

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, September 14, 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  
Ken Belliveau, Williston  
Dana Hanley, Essex  
Jacob Hemmerick, Milton  
Andrew Strniste, Underhill  
Clare Rock, Richmond  
David White, Burlington  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Dean Pierce, Shelburne  
Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Daryl Benoit, Charlotte  
Karen Purinton, Colchester

**Staff**

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

**Other** (for Agenda Item 4)

Geri Siegel, North Hero  
Marilyn Lagioro, North Hero  
Dick Ransom, Williston  
Jim Pratt, Swanton  
David Horton, Swanton

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

10 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.  
11

12 **2. Approval of July 13, 2016 Minutes**

13  
14 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Dean Pierce to approve the July 13, 2016 minutes with the  
15 addition of Alex Weinhagen to the attendee list. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
16

17 **3. Amend Municipal Plan Review Guidelines**

18 Regina Mahony gave an overview of the proposed changes to the guidelines including an additional process  
19 for a Town Plan amendment (as opposed to readoption which extends the timeframe of the plan and requires  
20 consistency with all new statutory goals and elements), replace Appendix A with the more simple ACCD form  
21 (with reference to latest legislative changes), change 5 year expiration to 8 years and the new plan  
22 implementation program. Regina Mahony explained that we are recommending a very simplified amendment  
23 process where Staff would review the amendment and make a determination about whether or not the  
24 amendment would put the standing CCRPC approval and confirmation in jeopardy.  
25

26 Dean Pierce asked if there is a review process for those municipalities who may need to buy more time under  
27 their existing plan. Regina explained that with the change in statute it makes it clear that when you want to  
28 change the expiration date of the plan you need to bring it into compliance with all new statutory requirements,  
29 so in this case we'd just follow the same process that we've had for full PAC and CCRPC approval. For the  
30 most part our plans have been consistent with the new requirements so we've been able to get through the full  
31 CCRPC approval process for plans that just require an extension. Regina Mahony indicated that she expects  
32 that to be the same going forward, however it depends on what new goals and elements will be added along  
33 the way. However, CCRPC will think about this a bit more. Paul Conner stated that he agrees that that are  
34 now two distinct plan update options – a simple amendment and a full update including data and new statutory  
35 requirements - and neither accommodate an extension.  
36

37 Joss Besse asked about the implementation program and asked if Staff should provide more guidance in the  
38 policy about what, and how much, is needed for plan implementation. David White explained that it is  
39 difficult to predict the readiness for implementation of the many plan objectives and actions, and it would be  
40 best to maintain some flexibility on plan implementation.

1  
2 There was discussion regarding the proposed plan amendment process. What if the plan amendment is  
3 problematic in some way? Would or could CCRPC revoke the existing plan approval and confirmation?  
4 Regardless of potential challenges, Alex Weinhagen suggested that the PAC have the opportunity to see and  
5 learn from all of the plan amendments, even if not for formal approval. There was consensus on that  
6 suggestion so Staff will incorporate that into the proposed amendments. Karen Purinton added that with the 8  
7 year timeframe we may be seeing a lot more amendments than before. Dana Hanley suggested that we may  
8 need to adjust and modify the process as we see how it is working and not working. Dean Pierce stated that  
9 Act 200 was all about implementation so there are probably documents in place to help with this already.

10  
11 CCRPC will amend the process as discussed, and bring the changes back to the PAC at the next meeting. We  
12 will then be looking for a recommendation to the CCRPC Board.

#### 13 14 **4. Statewide Property Parcel Mapping Program Project**

15 Leslie Pelch from VCGI provided an overview of this project. The project is funded by the VT Agency of  
16 Transportation to create or update parcel data to meet the state data standard over 3 years. The Vermont Center  
17 for Geographic Information is providing staff and coordination to the creation of the Program. While there is  
18 funding available to create the parcel data, as of now, there is no funding to keep the data set maintained in the  
19 future. A request for proposals will be published in late fall of 2016, seeking mapping contractors interested in  
20 working with multiple towns. It is anticipated that about 1/3 of the state will be mapped each year for 3 years.  
21 Project information can be found here: <http://vcgi.vermont.gov/parcels>. The state is trying to figure out if they  
22 can cover the costs for those municipalities that do this work in house. Leslie Pelch asked the PAC if they  
23 would be interested in having the parcel data linked to grandlist data, though they aren't sure yet if they will be  
24 able to take this step. There was some discussion of the difficulties associated with making a successful link.  
25 Municipalities that are interested in being included in the first year should send Leslie Pelch an email.

