

PLANNING COMMISSION

PRELIMINARY MINUTES

May 26, 2021

**6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87387936899?pwd=eG5DTUFENjd3Tyt0T2ZPdWc3bW9zQT09>

Meeting ID: 873 8793 6899

Passcode: 583569

Dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099

Meeting ID: 873 8793 6899

Passcode: 583569

Outside the area, find your nearest regional number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kxN8HhoKf>

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alan Couch, Chairman

Terry Carter

Ted Stryhas

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ryan Silvestri

Phoebe Tucker

STAFF PRESENT:

Rose Goings

OTHERS PRESENT:

Eric Alden

Jason Rasmussen

Eric Chattergee – Okemo Valley TV

Logan Nicoll

I. CALL TO ORDER – ELECTRONIC MEETING GUIDELINES

1. Alan Couch called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. He advised that the Electronic Meeting Guidelines, previously discussed are still in effect. He said that Lisha Klaiber will take the minutes off of the Okemo Valley TV video.

II. ROLL CALL

1. Alan Couch did a roll call of the board. All members are present, except Ryan Silvestri and Phoebe Tucker. He noted that there is a quorum,
2. Rose Goings advised that Ryan Sylvestri is attending the hearings (property tax grievances.)

III. **CONSIDERATION OF ANY CHANGES, ADDITIONS OR REMOVALS TO THE AGENDA**

1. None were needed.

IV. **APPROVE MINUTES**

1. Alan Couch advised that the minutes to be approved are from the meeting of April 20, 2021. He suggested that the review of those minutes be tabled until next month when Lisha Klaiber can be here as there are some questions about those minutes.
2. **MOTION by Alan Couch and seconded by Ted Stryhas to table the review of the minutes from April 20, 2021 until the June meeting. Alan Couch took a roll call vote and the motion unanimously.**

V. **COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS**

1. There were none.

VI. **REVITALIZE THE VILLAGE OF LUDLOW – DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS AND USES – REVIEW PROCEDURES**

1. Alan Couch said that Jason Rasmussen had sent information to board members regarding Dimensional Standards and possible conflicts.
2. Jason Rasmussen said that he incorporated some of the CNC (Center for New Urbanism) study. CNC were the consultants for the State of Vermont hired to look at housing. They identified some zoning related issues and suggested some solutions. He added that Ludlow was one of the pilot communities participating in that study. Jason Rasmussen said that he thought some of the ideas were good and some over the top. He'd like to run through the bullets. In the numbered bullets, he explains his thoughts and the circular bullets are the ideas of what you might want to do. He'd like to see where you agree and where you may think the bulleted idea is not an issue or if it is not politically feasible at this time. (Document attached at end of minutes)
3. Note #1 Village Map - He is talking about the Village RC district. They can talk about other areas. He said that after tonight, he will go back and work on the current zoning regulations and make changes based on tonight's discussions. He will bring it back next month for review. He said that he is focusing his efforts on the Village Center core area – Main Street from bridge to bridge. He said that they can update the map, maybe shrinking it and creating a Village Center District.
4. Rose Goings asked if the grant covers Pond Street.
5. Jason Rasmussen said not explicitly, but he thinks they may be able to do some work there. But it could possibly open a can of worms and take a while to decide what and where you should draw the lines. He would be happy to do it if this board wants.

