

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
2 PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
3

4 DATE: Wednesday, January 13, 2016  
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.  
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

**Members Present**

Joss Besse, Bolton  
Cath Yann LaRose, South Burlington  
Ken Belliveau, Williston

Dana Hanley, Essex  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg  
Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Karen Purinton, Colchester

Dana Hanley, Essex  
Jeff Castle, Milton  
Clare Rock, Richmond

**Staff**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner  
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

7  
8  
9 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

10 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.  
11

12 **2. Approval of November 18, 2015 Minutes**

13  
14 Cath Yann LaRose made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau to approve the November 18, 2015 minutes. No  
15 further discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
16

17 **3. Community Rating System – Colchester Success**

18 Colchester has successfully obtained status as a Community Rating System Class 8 Community. Sarah Hadd  
19 and Karen Purinton gave the PAC an overview of the Community Rating System process and benefits. This  
20 program provides benefits based on having higher standards in your floodplain regulations. They explained  
21 that this was a big paperwork exercise, however they were already regulating development in the floodplain,  
22 and collecting all of the needed information. After managing recovery of the Spring 2011 lake flood damages  
23 (were a lot of folks re-built and already have the elevation certificates), they thought it would be helpful to get  
24 all of that information down on paper in case they need it again. They were accepted into program, effective  
25 in May. There are a number of areas where you can get credit: outreach, stormwater management (and being  
26 able to prove those calculations), how strict your regulations are, etc. Colchester essentially allows no new  
27 building in the floodplain. Existing buildings can't expand footprint and can't add any other buildings, but  
28 they can add height if they flood proof and elevate the structure 1' above the base flood elevation (BFE is 102'  
29 along the lake).  
30

31 Colchester received a rating of 8 – the best in VT. This rating provides landowners a 10% discount on flood  
32 insurance; and is therefore an incentive for residents to get flood insurance. Insurance discounts are in 5%  
33 blocks – so with every improved rating step (an improved score is a lower rating number) residents will get  
34 another 5% discount on flood insurance. Sarah Hadd indicated that Colchester has about 100 structures in  
35 floodplain, and only a small fraction have insurance. The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of  
36 2012, which was intended to require landowners to buy insurance more representative of the real cost of  
37 potential losses, was pulled back except for second homes. It also provides the Town with the best match  
38 scenario for FEMA disaster relief funds. Other benefits included education on other programs that the Town  
39 could take advantage of such as the Building Safety rating. They may be able to get a better rating based on  
40 their building codes, and this may ultimately help their ISO rating. They also analyzed their repetitive losses  
41 which was an informative exercise. Also, Karen indicated that the FEMA training center in MD offers a  
42 variety of courses, and the cost is covered (VT can send one person per year).  
43

44 They found it challenging to be held to the same standards as a coastal community. There are a number of  
45 points that you can get regarding development, and they weren't able to get those points because they don't  
46 allow development at all. They were not able to provide all of the information for the public infrastructure

1 credits. While, it took a number of months to compile all of the documentation, they were already gathering  
2 all of the information anyway. They don't anticipate the program taking too much effort to maintain: they'll  
3 need to do a few outreach ads, and complete an annual report.  
4

#### 5 **4. New Municipal Plan Review Documents**

6 Regina explained that VAPDA has been working on a new set of municipal plan review documents (flood  
7 resiliency checklist, initial plan review consultation and formal plan review) to ensure consistency in plan  
8 reviews across the State. The PAC agreed that the new formal plan review document is a better alternative  
9 than the current 'Appendix A' spreadsheet that we've been using; so we will start using that form. Cathyann  
10 LaRose suggested that it would be helpful if the form asked for section numbers rather than page numbers so  
11 you don't have to update them as things shift. Regina Mahony suggested that we hold off on any formal  
12 changes to the CCRPC Plan Review Policy until we see if any legislative changes are made this year. Regina  
13 Mahony stated that the flood resiliency checklist is 13 pages long, and addresses quite a bit more than just the  
14 municipal plans. Regina Mahony will send the flood resiliency checklist out to the PAC. Dana Hanley  
15 indicated that VPA is cautiously optimistic that their comprehensive plan bill will go through; and if it does it  
16 will have some changes to the Regional Planning Commission's process. This led to the discussion about the  
17 length of Plans considering everything that needs to be included in them. Dana indicated that they were able  
18 to cut down the Plan by 88 pages, however with the pictures and design it added 25%. They re-wrote the plan  
19 from scratch and were able to weed out things that were added over the years that were no longer necessary.  
20

