

**Planning & Zoning Commission  
Regulations Committee - Village District Sub-Committee  
Minutes – April 19, 2010**

Present: Torrance Downes, Janet Edgerton, Nancy Fischbach, Peter Howard, Cathie Jefferson  
Absent: Jane Samuels

The Village District Sub-Committee meeting convened at 3:30 pm in the small meeting room at Town Hall.

Nancy advised the committee of Sally Carlson-Crowell's inquiry and her offer to attend a Historical Society meeting to provide further information on the Village District proposal. Also, Jane and Torrance will not be at the next discussion group due to other commitments. Nancy will cover Jane's piece at the Residential Focus Group and Janet will cover Torrance's

The committee briefly reviewed the invitee list and the responses to date. Janet will call those on the bottom half of the list which we have not heard from.

Much of the discussion focused on the definition of "substantial" as it would apply for residential properties. Jonathan Kastner's photos of homes on Village and Bridge Street were helpful in seeing how many different ways of doing the same thing, i.e., modifying a porch, would still be compatible with the neighborhood. Nancy will mount some of the photos for display at the residential focus group.

It was agreed that using the square foot method, a threshold of 100 SF was probably too small and 1000 SF was probably too big. The Residential Design Review handout will thus not 250 SF and 500 SF as under consideration. The examples of removing/adding a porch or garden shed and substantial landscaping will be removed. Exterior materials will be modified to include roofing, and addition of skylight will be added, both to be identified as not needing design review. The requirement that the construction be visible from a public way will also be added. The phrase "visible bulk presentation" might be incorporated into the explanation of when an application would have to be referred for design review.

It was noted that applications which met the threshold criteria would require a Site Plan approval since the ZEO would not be in a position to evaluate the Design Advisory report. Generally an application would not be delayed unless it just missed a Design Advisory meeting (assuming the Design Advisory Board is serving as the reviewer). History has shown that there are only one or two applications a month during peak building season which would be within the proposed residential Village District.

The phrasing on the Pros and Cons handout will be modified to emphasize what is essentially free design/architectural advice which applicants would be able to get as the result of design review.

The "Design Review" handout will be corrected so that the "substantial" definitions will be in sync with those on the "Residential Design Review" handout.

The committee also briefly discussed the draft Design Guidelines prepared by the DAB. It was agreed in that it was a first draft which had just come to us that none of it would be used for the focus group. All hoped for a joint meeting of P&Z and DAB to review, with the DAB providing a list of those items referred to in Peter Howard's cover memo: which design-related items from P&Z regs it feels should be in guidelines only, what redundancies there might be and which of these should be retained, and which items are inconsistent from one document to the other.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nancy Fischbach

04/21/10