6. Rose Goings said if we go beyond the scope of the grant, they may give us a hard time. We are already doing work with traffic. She does not want to have to pay back grant money. She said that parts of Pleasant Street are part of it, along with Main Street from bridge to bridge and Lamere Square up to Benson's.
7. Jason Rasmussen said it is a good question and we can ask about it. If you are interested, we can look into it and check for grant eligibility.
8. Alan Couch said we should look at the Village Center delineations and decide if we want to shrink that district down or reconfigure some zoning boundaries. If it is okay to look beyond that, we can also look into it. He added that he appreciates Rose Goings' diligence in protecting the grant money. We would like to spend it all and not have to pay any back. He said that it may be a blurred line if we do something adjacent to the area. He said he doesn't think we should "Do Nothing" on this, but should look into what works best for the village.
9. Note #2— he is talking about lot size. They did a basic analysis and most of the lots are ¼ acre, some are only 3,000 square feet. The current minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet. Does this make sense or does it cause problems? He said that his opinion is that for most lots, the 5,000 square feet is fine but there are some much smaller lots and it could pose issues for them with the DRB. One thought is to get dimensional standards based on what's on the ground and not create non-conformity. There is the option to do nothing. You can reduce the minimum lot size to 3,000 or 4,000 square feet.
10. Terry Carter asked if any of these changes would eliminate parking behind buildings.
11. Jason Rasmussen said not these changes, but we will look at parking in a couple of months.
12. Terry Carter questioned that none of these would eliminate parking.
13. Jason Rasmussen said these changes wouldn't. He said what we are trying to do is to make sure that if you have a minimum lot size that's too big it could potentially pose problems for someone with a lot that's really small and who wants to create a business with an apartment above. They may not have the space. He is wondering if this board wants to change some things or say no. He asked Rose Goings if this has been a problem for the DRB.
14. Rose Goings said that with the minimum lot size being too large, it has not been easy to develop multi-unit apartments or multi-use buildings in the Village. We are talking about the Village Center and some of Pleasant Street. If you have a single-family home on 5,000 square feet, you can't do anything else, even if the minimum lot size is 3,000 or 4,000 square feet, you still can't do anything because it is still a single-family home. But, if you eliminate it all together, depending on the size of the building and how small they want the apartment to be, they may be able to make it work. She said that Ted Stryhas, Alan Couch and Eric Alden would know more about the size of the house and how much you want to squeeze in. If you do a public building, it falls under the Fire Marshal. It all depends on how much square footage you want in the house and how much in the apartment.
15. Alan Couch said some non-conforming lots are pre-zoning and some things can be grandfathered. Would it make sense to leave the minimum lot size at 5,000 square feet and change the setbacks and road frontage.
16. Rose Goings said it doesn't change the number of units you can have.

17. Jason Rasmussen said that in the Village core, there probably will not be a lot of subdivisions. People are more likely to redevelop existing buildings and maybe the minimum lot size is not the major problem, maybe it is the frontage and setbacks.
18. Rose Goings said it's the density. If you don't have density, you can't have more units because it's the number of units per density.
19. Jason Rasmussen said possibly get rid of density and leave everything else the same.
20. Rose Goings asked, eliminate density totally?
21. Jason Rasmussen said they could look at the standards – the minimum lot size and the number of units. He said they could delete the density of multi-units and leave the lot size the same. They could have as many units as they want, they would be on village water and sewer.
22. Alan Couch said that would mesh with the town plan to develop properties where there is infrastructure. He said that multi-unit buildings now have to have sprinkler systems and they would possibly have to upgrade their water lines from the water main. We want to develop where we have the infrastructure. We should look into it.
23. Terry Carter said we want to keep a vibrant village, but would want to make sure that the multi-unit buildings are not just for Air B&B
24. Rose Goings said that she wants to talk to the Fire Marshal about this first, before we go with no requirements. She wants to hear what they have to say. We will need to have some limits. We don't want to allow 10 apartments in something that maybe should only have 4. We need to be careful that we don't allow a chaotic fire hazard. Alan Couch said that it would also be encroaching on our parking issues. Ted Stryhas said we need to get aggressive, but you can't get too aggressive. Terry Carter brought up a good point about Air B&B. Whatever you are trying to create, when you say no restrictions and wide open, that's probably not going to work. We know we need something in the middle, something that's sensible. He said that he believes that we need to be more aggressive in these situations for opportunities to happen, for more units, but we would need to be aggressive, but hold back a little.
25. Jason Rasmussen said that he is not a developer and does not completely understand some of that, but from what he's been told, having too low-density standards can sometimes make a project not cost feasible. We need a number of units in order to make it work financially.
26. Ted Stryhas said he thinks that's right. We need to be aggressive. What's going to happen is that people are going to figure out the state requirements and all of the different things. It's either not going to work because of cost, or the state's going to tell you all of the things you have to do. If you want to do that 4-unit building instead of a 2-unit building, then you are going to say you can't do it because it's not cost effective. It comes down to that every time.
27. Jason Rasmussen said he doesn't want to belabor the point, there are other points that he wants to get to. It sounds like we want to leave the minimum lot size alone, but maybe consider getting rid of the multi-unit standards. But, before we do that, we need to reach out to the Fire Marshal and get more input.
28. Rose Goings said she definitely wants to come back to this, we just don't want to create more problems.
29. Terry Carter asked if we could get this to Landon (Wheeler.)
30. Rose Goings said she will contact him,

