

1 **Richmond Planning Commission**

2 **Regular Meeting**

3 **January 20, 2010**

4 ***Approved Minutes***

5
6 **Members Present:** Gary Bressor (Chair), Lou Borie (Vice-Chair), Lauren Esserman, Mark Fausel, Gary
7 Holman, Jake Ide, Dan Renaud

8 **Members Absent:** None

9 **Others Present:** Cathleen Gent (Town Planner), Brandy Saxton (Consultant), Alison Anand

10
11 **7:00 PM** Call to order by the Chair.

12
13 **Public Comment:** None.

14
15
16 **Municipal Planning Grant FY09: Work Session**

17 Saxton joined the Planning Commission for the work session.

18 *Zoning Districts*

19 The Planning Commission first reviewed the draft zoning district map pertaining to the two rural zoning
20 districts, Rural 3 (R-3) and Rural 10 (R-10). Saxton explained the standards used to draw the district
21 boundaries. Borie said that the R-3 and R-10 districts are meant to be two distinct types. The R-3 district
22 is along roadsides, more settled areas in rural settings. The R-10 district covers more remote areas, less
23 settled, tend to be larger lots and contribute to wildlife habitat. Esserman said that she thinks the Snipe
24 Ireland Road should be in the R-10, not the R-3 district, because the area is important for natural
25 resource protection. She also said that the 1000 foot area along roads for the R-3 district is arbitrary.
26 Saxton said that, in cases where the line goes across a lot, she used the 1000 foot boundary, unless the
27 lot line was close (then she used the lot line). Fausel suggested looking at the Bolton and Jericho zoning
28 district maps to see the maximum lot sizes for districts which correspond to Richmond's Snipe Ireland,
29 Stage Road, and Wes White Road. Holman said it is difficult to understand the rationale for why the
30 districts are delineated as they are. Saxton said that road capacity is one factor. The Planning
31 Commission made changes to the district boundaries for Snipe Ireland Road, Stage Road, and Wes
32 White Road. Saxton will revise the map accordingly.

33
34 The Planning Commission then discussed the Article 2 draft language for the R-3 zoning district. Some
35 suggested changes were offered for the "Character" section. The Commission then discussed the
36 dimensional standards. They agreed with the draft density, lot size, lot frontage, lot coverage, road
37 setback, property line setback, and footprint for principal structures. The commission will discuss the
38 building height standard again after they have reviewed the definition of "height." Gent will talk with Fire
39 Chief Tom Levesque about the building heights that can be handled with fire equipment. The
40 Commission decided that, for accessory structures, the front setback should be 30 feet and agreed with
41 the draft language for property line setback, height, and footprint for the accessory structure. The
42 commission then discussed development standards. Saxton said that the "shall" statements are required
43 and the "should" statements are recommended. The commission offered several changes to the
44 development standards. The commission then discussed the subdivision and PUD requirements and
45 decided that a PUD is required when three lots at any one time or five lots within a five-year period are
46 proposed.

47
48 The Commission discussed the density calculation requirements for the R-3 district, but did not make any
49 decisions regarding the draft language.

50
51 As the Conservation Commission liaison to the Planning Commission, Anand asked the Planning
52 Commission for input as to how the Conservation Commission can help with the zoning re-write work.
53 The Planning Commission indicated that it will be helpful for the Conservation Commission to participate
54 in the February 17th public session and to review the draft regulations in March.

55
56 Saxton and Anand left the meeting at 10:00 PM.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Other Business

Town Planner Report

No updates to the Town Planner Report were offered.

Meeting Minutes – for January 6, 2010 – The Planning Commission postponed action until next meeting.

Mail – Ide reviewed the mail.

Executive Session: Town Planner Evaluation

Because he will not be participating in the town planner evaluation due to family connections, Bressor left the meeting at 10:20 PM.

A motion was made by Holman, seconded by Esserman, to go into executive session to discuss personnel matters.

Gent left the meeting at 10:30 PM.

The Planning Commission came out of executive session at 10:45 PM.

Esserman made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Fausel. The meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Cathleen Gent, Town Planner