

**Town of Richmond**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
AGENDA

Wednesday, June 2nd, 2021, 7:00 PM

Due to restrictions in place for COVID-19, and in accordance to Act 92, **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](mailto:rvenkataraman@richmondvt.gov).

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88419874605>

Meeting ID: 884 1987 4605

Join by phone: (929) 205-6099

1. Welcome, sign in and troubleshooting (7:00 pm)
2. Adjustments to the Agenda
3. Public Comment for non-agenda items
4. Approval of Minutes
  - May 19, 2021
5. Reorganization Meeting - Election of Chair and Vice Chair
6. Update on Zoning For Affordable Housing project
7. Discussion on Village Commercial, Residential/Commercial Districts, and Village Residential Neighborhoods North District
8. Discussion on State Permits and Nonconforming Lots
9. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment (9:00 pm)

**Town of Richmond**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
*ANNOTATED AGENDA*  
Wednesday, June 2nd, 2021, 7:00 PM

*\*My notes are in italics.*

1. Welcome, sign in and troubleshooting (7:00 pm)
2. Adjustments to the Agenda
3. Public Comment for non-agenda items
4. Approval of Minutes - May 19, 2021
5. Reorganization Meeting - Election of Chair and Vice Chair

*Per statute, a chair must be elected annually. There is no formal process for appointing chairs and vice chairs.*

*Draft motion to facilitate action: I, \_\_\_\_\_, move to appoint \_\_\_\_\_ as the chair/vice chair of the Richmond Planning Commission.*

6. Update on Zoning For Affordable Housing project

*Consultant Brandy Saxton has finalized two surveys: (1) [for Richmond residents](#); and (2) [for non-residents](#). The survey has been distributed via Front Porch Forum, and various boards/committees/organizations within town. I encourage you to distribute the survey to your neighbors and people you may know.*

7. Discussion on Village Commercial, Residential/Commercial Districts, and Village Residential Neighborhoods North District
8. Discussion on State Permits and Nonconforming Lots
9. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment (9:00 pm)

*To facilitate future conversations about accessory dwellings, I have included two documents for your consideration:*

*(1) "Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) How-to Checklist" from Vermont Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) - This is a general checklist DHCD prepared for ADU applicants. Most of the items in the checklist will apply in the Richmond context.*

*(2) "The Definitive Guide to Renting in Vermont" from Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity (CVOEO) and Vermont Apartment Owners Association - Typically, zoning does not include regulations on renting--especially in regard to landlord-tenant relations. In Vermont, rental housing is covered under 9 V.S.A. Chapter 137. In addition, Vermont Division of Fire Safety and (to an extent) Town Health Officers have jurisdiction for regulating rental units. Based on this information, I would advise steering clear of regulating rental agreement terms via zoning.*

*I have also included the "Planning Timeline for Sewer System Expansion into the Gateway District". Bard Hill gave me this document to give to you. Additional information on this subject can be found on the Water/Sewer Commission page on the Town website: [Water and Sewer Commission Meeting Documents - Richmond, VT \ Richmond, VT - Our Town \(richmondvt.gov\)](#)*

## Table of Contents

### 4. Approval of Minutes

- Page 5: May 19, 2021

### 7. Discussion on Village Commercial, Residential/Commercial Districts, and Village Residential Neighborhoods North District

- Page 9: Discussion document on Village Commercial Zoning District, prepared by Virginia Clarke
- Page 11: Discussion document on Residential/Commercial Zoning District, prepared by Virginia Clarke
- Page 14: Discussion document on Village Residential Neighborhoods North Zoning District, prepared by Virginia Clarke
- On standalone documents: Draft zoning maps
  - "DraftZoning\_North1.pdf"
  - "DraftZoning\_North2.pdf"
  - "DraftZoning\_North3.pdf"
  - "DraftZoning\_South.pdf"

### 8. Discussion on State Permits and Nonconforming Lots

- Page 16: Memorandum on Zoning Amendments
- Page 17: Draft zoning regulations on Nonconforming Lots
- Page 18: Draft zoning regulations on State Permit References