31. Jason Rasmussen said he can join her if she wants to talk to him together.
32. Rose Goings said yes.
33. Note #3 – Jason Rasmussen said that the existing minimum frontage requirements for residential properties is 60 feet and for non-residential, it's 70 feet. He said that uses change over time and asked if this has been a problem. He said that most existing frontages elsewhere are 40 – 50 feet. He said that from a non-conforming point of view, you may want to shrink yours down to 40 feet.
34. Alan Couch asked why there is a difference.
35. Rose Goings said she thinks it's been there for a long time. She does not think that it has ever been changed since zoning started in Ludlow.
36. Alan Couch said if there was a good reason for non-residential to have wider frontage, whether it's to provide parking or pedestrian access.
37. Rose Goings said it is possibly for curb cut, maybe for delivery trucks pulling into access. But, for non-residential the district standard has always been different than for residential. But it has never been changed.
38. Alan Couch said he can't think of a good reason why you would need 10 feet more, especially with smaller delivery trucks. He said that UPS accesses residences and businesses. It is something to consider and from his standpoint, unless there is a compelling reason, he thinks the setbacks should be the same and a lower number.
39. Jason Rasmussen said it may come back to how big and diverse the district boundary is. On Pond Street, you might want non-residential to be wide and not so deep. On Main Street, being residential and mixed use, you may like the idea of it being narrower and deeper. What is people oriented and what is auto-oriented. He said that thinking about Main Street, he can't think of a good reason to have 2 different standards.
40. Rose Goings asked if other towns have the same standards for residential and non-residential.
41. Jason Rasmussen said generally, they do. You may want to have one standard for all and may want to consider shrinking that based on what's on the ground. But it's a little complicated when you're talking about Main Street, Pleasant Street and Pond Street as one district.
42. Rose Goings said we should also look at the Highway Standards, just to double check what the width should be and if there's a recommendation there. We do have updates highway standards. We don't want to go against what they say.
43. Jason Rasmussen said like what's the separation of the driveway. Let's make sure it all adds up.
44. Rose Goings said she doesn't want to have 2 different documents saying different things, especially if we are changing it now.
45. Jason Rasmussen said, just to be clear, we are just talking now so that he can show you some more concrete versions of these changes later. We will do our homework and come back next month and you can decide if you like the changes or not.

