

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2014

Board Members Present: Sue Kavanagh, Gary Clark, Bill Brown, Kris Perlee, Chico Martin, John Elder, Bill Sayre, Skimmer Hellier

Other Present: Eric Forand (Zoning Administrator), Mary Arbuckle (NeafTV), Adam Lougee (ACRPC)

Public:

The Planning Commission meeting opened at 7:05pm

1) Approval of Minutes

Kris made a motion to accept the meeting minutes from the September 16, 2014 meeting as presented, seconded by Peter. All were in favor (6-0) Skimmer and Bill were not present for vote.

2) Administrative Matters

The ad hoc committee addressing recreation definitions issue has continued to deliberate but was not prepared to offer a final report to the PC for consideration. Kris Perlee offered some details of their work since the last PC meeting in September including several ideas expanding the Recreation Zone. There were several questions about this direction and the ad hoc committee will continue its work.

Sue gave an update on the Vermont Geological Survey map project. The Bristol Conservation Commission will be meeting November 13th (6 pm, Holley Hall) with representatives of the VGS, and will be discussing the project. John Elder and Kris will attend and report back to the Planning Commission at their November 18th meeting. Decisions on what maps to choose will need to be made quickly as the turn-around time schedule is very short for making recommendations to the Select Board for final map selection within the grant period. Sue shared a document prepared by BCC member Kristen Underwood as well as the draft memorandum of understanding for the Town and VGS, outlining map/information resources that will be available as part of this project.

3) Sue turned the table over to Adam to discuss the Village Planning Area specifically the Residential Office Commercial (ROC) zone.

Adam reviewed the work done at the last two meetings as the PC reviewed the ROC zone objectives and guidelines (description), boundaries, and proposed uses. Adam distributed an updated Districts and Standards (table of proposed uses) matrix. Adam began the discussion with a review of the dimensional standards for ROC.

The Commission's discussion and agreement of the proposed residential density for ROC of 4 dwelling units per acre caused the group to revised a use for ROC recommended at the September meeting: recommending that Dwelling, Multi-Family change from conditional (current) to Not Permitted. Much discussion about the value of the residential older homes along Rt 116 in the ROC (East St, West St) and at the 'gateways' to Bristol.

Other dimensional standards recommended for ROC agreed to by the Commission included:

Floor area ratio (first floor to second floor) 1.5
Lot size minimum 10,000 sq ft
Lot frontage minimum 75 ft
Lot coverage maximum 60%
Property line setback (side, rear) minimum 10 ft principal and accessory
Height maximum 35 ft (no two story minimum)
Footprint maximum 20,000 sq ft principal / 10,000 sq ft accessory

The discussion footprint max in the ROC led to a return for clarification to the Proposed Districts and Standards matrix and the Commission agreed:
Retail Store, Class 3 stores would not be permitted.

One item needing clarification by Adam at the next meeting: agreement on measuring Road / front setback dimensional standard (from middle of the road or from the right of way?). The Commission believes they have consistently used “middle of the road” measurement and if confirmed they will agree on this standard for ROC at the next meeting.

The Commission also suggested further revisions to the text of the objectives and guidelines for ROC, by making stronger reference to the residential aspects of this zone, particularly the value of older, “historic” homes. Adam will make recommended changes and give an updated paragraph to the Commission at the November 18 meeting.

It was decided that the Recreation (REC) and Residential Commercial 1 (RC-1) zones would be discussed at the next meeting, Tuesday, November 18.

Chico made a motion to adjourn, seconded by John. All in favor (8-0)
The meeting was adjourned at 9:30pm