#### 26 27 **5. Building Homes Together Campaign Training Topics**

28 Regina Mahony explained that we are contemplating a standing 'housing' agenda item at the PAC meetings  
29 for the next year or so, as one mechanism for implementing the Building Homes Together Campaign. In  
30 addition to providing the housing data we've previously discussed, we'd like to know if the following topics  
31 would be valuable:

- 32 1. Housing Tools – Accessory Units & Bonus Densities – we have a summary of the provisions that exist  
33 in the municipal bylaws, and we'd like to have a discussion on whether these are being used, and if  
34 not, why not? Would it be helpful to have a developer's perspective as well?
- 35 2. Homeless Issues – A presentation from the Chittenden County Homeless Alliance on the Point in  
36 Time data, their strategic plan information and performance measures.
- 37 3. Elderly Housing Issues – maybe AARP and/or an assisted living developer to get a sense from them  
38 on what they see as the needs in the future?
- 39 4. Housing Tools – Inclusionary Zoning – maybe David E. White can tell us what they learned from the  
40 consultant in Burlington?
- 41 5. Housing Tools – Housing Trust Fund – ask South Burlington or others to share info on their local  
42 Trust Fund? Perhaps we can also bring in CHT to explain how they can partner.
- 43 6. VNRC Inclusive Communities Work – Density Done Right case studies and reinstating the Housing  
44 Endorsement Program (Smart Growth VT used to do this).
- 45 7. Form Based Codes & other Tools to achieve the kind of development and infill that the community  
46 would like to see.

47  
48 There was consensus that having these in depth housing trainings would be valuable with the following  
49 caveats:

- 50 • Elderly housing may be big enough for two trainings – assisted living; and market rate universal  
51 design housing. Would be good to hear from developers and those that can inspire them.

- 1 • A topic on small houses (not tiny houses) and those that are a better fit for young families/starter  
2 homes. There was discussion that it would be helpful to understand the economics of building these  
3 types of units, and the importance of having someone from the private sector come and discuss this  
4 with us. Joss Besse has seen a good presentation on this from Chris Snyder as a starting point.
- 5 • When we have developers at the table it would be helpful to focus the conversation more specifically  
6 so that the problem isn't identified broadly as "permitting". It would be best to uncover specific  
7 solutions within the purview of planning.
- 8 • It seems pretty clear already that density bonuses are not working, so let's skip that step and identify  
9 how and when they are being used and under what circumstances. There was also a suggestion that  
10 perhaps it isn't the tool itself that isn't working, but the process that is preventing it from working.
- 11 • While the homelessness issue is an important consideration for all, if no solutions are within a  
12 planners purview, then it should only be a short presentation to raise awareness.
- 13 • Don't want this to be exclusive of other important non-housing topics that we'll need to cover.  
14

#### 15 **6. Charlotte Readoption of Updated Town Plan (public hearing not included)**

16 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Staff review of the draft 2016 Charlotte Town Plan, and  
17 handed out additional information that we've received since the Staff review went out in the PAC packet.  
18 Overall Staff finds that the Plan meets the minimum requirements for CCRPC plan approval and planning  
19 process confirmation. However, Emily Nosse-Leirer indicated that the language for the Village Center  
20 designation is not likely strong enough to be able to obtain a designation from the State.  
21

22 Daryl Benoit indicated that this is a full re-write of the Town Plan, and the Town intends to have this ready for  
23 the Town Meeting Day ballot. The Town contracted with the previous Town Planner to draft the Plan. The  
24 Planning Commission asked for some content from the existing plan to be added back in.  
25

