/5.21.25 meeting memo PC

**#6**:

At their 6/2/25 meeting, the SB will be directing us to increase the residential density allowance for the JC district. We don’t know exactly what their instructions will be, but they will likely be referencing the base residential density of the adjacent Village Downtown district, which is 24 U/A (developable). JC base density is currently 15 U/A (dev). We proposed allowing this to increase to a total of 20 U/A (dev) by means of the density bonus program. The density bonus program seemed to have some support, but the SB also seemed persuaded by the pro-housing arguments to increase the base density. They also seemed to like the idea of increasing the height allowance. Here are some possible scenarios to think about in advance, since we will only have one meeting in June. Let’s assume Buttermilk will put 6 units in the first floor of building 1 with tonight’s revision, and that they commence construction of building 2 after 7/1/27.

1. Increase base residential density to 24 U/A (dev) - no density bonus program – 72 total units for project , 20 in building(b) 1, could be 52 in b. 2 – even if we opt- in to 1B, no benefit to them if >50units – they might reduce to 50units if we opt-in to 1B as then no Act 250 -- – if we increased the height allowance by 1 floor, they could probably get 50 units into b. 2
2. Increase base density to 24 U/A (dev) and retain proposed density bonus program with a total allowed density of 30 U/A (dev) – would allow a total of 90 units for the project if all bonuses were utilized – Buttermilk might elect to stick with 50U if we opt-in to 1B and save the rest for future phases, or might bail on 1B by applying to make a larger b. 2 consisting of all 70 remaining units
3. A compromise might be to increase the base density to 20 U/A (dev) and keep the proposed density bonus program and allow a total residential density of 24 U/A (dev) – this would be like #1 if they took all the bonus units, but they could still have 60 units if they rejected all the bonus units

We can contemplate/mix and match these numbers. Two questions will need to be decided for the 6/2/25 discussion:

1. Do we opt-in to 1B?
2. Would we contemplate raising the maximum height for buildings, and if so, by how much? In all districts?

Two other related questions:

1. Is an alternate road through the FEMA buyout parcels actually possible? Is it desirable? Should we think about the possibility of a traffic light at the Jolina Ct / Bridge St intersection?
2. Should we publicize the SB’s 6/2/25 hearing to try to get a more diverse set of voices to weigh in on the density question?

**#7**

The Housing Committee is planning to recommend to the SB that Richmond opts-in to Tier 1B. I think this is an appropriate position for a housing committee, as this program was designed to remove barriers to housing development, and that is part of their mission. They were interested in the Planning Commission’s rationale for not opting-in.

**#8**

The deadline for initial comments on the map and housing targets turns out to be May 19th. I have emailed Maya Balassa saying our recommendations will be in by the end of May. She said they will consider them somewhere in the drafting or commenting process.

The Housing Committee is planning to recommend the following changes to the CCRPC new map:

1. Re-label Farr Farm 30A upland parcel on the Huntington Rd from “Rural Ag and Forestry” to “Transition”
2. Re-label Gov Peck Rd parcel beyond the GMP solar array, and the remainder of the Peet Farm adjacent to Sadler Meadow from “Rural Ag and Forestry” to “Rural General”

I have not heard anything from the Conservation Commission about the forestland designations. I have written to them asking for their recommendations ASAP. We should finalize our initial recommendations by tonight.

Both we and the Housing Committee have said that we think the housing targets are appropriate. The Housing Committee thinks we should aim for the middle target.