

Bristol Planning Commission  
Meeting minutes, Holley Hall  
Tuesday, October 16, 2012

Board members present: Chico Martin, chair, Bill Sayre, John Elder, Kris Perlee, Ken Weston, Susan Kavanagh.

Others: Adam Lougee, ACRPC, Mary Arbuckle, NEATv.

Public: none

Chico called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.

Chico asked that as soon as the monthly meeting agenda is available to please have it posted on Front Porch Forum and also a printed version on the Holley Hall/Town Offices outdoor bulletin board (at the South Street entrance).

Ken moved to approve the minutes from the September 18, 2012 meeting, John seconded. No discussion. All in favor (6-0).

Chico reminded the commission that the Town Plan (final draft approved by the PC and by the SB with changes) would be coming up for a vote on Election Day, Nov. 6, 2012. Discussion about ways to make the draft more readily available to voters in the weeks leading up to the vote (shared by Town staff online on Front Porch Forum, printed copies and appendix at the Town offices, and at the library). Chico made clear that the final version represents a consensus of the PC.

Before returning to discussion of RA2, Chico called on Adam Lougee of the ACRPC to discuss a topic still related to RA5 which was started at the last meeting when the PC requested Adam return with options to consider for density based zoning in RA5. Adam provided a handout (attached) that included current non-density based standards and three examples of others for comparison.

Kris introduced a general discussion of "open" land set aside in planned unit developments or lot size averaging plans. Concern expressed about maintenance of open land in these arrangements: whose responsibility, how enforced, discussion of and difference of opinion of the definition of open land.

Bill expressed concern about the effect of change in residential housing from one family to multi-family/dwelling units. Discussion among the PC regarding "in-law apartment" and accessory use apartments (measured by the percentage, appurtenant, restricted to one bedroom), determined these do not change a single family residence to multi-dwelling. (other considerations: wastewater and driveway.)

Review of current RA-5 non-density based standards, as outlined as a reminder on handout provided by Adam Lougee. Motion made by Bill and seconded by Kris: The Planning

Commission recommends revision of RA-5 minimum acreage per dwelling unit from 1 2/3 acres to 2.5 acres where dwelling unit is clarified to mean multi-family or two family dwelling unit. In discussion of the motion, Ken suggested clarifying text so that the maximum number of dwelling units would be two. Motion approved, all were in favor (6-0).

John requested a return discussion of open land. Ken reminded that open land as part of a lot size averaging or PUD is meant to be voluntary. He urged the PC to consider new ways for the Town to encourage ownership of larger parcels of land, recognizing concern about enforcement of maintenance of open land in these arrangements. Adam suggested that these arrangements require records that show open space allocations in deed and zoning permits. Kris concerned about “ham stringing” future generations with open land restrictions.

Discussion about multi-unit dwellings in flexible density arrangements, setbacks (measure from the center line, not the side of the right of way).

Discussion proceeded, using Adam’s handout, about dimensions. Motion made by Ken and seconded by Kris: The Planning Commission recommends the adoption of RA-5 density based dimensions from the next lower district (RA-2) as follows:

Residential density (unchanged)

Delete Floor Area Ration (FAR)

Lot Size (unchanged)

Lot Frontage (unchanged)

Lot Coverage (includes driveway and accessory buildings) 15% (from 20%) maximum

Road/front setback 80 ft principal/100 ft accessory minimum

Property line setback 25 ft minimum

Height 35 ft maximum

Delete Footprint (of 10,000 sf) maximum

Motion approved, all were in favor (6-0).

Adam asked the PC to review a second handout (attached) regarding the general standards for zoning districts (all agreeable) and exemptions in zoning which are generally via state statute (pointing out, in particular agriculture and silviculture, topics discussed in previous use reviews).

Returning the RA-2, the PC continued with a review of the schedule of uses. Motion made by John and seconded by Ken that the Planning Commission approve the following adjustments to the zoning schedule of uses:

**Household, Group Living, Health Care and Day Care Uses**

Add P (permitted) to Dwelling, Accessory

Add SP (site plan) to Home Business

Change from C (conditional) to P for Group Home

Add P to Family Childcare Home

**Civic, Cultural, Religious, Communications Uses**

Add SP to Educational Facility

Add SP to Place of Worship

Add C to Cemetary

**Office and Service Uses**

Add C to Personal Service

Add C to Media Studio

**Food, Lodging and Entertainment Uses**

Add C to Catering Service

Add C to Inn/Guest Facility

Add C to Retreat Center

Add C to Campground

Add C to Recreation, Indoor

Add C to Recreation, Outdoor

**Sales Uses**

No changes recommended

**Automotive Uses**

Add C to Vehicle Service

Add C to Repair Shop

**Industrial Uses**

No changes recommended

**Agriculture-, Forestry- and Resource-based Uses**

Delete C to Kennel

Motion approved, all were in favor (6-0).

Motion made by John and seconded by Ken: Extraction changed to a C (conditional) use in RA-2 and RA-5 outside of the Village Planning Area; that Sawmill in the RA-5 zone is added as a C (Conditional) use; and that Farm Product Sales, Class 1 be Exempt (E) in all zones, and Farm Product, Class 2 remain unpermitted in RA-5 and RA-2. Motion approved, all were in favor (6-0).

PC agreed that the Schedule of Uses document that they would continue to work from should be updated to reflect the work of the past several meetings when adjustments were suggested and approved.

Chico motioned to adjourn, Sue seconded, at 9:29 pm. All were in favor.