#### 21 **5. South Burlington Comprehensive Plan Review and Public Hearing**

22 Joss Besse opened the public hearing. No one from the public was in attendance. The public comment period  
23 was closed.  
24

25 Emily Nosse-Leirer, summarized the Staff comments and explained that this is the second time that we are  
26 reviewing this Plan. All previous Staff comments were incorporated, including water quality and flood  
27 resiliency, which have been more than adequately addressed. Cathyann stated that they did try to cut things  
28 out of the Plan and shorten it; however it was challenging to do that considering all of the things that people  
29 wanted in the Plan. Things were added, rather than deleted. However, the first version had about 50 more  
30 strategies, and they were able to narrow those down. There were a couple of topics that prolonged the process  
31 including education issues and an east-west road. The City Council will hold their second hearing Feb. 1<sup>st</sup>.  
32

33 Alex Weinhagen asked if they've given any thought to how to keep track of the strategies? They were not able  
34 to prioritize the strategies and they were okay with that. The Planning Commission will now talk about their  
35 priorities. They will likely work through the strategies in a similar fashion to the recommendations from the  
36 interim zoning reports where they met on a monthly basis to ensure things were moving along. Or perhaps on  
37 an annual basis as the sub-committees figure out their work plans. All of the committees were involved in  
38 development of the Plan to begin as well, so none of the strategies will be a surprise.  
39

40 Sarah Hadd made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, that the PAC finds the draft 2016 South Burlington  
41 Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the  
42 municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification  
43 that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information  
44 relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those  
45 changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the  
46 municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No discussion.  
47 MOTION PASSED.  
48

#### 49 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon**

- 50 • Hinesburg – nothing new
- 51 • Colchester – Solar project off of East Road towards Milton (All Earth Renewables). Alex asked if this  
52 was in Green Mountain Power's area as they've already met their cap; and they are asking for an  
53 increase. GMP and VELCO have both met their cap so they need to ask for an increase.

- 1       • South Burlington – there are likely projects on the horizon, but nothing that Cathy is aware of.  
2       • Richmond – solar farm proposed off of Governor Peck Road.  
3       • Essex – nothing that we don't know about already  
4       • Williston – former Pine Ridge school property is looking for an amendment to change the use to a  
5       church training program, and take down some buildings. There are a few things likely going to Act  
6       250 in about 18 to 20 months: Finney Crossing amendment and Cottonwood Crossing.  
7       • Huntington – 6 lot subdivision has been pending for quite some time on Camels Hump Road.  
8       • Milton – Lamoille solar city project 4.9 (megawatts), municipal community solar project at the old  
9       landfill (3.8 megawatts), and at the wastewater treatment plant (500 kilowatts). There are also pending  
10      Act 250 projects in Catamount: NG Advantage office, Camp Precast Concrete 14,000 sq.ft. building  
11      and 6,000 sq.ft. office, and R&D 13,000 sq.ft. expansion.  
12

13 **7. Other Business**

- 14 a. PAC Topic Review for Future Meetings – Staff will sound out a list of topics and ask for feedback on  
15      whether you'd find them useful or not, and if you have any other topics to add. Alex Weinhagen –  
16      renewable energy facility siting may be worthy of discussion here. Even if it doesn't go anywhere in the  
17      legislation, it would be helpful to know how everyone has handled this question in their Plans. Dana  
18      suggested that it may be helpful to learn what the three RPCs who received the Department of Energy  
19      grants have done to address siting issues within their regions. It would be helpful to have Adam Lougee  
20      come up and present what they've done in Addison County to the PAC.  
21 b. Form Based Code Panel Discussion in Burlington. **Wednesday, January 13, 2016 from 6:30pm to**  
22      **8:00pm at Contois Auditorium, Burlington City Hall.** Featuring Burlington Form Based Code Meeting  
23      with guest speaker Lee Einsweiler from Code Studio in Austin, TX.  
24

25 **8. Adjourn**

26 The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

27

28 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony