocate closer to our places of employment. While we are not homeowners, I believe the perspective of a young renter would be important to the Richmond Housing Committee.

I am currently employed at the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) in Montpelier, VT as a Land Use and Community Development Planner. My work includes providing municipalities in Washington and Orange counties with support in local governance activities, including municipal planning, zoning implementation, energy planning, as well as state-level permit review. No matter the project, our work revolves around facilitating meetings with key stakeholders to make positive change in our 23 municipalities.

A specific housing activity I've participated in was regional support in the Agency of Commerce and Community Development's statewide [Zoning for Great Neighborhoods](#) implementation tool. The final tool is a guide to help towns modernize their zoning to address regulatory inequities in the provision of affordable and convenient housing. This work required an analysis of current zoning standards in each of our municipalities to provide to the consultant for review and inclusion into the final guide. One of our towns, Middlesex, participated in a workshop and received technical assistance specific to Village Center-level development that we hope to implement region-wide in the coming year.

Another example of my housing-related experience includes our coordination of a Regional Housing Summit with a variety of partners. In conjunction with the Montpelier Housing Task Force, CVRPC coordinated and facilitated meetings with housing developers, the business community, and local human services groups to determine the purpose, scope, location, and timeline of the event. The group

decided to implement a conversation-series, where the same housing conversation will be held at different group meetings to engage them and inform the summit, in order to facilitate a constructive culmination event for all attendees. While the summit has been postponed due to COVID-19, we are looking forward to continuing this work into 2021!

My experience as a Regional Planner working on multiple programs with a variety of partners has led me to understand the importance of staying on track, within scope, and on-time for every project. Effective and timely communication is critical for any committee to be successful in their endeavors, and I look forward to bringing my skills and experience to the Richmond Housing Committee.

The 2018 Richmond Town Plan outlines 9 implementation actions under Housing, which I believe the Housing Committee can play a major role in achieving. I would be interested in pursuing tangential implementation actions alongside these in the Energy and Transportation sectors as well, leveraging other connections from my professional career.

Housing isn't easy, but I'm ready to use my professional experience and my local spirit to help craft recommendations that will make our community more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable for our current and future residents. Please contact me at zacharymaia@gmail.com or by phone at (978)-677-0330 if you'd like to talk more about how I may be able to serve on the Richmond Housing Committee.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Zachary Maia". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Zachary Maia



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

FPF post

1 message

Andrew Mannix <andrew@themalleygroup.com>
To: rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Wed, Jul 8, 2020 at 7:26 PM

Hello Ravi

I would be interested in participating in the housing committee discussed on FPF. I am a Richmond resident and seasoned real estate agent that sells roughly 40 homes a year in the greater Chittenden County area. I work for The Malley Group at Keller Williams and would be happy to discuss further the ideas involved because I believe my understanding of the market will be extremely beneficial to Richmond residents. I look to hearing from you soon. Thanks!

Andrew Mannix
802-399-6855
[105 Hidden Pines Circle](#)



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Interest in Richmond Housing Committee

1 message

Ruth Miller <production@mmctv15.org>

Wed, Jul 15, 2020 at 2:33 PM

To: "Ravi Venkataraman (rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov)" <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

To: Ravi Venkataraman

Town Planner

Town of Richmond

[203 Bridge St.](#)[Richmond, VT 05477](#)

July 14, 2020

Re: Richmond Housing Committee

Dear Ravi,

I am responding to your call to the public for interested people to join the nascent Housing Committee here in the town of Richmond.

I am the longest-residing resident of an affordable housing duplex at the Richmond Village Apartments on Borden St., located at the end of Railroad St. I've resided in the same unit since the 16-unit development opened to income-certified rental tenants in December of 1998. Tenants must be re-certified annually by the landlord, Champlain Housing Trust, in order to qualify for reduced (not subsidized) rent. It increases every year by approximately 3%, but is considerably below market rents for Chittenden Cty. My own rent has only just doubled over my last 20 years of residency there.

I also serve in a 60% of FT capacity as Production Mgr. in a staff of three at the local public access TV station, Mt. Mansfield Community TV, serving our Comcast cable-subscriber towns of Richmond, Jericho, and Underhill (not Huntington.) I have worked covering and processing town government meetings for all 3 towns (with help from a tiny field staff) since 2008, and have become far more invested in Richmond's inner workings since I started this job. Hence, I witness a significant amount of town-focused discussion and policy (like it or not) than the average resident!

