

3.1.23 meeting memo

#5 – The documents included in the materials are the versions that we had arrived at after several meetings, public input sessions and work with Ravi. They predate the report from our housing consultant, Brandi Saxton, and our work on the two R/C districts, so there are lots of old and new questions that we should now ask about this work. Here are a few that occur to me as I look the documents over:

- Village north parcels are currently in the HDR – is it useful to create a separate district for the lots that are in the village?
- Village south parcels are currently in the A/R – is it useful to create a separate district for them?
- Should the village north and south be in **one** district, i.e. “village neighborhoods”?
- Do our revisions support, or are they supported by, the report of the housing consultant? Do they make the progress that we might like relative to the housing crisis? Do they strike the right balance between allowing for more housing (by removing regulatory barriers) and retaining the current residential density?
- Are there district-specific amendments introduced during our R/C work that should be incorporated here? How will any of our proposed R/C packet RZR amendments or definitions (if adopted by the SB) affect the neighborhood districts (Multifamily Housing Standards, for example)?

#6 – Short term rentals will be new ground for us. What kind of information will we need to have to start? Some questions that occur to me:

- Is it preferable to regulate by a stand-alone ordinance or through zoning? What is the process of creating an ordinance?
- At what point should we engage the public on this topic?
- Apparently there are bills that the state legislature is considering that include this topic. Likely we should be following this.
- Should we be looking at the regulations of the 14 other towns in VT (per article in *Seven Days*)?
- Should we consider requiring **registration** of short term rental properties?

#7 – Jake Flood from BTV has contacted me several times about this issue. I spoke with Matt Boulanger, planner in Williston, about the BTV issue, as they also have hills in the approach cone. He pointed me to the language in their regulations that seemed to satisfy BTV. This language seemed like it might suit our purposes, so perhaps we could settle on language similar to Williston’s (in the packet).