**Form Based Code Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**May 6, 2015**

**DRAFT**

Committee members in attendance: Ingrid Nuse, Jollie Parker, Kylie Hill, Scott Meyer, Glenn Callahan, Walter Pomroy, Mark Nielsen, Kyle Nuse.

Other attendees: Paul Dreher, David Butler (Planning Commission Chair), Lea Kilvadyova (Community & Economic Development Coordinator)

***Questions, comments, feedback***

Walter asked to clarify the definition of 80% glazing. In the ideal world, Paul said, the 80% would represent the height of the first floor front wall. It doesn’t always work that way but generally the windows have to be taller than wider.

***Review of Form Based Code’s “Administration” section***

The Committee reviewed the Administration document supplied by Paul. Paul said that the two levels of review described in the document are a review by an administrative officer and a review by Development Review Board (DRB). Typically, permit applications get reviewed and decided upon by the administrative officer. Sometimes the officer may decide to forward the application to the DRB for their decision. This typically happens if the proposed project is large or the developer is asking for a variance, or the project can’t meet the letter of the law vis a vis environmental standards. The Administration document has a flow chart that describes the application process. The document also describes types of development that are exempt from the permit requirement.

There will be fees associated with the permit process. The Committee recommends to the Selectboard a fee ranging from $25 to $75 per application. There will also be a separate fee for recording the permit.

Exemptions: While reviewing the exemptions, Scott suggested changing the size of detached accessory structures from 64 sq feet to 100 sq feet.

Certificate of Occupancy: The Committee suggested changing the “Certificate of Occupancy” to “Certificate of Compliance”

Subdivisions: The administrative document does not address subdivisions. Currently, the subdivisions get reviewed by the State in case the subdivided development requires potable water and septic permits. Within the Village, a developer has to place a request with the Village Trustees for sewer capacity and if granted, then obtain the State’s permit.

Level of involvement by DRB: An extensive discussion happened around the discrepancy between sections 3.01 which limits the DRB’s review to Building Envelope Standards and 3.03(G) which enables the DRB a review that broadly exceeds the focus on Building Envelope Standards. There was no consensus in the group on how to resolve this discrepancy.

***Review of Form Based Code’s “Nonconformities” section***

Walter expressed a concern about the part of the document that says ”replacement, refurbishment or improvement greater than 35% of gross square footage shall comply with the façade standards and parking design standards”. He said that if an existing business makes interior changes that impact more than 35% of square footage, it doesn’t make sense to require from that business to comply with the suggested language. Through the discussion it was clarified that the 35% of gross square footage does not concern interior changes but it would apply to exterior alterations of the building footprint. Paul said he will amend the language to avoid future confusion.

Next meeting will be on May 20th.

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