46. Note #4 – Lot Coverage. Jason Rasmussen said that this is how much of the lot can be covered by the footprint of the building. He said the standard now is 50% for residential and 30% for non-residential. He said that some of the lots along Main Street are basically 100% covered. He asked if this has been a problem for the DRB. He said this board may want to look at that and possibly allow for more of the lots to be building.
47. Rose Goings said that hasn't been a problem. She said we check the coverage and it hasn't been an issue, except for maybe in the flood area. But she doesn't know if that's in the FEMA handbook.
48. Terry Carter asked how that would not eliminate parking. She doesn't get that increasing how much a building could cover wouldn't eliminate parking.
49. Jason Rasmussen said if you allow for 100% coverage, then there's no room left for parking.
50. Terry Carter said how changing that cannot eliminate all parking.
51. Rose Goings said they are already pre-existing lots like the Hatchery and the Ellis Block.
52. Terry Carter asked what if the Pot Belly expanded their back.
53. Rose Goings said no, we're not going to allow that. We'll talk about that later. Because, people who already have parking, specifically, he has several buildings, so that parking is not just for the Pot Belly. He has other buildings and apartments. But other buildings are pre-existing and don't have parking and they have to find their own parking. It's kind of like parking in the Village. Some people, under today's standards, have to prove parking. The other people are like, okay, we don't have parking. It's an unfair balance and doesn't work.
54. Alan Couch said to Terry Carter's point, if we increase the lot coverage, perhaps Aubuchon's could get rid of half of their parking, forcing people to park on the street, to expand their building.
55. Rose Goings said we don't want that to happen, so that's why we need to word things correctly. That's why we're not allowing anymore expansion into parking lots. Also, somewhere in there we need to say that you can't. She said that she and Jason Rasmussen talked about this and we don't want any more merchandise on the sidewalks. The whole idea is to beautify the Village, not to fill it up and let everybody put their merchandise on the sidewalks. She said that in their permit, Aubuchon's is allowed to put a certain amount of merchandise on the sidewalk. But it can only go in a certain way and a certain distance out. We don't want that continuing up and down Main Street. We don't want everybody to have their merchandise out there because that's not the look that we want. The idea is to beautify the Village and not keep doing this stuff.
56. Alan Couch said he does not think we should increase the lot coverage. He said that for the non-conforming, pre-existing buildings, that are 90 – 95% covered, if someone were to tear one of those buildings down, then they would have to conform to existing standards and perhaps provide extra parking. But, if we increase lot coverage to 70-80-90%, you'd have the potential of businesses expanding and eliminating parking on that property, forcing cars onto the street, which we already don't have enough parking, exasperating the existing problem.
57. Ted Stryhas said he doesn't believe most people would do that, because if they don't have parking, the customers aren't going to get to the store. You'd be foolish to take away all of your parking to make a bigger store if no one can get there. It's common sense.
58. Alan Couch said he agrees, but some people may not.

59. Jason Rasmussen said this sounds like a “Do nothing” case for #4. We will focus on parking standards later on, but for now, leave this one alone.
60. Note #5 Minimum Front Setbacks – Jason Rasmussen said there is a difference in the standard - 10 feet for residential and 20 feet for non-residential. He said there are a number of buildings that are much closer, 5’ to 10’. He thinks what is desirable on a main street, downtown, in spots where there are wider sidewalks that would be nice for outside dining. You may or may not want the other stuff, displays of materials. Maybe look at that as a separate issue. He is focusing on setbacks. Should we shrink them and maybe get rid of separate standards for residential and non-residential. Maybe shrink it to 5 feet. You can also do nothing.
61. Ted Stryhas said as long as everyone is comfortable with the sidewalk size, bring it to whatever distance everyone is comfortable with.
62. Terry Carter said think if we accommodate the realtors.
63. Ted Stryhas said we can accommodate everyone on that end. What does that mean as far as sizing?
64. Jason Rasmussen said basically, what he’s referring to is there are a number of buildings that are pretty much on the sidewalk. There’s the sidewalk and there’s the extra side walk. Some of the buildings are right up to the extra sidewalk. For the buildings not like that, do we want to set some standards that would enable them to come a little closer if they were to do an expansion.
65. Ted Stryhas said it’s all about people feeling comfortable.
66. Terry Carter asked if the state has anything to say about that to make sure it’s safe for handicapped people.
67. Jason Rasmussen said he thinks there are standards and ADA guidelines that dictate the width of the sidewalk. He was just wondering if businesses that might want to have an expansion for outside seating, maybe build a deck or patio in front. How close can they get to the sidewalk? Does it make sense to allow them to be a little closer than what the current rules allow for.
68. Terry Carter said like the Hatchery, with the outside window that we’re allowing, it would make it okay to do that.
69. Jason Rasmussen said they’re pre-existing. He doesn’t imagine that the Hatchery would get any closer, but maybe as you go east, some of those buildings could.
70. Alan Couch asked if the setback is off the sidewalk or the curb.
71. Jason Rasmussen said the setback is measured from the property line to not too far from the side of the roadway.
72. Rose Goings said correct.
73. Jason Rasmussen said so, 20 feet for businesses – you have the side of the roadway, then 5 ½ feet of sidewalk – then another 15 feet of lawn before you get to the building. A lot of buildings are closer. Do we want to make it a little more?
74. Terry Carter said yes.
75. Ted Stryhas said yes.
76. Jason Rasmussen said the next sections refer to the allowed land uses and the review process for the DRB.
77. Note #6 – Section 520.3 allows for only one principal use per lot. Jason Rasmussen said it may be nice in the Village to allow for multi-use and asked if it would be a problem for the DRB.
78. Rose Goings said that needs to be changed.
79. Terry Carter said definitely.
80. Alan Couch said it makes sense to have retail space on the 1st floor and possibly an office on the 2nd or apartment on the 3rd.