### 9. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment

- Page 19: Planning Timeline for Sewer System Expansion into Gateway District
- On standalone documents:
  - "Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) How-to Checklist" from Vermont Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD)
  - "The Definitive Guide to Renting in Vermont" from Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity (CVOEO) and Vermont Apartment Owners Association

Richmond Planning Commission  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FOR May 19, 2021

Members Present: Chris Cole, Virginia Clarke, Chris Granda, Caitlin Littlefield, Joy Reap, Jake Kornfeld, Mark Fausel, Alison Anand

Members Absent:

Others Present: Keith Osborne (Zoning Administrator/Staff), Lisa Miller, Trish Healy, David Healy, Allen Knowles, Huseyin Sevincgil, Tom Frawley

### **1. Welcome and troubleshooting**

Chris Cole called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.

Keith Osborne introduced himself to the Planning Commission.

### **2. Adjustments to the Agenda**

Cole and Chris Granda acknowledged that item 8 is to be removed from the meeting agenda.

### **3. Public Comment for non-agenda items**

None

### **4. Approval of Minutes**

Motion by Granda, seconded by Caitlin Littlefield, to approve the May 5, 2021 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.

### **5. Discussion on Accessory Dwelling Units, State Permits, Nonconforming Lots**

Clarke asked the commission about their opinion about Section 5.9(e) and the definition of "habitable floor area". Cole asked about the commission about removing the owner-occupancy requirement and allowing both dwelling units to be rented. Granda said that enforcing owner occupancy of the units is difficult and that he is not aware of issues around large-scale absentee ownership in town. Clarke said that the town does not have a rental policy. David Healy said that he is opposed to removing the owner occupancy requirement, that there are other policies in place that are not enforceable but followed on principle, and that expanding the allowance would lead to absentee ownership. Joy Reap said she was torn on this issue and accepts the need for housing in town. Reap asked how many accessory dwelling units are within Richmond Village. Healy said he was not sure, and noted the differences in impacts of accessory dwelling units in village and non-village settings. Reap asked about converting garages into accessory dwelling units.

Fausel provided background on the previous changes to the accessory dwelling unit allowances and owner occupancy, and the commission's intent at the time to prevent absentee landlords and to promote regular maintenance. Fausel said that the committee acknowledged that accessory dwelling units would aid new homeowners in affording their home, as they would be able to rent a unit. Fausel said that he favored keeping the policy as-is with the owner or family member living in either the single-family dwelling or accessory dwelling unit.

Kornfeld noted that the discussion has been focused on generational wealth and home financing, not access to housing in itself; that if the commission wants to improve the equitable access to housing, it should expand allowances and allow for more flexibility; and that in this current era, generating capital to purchase a house is difficult, leading to renters renting for longer terms than the commission assumes. Cole recognized that housing costs in Vermont are high, and said that the town had a decent amount of rental housing based on the amount of rental housing in the village. Fausel said that the owner occupancy policy promotes both homeownership and rental housing, as it allows a homeowner to be able to afford the house by renting the accessory dwelling unit. Kornfeld said that renter-occupied single-family dwellings would be ineligible to host an accessory dwelling unit if the town were to require owner occupancy. Cole said he was concerned the loss of home-ownership units, and that he has seen the loss of home-ownership units in South Burlington due to upzoning via accessory dwelling units. Allen Knowles asked for clarification about Cole's comment on housing quality, and said that his projects on East Main Street are evidence that quality does not need to be sacrificed for rental units. Reap asked if adding an accessory dwelling unit on a house in the village would be held to the same standard as duplexes and additions. Clarke said that single-family dwellings are allowed an accessory dwelling unit per statute. Cole made note of Reap's comment at a previous meeting about the difficulty of obtaining financing for an accessory dwelling unit. Clarke found that placing restrictions on who can rent a particular housing type to be discriminatory, considering that no such restrictions on other housing types are in place. Alison Anand said that the intent of the policy was to house family members and to allow joint family structures to live on the same property, and that the actuality changed over time. Anand said she had mixed feelings about this policy proposal, and that the commission may want to leave the policy as-is. Fausel said that the change to allow more family members to reside in accessory dwelling units.

