

Richmond Planning Commission
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FOR September 2, 2020

Members Present: Scott Nickerson, Virginia Clarke, Jake Kornfeld, Brian Tellstone, Alison Anand, Mark Fausel,
Members Absent: Chris Cole, Joy Reap, Chris Granda,
Others Present: Ravi Venkataraman (Town Planner/Staff), Marshall Paulsen, Ashley Farr, Cathleen Gent

Virginia Clarke opened the meeting at 7:02 pm.

2. Adjustments to the Agenda

Clarke revised the agenda to switch items 3 and 4.

4. Public Comment for non-agenda items

Clarke asked if the public had any comments. Marshall Paulsen said he had no comment on non-agenda items. Ashley Farr said he had no comment on non-agenda items but may have comments on item #5 based on the content of the discussion.

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Jake Kornfeld, seconded by Scott Nickerson to approve the August 19th, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Voting: 6-0. Motion passed.

5. Discussion on rezoning the Richmond Village

Clarke provided an overview of the Planning Commission's tasks of reviewing locations and expanse of the zoning districts. She said that the Planning Commission should compare and contrast the regulations for the Residential/Commercial and Village Commercial Districts in order to determine the need for establishing new districts, and, if so, to define the parameters of the new zoning district.

- a) Identification of the exact locations of the current zoning districts—in particular: the Commercial Zoning District

Clarke and Venkataraman identified the Commercial, and Village Commercial Districts on the current zoning map.

- b) Comparison of purpose, uses, dimensional requirements and limitations, and "other requirements" between the Village Commercial, Commercial and Residential/Commercial Zoning Districts

Clarke pointed out that the purpose statements of the Village Commercial and Commercial Districts are identical. Clarke continued by noting similarities and differences between the Village Commercial and Commercial Districts, and concluding that there aren't many differences between the two districts. Clarke posed questions on how to rezone the Commercial District in the village—or if it's even necessary because the district is already built out. Clarke identified the similarities and differences between the Residential/Commercial and Village Commercial Districts. Clarke said that the key difference between the two districts is the phrasing of how residential or commercial uses are allowed

48 within the respective districts, and therefore she asked if the language serves the same purpose as a
49 compatibility requirement. Clarke said that the Village Downtown and Jolina Court Districts have
50 language on compatibility standards. Venkataraman said that applying language regarding character of
51 the area would not hold up in review in front of the DRB or in court. Venkataraman added that language
52 about the character of the area in a compatibility and a purpose statement serve as a bridge between
53 the Town Plan and the regulations by explaining how the Town Plan is being applied to the ordinance.
54 Clarke said that based on the character of the area standards in the Village Downtown and Jolina Court
55 Districts, the amendments to zoning districts within the Richmond Village will have form-based code
56 components to further define the character of the area. Clarke said that the uses in the
57 Residential/Commercial District focus on residential uses, and that its dimensional requirements are
58 similar to the High Density Residential District. Mark Fausel said that regarding the compatibility
59 language in the Village Commercial and Residential/Commercial Districts, the Residential/Commercial
60 District is oriented towards residents, many structures in the Village Commercial District are not
61 neighborhood-oriented, and that he likes the idea of keeping the notions separate wherever applicable.
62 Alison Anand concurred with Fausel, and said that the homogeneity between the
63 Residential/Commercial and Residential areas should be recognized and kept. Anand added that
64 commercial-oriented buildings should be recognized as well, the Planning Commission should be
65 cognizant to the current scenario of more people working from home, and that the zoning categories
66 could be simplified. Clarke cited the mixture of residential and commercial uses in the Round Church
67 area and along Railroad Street, concluding that many areas of the village are already mixed use areas
68 and have been for a long time. Marshall Paulsen requested that the Planning Commission consider the
69 light and sound impacts of future allowable uses on the neighboring residential areas, as the
70 compressor units on the Richmond Market have an impact on nearby residential areas. Venkataraman
71 said that sound and traffic models may not match the actual sound and traffic levels of a project, and
72 that a solution could be to allow the DRB to review sound and traffic impacts after a project is developed
73 in order to mitigate any sound or traffic issues that were not measured, as a part of Conditional Use or
74 Site Plan Review. Clarke said that sound and light are issues that are in a different part of the
75 regulations. Fausel said that the Richmond Market project received a waiver, and proper enforcement
76 needs to be considered. Clarke said that the overall goal of rezoning is to foster a walkable village,
77 southern portions of the village are at a walkable distance from the village center, and that adding more
78 commercial uses to the southern portion of the village makes sense. Clarke asked Ashley Farr for
79 comments. Farr said that the Planning Commission should consider allowing more commercial uses
80 and more flexibility for his parcel as well as the southern portion of the village. Clarke said that there
81 were discussions on allowing more multifamily housing, similar to the development on the corner of Farr
82 Road and Huntington Road, and that the commission hopes to address the current housing shortage.
83 Anand asked if Farr preferred commercial uses over residential uses. Farr said he was looking to
84 develop a commercial use in the future because it would have less impact on the farm, compared to
85 residential uses. Cathleen Gent asked about the proposal for the draft map. Clarke overviewed that the
86 commission is considering expanding commercial uses to the burgundy areas on the map. Gent said
87 that the Planning Commission should think through the rezoning process as some areas would be
88 better for commercial uses and some areas would be better for residential uses. Gent asked about
89 implementing design standards. Fausel said the commission has had discussions on design standards
90 and need to discuss the details. Clarke said that the commission is committed towards implementing
91 design standards. Clarke asked if Scott Nickerson or Jake Kornfeld had any comments. Nickerson said
92 he had none. Kornfeld asked about the public's experiences with the zoning regulations. Farr said he
93 has not come across major zoning issues, but restrictions are in place, and that flexibility would give him
94 and his family more options for the future. Fausel asked if Farr would like the entire farm to be
95 categorized as Village Commercial, or only portions of the farm. Farr said that he is open to ideas but
96 opening the parcel to more flexibility would be better in the long term, but would not want to lose the
97 ability to run agricultural uses. Anand asked Farr if Thompson Road at one time extended to Huntington
98 Road. Farr said yes, and that the road can be easily found on the property. Anand asked if the road
99 were to be redeveloped, could more residential areas be developed too without much detrimental effect
100 on the farm. Farr said this would be possible as there would be a natural barrier, the grade of this road
101 would be steep, and town water and sewer should be extended to serve these possible developments.

