8.6.25 meeting memo PC

***Agenda item #4***

After thinking about this, I would like to make the argument that having 3 different kinds of PUD’s is cumbersome, unnecessary and different from what other ordinances use. I think Chris is correct in thinking that there is just one **PUD** procedure that allows for modifications of dimensional standards etc., but in general adheres to each district’s requirements for both **residential density** and **uses** (our ordinance actually says this)**.**

What we can do if we wish to vary the **uses** from the uses that are allowed in a particular district (the default) is to have a special call-out when we wish to do that. For example: in the VRNN district, a PUD could only consist of residential uses because those are the only uses that are allowed in that district. This is the default, and a special call-out is not needed. However, in the HDR district, for example, there are lots of commercial uses allowed, so if we wished to restrict PUD’s in that district to residential uses, we would put that stipulation in the “call-out” section of the PUD section. It would still just be a PUD, but with an added requirement about uses. If we wished to restrict the residential uses of a PUD in the VC district to the 2nd floor and above, that would be a special call-out as well In my draft of this idea, subsection 5.12.8(e) is the “special uses call-out section.”

This is a simpler way to handle the previously identified conflict. There is no such defined “thing” as a “Residential PUD.” If we want to talk about such an entity we can say “a PUD that contains only residential uses.” We will still need to debate where call-outs are needed. In the A/R district, for instance, we have many allowed commercial uses. Do we want to restrict PUD’s to only residential uses as our current ordinance requires (why) ? In the meeting materials I have put a chart, as Mark suggested, of the districts where our PUD use requirements differ from the default (of the district’s allowed uses), and I have also included the revised subsection 5.12.8(e) We can decide if these are what we want.

***Agenda Item #5***

As you know, CCRPC has produced a new FLU map, based on the land use categories mandated by the legislature’s Act 181. We are in the process of updating our Town Plan, which also contains a FLU map, the “fuzzy map.” Do we want to use CCRPC’s map and categories in our new 2026 Plan? Our map must be “compatible” with the regional map, it doesn’t have to be exactly the same, but would it be useful for us to have them be the same? At our meeting we will look at the 2 maps and the land use categories used, and see if there are any pros and cons. I am also working with the Natural Resources people (Conservation Commission, ACFC, etc.) and the Steering Committee to see what they think. It might be easier in a way, as it would assure us of CCRPC’s approval.