

5.17.23 Planning Commission meeting memo

Agenda #5 A request has come in from Michelle and Zachary Beal for zoning that would allow housing in the I/C district. As one of the Planning Commission's goals in our updating of the RZR has been to remove regulatory barriers to creating additional housing to address the housing crisis, this presents an opportunity to do just that. The simplest fix, of course, is just to amend the I/C allowed uses to include dwellings.

However, there is also the opportunity to address some other issues with the I/C and the C districts and update these sections of the RZR at the same time as increasing housing. There are several features that suggest to me that these 2 districts be combined into 1.

Proposal: combine C and I/C into one C district and allow residential uses.

Some features about these two districts:

location

- Both are mostly clustered around Exit 11
- Outlying portions:
 1. I/C -- Kenyon Rd gravel pit (5.6.6? – should be 5.6.5 – now nearby housing)
 2. C -- Portion of VYCC on E Main St/Rt 2 (agricultural and on-farm businesses)
 3. C -- Small section of Jonesville (R/C better?)
 4. C -- Round Church Corners Complex (we would like to make that Village Commercial?)
 5. C – parcel NR0151 (this is a 3A mobile home lot per parcel viewer)

uses

- Almost all allowed uses are allowed in both districts
- The 3 uses allowed in I/C but **not** in C:
 1. Equipment service and repair (no definition in RZR – but equipment supply and/or rental and powered vehicle and/or machinery uses allowed in both districts)
 2. Communications and telecommunications (actually also allowed in C as per 6.12.4)
 3. Mobile homes sales business (no definition in RZR – but the I/C is located next to MHP district, so why not have sales? Also C allows auto and boat sales)
- There are several uses allowed in the C but **not** the I/C: (I don't think there are any of these currently existing in the C district)
 1. Artist/craft studio
 2. day care center
 3. inn or guest house
 4. museum
 5. religious use
 6. educational facility
 7. funeral parlor
 8. group home
 9. retirement community
 10. rooming or boarding house (do we have these anymore?)
- there are no allowed dwelling uses in either district (there are existing dwellings in both districts)
- neither district lists residential PUD (PRD) as an allowed use, however in 5.12.2 (a) a residential PUD is allowed in the I/C district

other parameters

- dimensional – see chart – not much difference
- no residential density in either (no housing)
- no other differences
- no municipal W&S in either and not likely in foreseeable future

SO: Why don't we combine these two districts into one called "Commercial" with all the uses from both existing districts (cleaned up), plus add to uses:

- permitted:
 1. single unit/ family
 2. duplex
 3. Multiunit buildings 3-4 units
 4. 2 principal structures on a lot
 5. Multiple use building w/ permitted uses
- Conditional:
 1. Multiunit building 5+ units
 2. Multiple use building w/ conditional
 3. (Our new definitions?)

We can compromise on the dimensionals.

We could visit the areas involved to understand the neighborhood better.

We could consider changing the RCCC area from "Commercial" to "Village Commercial"

List of Uses in C and I/C (in packet)

Dimensional parameters of C and I/C (in packet)

Agenda #6

S. 100 has been approved by the legislature and likely will be signed by the governor. Jana will come and answer questions for us at a June meeting. Meanwhile, we should figure out what we need to know.

See summary by Office of the Legislative Counsel 2 May 2023

Some ways we will be affected:

- Must allow multiunit dwellings of up to 4 units wherever municipal W&S
- Must allow for 5+ U/A wherever municipal W&S if residential use allowed (5 U/A = 8,712 sf/unit)
- Can't require >1 parking space / dwelling unit wherever municipal W&S if residential use allowed

Here are a few quotes from the 45 pages of S. 100:

"In any district that allows year-round residential development, duplexes shall be an allowed use with the same dimensional standards as a single-unit dwelling. In any district that is served by municipal sewer and water infrastructure that allows residential development, multiunit dwellings with four or fewer units shall be a permitted use, unless that district specifically requires multiunit structures to have more than four dwelling units."

“In any area served by municipal sewer and water infrastructure that allows residential development, bylaws shall establish lot and building dimensional standards that allow five or more dwelling units per acre for each allowed residential use, and density standards for multiunit dwellings shall not be more restrictive than those required for single-family dwellings.

(13) In any area served by municipal sewer and water infrastructure that allows residential development, bylaws shall permit any affordable housing development, as defined in subdivision 4303(2) of this title, including mixed use development, to exceed density limitations for residential developments by an additional 40 percent, which shall include exceeding maximum height limitations by one floor, provided that the structure complies with the Vermont Fire and Building Safety Code.”

“§ 4382. THE PLAN FOR A MUNICIPALITY

(a) A plan for a municipality may shall be consistent with the goals established in section 4302 of this title and compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region and with the regional plan and shall include the following:

* * * (10) A housing element that shall include a recommended program for addressing low and moderate income persons’ public and private actions to address housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission pursuant to subdivision 4348a(a)(9) of this title. The program should use data on year-round and seasonal dwellings and include specific actions to address the housing needs of persons with low income and persons with moderate income and account for permitted accessory dwelling units, as defined in subdivision 4412(1)(E) of this title, which provide affordable housing residential development as described in section 4412 of this title”

I have added my interpretation of these concepts into the next draft of the neighborhoods for us to discuss.

VRNN draft #10 (In packet)

VRNS draft #10 (in packet)