Although I have no formal experience in Housing, Planning, or Zoning, I do have direct experience as a person living in affordable housing in Richmond and working for a local non-profit that serves this community. I have a 4-year degree from UVM, and have lived in Chittenden Cty. since college; and in Richmond since 1998 when I moved from a substandard house-share of 3 adults for 13 years in Shelburne in order to acquire enough room to continue running my small side business doing litigation video support, and finally be able to live alone. Champlain Housing has served me very well in all regards, and I cannot say enough positive things about where I live.

One of the main reasons I initially expressed interest in the Housing Cmte. is that in my observance of town meetings that occasionally tackle the topic of "affordable" housing in Richmond, I observe members of various boards & commissions, as well as developers seeming to have no real idea of what the term "affordable" means when it comes to housing in our town. All members appear to be long-time homeowners with mortgages, not renters. I am shocked when I hear what kinds of rents are paid to private landlords in this town, and others in this county. Every day I see hardworking, single-parent families, and retired fixed-income neighbors who are fortunate enough to have safe, stable, quality housing in a great neighborhood, in this very community-oriented town. The only thing missing in Richmond is more rental units that people making \$25/hr. or less can afford. My neighbors include a RFD employee, a retiree who donates tons of time to OCCC, a BIPOC single-parent, several small families in 1-4 child households, a disabled elderly lady, and more. There is a waiting list to get into these units, for good reason. As an aside, several years ago in a contract position, I interviewed Section 8 tenants for a HUD study on income-certification standards and implementation through various Public Housing Organizations all over northern and central VT. It gave me a clearer understanding about what kinds of tenants, in what kinds of circumstances, rely on affordable housing.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and my neighbors, as well as other people hoping to live in Richmond and enjoy its charms and opportunities that are middle-income at best, please acknowledge receipt and review of this letter of interest, and advise me of my status as a candidate to the committee. I believe I have a perspective that is not well-represented that may be of use to the group, and a willingness to share it with them in pursuit of finding policies and solutions.

Sincerely,

Ruth E. Miller

[81 Borden St.](#)

[Richmond, VT 05477](#)

802-399-7296 cell

vtvidiot@gmail.com



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Re: New Town of Richmond Housing Committee

1 message

Jackie Pichette <18turtles@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 22, 2020 at 8:51 PM

To: rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Hello Ravi,

I'm interested in participating on the Richmond Housing Committee. I have lived in Richmond since April 2000 and have experience as a tenant, homeowner, landlord and most recently, as I am in the process of divorce, I'm faced with the challenge of finding housing in our school district that is affordable on one income.

I feel that Richmond is a lovely place to live and to raise children, not to mention its an ideal geographic location for work, commerce and recreation. Simultaneously, I see disparity in the Richmond community; a significant socio-economic divide on which I feel we can affect a 'closing of the gap' by finding ways to offer more affordable housing, not just for low-income residents but also single people who prefer not to have roommates. I think that people should have opportunities to live in a nice area like Richmond, in nice housing that they can afford and still be able to grow their savings accounts, pay their bills on time and enjoy the local amenities. I think a thriving, vibrant, diverse and inclusive community is dependent upon opportunities within the community for its citizens to thrive. A big piece of thriving is having access to well-kept and affordable housing.

My professional background is in Human Services, specifically with Howard Center serving adults with Developmental Disabilities and/or Autism in both direct service and management roles. I recently made a partial career change and am the owner of Loon Song Healing, LLC based out of Advance Wellness on Huntington Road, where I offer Massage Therapy and Reiki.

If you have further questions about my interest or qualifications please feel free to contact me by phone at 802-734-2479 or at this email address.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jackie Pichette



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Housing Committee

Virginia Clarke <vclarke@gmavt.net>

Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 11:11 PM

To: Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Ravi:

I would like to apply for a seat on the newly forming Housing Committee. As a member of the Planning Commission I will be able to provide the Committee with a necessary liaison to the planning board as we work to incorporate housing policy and, in particular, the provision of affordable housing into our municipal documents.

