General Summary of the Issues raised in the Survey 158 Responses

Note: the percentages below are from the on-line survey. Comments in RED are from the day of the vote exit survey.

1) The term elderly was replaced with senior throughout. 155 responses - 88.4% agreed (previous 107 responses 93.5% agreed)

Comments:
- Makes no difference
- Please define senior more clearly....
- Don’t think the change is needed
- Changing the wording does not fix the problem with the reg.
- The term Senior is more appropriate than elderly; Senior denotes aged and experienced, elderly denotes frail and weak
- "Elderly" implies (to me) a person who is much older than the official retirement age that many people accept because of Social Security. "Senior" starts at an earlier age, 62, when Social Security and many others define it as such.

2) Zoning district purpose descriptions are revised to match Town Plan language. -155 responses – 83.9% agreed (previous 108 responses - 89.8% agreed)

Comments:
- Town Plan has been forced upon us, and many don't agree with parts of the plan that was previously passed. This is deeper than "just" this vote. (6)
- The Town Plan is wrong. We are suburban, not rural.
- Description/definition changes are sneaky in the changes
- I feel the descriptions for the Commercial and Village Center Districts were too restrictive and tried to limit creativity and imagination on dealing with unique situations.
- Should not have changed Com District prior to tonight's meeting

3) Addition of a Green Stormwater Infrastructure definition. – 151 responses – 88.1% agreed (previous 107 responses - 89.7% agreed)

Comments:
- $$$ - How much will this type of thing cost???
- Isn't there a standard we can refer to so we don’t have to change this every time new techniques are accepted?
- try not to make it sound so snooty. it also adds cost to development.
- Heard the changes were not in line with states regs
- To complex
4) Renaming the Agriculture District to Rural/Agriculture Residential District and the Rural Residential District to the Low Density Residential District to mirror existing uses and development. –151 response – 82.1% agree (previous 105 responses- 87.6% of people agreed)

- They don't need to be changed.
- It really the purpose. I don’t accept that agriculture is dead.
- It is a restriction of our freedom to use our own property as we see fit.
- Description/definition changes are sneaky in the changes
- I would like to better understand this renaming particularly the rural residential district to low density residential district.
- I agree with the change IF you define each term the first two or three times they are used in the document ... and putting them at the end of the document so the reader has to flip through doesn't cut it. Define the first time they are used and place right after the term.
- Why did you rename the Agriculture District to Rural/Agriculture Residential District and the Rural Residential District to the Low Density Residential District to mirror existing uses and development. How will that effect what land owners will be able to do with their land?
- It isn't broken, don't change what works

5) Density bonus availability and eligibility requirements for Planned Unit Developments were changed. – 138 responses - 71.7% agreed (previous 97 responses -75.3% agreed)

Comments:
- too much.gov't interference (2)
- Very difficult language to understand - why must I hire a professional just to read the literature?
- New regulations were far too restrictive (1)
- No info on HOW they were changed
- Why did you cut the bonus in half?
- I'm not clear on what the changes are. (7)
- The town has voted on numerous occasions on what we want, and this isn't it
- Such a short sited change. Creates a complete disincentive to the two most important things we need to support. Ensures that both will not exist in Jericho
- I do not want to see many or any PUDs in Jericho. You get put through hell to subdivide a 10 acre lot to build to 2000sf homes which will ensure we still look like Jericho, but you all are on board with doing what Williston has ... all to bring in more people and cram them into small spaces. If you want a PUD for Seniors, I'm good with that if the design is tasteful and it's affordable for seniors. I would rather see an area developed with homes in the 1200-1800sf range on 1/2 to 3/4 acre lots that are AFFORDABLE so we can get some young families back in Jericho.
- Need to change the PUD requirements that result in the need for bonuses.
- Need Clarification(2)

6) The Zoning Administrator is allowed to grant a 90-day extension for recording a final plat if other permits or approvals are still pending. -149 responses - 89.9% agreed (previous 105 responses - 91.4% agreed)
Comments:
- Sorry, don't really understand this one, and the implications of it. (3)
- to much authority to zoning administrator (2)
- 180 days is the current statute that should be sufficient
- From what I hear the whole permit process, town and state takes far too long. Will this change correct that problem or add to it?
- Put it to a vote on town election day

