

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, September 13, 2017
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present:

Jacob Hemmerick, Milton
Dana Hanley, Essex
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Darren Schibler, Essex
Andrew Strniste, Underhill
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Luke Valentine, St. George
Victor Sinadinowski, Milton
Sarah Hadd, Colchester (left at 3:10pm)
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg (arrived at 3:05pm)
Paul Conner, South Burlington

Others:

Leslie Pelch, VCGI
Jenny Bower, VCGI

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner
Pam Brangan, GIS Data & IT Manager

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

11 Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

12
13 **2. Approval of July 12, 2017 Minutes**

14
15 Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau to approve the July 12, 2017 minutes. No further
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED. Sarah Hadd abstained.

17
18 **3. Final Building Homes Together Housing Numbers for 2016**

19 Regina Mahony explained that the numbers in the packet were in fact not the final. Underhill and Huntington have
20 been added for a total of 843. Ken Belliveau indicated that the Williston numbers look low. It is possible that only
21 buildings are reported rather than total units. Add "CY" so we know that it isn't a fiscal year. South Burlington did
22 not give us their accessory units, so they probably have more. Question about camps going forward and if we want
23 to count them when there is a conversion from camp to full time. Staff will take a look and revise again if necessary
24 before the September 27th press conference.

25
26 **4. ECOS Plan Update**

27 **Schedule** - Regina Mahony explained that we'll be trying to get feedback on the three big topics (energy, transportation
28 and economy) of the ECOS update over the next few months. Including meeting with the staff to discuss the MTP
29 project list and CEDS project list. We'll be meeting with the Managers, Planners and Public Works staff to review these
30 lists and then will meet with Selectboards as well. We know you'll be starting budget conversations soon and we are
31 doing our best to get these started as soon as possible.

32
33 **Planning Area Map Changes** - Melanie Needle explained the three proposed edits that we've made so far; and asked
34 the PAC to let us know if there are any other potential edits out there.

35
36 **Energy Planning Status** - Melanie Needle provided an overview of the draft Energy Siting Policies and asked if they
37 make sense conceptually? Regina Mahony added that when we've got this framework correct, we'll be circling back
38 with the municipalities on how we've categorized the constraints. We've taken a strict interpretation of what we'll
39 include as a 'known' constraint to ensure that all development is being treated equally, and to make sure we aren't being
40 overly restricted to renewable generation. Questions/comments included:

- 41 • In the real world the constraints should be field verified, and the maps treated more as a 'red flag'. Yes, that is
42 how we are treating the constraints.

- 1 • Some members indicated that this works, but they are looking forward to the continued conversation about
- 2 classifying the constraints.
- 3 • The first suitability sentence starts out negative; can we be more positive?
- 4 • There was a suggestion to instead describe the suitability section as a suitability analysis process. Since we can't
- 5 typically answer the "can I develop my lot as..." without going through all the steps of development review first.
- 6 • There was a lengthy discussion regarding the connection to three phase power. The proposed policies suggest
- 7 that close proximity (and specifically within 1,000' of existing transmission and distribution infrastructure) is a
- 8 more ideal location for wind and solar generation facilities than further away. The intention is to limit expansion
- 9 of this infrastructure and create pressure for other types of growth outside of the core. There was some
- 10 discussion that three phase power really isn't a sprawl vehicle – certainly not for residential. There was some
- 11 discussion regarding the siting of three phase power and the aesthetic impacts to places where it doesn't
- 12 currently exist. What size project needs three phase power? Staff will research this. Also, can we buffer the
- 13 current lines to see how much land this encompasses? Would we be eliminating the majority of places where
- 14 these resources can go. And would we be able to meet our target by limiting this? On site storage is being talked
- 15 about more and more and not sure how that will impact the need for 3 phase power. This will almost eliminate
- 16 all the work on the constraints, because this would be the most limiting.

17
18 Melanie explained that we updated Map 6 to match the constraint language under Strategy 3 & 4.

19
20 Emily Needle described how we've made the distinction between known and possible constraints. There was a

21 suggestion to add "mitigate" under the first bullet under "possible constraints". There was some discussion about

22 the timeframe and when constraints can be added. There was a suggestion to say something like "so long as the

23 RPC approves the Plan, then the constraints as approved in that plan have the backing of the regional plan." We'll

24 need to have some flexibility, presuming you can meet your targets and so we don't have to update the ECOS plan

25 every time a local plan is updated. However, we had similar language to this and the Board wasn't comfortable

26 leaving the language this open ended.