Thank you for your consideration.
Virginia Clarke



Ravi Venkataraman <rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov>

Housing Committee

mlfausel@aol.com <mlfausel@aol.com>
To: rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 5:44 PM

Hi Ravi,
This is my letter of interest.
As discussed, let me know if I'm needed/recommended.
Thanks,
Mark
Sent from my Verizon LG Smartphone

Zoning changes RE 24 VSA 4413 7.16.20

1.2 A Zoning Permit must be issued prior to the commencement of any land development, unless regulated by 24 VSA 4413 as described in section 5.1.2 of these regulations.

2.4.5 **Uses regulated by 24 VSA 4413, including agriculture and silviculture; and 24 VSA 248, public utilities** –These uses shall be regulated as per section 5.1.2 of these regulations.

5.1 No land development may be commenced in the Town of Richmond without a zoning permit issued by the Administrative Officer, except as regulated by 24 VSA 4413 and 24 VSA 248 as described below. Please note in section 5.1.1, a review of the proposed development is required even if no zoning permit is needed. In section 5.1.2, the issuance of a zoning permit shall be in conformance to 24 VSA 4448 and 4449.

5.1.1 Land development regulated by 24 VSA 4413 for which a zoning permit is NOT required:

- a) **Agricultural uses**, including the development of farm structures -- In addition to State Statute 24 VSA 4413, the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets (VAAFMM) regulates these uses and should be consulted. As per these documents, applicants proposing to develop a farm structure shall:
 - i) confirm that they qualify as a farm and are operating under Required Agricultural Practices (RAPs),
 - ii) ensure that the proposed structure is at least 50 feet from adjoining surface waters. Additional setbacks may be required for waste storage facilities.(see VAAFMM regulations).
 - iii) ensure that the proposed structure complies with municipal setbacks or a waiver has been granted by VAAFMM.
 - iv) notify the Richmond Zoning Administrator of the proposed structure, including a sketch of the structure, and setback measurements from adjoining road rights-of-way, property lines and surface water.
 - v) If the proposed farm structure will be constructed in a Flood Hazard Area and/or River corridor, or will disturb one or more acres of land, applicants must obtain a permit from the Agency of Natural Resources prior to construction.
- b) **Forestry uses**, including silviculture and other forestry operations – In addition to 24 VSA 4413, these uses are regulated by The Agency of Natural Resources and the Vermont Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation. Any forestry use that involves logging, shall adhere to the “Acceptable Management Practices for Maintaining Water Quality on Logging Jobs in Vermont” published by the Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation.

[I am trying to find out if we can require notification for forestry uses if structures are or are not involved – would structures have to comply with these regulations? should neighbors be notified? setbacks from property lines? Also, is silviculture different from forestry operations?]
- c) **Public Utility** power- generating plants and transmission facilities – In addition to 24 VSA 4413, these uses are regulated by 30 VSA 248.

5.1.2 Land development regulated by 24 VSA 4413 for which a zoning permit IS required.

For the following uses, site plan approval (for uses allowed in a district) or conditional use approval (for uses allowed conditionally in a district) shall be required before a zoning permit can be issued as per sections 5.5 and 5.6 of these regulations. However, these uses may be regulated only with respect to their location, size, height, building bulk, yards, courts, setbacks, density of buildings, off-road or highway parking, loading facilities, traffic, noise, lighting, landscaping and screening, and only to the extent that such regulations do not have the effect of interfering with the intended functional use.

If any of the following uses, with the exception of (a), is proposed to be located within the Flood Hazard Overlay District of these regulations, the land development shall be regulated by section 6.8 of these regulations, as long as the regulations do not interfere with the proposed functional use.

- a) State- or community-owned and operated institutions and facilities
- b) Public and private schools and other educational institutions certified by the Agency of Education
- c) Churches and other places of worship, convents and parish houses
- d) Public and private hospitals
- e) Regional solid waste management facilities certified under 10 VSA 159
- f) Hazardous waste management facilities for which a notice of intent to construct has been received under 10 VSA 6606a

~~5.10.4~~ *[omit]*

TO: Richmond Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: July 30, 2020

SUBJECT: Discussion of received requests for zoning changes

Based on the input Planning Commission members provided in response to the discussion on the list of priorities during the July 15, 2020 meeting, I concluded that the commission has voted to pursue zoning changes based on the requests from the Farrs, the Cochrans, and the Development Review Board (DRB).