7) How to calculate the maximum square footage for an accessory apartments, clarification to the definition of accessory apartments and how to determine if an accessory apartment is subordinate to the principal dwelling. – 149 responses - 73.2% agreed (previous 104 responses - 76.9% agreed)

Comments:
- Too controlling (2)
- Too many rules, period.(3)
- I mostly agree, but have some concern with the necessity that septic be shared. (4)
- disagree with same driveway, septic needed
- Don't like the 200 ft. distance and shared drive and sceptic.
- Explain Yourselves! (3)
- let’s make this a more relaxed thing, we need more housing, so let’s not get in the way of this kind of development at all.
- Should be allowed to build as you like, less own driveway
- Something like an in-law apartment should be able to be larger than the limits presented.

8) Clarification on how to make structural changes to existing structures in the Riverside Character Based Zoning District. – 145 responses - 77.9% agreed (previous 100 responses - 82% agreed)

Comments:
- I disagree with the "character based zoning" that was put into place. This was developed by out-of-state people, paid large $$$ by the Selectboard, and didn't reflect the desires of many people in town. Again, the failure of this vote is much deeper.
- More respect needs to be given to the property owners with less regulation.
- I'm not sure I under the Riverside Character Based Zoning District.
- Don't have enough info to answer.
- The town drew up a specific plan for that area years ago, without input from owner. Anything the owner wanted for the property was promptly rejected. More respect needs to be given to the property owners with less regulation.
- The Riverside Character Based Zoning District is a deterrent to business owners wanting to move into the area. What is wrong with the way residential homes have been turned into businesses in the Jericho Corners Village District?
- too much regulation, there are nice looking buildings here and dumpy looking (2)
9) A reduction in the maximum allowed square footage for any building in town from 60,000 square feet to a footprint of 12,000 square feet. Exempted from this size are structures in the Commercial District which are now limited to 30,000 square feet, which is the size of the largest building in that district and agricultural structures which have no limitation on size. – 156 responses – 65.4% agreed (previous 108 responses - 70.4% agreed)

Comments:

- Do not limit growth in a dying town
- Square footage reduction seems to be a way to "fight" against businesses we don't want.
- Maximum square footage in commercial district is too low. Unfairly limits economic development. (3)
- Limits Recreation Facility (3), schools (4) (4), senior group housing, indoor parking, pool, event space, schools.
- Need a process for any deviations. Is it a hard rule or can non-conforming uses be approved?
- Not enough public input was put into this decision. Let's hear more of what the community has to say.
- I initially supported this change, but after attending the planning meeting the night of the vote, I don't. Creating a blanket limitation on size seems to eliminate possibilities before they can be considered. How buildings look and feel, in order to preserve that "small town" culture, seems to be controlled pretty well by the group that reviews plans and designs.
- How about we take it down by 1/4 instead of 1/2 then re-assess in a year or 2 (2)
- If a person can afford and wants a larger than 12000 square foot house, why refuse it? Take in the large taxes with less strain on Jericho schools and infrastructure.
- I agree in spirit with this change, but I think that size is somewhat arbitrary. It's probably better to focus on aesthetics, fire/water requirements. I don't think we want a bunch of 30,000 sq ft warehouses (like the one next to Jerihill), which this wouldn't prevent.
- But maybe more specific use / size maximums would be better. For example, we could cap retail at 30K, and allow community center / recreational to be at the max 60K. I don't ever want to pay for another Cairns arena, but I do want the hockey pie in the hockey sky dreamers on my side.
- 12,000 may be too limiting, however aside from a potential sports facility which could really only go behind Mountain High somewhere, and would then be exempt from this as it is in the commercial district. I feel 60,000 square feet it too large.
- What is the point? Have we had issues with this? Are we expecting issues? Why not 40,000? Why 30,000? Have companies come to town wanting 60,000
- I'm good with the in town limitation. Do not agree with the 30000sf limit.
- If its design right and looks good why limit the size
- What if someone wanted to build a 9000sq' footprint home (ranch style) but wanted and attached 4000sq' indoor pool? Not enough thought has been put into this! We'd also be losing tax $$$ by not allowing people to build what they want

