Ned Dubois Comments/Responses by Joe Flynn:

Ned:
Thanks for the detailed review.
My thoughts below in bold, but I will convey your wishes, on the items.

Regarding the "Maintain extensive list of uses" in the mind map, would it be better to maintain a small list of uses that should be discouraged thus avoiding the majority of questions about use.
It has been my experience that no matter how well you formulate a list, be it inclusive **or exclusive, there are still many uses that are missed which will fall into a conditional use criteria. Typically an inclusive list prevails.**

Single use buildings that are limited to 15,000 sq. feet are excluding possible sports arenas or other such facilities.
Agreed, the movement towards set standards should be discouraged. The site greatest limitation is septic, that should be the only factor that limits building square footage.

Do all parking lots require paving with asphalt or is there some possible point advantage to not installing impervious materials.
Agree, there needs to be flexibility, and since gravel and pavement have basically the same runoff values it should be a moot point. As long as public standards are meet.

As nice as the idea of renewable energy is, the panels and windmills are somewhat of an eyesore on their own, like the one next to the bank. When the signs and billboards laws were established a few years back, was any consideration was given to these items, certainly they obstruct our precious view yet each can be argued to have a useful purpose.
Agree, while I admire solar and wind, I have solar, appearance needs to be a primary concern. The panel at the bank looks like it was just thrown up there!

Perhaps a hedge that grows only 5 or 6 feet could installed on the north side of Rt 15 within the states ROW for the entire length in question. Then no issue about screening for parking would come about. I think this was done between Rt 2 and Rt 89 as a headlight screen in some areas, not sure if it was successful.
Not sure if I completely agree, depending on the appearance of the structures, seeing them, especially if mixed use is involved, can be favorable to a wall of trees.

Chris Brown made a good comment at the last PC meeting comparing the complexity of the point system needed for this project and that of Westford's which apparently is a much less complex

district. The complexity required might make developers have second thoughts. As our goal is development of this district then it should be complemented with a simplified regulatory system. **Again, the point system is a good approach, but not for a commercial district that allows mixed use. Back to the development potential, it still septic. You can tie all the density to the points system but in the end it what septic will yield. I think we are creating an answer for a question that doesn't exist.**

Wendy Verrei Berenback Comments:

It is important to look at the general Town Plan goals, not just the goals of the CD, when defining Planning and Design Standards. We should also look at the CCRPC ECOS plan again to make sure we are aligned with the that vision.

Point system has potential, but the devil is in the details. 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. Also, not sure about the relationship between PUD and the point system.

Miscellaneous Comments on P/D Standards
Concerns about density and FAR -It's very difficult for me to visual this. I would appreciate seeing some build out visuals or examples from other towns. With the information provided thus far, I can't say whether or not a FAR of 2.0 is appropriate.

Renewable energy generation and building efficiency needs be robust and if we go with the point system, heavily weighted. The State (and Jericho providing the Town Plan is amended) has ambitious energy target. Examples include - roof top solar, solar canopy parking, EV charging stations.

Need to clarify maximum building height and building size

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.

View - Rt 15 is important but not the only view. Equally important is the view for residents both north and south of CD - Foothills, Jericho East, etc. (they live here and pay taxes)

Parking -provide incentives for share parking, and permeable surfaces, Park and Ride
Reduce the required size of parking lots

Connectivity needs to be more robust

Don't forgot about the prime ag soils in this area. Be creative and bold about encourage small-scale ag with value-added businesses

Mind Map

Respectful of the Landscape - Add protection of the Ag land (it's in the Town Plan 6.2.3.1)

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

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

Bill Gardner Comments:

As I was reading the FAR discussion, it seemed to me that the base area of the lot within the setbacks should be the basis for buildable land area rather than also subtracting any unbuildable areas (wetlands, etc). Seems protecting the wetland and decreasing the buildable area is a double hit on the developer trying to develop that property. **Agreed, this was the same case/situation in Westford and once brought to the attention of the ZA, the rules were changed. (Joe Flynn)**

I also want to remind folks that once a commercial building is two stories, it will probably need an elevator. This increases the cost of construction. Retail and residential buildings (and mixed use) have differing elevator requirements

Susan Bresee Comments:

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).

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.
While setting parameters for size is a function of the planning phase, making a pre-determined assessment may prove overly restrictive. An athletic area, or brewery could very well be excluded. Site capacities need to be the governing factors, wastewater, stormwater and architectural must be the criteria judged upon. While the town is "small" growth is a function of the commercial zone. (Joe Flynn)

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.
A master plan roughly defining the placement of roads needs be a function of the task. This also must become a part of the Town Plan and on notice for all who wish to develop that they must meet the criteria. (Joe Flynn)

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 storm water?

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?

Mind Map - vision statement shown should be the full final vision statement, not the earlier version as it does now.

The Mind Map could be a great public engagement tool - can we put it on the website once it's edited?