Granda asked the commission about enforcing the current regulations. Osborne said that he is unaware of past enforcement actions toward violations of residency requirements. Clarke suggested including language that would allow a tenant to stay in the property for a period of time if the ownership changed. Granda said that he agreed with Healy's prior comment on policies that are not enforceable, and that in this instance, he questions the basis for including the owner occupancy requirement.

Cole asked Clarke about next steps. Clarke suggested tabling this item to another meeting. Cole agreed.

## **6. Recap on Village Commercial and Residential/Commercial Districts**

Clarke overviewed the questions listed in the handout in the packet. Cole suggested reviewing the questions in order, starting with the designation of the Goodwin-Baker Building. Sid Miller accepted that the area surrounding the Goodwin-Baker Building is residential, noted past concerns about the possible inclusion of low-income housing within the building, and said that the office uses work well and that having the allowance for housing could be helpful. Miller asked for clarification about light manufacturing uses. Clarke read the definition of light manufacturing and said that light manufacturing could be a suitable use as a conditional use within the building. Miller said that he is leaning towards designating the building as the Residential/Commercial District and that he could envision a suitable light manufacturing operation within the building. Miller said that he received inquiries about using the building for wholesale distribution, that interest waned because the site is not suitable for the activity, and that the building has the potential to be residential considering the residential nature of the surrounding area.

Cole asked the public and the commission for comment. Anand said that the building should be designated as Residential/Commercial. Trish Healy asked if the commission had to make the decision this evening. Clarke said that additional conversations on this item are required. Healy said that her desire is to have the building remain commercial and not to have it become residential. Fausel asked for specifics about her reasoning. Healy said that he she owns rental property on Baker Street. David Healy said that historically the neighborhood was centered around the Goodwin-Baker Building as its commercial hub, and that he had concerns about the traffic impacts of residential uses. Clarke clarified the differences

between Commercial and Residential/Commercial Districts in terms of uses, and that the allowed uses in the Commercial District would have higher traffic impacts compared to residential uses. Granda said that from his experience on the Selectboard and Planning Commission, he noted that the decrease in demand in commercial spaces is real, and that zoning should enable reasonable use of the property based on the current reality. Reap said that residential uses would probably generate less traffic compared to the current usage of the property.

Fausel discussed the density limitations per the current and proposed zoning. David Healy asked if mixed use was an option and said that mixed use was a preferable option. Reap said that the proposed zoning for Residential/Commercial allows for less units than the current zoning. Clarke asked the commission if it wants to allow for additional units through an additional permitting process.

Cole asked for comments about the uplands section of the Farr property. Clarke said that based on prior meetings, the Farris wanted flexibility to use their property. Anand fielded concerns from nearby business owners about housing in the subject area, and that if the commission were to expand its residential area, the subject area would be the logical choice to place housing. Clarke overviewed the current conditions and uses.

Cole asked the commission if it wanted residential uses in the Commercial District and said that based on previous conversations, it was concluded that the Commercial District should not include residential uses. Reap asked if items could be voted upon during the next meeting.

## **7. Presentation and Discussion on Richmond Mobil Gas Station Redevelopment Plan**

Huseyin Sevincgil overviewed the Richmond Mobil Gas Station project, highlighted that they had considerably scaled back the project scope, and asked the commission on how they should proceed. Cole asked if the mound in the northern part of the property would be removed. Sevincgil said it would depend on the potential impacts to the floodplain, and that impacts to the floodplain would necessitate removing the mound to improve flood storage. Tom Frawley said that a wetlands specialist consultant attended the last meeting, and that the project has received a wetlands permit from the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation for their previous larger proposal. Frawley said that the project has issues with the definition of "Automobile Service Station" as well as the wetlands buffer. Frawley said that conversations with the town to extend the sewer service line are progressing, that considering the benefits of the project, he hopes that the zoning issues can be addressed, and that their proposal would conform to the industry's standards.