81. Rose Goings said absolutely.
82. Terry Carter said she thinks it ends up being really expensive for people who want to change the use and it shouldn't be.
83. Jason Rasmussen said this exercise is basically to streamline things that we want to see happen.
84. Note #7 –Multi-use dwelling (3-4 units) is required to go through the Conditional Use Review Process - Jason Rasmussen said people have to go through public hearings and the DRB. He thinks it is a longer and more drawn-out process. He said you may want to make it easier and have people go to Rose Goings to get a building permit.
85. Alan Couch said he thinks it would make things easier, but he is not sure whether or not it is a good idea.
86. Jason Rasmussen said when you get a 3–4-unit apartment, abutters may complain and ask things like where the dumpster will be and will it be screened. Where will the parking and driveway be? An option to this would be an Administrative Review. People would still go to Rose Goings, but there would be more standards. They might have to meet site plan review standards, but skip the public DRB hearing.
87. Rose Goings said they would still have to go to the Fire Marshal.
88. Jason Rasmussen said yes, and still have to get water and wastewater and meet state building codes.
89. Alan Couch said he thinks if we work with lot size and density, we could come up with a plan to integrate Administrative Review into it for smaller projects. It is worth looking in to. He doesn't want to create more work for Rose Goings and Barb Davis, but it would alleviate things in other areas of the bureaucracy.
90. Jason Rasmussen said he would work something up and they can look at it and decide later on.
91. Alan Couch said if we hash out some of the lot size and density issues, this will create a remedy on its own.
92. Note #8 – Most non-residential uses require Conditional Use Review – Jason Rasmussen said if we look at the Village RC district, there are single family homes, duplex, and accessory building as permitted uses. The list of permitted uses is short. The list for Conditional Uses is long; retail store, personal service, offices, etc. Other towns go through the full conditional use process and the standards may not apply. You could allow permitted uses or Administrative Review to make this an easier process. He asked if the board is interested in doing this.
93. Rose Goings said yes.
94. Ted Stryhas said definitely.
95. Alan Couch said it's something to look at.
96. Terry Carter said either way, Rose Goings still has to work on the conditional use part.
97. Alan Couch said a lot of this will get ironed out when as we look at dimensional standards. We should look at this and its review process.
98. Jason Rasmussen said this makes sense. You are not getting a lot of new building, more new businesses coming in and out of existing buildings. It's a lot of stuff not necessarily changing that much. What is the expansion of use, new hours of operation, and some basic things like that? We will try to spell these out in the standards. You can look at what we come up with and let us know if it works.

