

## **Suggested Zoning Approach**

Typo - Chris' summary says CD is not a village district. I think he means is not a village center district.

Mention of 15k total limit for commercial - Chris says this is different than what we have discussed? We have not discussed yet any size issues - we constantly deferred discussion of size (until now). It has been deferred but should be discussed (JC), should we incentivize smaller footprints and smaller lots? (JC)

FAR - how would that work on a 10 acre site? (Look at sizes of existing lots - what's the biggest lot? - to see if this is a real concern). Can we see example that does include parking (less than currently required but still reasonable example, assuming we will reduce parking minimums), and 3 stories. I'm personally very concerned about size, massing, heights. We are a small town, characterized by small buildings. We should not encourage sprawling development. Our neighbors Williston and Essex are well suited, with transit, etc. We are not. We should not seek to duplicate their pattern of development.

Could we offer incentives so that land owners "cluster" development and leave some open space for public access (the Stowe bike path vision). This may be particularly appropriate for the 10 acre lots.

Access - sounds like Rt 15 NEW CURB cut would still be allowed? I thought we have consensus no new curb cuts. Future lot subdivisions should be restricted from adding new curb cuts to Route 15.

- What about new curb cuts on the south side of RT 15?
- No new curb cuts on rte 15 is a consensus agreement (JC)
- No parking should be allowed on route 15 (JC)
- Parking should be encouraged on internal roads
- Shared

View - Rt 15 is important but not the only view. We need to consider residents both north and south of CD - Foothills, Jericho East, etc.

Parking - keeping lots small with pedestrian paths through (medians, etc.)

Off site impacts - might this include stormwater? Off site parking (JC)

Connectivity - could be more robust. Westford awards extra points for ag/food based biz, we could use points to encourage development of connectivity assets - park & ride, EV chargers, bike share location, shuttle pick up, bus stop, etc. Should require complete streets design on new streets - town and private.

PUD - thoughts on how the new zoning will preserve, enhance, or require the PUD tool?

Incentivising. There are certain things that the town has said they want in the CD. Like mixed use housing, shared parking, street parking, underground parking, solar canopied parking, screening from RT 15, connectivity. Those things might not work as well with the point system. Would these be better suited somehow with an incentive?

When you presented the approach earlier, you were thinking that PUDs would be utilized in the CD. What is your thinking on that now? If they are utilized, how does that work with the proposed zoning?

Would there be a different permitted density before community water (and septic) are provided?

How does FAR work with larger parcels? Does that mean there could be really large buildings? Aside from recreational facilities, it doesn't seem like people wanted large buildings.

Maybe preferred uses would get a higher FAR? Smaller lots having a higher ratio? (JC)

Are the current Zoning height standards still in play? If not, what is the max height? (understanding buildings could be taller in the lower lying areas.) We should discuss the pros and cons of incentivizing higher buildings with concern that too many taller buildings will permanently change the landscape of Jericho (JC)

We also need to consider the Raceway "viewshed" in addition to RT15. I would argue that this is more important, as these folks live there (and pay taxes here) and are more impacted by the view than by folks driving down Rt 15.

Points system. This seems pretty complex compared to Westford's. Is this too complex? Are there other examples of other towns using this? What criteria does the PC use to "assign" points to criteria? This assumes that they will be weighted by priority (as defined by the Town Plan) and not of equal value.

Should some of the criteria just be required? Such as not interrupting the view? Need Connections. No storing of things outdoors. Yes yes yes and yes (JC)

Some criteria needs to be required and some can be seen as optional/points

Incentivize: energy

- Need to be careful about making too many things as requirements. The land owners have been clear about the new regulations not being too cumbersome. There should be some flexibility.
- Could there be incentives for doing some nicer things? Like nicer screening?
- Incentivize shared parking/ off site parking/ parallel or road side parking on interior roads (JC)

Is Stowe a good example of what we want to see along the Mtn. Rd? But with depth, not just development along RT 15.

It is important to look at the general Town Plan goals, not just the goals of the CD. Such as the energy efficiency and renewable generation

## **Mind Map**

vision statement shown should be the full final vision statement. The Mind Map is a great public engagement tool - can we put it on the website once it's edited?

Wondering if on the map, the specifics of the FAR can be left out. Just say "Use FAR"

Respectful of the Landscape - Add protection of the Ag land

Energy Goals needs to be its own category; it is very different than Respectful of the Landscape. The should include renewable energy generation, energy efficiency, park and ride, EV charging, etc

Connections could also have park and ride; also could include access to public space

Mixed use should have something specific about affordable and senior housing.