From my understanding based on prior conversations with Ashley Farr and the Planning Commission, the request by the Farrs is to have the allowance for self-storage uses on their property on Huntington Road.

I'm not familiar with the request from the Cochrans, and will need guidance from the Planning Commission regarding this matter.

From my understanding, based on the October 30, 2019 joint Planning Commission and Development Review Board meeting (these meeting minutes are enclosed for your review), the DRB had the following recommendations for ordinance revisions:

- Revise Section 5.4 (Subdivision Regulations)
- Revise Subdivision Regulations regarding review processes
- Revise Definitions that require additional clarity
 - One specific item: lack of clarity regarding a “Steeply pitched roof” under Section 6.6
- Revise PUD regulations
- Revise Section 5.9 (Accessory Dwellings)

I recommend that the Planning Commission takes on the zoning revision tasks one-by-one. Some of the requests overlap with the current work of revising regulations within Richmond Village, including:

- Regulatory changes to the Farrs' parcel
- PUD regulations – Section 4.5 states that “There shall be only one Principal Structure on a lot and there shall only be one use on a lot, unless the lot is part of a Residential PUD or PUD as specified in Section 5.12.” This could potentially inhibit or discourage mixed-use development in areas the Planning Commission hopes to encourage mixed-use development. As an aside, I also think that the town's PUD standards could be more robust, in order to give applicants a better sense of the flexibility they have.

48 Planning Commission or Selectboard remained silent, or overlooked relevant issues in
49 the specific wording of the ordinances. Specifically, he noted that in the case of the
50 interim zoning for Jolina Court the DRB felt it had to make judgmental decisions that
51 they were not entirely comfortable making, especially as the developer was actively
52 building as the decisions were being made in the review process. Both Anand and Cole
53 indicated that all of us have been uncomfortable with the unusual nature of this special
54 interim zoning situation. Sunshine expressed his appreciation that our efforts to deliver
55 a clearly written zoning ordinance for Jolina Court would go a very long way in assisting
56 the DRB in discharging its responsibilities.

57
58 Cole: clearly in the future the Planning Commission would like to get our proposed
59 revisions to the DRB well before we entered the formal adoption phase so that the
60 Selectboard would have a clear understanding as to the preferred desires of both the
61 PC and the DRB.

62
63 Cole requested whether or not members of the DRB had any other specific examples of
64 where the PC could improve things for the DRB? Sunshine's immediate response was
65 to indicate that the DRB would like to streamline the approval hearing process in the
66 sub division regulations, moving from three hearings to two. Thus he envisions the
67 process as demanding the petitioner to participate in a "preliminary hearing" and then a
68 "final hearing." Not only would this simplify the process for petitioners, it would also
69 serve to put the applicants on notice that they MUST follow standard procedures. In
70 addition, it would serve to save the applicant time, fees, and frustration—and this is
71 currently a major source of frustration and complains from petitioners. Cole inquired if it
72 was section 5.4 of the current subdivision regulations that Sunshine was noting?
73 Sunshine: "yes."

74
75 In reference to this, Mantegna stated that Hinesburg currently has three meetings in its
76 zoning regulations: (1) Sketch; (2) Preliminary; and (3) Final. Petersen interjected that
77 the key is to have clarity in the regulations as to what the DRB requires in an application
78 so that petitioners know exactly what is required of them at the very start of the process.
79 Cole said that we clearly should examine and compare Hinesburg's regulations as we
80 seek to update ours. Clarke noted that section 5.4 needs to be refined and updated as
81 one of our first steps after Jolina Court draft is finished.

82
83 Sunshine then indicated that sooner than later a number of problematic issues and
84 areas need to be addressed, and that perhaps we could schedule another joint session
85 so we can think about and discuss the most pressing problem areas in the current
86 regulations. He also noted that most of the DRB problems arise in the most densely
87 populated areas of the town.

88
89 Cole, Clarke, and Petersen, all stated that definitions are very often one of the most
90 problematic aspects of the regulations. Fausel noted that we should turn more
91 frequently to the "Red Book" in order to streamline and standardize the definitions we
92 include in our revised regulations. As an examples Sunshine raised the definition of
93 "professional offices," asking if this is meant to mean only offices staffed by those
94 professional with official certification, or does it simply mean "all" offices? As another

95 definitional example, Moules raised the question of PUDs as another example in section
96 5.12 where applicants have flexibility, yet in section 5.2.12 there arises a confusing
97 conflict.

