

TOWN OF STOWE PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes June 22, 2023

The Town of Stowe Planning Commission held a special meeting on **Thursday June 22**, **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, Bob Davison, Brian Hamor, Chuck Ebel, Jill Anne, Heather Snyder, and John Muldoon. Also present was Sarah McShane (staff), Ken Belliveau (planning consultant), Barb Pubbicombe.

The meeting was called to order by Chair M.Lonetto at 5:30 pm.

Adjustments to the Agenda & Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items None

Review Prior Meeting Minutes [06/05/2023]

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

Continued Discussion- Bylaw Modernization Grant

Planning Consultant K.Belliveau provided an overview of the existing regulations pertaining to the ADUs and TDRs. The Commission reviewed the existing ADU regulations and suggested changes.

Current Standards	Ideas to Consider	
One attached or detached dwelling unit (ADU) accessory to a single family dwelling	Require property owner to live on the property.	
Permitted in any zoning district		
Living area not to exceed 900 square feet for single-family dwellings under 1,800 square feet of living area. OR		
Living area not to exceed 50% of the square feet of living area for single-family dwellings over 1,800 square feet of living area.	These two items appear to be in conflict with each other	
And In no case, shall the maximum accessory dwelling unit living floor area exceed 1,200		
square feet or 30% of the living area of the single-family dwelling, whichever is greater.	These two items appear to be in conflict with each other	
The accessory dwelling shall contain no more than two bedrooms.	Consider no greater than 50 % of square footage of living area for single-family dwellings over 1,800 square feet	
On-site parking shall be provided for the residents of the accessory dwelling in accordance with Table 14.2.	of living area or 1,200 square feet whichever is less	
The accessory dwelling shall be served by the same access and driveway as the primary single-family dwelling.	Must be in compliance with new state requirements, 1 space per dwelling	

K.Belliveau suggested considering requiring that either the ADU or the primary dwelling be owner occupied as allowed under statute. B.Davison asked whether owner occupied is a defined term in statute. Members discussed lawful nonconforming ADUs and creating an amortizing period to gain conformance with any newly adopted owner occupied provision. M.Lonetto mentioned an example from other municipalities that allow a second ADU when it's used for long-term housing. Members discussed the maximum allowed area of ADUs and whether the existing language could be simplified by creating a maximum living area regardless of how large the primary dwelling is. Following discussion members agreed to requiring owner occupancy and an amortizing period of 15 years to gain compliance with the new provision and establishing a maximum living area of 2500 sf for an ADU.

K.Belliveau provided an overview and purpose of the TDR program. He explained that it is a tool to move density, or development rights, from one area of town to another (i.e., sending and receiving zones). S.McShane shared her understanding of the TDR program in Stowe and how it was created to provide property owners in the Upper Mountain Road (UMR) district an opportunity to transfer density to at the time newly created zoning districts of Mountain Road Village and Mountain Road Crossroads, and others. K.Belliveau added that TDRs are not widely used in Vermont however in some cases it has been a useful tool and in other cases it's been underutilized. Following discussion, members agreed to table the issue and add it to the list of items to study later. J. Muldoon agreed to do follow-up TDR research for future discussion.

S.McShane shared the existing regulations pertaining to Boarding Houses, including the definition, table of uses, parking requirements, etc. Following discussion members agreed to modify the definition to indicate that boarding houses are a type of lodging rather than dwelling unit, reduce parking to ½ space per room, and remove the requirement that food be provided. S.McShane will make the suggested modifications and present to the Commission at a later meeting.

Members reviewed the dimensional requirements of the Mountain Road Village and Mountain Road Crossroads zoning districts. S.McShane explained that as part of the Bylaw Modernization Grant the Commission has focused on the designated downtown (Stowe Village) and Lower Village Center (LVC), however the town has other growth areas not recognized by the state. She provided an overview of the existing regulations and suggested modifications. Members agreed it would be appropriate for the other two growth areas to mimic the dimensional requirements of the LVC district. Members agreed not to recommend changes to building height until further S.100/Act 47 analysis is completed.

MRV/MRC Zoning District- Mountain Road Village & Mountain Road Crossroad	To foster a development pattern along the Mountain Road (Route 108) corridor comprised of compact, mixed-use settlements separated by rural countryside. The MRC district is intended to serve as a relatively small, concentrated mixed-use settlement with good pedestrian circulation between uses and properties and a village streetscape; the MRV District is intended to serve as a larger commercial village characterized by an integration between land uses, pedestrian accessibility, a mix of uses compatible with a four-season resort community and a village streetscape defined by narrow streets, street-trees, curbing and sidewalks.				
These zoning districts are served by municipal water/sewer		Suggested changes		To Consider	
	Current	VC-10	LVC	MRV/MRC	
Lot Width	100 ft	40 ft	100 ft	match LVC	
Lot Area	20000 sf min	10,000 sf Min	20,000 sf Min	match LVC	
Building Height	28/35 bonus	xtra elv for defined housing	xtra elv for defined housing	The regulations currently allow for 35 feet for mixed-use buildings with pitched roofs, with a minimum 3:12 pitch, containing at least 2 dwelling units; 5:100 will require an additional habitable floor for affordable housing and mixed use developments.	
Building Coverage	20%	eliminate	eliminate	eliminate. Landscaping, green space, bike and ped access through/across property is all required under site plan review.	
Setbacks	20/20/10	10-20' range, require articulated entry	10-20' range, require articulated entry	Maintain existing setback requirements; Establish design features and articulated entrances under site plan review.	
Parking	20-25% bonus possible			encourage underground/understory, encourage shared and connections. How to encourage small streets and street parking on blocks off of 108 from current strip pattern?	
Density	1:20,000, 2:10,000, M:7000, L:3500	1: 1/8500 sf, 2+: 1/2500 sf, L:1/1000 sf if housing meets criteria	1: 1/8500 sf, 2+: 1/2500 sf, L:1/1000 sf if housing meets criteria	match LVC changes	

Members agreed not to recommend changes to the UMR and HT districts until further S.100/Act 47 analysis is completed.

Lastly, K.Belliveau shared the statutory definition of Affordable Housing Development and members discussed S.100/Act 47 which recently was signed into law. S.McShane provided Commission members with a draft outline of the S.100 requirements and how some of them could be incorporated into the zoning regulations.

Members discussed the upcoming meeting schedule. Members decided to cancel the July 3^{rd} meeting and meet on July 17^{th} (regular meeting) and July 31^{st} (special meeting). On July 31^{st} K.Belliveau will present his final recommended changes.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 7:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah McShane, Planning & Zoning Director