

WATERBURY PLANNING COMMISSION

Approved Minutes

Monday, May 14, 2018

Planning Commission: Ken Belliveau, Chair; Mark Ray, Eric Gross, Mary Koen, Martha Staskus

Staff: Steve Lotspeich, Community Planner; Patti Spence, Secretary

Consultant: Brandy Sexton, Place Sense

Public: Alyssa Johnson, Economic Development Director; Dave Lachtrupp, Gristmill Builders; Kathy Grace, Resident; Judy Foregger, Mailiah Norton, Doug Foregger, Rob Foregger

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:03 p.m. at the Municipal Center at 28 N. Main Street

AGENDA REVIEW AND MODIFICATIONS

No changes were requested but a few additional topics were requested by Mary Koen under the Zoning Re-write item.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were none.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mary Koen moved and Eric Gross seconded the motion to approve the minutes of April 23, 2018, with changes.

Vote: Approved 5 - 0

WATERBURY ZONING REGULATIONS – RE-WRITE

Density issues and draft zoning map:

The updated draft zoning maps were reviewed. It was agreed to look at each residential and mixed residential district in the Village of Waterbury by neighborhood and come up with a reasonable density of dwelling units per acre. Steve agreed to analyze the proposed R-10 District area to the north of I-89 to inventory the range of existing housing density in these districts to delve in to this more deeply and to come up with a recommended density in the new zoning district(s).

A spreadsheet was handed out with the density calculations by district in the downtown area (using total acres, # of dwellings and calculating density) that Brandy prepared. Brandy used the information in the grand list to determine the dwelling units by parcel. Steve believes that the dwelling unit counts listed in the grand list are quite accurate because in most cases the number of units is linked to the sewer and water allocation for each property. This data was discussed with Brandy.

It was requested to put the wastewater service district boundary on the map that is currently the same as the Village of Waterbury boundary.

Martha asked what the current % of commercial vs. residential land and uses is in the downtown area in order to inform the discussion.

Brandy suggested we explore the “new neighborhood” program that is available through the State of Vermont that offers incentives for promoting density in these village areas.

Mary requested to see the Downtown Design Review Overlay District on the draft village zoning map. Steve thought we should compare this to the existing and proposed Waterbury Village Historic District boundary and consider expanding the Downtown Design Review Overlay.

Dave Lachtrupp asked about sending and receiving areas that can be involved with transfer of development rights (TDR). The current proposal for lot size averaging is a simpler alternative. It works well with sub-divisions where you are trying to cluster house lots in appropriate areas without an elaborate and more expensive Planned Unit Development (PUD) subdivision.

The Forregers spoke up on the proposed change from one unit per two acres to one unit per five acres in the Rural Zoning District which includes all of their property off Loomis Hill Rd. Currently all of their property is in the Mixed Use Residential zoning District tht has a density of one dwelling unit per two acres. The current Act 250 jurisdictional thresh hold of 10 lots within a 5 year period was discussed. The Act 250 process is becoming more stringent and expensive for large landowners when they subdivide their property and the development is under Act 250 jurisdiction.

Brandy addressed the proposed category of “land division” with administrative review vs. “sub-division” which required Development review Board review and approval. The way the review criteria and process differs was discussed. Steve offered to get a legal opinion through the Municipal Planning Grant funded project as to whether administrative “land division” is permissible under state enabling statute for subdivision review.

Kathy Grace asked about the 11 unit apartment building across from the fire station on Main Street and the associated setbacks. She raised a concern about the placement of propane tanks outside of buildings and the need for adequate setbacks for buildings in order to accommodate the required setbacks for the propane tanks. She submitted a letter regarding her concerns on density. She'd like to differentiate in the downtown area the flood area and the area not in the floodplain. The 100-yr floodplain boundary needs to be added to the zoning maps.

The zoning district descriptions and dimensional table needs to be revised to include the Planning Commission’s comments regarding the naming of districts needs to be cleaned up. (such as; General Business should be Industrial / Commercial. This was changed in some places and not others.

Sub-division standards

The current draft includes language on road standards, stormwater, underlying utility and infrastructure standards. There needs to be further discussion with our public works staff on these issues.

Design standards

Multi-family aligns with the use which is five or more units in one building. The five units for multi-family is consistent with other parts of the regulations. The draft doesn't specify design standards for any uses that are below five units.

Mixed Use

Apartments in a multi-use building need to be referred to more clearly. Add to definitions. The density in mixed-use – how does it recognize a tiny house? There is no minimum unit size in our regulations and tiny houses are dwelling units like any other type of dwelling unit.

Regarding the setbacks in the Dimensional table for the R 10 and R 5 Districts, Kathy Grace asked why they are so different. Steve offered to do some further analysis on this topic of setbacks looking at what the existing building setbacks are in these areas.

Historic buildings

Replacement requirements for historic buildings needs further review. The idea presented is the Re-write is to follow with levels of deviation that need to be determined. (3-27 to 3-33). The fact that a building is a contributing structure in the State and National Register of Historic District does not have regulatory authority by itself. The Planning Commission can recommend what the standards should be in the historic districts through zoning.

Signs

Steve summarized the legal review of the signs. It was agreed around the table that the town attorney's recommended edits be incorporated in to the draft sign regulations.

MUNICIPAL PLAN - REVISIONS

The schedule and tasks related to revising the Municipal Plan and getting it reapproved by December, 2018, was discussed. This process could include further review of the draft Energy Plan prepared by the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission.

Steve distributed a draft time line to work towards a completion of December 13, 2018. There was a rewrite in 2013 which was comprehensive. This upcoming revision needs to be in conformance with the regional plan. We need to address the state energy standards and forest fragmentation in order have a valid Plan. We can use the CVRPC plans and incorporate new language in the Municipal Plan as local revisions.

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS:

1. Bike lane on Route 100 – south of Shaw's and across the I-89 overpass. Ken discussed his communication with VTrans to have bike lanes marked across the slip lanes in the I-89 Exit 10 interchange area. This will be discussed with the Select Board and representatives from VTrans at the upcoming Select Board meeting.

Next meeting, June 11, 2018: Discuss revising the Municipal Plan including review of the draft Energy Plan and possible revisions to language relating to forest fragmentation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 09:23 pm

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Patti Spence".

Patti Spence

Secretary