98

99 At this point, Parke suggested that the formation of a joint subcommittee might be very
100 useful in identifying and screening the most important and pressing topics or issues.
101 Cole immediately initiated such a subcommittee, with Parke, Fausel, and Anand
102 volunteering from the Planning Commission, member(s) from the DRB to be determined
103 at a later date.

104

105 Cole asked if there were any additional problematic areas:

106

107 -Moules: tall structures in section 6.0.6, What is the definition of “steeply pitched
108 roof?”

109 -Dyer: accessory dwellings in section 5.9.1d, there is much confusion in what the
110 regulations actually say and how we should interpret this section, i.e. for
111 example what should be the maximum percentage in relation to the state
112 regulations on this matter?

113 -Petersen and Dyer: Air b-n-b is also an issue (Cole noted that the PC plans to
114 engage the broader community in a discussion of this issue in the near
115 future).

116

117 Cole closed out the joint session by indicating that a detailed review of the current Jolina
118 Court draft and the compilation of a “red-hot” list of the DRB’s most pressing issues and
119 concerns would be a great place for the newly formed joint subcommittee to start its
120 efforts. Sunshine thanked the Planning Commission for organizing this session and
121 noted that Mantegna would distribute the most current draft of the Jolina Court proposal
122 to the DRB members

123

124 **3. Administrative Items:**

125

126 Cole asked for motions to approve the minutes from 5/1/19; 5/9/19; 5/15/19; 5/22/19;
127 6/5/19; and 10/16/19. Clarke suggested that we approve all in one motion, so moved,
128 Parke seconded, unanimous approval.

129

130 Cole indicated that he and town manager Josh Aronson were in the process of
131 negotiating a contract with Jessica Draper for part time support of the Planning
132 Commission until her replacement was hired. Interviews of candidates for the position
133 should begin shortly, Cole stated he would keep us updated as the process progressed.

134

135 Fausel encouraged members to re-read the 2012 proposed zoning changes as there
136 were many sound suggestion in that document that might be included in our current
137 efforts.

138

139 Parke raised the issue of our need to simultaneously engage in discussions about some
140 long-range planning issues such as future traffic flows and possible congestion from the
141 Jolina Court development necessitating a second exit from the site; the possibility of

142 creating a transportation hub at the town center complex with additional parking on
143 Jolina property; the possibility of securing purchase options on property abutting the
144 town center; and a review of new town plan in order to establish priorities for our
145 planning efforts.

146
147 Cole meetings of the newly formed transportation committee are open to the public-he
148 encouraged interested members to attend.

149
150 Cole—issues for the remaining 15 minutes?

151
152 **4. Jolina Court Zoning Amendment Update from Selectboard**

153
154 Clarke, we need to get this section done! Following is what the Selectboard seems
155 ready to adopt:

156
157 -Uses: three categories—allowable; allowable with site plan; conditional use
158 the selectboard seems ready to accept the revisions we recently made in each
159 of these categories.

160
161 -Residential density: 15 units/acre, above OR below the main floor (i.e. can be in
162 the basement provided relevant fire codes are met). Main floor reserved for
163 commercial use (i.e. NO residential dwellings).

164
165 -Lot coverage: maximum 80% of the entire 6 acre parcel.

166
167 -Building height: maximum 35 feet; 32 feet to window sill for fire code.

168
169 -Compatibility of all buildings on the site: (Cole noted we should highlight this to
170 the DRB).

171
172 -New definitions: main floor; residential use+ dwelling units and residential
173 services.

174
175 Cole-members should read the Selectboard's most recent draft of the Jolina Court
176 Zoning Regulations before our next meeting. In addition, hopefully we will fill the
177 planner position with a full time candidate soon.

178
179 Cole call for a motion to adjourn? Tellestone, so moved, Granda, second, unanimously
180 approved at 9:08 pm.