Fausel asked about the floodplain on the property. Sevincgil identified the 306-foot contour, said that further analysis for flood storage is needed, and that their intent today is to receive feedback from the commission. Cole asked for clarification on the buffers. Sevincgil identified the wetland buffers, and clarified the 306-foot contour.

Clarke asked about stormwater management and how the proposed use would differ from the existing use. Frawley discussed food service within the proposed use. Sevincgil said that they will need to look into onsite stormwater management further. Littlefield asked if their project will include restoring the wetland and removing invasives. Frawley said that this is on their list to consider and was identified by the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation. Anand praised the design. Cole said that he did not see much of a change in use with the proposal and that he has to tease out the buffer encroachment issue.

## **10. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment**

Motion by Reap, seconded by Granda to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

### **Chat Log**

00:32:52 Lisa Miller: I have a question - what was the original intent for creating the accessory structure statute in Richmond? Was it to house relatives, was it to increase affordable housing, was it to increase density, etc?

01:05:23 Joy Reap, Planning Commissioner: CAN WE PUT THIS DOC UP ON SCREEN?

01:05:56 Joy Reap, Planning Commissioner: THANKS

01:42:01 Trish: Thank you for listening to our opinions. Trish and David Healy

**For Discussion: PC meeting 6.2.21**

**Village Commercial ZD**

**Proposed Area: (see map)**

1. most of Railroad St – including RHS/ lumber yard & Grocery Store, and Richmond Rescue and beyond
2. Round Church Corners Complex

**Proposed Purpose:** The purpose of this district is to retain and encourage commercial activities within the central village area, to allow for changing needs within the commercial sector and to promote the possibility of walking between dwellings and commercial services. Retail, wholesale, and light manufacturing activities that meet performance standards, as well as service sector businesses will be allowed. Parking, pedestrian and biking facilities will be provided. Greenspace and screening standards that will keep the district attractive to residents and visitors will be encouraged when feasible.

**Features:**

- Diverse businesses, services and light industrial uses located in or near the center of town but outside the residential neighborhoods
- Designated for a busy mix of moving pedestrians and vehicles

**Permitted uses:**

Multiple permitted uses may be permitted on a lot.

- Artist/craft studio
- Automobile or engine repair services
- Bank
- Catering
- Commercial multiuse building
- Educational
- Equipment supply or rental (CU if outdoor storage)
- Funeral parlor
- Hotel or motel
- Light manufacturing
- Museum
- Office, professional or medical
- Personal services
- Pharmacy
- Pub or tavern
- Religious facility
- Retail sales
- Recreation, indoor or outdoor
- Research lab
- Restaurant
- State or community-owned facility
- Theater
- Veterinary Clinic

**Conditional:**

Multiple conditional uses, or conditional and permitted uses, may be allowed on a lot with conditional use review.

- Automobile or marine sales
- Brewery
- Car wash
- Gasoline fueling station
- Lumber yard/building supply
- Outdoor storage as accessory to any allowed use
- Warehouse facility (any indoor storage use including self-storage, wholesale, distribution center)
- (adaptive use)
- (PUD)

**Dimensional Standards:**

Height: as in section 4.12

minimum lot size: 1/4A

lot shape: as in current

lot coverage: 50%

lot frontage: 75'

setbacks:

front 5' - 25'

side: 10'

rear: 10'

Other requirements:

All lots shall be served by municipal water and sewer

Parking and loading: as in section 6.1

*EV charging parking space requirement (?)*

*Utilize on street or shared parking when available and feasible (?)*

Traffic impact: as in current

*Sidewalks and bike lanes shall be provided when feasible or as needed for pedestrian or bicycle safety*

Signs: as in section 5.7

*Sections 5.7.4 and 5.7.5 will need to be rewritten*

*Greenspace and street trees shall be provided when feasible to maintain and enhance a desirable village appearance and reduce urban pavement heating effect*

**For Discussion -- PC meeting 6.2.21**

**Residential/Commercial ZD**

**Name** – Residential/Commercial Zoning District

**Proposed Area: – (see map)**

North of river:

- current (both sides of E. Main St; both sides of Bridge St from Railroad St to Volunteers' Green/river)
- 2 parcels next to Greensea on south side of E Main St
- 6 parcels next to MMCTV on south side of W Main St
- 4 parcels on north side of W Main St Ski Express to Millet St
- 4 parcels on Depot St
- 4 parcels on south side of Railroad St
- west side of Jericho Rd from the ski shop to School St
- east side of Jericho Rd from the Harley Brown building to Burnett Ct
- Goodwin-Baker building/ Millet St?