10) Limiting parking in the Commercial District to the side and rear of a building. This mirrors a requirement already in existence in the Village Center and Village Zoning Districts. – 157 responses – 68.2% agreed (previous 110 responses - 73.6% agreed)
Comments:

- Who cares? Stop making regulations to make regulations
- People need to see cars parked in front of businesses (3)
- Need to have more options for business owners.
- Each parcel is individual in its geographical orientation and needs. Too broad of a brush stroke with this policy. I feel like I would prefer to assess this on a case by case basis.
- There should be means to waver this when excessive cost or physical barriers make it impractical.
- Conditional use could mitigate the effects of road side parking, often needed for business viability.
- It would depend on the property and it's use. (4)
- There should be means to waver this when excessive cost or physical barriers make it impractical. I believe it is more important to provide Adequate Parking. Circumstances such as parking haphazardly on the street (Jericho Tavern) create a dangerous situation for patrons as well as the general public.
- I feel like I would prefer to assess this on a case by case basis. The "Commercial District" is not as developed now as it may become, and I'm not sure if this is a necessary regulation, or something that should be considered for each individual site.
- Nothing in these zones has this parking requirement. Again seems like a targeted regulation, and over regulation.
- It's a COMMERCIAL district, limiting parking this way makes it far more difficult for someone to have an in-home business, and makes a small business in an existing structure a lot more difficult. This seems designed to prevent businesses from being successful or starting in the commercial district.
- Disagree even with the parking in Village Center and Village Zoning District.
- Making access harder is detrimental to growth.
  - Shouldn't matter. Can be screened with landscaping.
  - Too many unanswered questions regarding changes & not enough input.

If you voted no on January 17, were there other reasons than listed above to why you voted no? – 153 responses – 73.2% voted yes (previous 108 responses - 75% of people voted yes)

Comments:

- Too much all at once. Gives pc too much authority
- By asking for how I voted, you are somewhat doing a dry-run to see if another vote might change things without making substantive changes.
- If there are things that were REQUIRED by the State of VT, then you should go ahead and propose a minimal set of LEGALLY REQUIRED changes, present this to the public, and then ask for approval.
- Respect those who would like further clarification.
- I did not agree with the idea of the Town using taxpayer dollars to send out a postcard telling us how to vote. (3)
• If a Jericho resident attends a meeting, they should be allowed to speak and ask questions. That should always be on the "agenda"
• The planning commission has been making their plans according to what the three selectboard members want, instead of listening to the people of Jericho.
• I would have liked like more transparency and communication in advance of the vote, and I feel like the vote could have been completed on town meeting day without the time and expense associated with a special election. (2)
• too many regulations for our town. (3)
• The Planning Commission needs a complete overhaul and needs people of conservative values who have at least a modicum of common sense.
• Don’t rush changes" "Process - more information needed - want to see tax base in Jericho grow commercially to help with high taxes
• I wanted more input and time for all to contribute (3)
• Not enough info.
• Voted not because knew nothing about it.

12) Do you have any additional comments?

• I don't have a specific reason to add. It is complex and detailed language and I need more time to study it and ask questions.
• When there is too much that is not understood... it is looked at negatively. Why do we need it if we don't understand why we need MORE regulations or CHANGED regulations that served us well all these years?
• I think a lot of the opposition was more to the fact that people didn't really know or understand what they were voting on. Breaking the zoning changes up into more, smaller packages with a more concerted effort by the PC and SelectBoard to explain them would make a big difference
• These changes should of been presented, discussed and voted on at town meeting.
• Zoning regs can be eye glazing; confusing. I appreciate many of the changes, but, how do we read them and not fall asleep?
• Too much control (4)
• Many of the changes are benign and of little consequence. I would recommend resubmitting changes to the Selectboard, omitting the issues of primary contention for further discussion so the town might be brought closer in line with the town plan and state regs
• Perhaps Front Porch Forum could be used more frequently to communicate with Jericho residents who don't follow the town's governmental matters. That said, having the videos of all the meetings online has been very interesting to me, so keep that up!