181
182 Respectfully submitted: Parke

183
184
185

List of Future Priorities (From 2/5/2020 PC Meeting):

- Correct the Village Downtown Zoning District
- Address recommendations from the DRB
- Address request from the Farris for a self-storage facility
- Address request from the Cochran's
- Address the Town Plan Implementation items
- Revise the Gateway District regulations
- Address short-term rentals
- Strategize for engaging the Richmond community and gaining their input
- Address housing affordability
- Integrate stretch code into the zoning regulations
- Establish subcommittees, such as housing subcommittee
- Incrementally update the zoning regulations
- Develop renewable Energy siting standards (Section 248)
- Establish Unified Development Ordinance
- Modify the zoning map (after the commission gains public input)

Items Staff recommends pursuing in addition to the abovementioned items:

- Adopt inclusionary zoning policies, or affordable housing bonuses
- Consider applying for the Downtown Designation program to promote growth in the downtown area
 - Benefits of state designation programs: Reduced Act 250 review and fees, additional grants, and priority for grants
 - Richmond currently has a Village Center designation
- Establish a Design Review District and become a Certified Local Government
 - Benefits: Increases access to funding to protect historic resources in town
- Put in place Tactical Urbanism standards (To fulfill ED 1,5 and 4,4)
- Integrate SmartCode into zoning regulations to foster sustainable development and walkable neighborhoods

Other ideas worth considering

- Additional PUD standards to protect core forests, prime ag soils, other natural resources, and trail networks, as well as to encourage the clustering of development

Difference Between Form-Based Code and Historic Preservation Standards

	Form-Based Code	Historic Preservation Standards
Definition	A form-based code is a land development regulation that fosters predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organizing principle for the code. A form-based code is a regulation, not a mere guideline, adopted into city, town, or county law. A form-based code offers a powerful alternative to conventional zoning regulation. (from Form-Based Codes Institute at Smart Growth America)	Historic preservation standards are guidelines for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction of historic structures, sites and districts in order to maintain the character and heritage of such structures and places. Generally, guidelines are non-regulatory, because, as noted in <i>The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic of Historic Properties and Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings</i> , it cannot provide case-specific advice, address exceptions or unusual conditions.
Objectives	Regulate the built environment based on size and scale of buildings, which in return promotes uniformity, and a certain streetscape form	Protect existing historic buildings and landscapes—including influencing the aesthetics of nearby buildings to protect the interpretation of historic buildings and sites—in order to maintain history and heritage of a community.
Regulatory basis	24 V.S.A. 4414 (as Zoning)	24 V.S.A. 4414 (Under Design Review Districts, and Local Historic Districts)
What's included?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Form-based codes are incorporated into the zoning regulations. - Five elements: (1) regulating plan showing the areas form-based code applies and which form standards apply; (2) public realm (sidewalk, street, open space) standards with specific, pinpointed design elements; (3) building standards, with specific parameters for configurations, articulations, and uses; (4) a clearly defined review process; and (5) Definitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A survey identifying the historic resources in the municipality, with notes on its style, uses over time, and significance to the community - An ordinance recognizing the Historic Preservation Commission; the Certificates of Appropriateness process; design criteria and guidelines; a demolition delays clause that would allow communities to negotiate a solution to prevent the demolition of historic resources; a clause for claiming economic hardship; and the enforcement and appeals processes. - Local design guidelines that clearly identify the historic character of the area, and methods and approaches the community encourages and discourages.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inherently supposed to streamline the permit process due to clear and reliable design standards - Inherently supposed to be shorter and thus easier to comprehend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to additional funding to preserve historic resources - Provides standing to municipalities for federal projects that trigger Section 106 Review, if historic resources are within the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allows for more flexibility for uses within a building, as regulations are supposed to be building-specific, not use-specific - Supposed to make streets fully multi-modal and complete 	<p>scope of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides standing for the community when reviewing projects involving identified historic resources or buildings within the historic district (which would be unavailable in DRB or administrative review if no clear regulations and standards for historic preservation are in place) - Review is conducted by professionals in historic preservation, archaeology, history, architecture, or related professions - More influence building aesthetics and materials—so long as it aligns with the historic character of the district
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The prescribed building form can be seen as too rigid, and does not promote the diversity of form in areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Starting up a historic preservation committee is resource intensive, because it involves surveying existing historic resources - The review process may be viewed as too onerous, especially for small projects (like, a fence built by a homeowner).
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shelburne - South Burlington - Newport - Winooski 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shelburne - Williston - Stowe (See pages 117-130) - Montpelier (here and here) - List of Certified Local Governments and respective ordinances