South of river:

- O'Brien block ("A" on attached map)
- Farr uplands ("B")

**Proposed Purpose** – The purpose of this district is to allow residential and residential-compatible commercial uses to coexist in a traditional village center, with housing of varied types in moderate density and flexibility of commercial and residential building uses. The district encourages walkability between residents, businesses, and community amenities.

**Features:**

- residential-compatible commercial uses on the main arterials to promote economic vitality,
- increased and varied housing opportunities, including multi-family structures,
- "mixed use" structures that will allow more flexibility in use of property to meet changing needs in commercial real estate and live/work strategies,
- increased walking, biking and public transit options both within and into the village area to meet climate change and livability goals,
- street trees, landscaping and green space to keep the village attractive for residents and visitors,
- plentiful gathering spaces and recreational opportunities to meet community needs

**Permitted Uses:**

- accessory dwelling
- accessory structure or use, except outdoor storage
- arts/craft studio
- bank
- bed and breakfast



- setbacks for accessory structures including accessory dwelling unit, (but not including fences)
  - front = no closer to front of lot than 10' behind front of principal structure
  - side – 10'
  - rear -- 10'
- **maximum building footprint: 10,000sf**

**Development standards:** ( also called “compatibility,” “character of the neighborhood” or “design standards”) These standards are intended to insure compatibility between residential and commercial uses and retain a traditional village appearance.

- Principal structures shall have windows and principal entrance facing the road and shall have windows on all sides facing inhabited properties
- Front façade >50' of new principal structure shall be broken down into a series of smaller facades that incorporate changes in color, texture, materials or structural features
- Sloping roofs shall ensure that falling snow or ice does not endanger pedestrians.
- Front and side setbacks that are not covered with impervious surfaces should be vegetated, and landscaping and/or screening shall be required for outside storage, parking and loading areas, or if needed to protect privacy of residents or neighbors
- new streets serving multiple lots shall be connected in such a way as to have multiple points of ingress and egress
- curb cuts shall be shared when feasible
- sidewalks shall be required for all new streets with the goal of pedestrian connectivity with the center of the village
- bike lanes shall be installed where feasible
- utilities/mechanicals shall be located to the rear of the building
- garage doors shall be located to the rear or side of the building, or set back from the front as for accessory structures ( see above)

**Other requirements :**

- all lots shall be served by village water and sewer
- parking and loading: as in section 6.1
  - ✚ *residential parking shall have 1 space per dwelling unit for multifamily dwellings*
  - ✚ *on-street or shared parking shall be used when available and feasible*
  - ✚ *parking shall be behind or to the side of the principal structure*
  - ✚ *parking areas for >2 cars shall be landscaped or screened from view from the road*
  - ✚ *EV parking/charging shall be required (?)*
- traffic impact: as current
- signs: as in section 5.7
  - section 5.7.3 will likely need to be rewritten*

**Village Residential Neighborhoods North ZD** FOR DISCUSSION PC meeting 6.2.21

**Area: (see map)**

This district is comprised of the following areas: Pleasant St; Baker St and Tilden Ave; Church St; Esplanade; Borden St; Burnett Ct; Brown's Ct; portions of Jericho Rd, W Main St and Lemroy CT

**Purpose:**

The purpose of the Village Residential Neighborhoods District is to provide residential neighborhoods of moderate density within walkable proximity to the services and amenities of the center of Richmond village.

