

4.17.24 meeting memo from the Chair

Aiming for about an hour on each of these two agenda items – goal is to identify any topics that need more work, and what that work would be. Hope to wrap up the VRN's very soon, and then Buttermilk.

5. VRNs

The main docs for this agenda item are as follows:

- VRNN (new Section 3.11)
- VRNS (new Section 3.12)

Then there are 5 short supporting pieces to clarify and define old or new terms in these sections, and also will be useful more broadly:

- Elder care and related terms
- On-ground improvements and related terms
- Update on parking as required by Act 47
- Revised multifamily housing development standards (6.13)
- Residential density explanatory section (6.14)

**We've been working on these for a while so I thought we should review the FAQ's:
(What problems are we solving with the VRN's?)**

Why are we making these 2 new districts? How were they zoned before?

- To protect these special residential areas that are contiguous with, and walkable to, the village center by identifying them as different from their current larger, more inclusive districts (taking VRNS out of A/R, and VRNN out of HDR)
- To make it easier to institute Act 47 changes in a targeted way (residential areas served by W&S infrastructure)

Why are we making a new definition of "elder care facility"?

- This allows us to select certain kinds of supported housing for which we have the public safety and other resources in place. Elder care facilities include nursing homes, hospice and assisted living designed to house a majority elderly population, and seems to have support in the community as opposed to the broader category of all supported housing.

Why are we making a new definition of "on-ground improvements"?

- When talking about setbacks and lot coverage there is often a confusion about whether parking areas and driveways and other man-made impervious surfaces are "structures" or not, and which regulations apply to them. This definition separates "structures" (man-made, above the ground) from "on-ground improvements" (man-made, on the ground) so they can be clearly regulated. For example, on-ground improvements are included in lot coverage, but are not included in setbacks.

- Always a goal to use the common, intuitive meaning of words when possible – a gravel driveway does not immediately register as a “structure.”

Why do we need an amendment to the parking section?

- Act 47 requires only 1 required parking space per dwelling unit in residential districts served by W&S infrastructure. Other districts allow us to set our own parking requirements, so we need to be able to differentiate between districts with and without W&S, which our current parking table does not. This seemed to us to be the simplest way to do this, in addition to placing this information directly into the affected districts (here, the VRN’s).

Why are we revising the Multifamily Housing Development Standards (Section 6.13) that we just put in place for the R/C districts?

- Our Zoning Administrator, Tyler, had occasion to use these standards and found them difficult to work with, so Keith and I reviewed them and discussed the purpose and wording of each item. The reason we adopted these standards was to make sure that multifamily buildings make good neighbors, and to ensure quality of life for the residents. Now that act 47 requires us to permit 3-4 unit multifamily buildings in the VRN’s, these standards will also apply here (in addition to the V R/C) and we wanted to make sure that these standards are what we want. These will also apply to the Jolina Court district, so this is part of our Buttermilk work as well. This section also applies to the rest of the RZR.

Why are we adding a new Section 6.14, “Residential Density”?

- “Residential density” is relatively new for our zoning, because multifamily housing and more than one residence on a lot has not been common here until recently. This concept really only entered our thinking with the JC and VD districts (with a couple of small exceptions). As we try to alleviate the housing shortage there will be more multifamily housing, ADU’s, duplexes etc, and we will need to understand the particulars of residential density, including such statutory efforts such as Act 47. This section will be an explanatory reference for these particulars. This section applies to the whole of the RZR.

6. Buttermilk

Same draft as last meeting – redline version (I hope)

Consideration of possible density bonus section 6.15

Consideration of 6.1.6 (n) “joint parking facilities” language:

“(n) Joint Parking Facilities – Joint parking arrangements may be approved by the DRB, provided that the Applicant has submitted legal documentation to guarantee continued long-term availability of said parking. Within any shopping center or other areas where joint parking has been established, the DRB may not approve any site plan amendments or

other use changes which would increase parking needs, or any waivers of parking requirements, until the Applicant has submitted proof of notice to all tenants or shared parking participants of the proposed change.”