

Town of Bristol  
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING  
HYBRID Public Meeting  
Tuesday, April 4, 2023  
Meeting Minutes

**D R A F T**

**Planning Commission Members Present** *[in person and by remote]*: Kevin Hanson, Robert Rooker, John Moyers, Fred Baser, Chanin Hill, Melissa Hernandez, Slim Pickens  
**Absent**: Bill Sayre, Jeff Lunstead

**Visitors**: Addison County Regional Planning Commission (ACRPC) Executive Director Adam Lougee, Jim Quaglino

**Others Present**: Zoning Administrator Kris Perlee, Peggy Connor, recording secretary

**Call to Order**: Kevin Hanson called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

**I. Review agenda for additions, removal, or adjustment of any items per 1 V.S.A. §312(d)(3)(A) and implicit approval**

None.

**II. Continuing Business:**

**a. Discussion: Continue By-Law Modernization Grant Work with ACRPC:**

**1. Continued Discussions on the High Density Residential (HDR) District to include:**

- i. Are the setbacks and other zoning dimensional standards appropriate to the area?**
- ii. Is the density of the units appropriate for the district?**
- iii. Are the housing units allowed in the district appropriate for the area?**

Continuing the discussion held at the Planning Commission's February 21<sup>st</sup> meeting to consider changes to current dimensional standards in the High Density Residential (HDR) district, ACRPC Executive Director Adam Lougee shared a sample map showing a portion of the HDR district to include Elm, Pleasant, Taylor and North Streets. Adam reviewed the current dimensional standards for the district as cited in the Unified Development Regulations:

	Minimum	Maximum
Residential density	n/a	4 dwelling units
Commercial density and lot size	n/a	1 unit/acre
Residential lot size	10,000 sf	n/a
Lot frontage	75 ft.	n/a
Lot coverage	n/a	50%
Front-yard setback	40 ft. principal; 20 ft. accessory (behind principal frontline)	n/a
Side-yard/rear-yard setback	15 ft. principal; 10 ft. accessory	n/a
Building height	n/a	35 ft.
Footprint/structure	n/a	5,000 sf principal; 1,000 sf accessory

**Dimensional Standards to Remain the Same:**

PC members agreed to maintain the following dimensional standards in the HDR district since Adam indicated that the ACRPC study confirms the following work in terms of compliance:

- Lot depth: 75 ft.
- Lot coverage: 50% maximum
- Front-yard setback: 40' for principal; 20' for accessory
- Side-yard/rear-yard setback: 15' for principal; 10' for accessory

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97

- Footprint/structure: 5,000 sf maximum for principal; 1,000 sf for accessory
- Height: 35' maximum

Proposed Recommendations:

Noting that two of the lots shown on the sample map are in violation of the 75-foot frontage requirement for the district, Adam suggested reducing lot frontage to 60 feet. By decreasing the lot frontage requirement to 60 feet, the pre-existing non-conforming structures will be in compliance thereby making the permitting process easier (i.e., by-right permit issued administratively by ZA versus applying to Development Review Board for a variance), as well as creating more opportunity for more housing density in the village.

Regarding residential lot size and residential density, which Adam suggested are tied together, he recommended that by reducing the current lot size of 10,000 square feet in the HDR district to 8,000, pre-existing non-conforming lots would be brought into compliance thereby facilitating the permitting process, and allowing for 5 units per dwelling versus the current 4. Adam explained that an acre consists of 40,000+/- square feet, so if the residential lot size were decreased from 10,000 to 8,000 square feet, the density would be increased to allow for a maximum of 5 development units versus 4:

- 16,000 square feet = 2 units
- 24,000 square feet = 3 units
- 32,000 square feet = 4 units
- 40,000 square feet = 5 units (maximum)

Following discussion, support for reducing lot size from 10,000 to 8,000 square feet failed to garner a majority of those present. Adam then asked if members would consider increasing residential density for two-family and multi-family dwellings. For example, increase the current 4 units per acre to 6 or 8 for duplexes, depending on the desired density. Citing 24 V.S.A. §4426, Adam noted that although one- and two-family dwellings are subject to site plan review by the DRB, multi-family homes and accessory dwelling units are not.

Following review of the sample map provided by Kris and Kevin showing ADU's, duplexes, and multi-family homes in the HDR district, Fred Baser requested additional time to consider increasing density for duplexes. Melissa Hernandez asked that additional data be made available showing the number of existing duplexes and multi-family units impacted by changing the residential density standard.

Next steps for next PC meeting:

Adam will work with ACRPC's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Manager Hannah Andrew to provide additional data to include the HDR district in its entirety, with lot sizes and the number of existing lots that can be subdivided. Kevin pointed out that state legislation now being debated, S.100 and H.68, that would allow additional dwelling units on individual lots, may render the issue moot.

**III. Public Comment**

None

**IV. Adjournment**

Chanin Hill moved to adjourn; John Moyers seconded. All in favor 7-0. **MOTION PASSED.**  
Meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peggy Connor