102 Gent said that the Planning Commission should consider what it envisions for the parcel when it is
103 discussing the rezoning of the parcel. Gent added that for southern portions of the village, topography
104 and existing lot sizes would constrain the developability of parcels. Clarke asked if Farr considered
105 development via PUD regulations. Farr said yes, and that the proposals he has received did not seem
106 to be a proper fit. Clarke said that the performance standards may need to be revised instead of the
107 uses. Anand asked if the commission has received any particular zoning change requests. Clarke said
108 no, and that the commission may receive input based on their outreach efforts. Clarke asked if anyone
109 had additional comments. Venkataraman said that he invited the historical society to speak during the
110 next Planning Commission meeting.

111
112 c) Examination of the current zoning regulations for the High Density Residential Zoning
113 District to facilitate a discussion of how a Village Neighborhoods Zoning District might
114 differ from the High Density Residential Zoning District

115
116 Clarke overviewed the location and regulations of the High Density Residential District, and asked the
117 commission about the need for creating a Village Residential District. Nickerson said that the
118 commission should consider unique regulations for the High Density Residential and Village Residential
119 Neighborhoods Districts so that the Village Residential Neighborhoods District could retain unique
120 characteristics separate from the rest of the High Density Residential District, but that dimensional
121 requirements would remain the same. Clarke said she didn't understand the correlation between density
122 and the capacity of existing lots to hold density. Fausel suggested that areas north of I-89 could have
123 more flexibility with allowable uses. Clarke concurred with Nickerson's point on severability. Clarke
124 identified the extent of the High Density Residential District. Clarke asked about the application of PUD
125 requirements. Nickerson said he was thinking that PUD requirements would be triggered for multifamily
126 uses in the proposed Village Residential Neighborhoods District. Clarke asked Nickerson if the intent of
127 unique regulations is to prevent multifamily dwelling uses in the Village Residential Neighborhoods
128 District. Nickerson said no, that is not the intent. Venkataraman said that there could be the possibility of
129 multiple primary structures on a lot in the village depending on which form-based code aspects are
130 adopted. Clarke said that the commission will consider multifamily dwelling uses to not trigger PUD
131 requirements and asked Nickerson for any concerns. Nickerson said that such changes would change
132 the character of the Village Residential Neighborhoods compared to parcels north of I-89. Fausel said
133 that such amendments would be influential along Jericho Road, and other areas of town that can
134 accommodate infill development. Venkataraman said that the water/sewer lines end just south of I-89
135 and expansions of those lines would depend on various factors. Fausel concurred with Clarke that the
136 areas north of I-89 as High Density Residential are not a major concern, and that the focus should be on
137 the village. Clarke asked Fausel if residential areas in the village belong in the High Density Residential
138 District. Fausel said that the High Density Residential District currently is conservative and that he would
139 like to take portions of West Main Street out of the High Density Residential District and keep the
140 remainder of the High Density Residential District as is. Nickerson concurred, saying that the
141 commission should keep the interests of the neighborhood in the background while addressing higher
142 priorities.

143
144 **6. Other Business, Correspondence, and Adjournment**

145
146 Clarke called attention to the memorandum received from the Town of Jericho on housing regulations,
147 and said that the Planning Commission should consider the changes in the Town of Jericho zoning
148 regulations in the Town's rezoning considerations. Venkataraman said that he read through the
149 memorandum, and saw that it was about expanding senior housing allowances and electric vehicle
150 charging stations. Clarke said that along with this memorandum, she would like to further discuss the
151 difference between density and lot size. Clarke told the Planning Commission that the Housing
152 Committee met for the first time last week. Fausel told the Planning Commission that the Recreation

153 Committee met on Monday. Clarke said that the commission should check in with other boards and
154 commissions on their progress with their Town Plan goals. Fausel said that for future meetings he
155 would like to hear from people from the southern portion of the village and off Cochran Road.
156
157 Motion by Tellstone, seconded by Fausel to adjourn the meeting. Voting: unanimous. Motion carried.
158 The meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.
159
160 Respectfully submitted by Ravi Venkataraman, Town Planner