VII. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Next Meeting

- i. Eric Chattergee asked if the meeting next month would be via ZOOM.
- ii. Alan Couch said that at their December meeting, the board voted to continue with ZOOM meetings through June. He noted that other board have committed to in-person meetings starting in June. We would need a motion to return to in-person meetings.
- iii. Terry Carter said she would rather continue with ZOOM meetings.
- iv. Rose Goings said she prefers ZOOM.
- v. Ted Stryhas said he is okay with ZOOM meetings.
- vi. Alan Couch said they will do the June meeting via ZOOM and vote then.
- vii. Jason Rasmussen said that the Legislature never changed to open meeting law and once the emergency orders are lifted by Governor Scott, we may be back to doing it the old way. It would allow for ZOOM if there is a physical location where the meeting could be, but then everybody could participate via ZOOM.
- viii. Alan Couch said that he went to the VLCT website to look at FAQ about open meetings. There is a stipulation for people to participate via Skype or ZOOM, but he doesn't recall if they need a quorum in person. We will talk about this at the June meeting.
- ix. Eric Chattergee said that the next meeting will be via ZOOM on June 15, 2021

2. Meeting Minutes

- i. Alan Couch said that there are rules for meeting minutes and we will discuss them at the next meeting
- ii. Rose Goings asked if he would like to put that on the agenda for the next meeting.
- iii. Alan Couch said yes.

3. Legislative Bill S101

- i. Logan Nicoll said that a bill was passed in the house, but did not make it through the Senate in time. S101 would have created a program for funding for towns to be able to hire Regional Planning Commission personnel to help with amending zoning regulations to be more supportive of Affordable Housing. It used the term "Smart Growth Areas". It would be to get rid of unnecessary regulations and to try to encourage development in those areas. He said it would help with the ability to change the uses of non-conforming structures. He said that in Ludlow, we do have limited parking and changes to the zoning may negatively impact parking. He said that if it does pass, Ludlow may or may not get funding, but some similar towns may get it and have things for you to look at.

4. Legislative Bill S79

- i. Logan Nicoll said that another bill that did not pass in time this session was S79, which would provide for a registry of long- and short-term rentals.
- ii. Terry Carter said at the Regional Planning Commission meeting, a solution was suggested to Air B&B and not having long term rentals. It suggested that you can't have Air B&B unless the owner is on-site to deal with any issues that may arise. This would eliminate a lot of them. She said that she thought it was a pretty good idea.
- iii. Rose Goings asked if that was through zoning regulations or state issue.
- iv. Terry Carter said it was a suggestion for zoning regulations.

- v. Jason Rasmussen said that it is one idea and may not be the right fit for every town. There is a lot of concern around the party noise for short term rentals and maybe to some extent, the condition of the property. Some towns are opting to require the owner to be on site. They would own the house, and rent out the apartment. If the owner is there, it may be managed better. He has also seen where the Air B&B policy is for the owner be on the premises or adjacent property. This works well for the original premise of renting out a room in your house. He doesn't know if that would work well for VRBO situations.
- vi. Terry Carter said she can see the Trustees not having as big a problem with that because one of their arguments was what if a person wants to rent out an apartment above the garage to a new teacher in town or something. That would still be possible.
- vii. Alan Couch said he is glad the state is looking into it, maybe it would take the onus off of us.
- viii. Logan Nicoll said an additional bill that we did not pass this session would allow the Select Board (or trustees) to adopt short term rental ordinances that would be very open ended. The Select Board has the power to write the ordinance to do what they want it to do. We did not pass the bill that would not allow rentals unless the owner occupies a unit. He said that S79 may pass but it basically establishes a registry and doesn't restrict anything. It does put some health and safety powers in the hands of the Division of Fire Safety and if the town wants to do anything with that, the town has the opportunity to set up its own registry and can enforce it themselves.
- ix. Rose Goings said she thinks we can file that under "been there, done that." We are not even going there.