Features of this district include:

- housing clusters that function as cohesive units where neighbors know each other and often provide mutual support and assistance,
- traffic is minimal and driving speeds are low in most neighborhoods,
- sidewalks and crosswalks provide pedestrian safety and connectivity, and nearby bike lanes allow for safe cycling routes to schools, parks, town services, nearby trails and public transit options,
- street trees, backyards and green spaces provide natural amenities,
- housing types may be varied, including single family and multifamily dwellings, and accessory dwelling units may provide additional housing.
- the appearance of these neighborhoods will be residential.

**Permitted Uses:**

- Accessory dwelling
- Accessory structure or use, except outdoor storage
- Family childcare home
- Group home
- Home occupation
- Single-family home
- Two-family home (duplex)

**Conditional Uses:**

- Large home-based childcare facility
- (adaptive use)
- (residential PUD)

**Dimensional requirements:**

- Minimum lot size: 1/4A
- Maximum lot coverage: 40%
- Minimum lot frontage: 75'
- Minimum lot shape: must contain a point from which a circle with a radius of 25' can be inscribed within the boundary of the lot
- Building setbacks from lot lines:

Front: principal structure

minimum = 10'

maximum = 25'

accessory structure or dwelling

minimum of 10' behind front of principal structure

Rear: any structure

minimum = 10''

Side: any structure

minimum = 10'

- Height: as in section 4.12

**Other Requirements:**

One principal structure per lot

Served by municipal water and sewer

Parking: as current

*with addition of 1 EV-ready (Level 1) accessible parking space required per lot(?)*

Signs: as current

(traffic impact, access: omit)

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner

DATE: May 28, 2021

SUBJECT: Discussion on Zoning Amendments

Items under consideration

For your consideration, I have enclosed:

- Draft language regarding nonconforming lots, as previously discussed, and
- Draft language regarding state permit references, as previously discussed,

Recommendations for Action

If you are satisfied with the enclosed draft language, I recommend that you move to warn a public hearing for June 16, 2021.

To facilitate action, I have prepared the following draft motion:

*I, \_\_\_\_\_, move to warn a public hearing for July 7, 2021 on the amendments to the Richmond Zoning Regulations Sections 3.8.5, 4.6, 5.2.1, 5.6.2, 5.6.3, and 5.8*

## 4.6 Nonconforming Lots

**4.6.1 Existing Small Lots** - ~~In accordance with the Act [§4412(2)], a~~Any lot that is legally subdivided, is in individual and separate and non-affiliated ownership from surrounding properties, ~~that is legally~~ in existence on June X, 2021 may be developed for the purposes permitted in the district in which it is located, with exception to lots as described in Section 4.6.1.1, even though the small lot no longer conforms to the minimum lot size requirements of the respective district in which the lot is located ~~on the Effective Date of any Richmond Bylaw may be developed for the purposes permitted in the Zoning District in which the lot is located, even though the lot does not conform to minimum lot area requirements of the Zoning District.~~

4.6.1.1. For existing small lots which are not served by municipal water and sewer service, and are unable to connect to municipal water and sewer service, land development may be permitted if said existing small lots have both of the following dimensional requirements a) At least one-eighth (1/8) acre in area; and  
b) A width or depth dimension of at least 40 feet.

~~. Notwithstanding this exception to minimum lot area requirements, no Zoning Permit shall be issued for Land Development on an existing small lot unless such Land Development complies with all other provisions of these Zoning Regulations.~~

State permit references

### 3.8.5 Other Requirements Applicable to Lots in the MHP District

~~d) State Approval of Mobile Home Parks—No Zoning Permit may be issued for Land Development within a mobile home park unless satisfactory evidence is produced to the DRB that all applicable state laws and regulations relating to Land Development have been met.~~

#### 5.2.1 [Application, Fees, Reimbursement for Technical Review]

~~d) State Permits - All required state permits shall be a part of and made a condition of each local permit. Unless otherwise required, state permits may be obtained after local permits. In no case shall a project or use commence without all necessary state water and wastewater and local permits. Local permits do not absolve the applicant from obtaining applicable state and federal permits, and the applicant is responsible for obtaining relevant state and federal permits. The applicant should contact the regional permit specialist employed by the Agency of Natural Resources for additional information on related state permits.~~