26 Comments from the PAC include:

- 27 • The natural resources section is helpful and Huntington will likely look to it as an example.
- 28 • There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the compact settlement pattern goal, which governs all  
29 municipal planning in the State. Dana Hanley found that the new draft plan appears to be weaker in  
30 this respect than the previous plan. PAC members also suggested several ways in which the plan could  
31 make progress towards this State goal, and other Charlotte Town Plan goals—including applying for a  
32 Village Center designation, protecting the town's natural resources and scenic views, and increasing  
33 affordability and the number of young families in town—by strengthening the discussion of  
34 Charlotte's compact settlements.
- 35 • Dana Hanley reiterated the need to strengthen the West Village center language as a compact center in  
36 order to obtain state designation, because the Town's Village Center application was denied a few  
37 years ago for not having a strong enough connection in the Town Plan. These improvements could be  
38 made in the Land Use Strategies section (page 1-3). There was also a suggestion to update the water  
39 and wastewater information for the West Village in the economic development section (page 1-30).  
40 The Selectboard appointed Economic Development Committee submitted a West Village wastewater  
41 management plan, and recommended ordinances in 2016. The Selectboard is now working on those  
42 policy recommendations. Daryl Benoit agreed that the Plan should include the most recent work that  
43 has been done.
- 44 • Alex Weinhagen had a question about the future land use map in the Plan. It didn't appear that all of  
45 the concentrated community areas on the map are well discussed in the text. The PAC looked at the  
46 future land use map (Map 12) online. The relationship between the map in the text (page 1-5) and Map  
47 12 should be clarified. It appears that Map 12 online may be an updated version of the map on page 1-  
48 5 and the plan should be updated.
- 49 • Paul Conner indicated that the demographic analysis is really thorough and informative. However, the  
50 Plan could be strengthened with more concrete objectives and actions on how the Town intends to  
51 meet the Plans stated goals of affordability and attracting younger families. Considering the Plans  
52 own stated goals and the regional need for more housing the Plan could be strengthened in this area.

- 1 • The PAC also offered some suggestions on the layout of the plan. Dean Pierce commented that it may  
2 help to have a stronger connection to Part II within Part I. As it reads now, it isn't very clear that there  
3 is further analysis in Part II.  
4 • Dean Pierce also commented that most of the strategies in the implementation table do not have  
5 timelines associated with them. Identifying timelines for plan strategies will be effective for  
6 prioritizing the town's work and will increase the plan's compliance with Vermont's new  
7 implementation program requirements for town plans.  
8

9 There was consensus to provide these recommendations to the Charlotte Planning Commission and review the  
10 Plan again before making a recommendation to the full CCRPC Board.  
11

## 12 **7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon – didn't get to this.**

### 13 **8. Other Business**

- 14 a. There was consensus to hold an October PAC meeting on October 12th. We will need to review  
15 Williston's readoption of their existing Plan, and we anticipate sharing housing data, demographic  
16 data and potentially energy planning.  
17 b. ACCD Annual Report – The PAC reviewed the list that Regina Mahony handed out.  
18 c. Grants and Technical Assistance:  
19 i. The Municipal Planning Grants are due October 31st. See the attached email from Annina  
20 Seiler for more detail\*, and here:  
21 [http://accd.vermont.gov/strong\\_communities/opportunities/funding/overview/municipal\\_plann](http://accd.vermont.gov/strong_communities/opportunities/funding/overview/municipal_planning_grants)  
22 [ing\\_grants](http://accd.vermont.gov/strong_communities/opportunities/funding/overview/municipal_planning_grants)  
23 ii. American Institute of Architect's Sustainable Design Assessment Team (SDAT) program  
24 offers free technical design assistance from AIA. Deadline 12/9/16. To view the application  
25 packet and other related resources, please visit the AIA Center for Communities by Design  
26 website. Example project from Shelburne is here.  
27 iii. The VT Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) announces four workshops in  
28 September following the release of the next Request for Proposals (RFP) for the DEC  
29 Ecosystem Restoration Grant Program. The tentative date for release of the RFP is September  
30 15th with an expected application deadline of October 25th. Of the four workshops, this one  
31 is in our region: Sept 20th from 1pm to 4pm at the Act 250 conference room, DEC Fish and  
32 Wildlife office, 111 West St., Essex Junction. Attendance and RSVPs are strongly  
33 encouraged for questions and discussion. Contact Marli Rupe – [marli.rupe@vermont.gov](mailto:marli.rupe@vermont.gov),  
34 490-6171.  
35 d. The proposed 2017 Vermont Stormwater Management Manual Rule was filed to initiate adoption of  
36 the Manual through rulemaking. A public meeting to solicit comment on the proposed rule will take  
37 place on Tuesday, October 25th, 2016 from 9:00 AM until 12:00 PM, at the Pavilion Building  
38 Auditorium, located at 109 State Street in Montpelier. Public comments will be accepted from Friday,  
39 September 16, 2016 through 4:30 PM on Tuesday, November 1, 2016. A copy of the proposed rule  
40 and associated filings is available on the VT DEC Stormwater Program website at the following link:  
41 [http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/manual\\_update](http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/manual_update). Full email announcement from Kevin  
42 Burke is attached\*.  
43 e. The Urban Institute and National Housing Conference have joined forces to create a new tool that puts  
44 readers in the shoes of a developer, trying to build an affordable apartment  
45 building. <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/affordable-housing-development-online-game>  
46  
47  
48

### 49 **8. Adjourn**

50 The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.  
51

52 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony