



Town of Jericho  
Planning Commission

**Jericho Planning Commission Minutes**  
**Special Meeting**  
**June 14, 2016**  
**Approved July 5, 2016**

**Present:** Jason Cheney, Susan Bresee, Katie Forleo, Barbara Bedard  
**Absent:** Conor Lahiff, Phyl Newbeck, Samantha Dunn  
**Public:** Glenn Martin, David Villeneuve, Ellie Martin  
**Guests:** Katherine Sonnicks (Planner), David Raphael (LandWorks)

Jason called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Public Comment

David V asked if there was a formal vote taken after the PC discussed land use regulations concerning square footage.

Commercial District Community Discussion with Land Works

David Raphael from LandWorks noted that the object of the meeting was to sort through the information gathered from the workshop. He noted some takeaways from the questionnaire, survey and feedback:

- 1) The first item was transportation, such as speed limit and how roads are managed.
  - a. Walkability, provisions for a bike path as well as incentives for curb cut and access management. Shared access, sidewalks and more integrated development to the district makes sense. Pedestrian safety and connectivity was important and could be articulated in the town plan. An official town map or district master plan would be framework for how sidewalks were built or how transportation was recommended. How a bike path could be integrated with a walking capability and whether it would work within the district.
  - b. The PC already has the ability to request easements for pedestrian connectivity for development. The DRB can request that as a condition and has been asking for that.
  - c. There is an unstated presumption that the uses in the district would be well served to have lots of pedestrian access. But some businesses would not be able to be accommodated there, in relation to auto connectivity. Such as how some people drive to drop of a car at an auto repair shop walk home. A use that does not require or use pedestrian connectivity may not be needed in that district. Uses, standards and requirements should reflect whether or not a district has pedestrian connectivity.
- 2) Design standards (which are different from guidelines) should be specific and doable, but not onerous.

- a. Level of detail should be made carefully as standards can turn into lawsuits. Concerns should be heard such as how parking in the back may not be feasible. On the other side, views about scenic views and town character may not want long strips of only parking lots in the front.
  - b. Example: South Burlington had pretty high standards for any residential subdivision as far as landscape, which was substantial but not overwhelming investment in street trees which may have a burden up front for development cars but now are very pleasant to look at and have property value which may not otherwise have been there.
  - c. The town should require as well as encourage certain types of development practices, which were very stressed in the feedback. While may be more expensive in the short term, will make more sense in the long term. Such as green infrastructure, something that the people are looking for as well as integrating renewable energy such as wind and especially rooftop solar.
  - d. As far as character and performance standards, it should be made clear which development performance standards are expected to meet goals. It gives developers specific and logical ways to reach overall design standards.
- 3) District boundaries
- a. There are fiscal and natural resource constraints that will over time affect where building can happen.
- 4) Development
- a. Limiting and exempting drive-thrus for restaurants would make sense. But franchises cannot be banned because of definition technicalities. If businesses really want to develop they will fit within the provided parameters.
  - b. The workshop provided information about what type of businesses the people want and will support which will be useful to developers.
  - c. It could instead be made clear what types of development is not wanted and leave it open ended, and then evaluate submissions based on merit so that zoning does not exclude types of development that is wanted.
  - d. The village center is not developed enough so there is a need for development which is being asked for elsewhere.
  - e. According to the survey, 77% of respondents thought the town should do nothing speeds up development. Later, 41% said they wanted the pace of development (in specific commercial) slow down. The overall impression is that the town wants the PC only to protect, preserve, be mindful and bring in services that will enhance property value, bring in local employment, make their life more convenient and make quality of life better.
  - f. For this reason, the name master plan should not be used because it sounds like a promotion of development, but there should be an overall framework to facilitate current development and redirect 'visually challenging' buildings.
  - g. What has happened in the past should not dictate what will happen in the future.
  - h. There is one large parcel that is owned by the homeowners association. The parcel across the watercourse could be preserved and utilized. David V commented that it is the only parcel that does not have, and will not have access to route 15.
  - i. Some parcels should not be developed, or have limited development.

5) Scenic piece

- a. Whether there should be an overlay that addresses some of those elements (open space and greenspace) would not be confined to those district but extend beyond the village center.

Jason asked for public comment.

Ellie Martin commented that Vermont is becoming unaffordable for businesses and homeowners because of high taxes. She also voiced her belief that the town had done another study because of dollar general and it was unfair to discriminate. She also said environmental court is not fun, a waste of money, but she had never lost.

Jason answered that it was important to come together to work with both the general public as well as the major land owners. The reason the study is happening is because there was an inconsistency in the language of plans and the study is to help with how to go about that. David R added that plans should always be revisited and revised as the town changes so that it reflects the needs and values of the community as a whole as well as the major property owners.

Ellie Martin commented that the real issue for her is that she did not want the PC to pass a zoning ordinance that discriminates against her land or find herself in court.

(Person who did not sign in) commented that there was a lot of cross country skiing in an undeveloped area of a commercial district near route 15.

PC discussed planning for future meeting on commercial district

- 1) Review draft with property owners before getting to public workshop
- 2) Return back to frame decisions that need to be made
- 3) Get a handle on what needs to be changed in current language, frame question about uses, and take next step into overlay discussion
- 4) Revisit standards and guidelines because there was such an interest shown in the workshop.
- 5) Put down on paper specific decisions and what they would look like then create a first draft based on those recommendations as well as articulate specific concerns language uses.
- 6) Create framework without using the word master plan, but create an understanding of where things are thought to be going.

Jason asked for public comment

David Villeneuve commented that the name master plan should be used because that is what he believes is needed. He thinks the district boundaries should be made to encompass more land so that all land is in one district or another. He also believes the commercial district (200 acres) is too small and should be 500 acres.

Ellie Martin commented that high density is moving this way from Essex.

Other Business

None

On a motion by Barbara, seconded by Katie, the PC adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m. Motion passed 4-0.