VIII. **ADJOURN**

- 1. **MOTION by Terry Carter and seconded by Ted Stryhas to adjourn this meeting. Motion passed unanimously.**
- 2. Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisha Klaiber

Alan Couch, Chairman

Ted Stryhas

Terry Carter

Phoebe Tucker

Ryan Silvestri

SUBJECT: Village Center Master Plan – Draft Zoning Changes – Dimensional Standards, Land Uses, Review Procedures

The purpose of the ongoing Ludlow Village Center Master Plan project is to further village revitalization efforts and identify zoning amendments that will help with pandemic economic recovery efforts. The following observations and zoning amendment ideas are presented for your consideration.

Village R-C District – Dimensional Standards

1) The Village R-C District is quite large and includes parts of town that have very different land use patterns. This can make setting dimensional standards challenging. Consider changing the zoning district boundaries and creating a Village Center District in the core area. Options to consider include:

- Do nothing.
- Modify the Zoning District Map to better align with existing conditions and character of the area.

2) Most existing lots along Main Street are about 10,000 square feet (roughly ¼ acre) in size, but there are some smaller lots around 3,000 square feet that are non-conforming. The existing 5,000 square foot minimum lot size is likely not problematic for most lots. However, the standard for multi-unit dwellings could restrict affordable housing projects. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Reduce minimum lot size to 3,000 or 4,000 square feet.
- Eliminate the lot requirements for two- and multi-unit dwellings.
- Eliminate the minimum lot size requirement altogether in the Village R-C District; regulate instead by lot width.

3) Existing minimum frontage requirements are 60 feet for residential and 70 feet for nonresidential. The existing, as-built frontages are generally smaller (about 40 to 50 feet). Uses also change over time (e.g., from residential to non-residential). Additionally, many properties are mixed use. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Change the minimum lot frontage to 40 feet.
- Eliminate different standards for residential and nonresidential uses.

4) The maximum lot coverage is 50% for residential and 30% for nonresidential. Some lots are completely covered by buildings. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Increase lot coverage to 80-90%.
- Eliminate lot coverage requirements for this District.

5) Minimum front setback requirements are 10 feet for residential or 20 feet for nonresidential. Many buildings along Main Street are closer than that. What I think is particularly desirable are many of the buildings on the south side of Main Street, where the sidewalks are wider, allowing for outside dining, etc., and buildings are built right up to the edge of the extended sidewalk.

Options:

- Do nothing.
- Reduce minimum front setback to about 5 feet for all types of uses.

- Add a maximum front setback to maintain buildings close to the roadway and not allow new buildings to have parking in front.

6) Section 520.3 allows only one principal use on a lot. It is customary for buildings in the village to have multiple uses. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Allow more than one principal use on a lot within the Village R-C District.

7) Any multi-unit dwelling (i.e., 3 units or more) is required to go through the Conditional Use Review process. Making the approval process easier and quicker can better encourage more affordable housing options in the community. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Allow 3- and 4-unit dwellings as a Permitted Use in this District.
- If you are concerned about parking, circulation, screening, etc., consider making these go through Administrative Review¹ and require it to meet Site Plan Review standards.

8) Most nonresidential uses require Conditional Use Review. The conditions along the core of Main Street are mostly the same they have been for many years. Consider making it easier to permit new businesses/changes of use, particularly when no new structures are being constructed. Options:

- Do nothing.
- Require either Permitted Use or Administrative Review¹ for certain nonresidential uses, such as a day care center, retail store, personal service, professional service, business office, restaurant, bed and breakfast, specialty craft shop and/or other desirable uses for the village center area.
- As discussed above, Administrative Review can help control the site layout and design of such projects.

¹Administrative Review is enabled under 24 V.S.A. §4464(c) to expedite the permitting process for certain types of projects. It gives the Administrative Officer (i.e., Zoning Administrator) broad authority to approve projects without needing to go through a public hearing and not needing Development Review Board approval.