#### 5.6.2 [Conditional Use Review Specific Standards]

~~d) Applicable state permits for water supply and sewage disposal shall have been obtained, and any other applicable state permits, before the use commences. e) d) ...~~

~~f) e) ...~~

~~g) f) ...~~

~~h) g) ...~~

~~i) h) ...~~

~~j) i) ...~~

~~k) j) ...~~

#### 5.6.3 Performance Standards

~~h) Industrial wastes shall be so stored and removed from the lot in manners as to not be reasonably objectionable to adjacent lots or create a public nuisance, or pollute the environment. These shall be stored within a structure.~~

~~i) All uses shall comply with all Federal and State laws and regulations for the use, storage, hauling and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes.~~

~~h) No fire, explosive or safety hazard shall be permitted that endangers public health, safety or welfare, public facilities, or neighboring properties; or that results in a significantly increased burden on municipal facilities and services shall be permitted.~~

~~i) No radioactive emission or other hazard that endangers public health, safety or welfare, public facilities, or neighboring properties; or that results in a significantly increased burden on municipal facilities and services shall be permitted.~~

~~j) The storage of any highly flammable liquid in above ground or below ground tanks shall comply with applicable provisions of these regulations and all applicable state and federal regulations. All hazardous materials shall be stored within a structure. j) k)...~~

### 5.8 Boundary Adjustments

~~5.8.4 State Permits—All state permits must be approved prior to submission of application and state permit numbers must be included on the application.~~

~~5.8.5-5.8.4 New Lot Configuration 5.8.6-5.8.5 Appeals~~

Row #

**Planning Timeline for Sewer System Expansion into Gateway District**

Draft as of 5/20/21

Changes since the 5/7/21 version are in red

Item	Goal Completion Date	Status	Notes
RFQ for Engineers		Completed	
Review of timeline with Green Mountain Engineering	2/25/2021	Completed	
Submit to Priority List	2/25/2021	Completed	
Phase 1a Cost	2/25/2021	Completed	Jericho Rd. to Reaps
Phase 1b Cost	2/25/2021	Completed	Village to Reaps
Phase 2 Cost	2/25/2021	Completed	Reaps to Synerpic Health
Phase 3 Cost	2/25/2021	Completed	Synerpic Health to Mobile Home Park
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>3/1/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Meet with Thomas Brown on funding options and Mobile Home Park interest and desired timeline for construction	3/5/2021	Completed	CWSRF does not offer a subsidy for Mobil Home Parks unless the Mobile Home Park is in a designated growth center or the MHP septic system has failed
Explore USDA Funding Option	3/11/2021	Completed	There may be some subsidy, or at least lower interest rate, for Phase III if income in Mobile Home Park service area is low enough to qualify.
Clarify how financing/subsidy would work for construction conducted in phases over several years.	3/15/2021		
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>3/15/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Discussion with attorney regarding process to expand water and sewer district.	3/23/2021	Completed	One vote needs to be held to include residents in current district and in the proposed area of expansion.
Determine if Reaps, Mobil Station, and/or Mobile Home Park are interested in water service.	3/31/2021		
Discussion with Peter Brown regarding lack of substantial subsidies for the project and voting requirements.	3/31/2021	Completed	
Ask attorney if we need a new bond vote.	4/1/2021	Completed	A new bond vote is prudent.
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>4/5/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Adjust boundary line between Phase II and Phase III such that Phase II would include Mobil Station	4/7/2021	Completed	Request has been made to GME. GME will update their work on the PER to include this change.
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>4/19/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Create map of current district and verify with attorney	4/30/2021	Completed	
Water and Sewer Commission to approve map of current Water and Sewer District	5/3/2021	Completed	
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>5/3/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Clarity of CWSRF Subsidy for Construction	5/5/2021	Completed. Application has been denied.	
CWSRF Priority List will be released	5/14/2021		
Meet with Reaps and Mobil Station to discuss their desired timelines for construction	5/15/2021		
Water and Sewer Commission to recommend CWSRF planning loan application be signed by the Selectboard.	5/17/2021	Completed	
Selectboard sign CSWRF planning loan application	5/17/2021	Completed	
Updated map to show proposed expansion area and define parcel IDs included in this area	5/17/2021		
<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>5/17/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
<b>Annual Meeting</b>	<b>5/18/2021</b>	<b>Completed</b>	
Create draft rates based on original PER	5/21/2021	Completed	
<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>5/24/2021</b>		
Determine timeline and costs for holding special meeting to expand the Sewer District	5/31/2021		Timeline has been worked on. Cost estimates are pending.
Confirm 50% subsidy for PER	5/31/2021		We have been told we can get this. Will not be finalized until CWSRF loan application is completed.
Consult with Town attorney regarding allocation of costs to new users	5/31/2021		

