**Form Based Code Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**April 8, 2015**

**DRAFT**

Committee members in attendance: Ingrid Nuse, Jollie Parker, Kylie Hill, Charles Flaum, Dan Langevin, Scott Meyer.

Other attendees: Paul Dreher, David Butler (Planning Commission Chair), Abby Mattera, Lea Kilvadyova

------

***Public outreach***

David Butler explained that he came to the Steering Committee meeting for two reasons. First, he would like to ensure good coordination of public outreach between the Steering Committee and the Planning Commission. Second, he invited the Steering Committee to participate in Planning Commission’s meetings and regularly report the Committee’s progress. The next Planning Commission meeting is on Tuesday, April 14th at 7:00 p.m.

David offered Planning Commission’s help with holding future public input meetings. He said his vision for a public meeting is for a day-long (say 8 hours) session where people can come in and out to look at the plans and ask questions.

Steering Committee members agreed that it was important to have more public meetings and let people be heard. Paul Dreher said he is available to help as well. Dan Langevin suggested creating a “frequently expressed concerns list” and making it available to the public.

***Table of contents for the proposed code***

Paul presented an outline of the table of contents for the proposed code. A couple of items in the table that Paul needs to get clarity about include administration, architectural standards, parking and loading, and building functions and uses.

Administration

Paul said that there are two processes for processing applications; Administrative and Development Review Board.

1. The administrative process is the simpler of the two processes. It involves one person (administrator) who compares the proposed project against a checklist of FBC requirements. Paul said that the checklist review is very simple with only a few questions such as: “Does the proposed building has x number of stories? Does it have X% of glazing?” Lea suggested that it might be helpful to have the checklist available at a public input meeting so people can visualize the review process new projects would go through.
2. The second approach to a project review requires an evaluation by a Development Review Board which Johnson will need to set up. A model that might work for Johnson would be to use the administrative review for smaller projects. Projects exceeding a certain threshold size would be evaluated by the Development Review Board.

Architectural Standards

We need to discuss whether to include these in the code or not.

Parking and Loading Standards

Paul suggested that it would be a good idea to require that new projects create parking spaces. Residential construction in particular should incorporate on-site parking solutions. For commercial projects, a standard could be to require three parking spaces for every 1,000 sq. feet of the project. Scott thought it would be a good idea to define parking standards because in some parts of the Village parking is a mess.

Building Functions and Uses

As previously discussed, form based code does not typically focus on regulating building uses. However, Paul said that it may be good to have a discussion about this topic. For example, in Newport, one “use” standard does not allow, in certain districts, businesses that rely on heavy industrial traffic.

Paul suggested that he will draft some language for the Committee to review. Ingrid requested that the language be emailed to the Committee prior to the meeting. She also requested that an Agenda for the meeting was created in order for the committee to stay focused.

----------- Notes taken by: Lea Kilvadyova