



**TOWN OF STOWE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Meeting Minutes  
April 17, 2023**

The Town of Stowe Planning Commission held a meeting on **Monday April 17, 2023**, starting at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held at the Stowe Town Office with remote participation available via Zoom. The meeting began at 5:30 pm.

Members present included Mila Lonetto, Hope Sullivan, Bob Davison, Brian Hamor, Neil Percy, and Chuck Ebel. Also present was Sarah McShane (staff), Ken Belliveau (planning consultant), Billy Adams, Heather Snyder, Jean H. [last name unknown].

**Review Prior Meeting Minutes [04/03/2023]**

On a motion by C.Ebel, seconded by H.Sullivan, the meeting minutes from the prior meeting were approved as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjustments to the Agenda & Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items**

None

**Continued Discussion- Bylaw Modernization Grant**

Chair M.Lonetto provided an overview of the agenda topic. Planning Consultant Ken Belliveau was present to discuss the existing parking requirements and possible amendments. K.Belliveau provided the following overview of existing parking requirements:

- *Parking Facilities off the street or highway right-of-way shall be provided to serve any building erected, altered or enlarged, and all premises otherwise developed.*
- *In the MRV, MRC, VC, Village PUD, MC and LVC districts, new parking spaces should be designed to reinforce an internal street network by maximizing the use of parallel parking or angle parking on streets, but not on State highways.*
- *In these districts, **required parking may be constructed in the street or highway right-of-way with approval by the DRB and the Director of Public Works.***
- *These new spaces will be counted toward any spaces required under these regulations.*
- *Parking facilities shall be designed to minimize the visibility of parked vehicles from off-site through location, landscaping and screening.*
- *Parking shall generally be located to the rear of interior side (side not fronting on public road) of buildings and large, uninterrupted expanses of parking should be avoided.*
- *Driveway connections to parking areas on adjacent properties shall be required where feasible; in the event that such connections allow for shared parking between properties, the over-all parking requirements may be reduced.*

## RESIDENTIAL USES- Table 15.2: Minimum Parking Requirements

Types of Dwelling Units (DU)	Number of Spaces Per Dwelling Unit
Single detached or attached dwelling;	2
Duplex (Units larger than 400 sq. ft.)	2
Duplex (Units larger than 400 sq. ft.)	1
Multi-family (Units larger than 400 sq. ft.)	2
Multi-family (Units up to 400 sq. ft.)	1
Housing for the Elderly	1
Home occupations	2 spaces per DU and 1 per add employee
Boarding House, Bed and Breakfast	2 spaces per dwelling unit plus 1 per guest room

K.Belliveau suggested for the Commission to consider the following:

- Simply parking requirements table and define dwelling unit types more generally.
- Limit maximum requirement of one parking space per dwelling unit.
- Expand use of shared parking between properties.

Members discussed design standards and where parking should be located. Members discussed current bills being considered by the State legislature, municipalities might be required to limit parking requirements for residential uses in certain locations and situations depending on the outcome of this legislative session. Members discussed whether parking for residential uses should be based on the number of dwelling units versus the number of bedrooms. K.Belliveau noted that some municipalities with robust pedestrian facilities, transit, on-street parking, etc. have decided to eliminate parking requirements. M.Lonetto reported that the recently completed Riverbend affordable housing project was required to provide two parking spaces per unit even though the parking was not necessary to meet the demands of the residents. Had the parking requirements been reduced, the Applicant could have used that space to provide another dwelling unit. Members shared examples of other stories from their neighborhoods, each noting the difference in situations and parking needs. K.Belliveau shared the parking recommendations from the Building Better Neighborhoods handbook. Members discussed shared parking provisions. B.Davison inquired whether the number and location of existing parking spaces within the village had been inventoried. Parking within the village has been inventoried by LCPC in the past and was updated more recently as part of the village streetscape project. Members discussed how some workforce housing projects might need additional parking to meet the needs of their residents. H.Snyder reported that short-term rentals often have multiple vehicles. M.Lonetto suggested the Commission also consider the lower village and requirements in the VR districts. B.Adams noted that a few parking spaces were lost during the village streetscape project and a few were gained. He noted that the parking in-front of Black Cap Coffee is private and the Selectboard often partners with private property owners to utilize additional spaces when possible. B.Hamor shared that areas along Maple Street should maintain an area in front of the dwelling for a future sidewalk and projects that cannot provide sufficient on-site parking could potentially partner with Shaws, or similar nearby spaces, to provide overnight and/or shared parking. M.Lonetto suggested maintaining the requirement of two spaces per unit except for projects involving the types of housing the Commission is hoping to encourage (i.e. workforce, affordable housing, etc.). Members discussed tandem parking and options to provide shared parking when close to transit, municipal parking, and/or when on-street options exist. Members discussed options for regional housing solutions and repurposing VSU buildings. K.Belliveau suggested considering using the average demand generated by a project as a

whole to calculate required parking rather than the number of dwelling units. B.Davison suggested that if the Commission considers allowing an increase in building height, the Applicant should be required to provide covered or subsurface parking. M.Lonetto suggested the Commission should also evaluate the VIL-PUD district. K.Belliveau summarized the discussion. The Commission supports simplifying the parking requirements, considering the number of bedrooms rather than floor area, improving and expanding the existing shared parking provisions; requiring subsurface parking where feasible; allowing an increase in building height when projects provide subsurface or covered parking; providing parking incentives for projects involving the types of housing projects the Commission encourages, etc. K.Belliveau will provide a summary of all of the prior discussions and present recommended amendments during the next meeting.

### **Updates/Correspondence/Other Business**

M.Lonetto reported that the Selectboard has requested a brief overview of the projects Boards/Commissions are working on this coming year. Staff will prepare an overview for discussion during the next meeting. Also at the next meeting will be the annual election of officers and K.Belliveau will present an overview of all recommended changes agreed upon thus far. The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 1st.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah McShane, Planning & Zoning Director