7	Item	Goal Completion Date	Status	Notes
43	Determine if cost of PER will be borne by the new users	5/31/2021		
44	Guidelines for cost of private infrastructure for new customers	5/31/2021		
45	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>6/7/2021</b>		
47	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>6/14/2021</b>		
46	Contact State to inquire about how the new budget bill may benefit the project	6/15/2021		
48	Finalize Financing Structure	6/21/2021		
49	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>6/21/2021</b>		
50	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>6/28/2021</b>		
51	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>7/6/2021</b>		
52	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>7/12/2021</b>		
53	Preliminary Engineering Report Completed	7/14/2021		
54	Updated Engineering Estimates for all phases	7/14/2021		
55	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>7/19/2021</b>		
56	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>7/26/2021</b>		
57	Estimated flow per each Phase and Determine if there is a need to reduce septage received based on not exceeding 80% capacity	7/31/2021		
58	Determine incremental increase in O&M	7/31/2021		
59	Update Rate Structure	7/31/2021		
60	Re-Calculate fixed costs and variable costs and Increased customers	7/31/2021		
61	Re-Calculate rate structure based on estimated uses and usage in each Phase	7/31/2021		
62	Informational sheet for water and sewer district expansion vote	7/31/2021		
63	Check in with potential new customers in Phases I, II, and III to share updated costs and sample rates.	8/2/2021		
64	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>8/2/2021</b>		
65	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>8/9/2021</b>		
66	Decision point: Determine based on feedback from new users if we hold a bond vote and vote to expand water and sewer district? If answer is NO then determine how to move forward with water and sewer service to Reap property.	8/16/2021		
67	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>8/16/2021</b>		
68	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>8/23/2021</b>		
69	Potential date for Water and Sewer Commission to vote on recommending bond vote and vote on water and sewer district expansion.	9/7/2021		
70	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>9/7/2021</b>		
71	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>9/13/2021</b>		
72	Potential date for Selectboard to vote on passing resolutions to hold a bond vote and to hold a vote on water and sewer district expansion.	9/20/2021		
73	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>9/20/2021</b>		
74	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>9/27/2021</b>		
75	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>10/4/2021</b>		
76	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>10/11/2021</b>		
77	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>10/18/2021</b>		
78	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>10/25/2021</b>		

7	Item	Goal Completion Date	Status	Notes
79	Potential date to hold a bond vote and to hold a vote on water and sewer district expansion. If vote is NO then determine how to move forward with water and sewer service to Reap property.	10/26/2021		
80	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>11/1/2021</b>		
81	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>11/8/2021</b>		
82	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>11/15/2021</b>		
83	Decision point: Determine which phases (if any) go to bid for Construction?	11/15/2021		
84	Begin Final Design and Permitting	11/16/2021		This is a 6 month process
85	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>11/22/2021</b>		
86	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>12/6/2021</b>		
87	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>12/13/2021</b>		
88	Determine Coordination with Rt. 2 re-paving project scheduled to begin Fall of 2022	12/15/2021		
89	<b>Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>12/20/2021</b>		
90	<b>Special Water and Sewer Commission Meeting</b>	<b>12/27/2021</b>		
91	Proceed with bid for construction as necessary	1/15/2022		
92	Construction begins	Spring 2022		