



RUTLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

City Hall – 52 Washington St. – Rutland, VT 05701
Mailing Address: P. O. Box 969 – Rutland, VT 05702
Phone: 802-773-1800

3/2/2016

Minutes March 2, 2016

Present: Dave Coppock (DC), Susan Schreibman (SS), Alvin Figiel (AF), Larry Walter (LW) and Patrick Griffin (PG).

DC, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm.

I. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS – The following items were added to the agenda:
New Business: Architectural Review alternate and Correspondence: Memo from Jeff Wennberg dated 3/1/16.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 17, 2016.

PG moved to approve the minutes of February 17, 2016. AF seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. NEW BUSINESS – Architectural Review Alternate.

Currently the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) is comprised of two members of the Planning Commission and two members of the RRA Board. For the Planning Commission the seats are held by DC and AF. AF is unavailable for the March 16 meeting of the ARC and therefore an alternate is necessary. ARC meetings are held on the 3rd Wednesday of every month at 8:30 am at City Hall in the downstairs conference room.

LW volunteered as alternate for the Architectural Review Committee.

Discussion continued on which projects the ARC reviews. In order for Planning Commission members to attend DRB meetings to review projects in all design control districts its' current meeting schedule does not work. AF moved to amend the meeting dates of the Planning Commission to the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays of the month. PG seconded. Motion was approved. The next meeting will be March 23. DC said he would reach out to Alan Shelvey regarding ARC responsibilities according to Charter.

V. OLD BUSINESS.

Sign Ordinance: Using a projector again, the Commission was able to view Google Maps to continue its work on the sign ordinance. The Commission reviewed the work on the sign ordinance that was done at the last meeting.

Discussion continued with regard to the maximum area of a free standing sign in the State/West, Woodstock, POP and NB district. AF lobbied for the max area to be 12 sq. ft. and business complexes should be identified by street address. DC did agree to reduce the max area from 32 sq. ft. to 24 sq. ft. SS said the Manchester sign ordinance allowed 16 sq. ft. with 8 tenants and up to 2 sq. ft. per additional tenant over 8 up to 24 sq. ft. max. AF proposed 12 sq. ft. max with 2 sq. ft. for address.

PG asked if Woodstock Avenue would be its own district and the Commission decided not to single it out.

The Commission discussed prohibiting reader boards or LED changing signs in all districts.

There was discussion regarding gas stations. DC suggested, as homework, they should each research how gas stations are dealt with under other towns' ordinances and report back at the next meeting.

The Commission then discussed Gateway 4 & 7. AF said the area of 4 & 7 is the oldest part of the City and the lack of landscaping, varied signs and highway signs dishonor the history of this gateway. He proposed drastic changes to the landscape and encouraged the Commission to consider a future vision for 4&7. He also proposed 12 sq. ft. max area free standing signs and 1 sq. ft. per lineal ft. of building frontage for building signs. He suggested prohibiting readers, internally lit signs and rooftop signs.

Regarding Downtown building signs the Commission discussed a separate section in the ordinance for the Plaza. AF believes the Plaza signage falls under Act 250 jurisdiction. The Commission decided to focus on multi-story downtown buildings and discussed vertical signage, insurance requirements, how signage livens up the Downtown and how it is at the discretion of the ARC. LW pointed out that the ARC has no "teeth" and therefore building signs for the Downtown should be in the sign ordinance. AF proposed 1 sq. ft. x lineal ft. x #of building stories.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE.

3/1/16 – City of Rutland Jeff Wennberg, Complete Streets Plan Request.

Commissioner Wennberg's memo requested that the Planning Commission prepare a draft long term plan for integration and build-out of a shared use path system for the City.

SS discussed the re-engineering of Segment 4 of the Rutland Creek Path and how it could connect to Spruce Street Ext. PG asked SS to bring a map of the path for the next meeting. DC said it would be imperative to get a list from DPW of planned road improvements for the next 5 years. SS asked Barbara to scan the memo and send it to the Commissioners.

VII. ADJOURN.

The next meeting will be held at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, March 23 at the RRPC. PG moved to adjourn. AF seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting ended at 7:48 pm.

For the Commission
Barbara Spaulding, Recording Secretary



MEMO

To: David Coppock, Chair, Rutland City Planning Commission

From: Jeff Wennberg, Commissioner of Public Works

Date: March 1, 2016

Re: Complete Streets Plan Request

Summary

The DPW requests the Planning Commission prepare a draft long term plan for integration and build-out of a shared use path system for the City.

Background

The DPW, with input from the Police and Recreation Departments and the RRA, is in the process of preparing a draft Complete Streets Plan for review and comment later this year. In our most recent meeting we discussed the need to integrate the three shared use paths into a 'system'. The three pieces are the shared use path along Main Street Park and down the hill, Spruce Street Extension behind the downtown plaza, and the Creek Path. At a minimum we would like to propose workable routes that could link these segments together. Once the routes are identified, future capital investments along these corridors should seek to incorporate the new shared use segments.

Given the built up nature of these areas, we assume many new segments will have to be within or along existing streets, which will come up for reconstruction or upgrade at some point in the future. The example offered was to connect the Main St. shared use path with Spruce Street Ext. via River St and Madison Ave. When the state prepares to replace the River St. Bridge, having this corridor identified would signal the need for a bridge that could accommodate a "lane" for non-vehicular traffic.

If the commission is interested it would also be desirable to consider a further build-out of the shared use path system, potentially connecting key facilities with the off-road network. A map showing the existing segments and facilities is being prepared by the Engineering Division for your use if you decide to undertake this planning task.