27
28 **5. Williston Comprehensive Plan - Final Review**

29 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Williston Comprehensive Plan. The PAC already reviewed the

30 draft Plan back in October. Staff finds the Plan and planning process to meet all statutory requirements. Ken

31 Belliveau said the major changes between October and now were that they updated all of the goals based on what

32 has actually been started or completed within that timeframe. For example, they started the new sewer allocation

33 process, so changed to "implement". School districts are now merged, etc. They utilized and relied on the CCRPC

34 technical staff review, and the PAC review last fall helped to understand all necessary updates. The plan was

35 adopted by the Selectboard on August 22nd.

36
37 Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall, that the PAC finds the 2016-2024 Williston

38 Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the

39 municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation, and forwards the Plan to

40 the CCRPC Board for approval. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Ken Belliveau abstained.

41
42 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

- 43 • Milton – No Act 250 stuff. Addition to cell tower and 40 acre solar farm. Planning Commission no
- 44 concerns. The property is currently in agriculture.
- 45 • Williston – Maple Tree Place amendment to include a splash park and ice rink.
- 46 • Essex – UVM medical primary care facility right on corner of Essex Way and Rte 15. Town is happy with
- 47 it. There is a very conceptual plan to totally re-vision the outlets including 6 story buildings. Current plans
- 48 don't conform with existing regulations and most residents that came to conceptual design weren't happy
- 49 about it. An issue about criterion 9(B) (agricultural soils) at the Saxon Hill Industrial Park has been
- 50 resolved. It was originally ruled that proposed development on Saxon Hill Road did not meet the standards
- 51 for being in an industrial park, since the park was not permitted as such through Act 250. After
- 52 communications between the town and the commission, it was determined that the development was in an
- 53 industrial park, and had to pay 1:1 agricultural mitigation fees as opposed to a higher ratio (the standard for
- 54 development outside an industrial park).

- 1 • St. George – two new industrial storage sites. Residential in St. George estates.
- 2 • South Burlington – 45 pre-application notice for two Section 248 projects: substation upgrades at UVM,
- 3 and Queen City Park. PC no action yet. Quarry Hill Road residential building. South Village Phase III –
- 4 connect Spear to Dorset. Also amendment to South Village to change original school design. AT&T
- 5 technology with a box that goes under a utility pole for a wifi to wifi network. The intent is to establish
- 6 more tower locations in order to be able to accommodate all of the data plan internet needs (ie. in cars,
- 7 phones, etc) but not as powerful as the big poles. Talks have also taken place in Williston.
- 8 • Hinesburg – nothing on Act 250 or PSB front.
- 9 • Interesting decision from Charlotte – public investment from Mount Philo, solar application denied. Denial
- 10 not based on local town plan language.

11

12 **7. State Parcel Mapping Project**

13 Leslie Pelch provided an update on this 3-year project to create and regularly update parcel data to meet state
14 standards. Leslie is also looking for municipalities to participate in the second year. Project information can be
15 found here: <http://vcgi.vermont.gov/parcels>.

16
17 Leslie Pelch introduced Jenny Bower who has been working on this project. They, and the RPC, can help work
18 with Towns when working with vendors for parcel updates (RFPs, contract templates, etc.). There may be limited
19 capacity to help some municipalities with parcel data (Buel's Gore may be the only place in Chittenden County that
20 they can help). Haven't answered the question about what attributes will be included and available and online. At
21 this point vendors have been chosen. Parcel data work should begin in November on the year 1 municipalities.

22
23 Questions/comments included:

- 24 • How often should the municipalities send the state their updated parcel data? Likely once a year for now.
25 Would like it to be more real time every time the municipalities update the data, but they are not there yet.
26 Have thought about an online interface where the data is shared between the local and state level. For now,
27 the vendors have it in their contract to send/share the data to the state. Extract, transform and load tools will
28 need to be created in order for municipalities to upload their data to the state in the "standardized" parcel
29 data.
- 30 • When municipalities are approving a subdivision, it would be great to know exactly what data we should be
31 asking for or requiring. The mapping contractor would be the best person to ask what geospatial data they
32 want. For VCGI a shapefile is best, but it is also really helpful to have the actual survey (in pdf) alongside
33 to see it. Can you provide the municipalities with a preferred file format? They don't have this suggestion
34 yet.
- 35 • What data will go live once this gets updated? They haven't decided this yet.

36
37 VTrans is assigning the contractors to the year 1 Towns (Underhill, Westford & Williston, and others). Trying to
38 take municipal input into account, but may not be able to accommodate all requests. Needs to be a 99% match to
39 the state grand list. Not requiring vendors to create a parcel for inactive parcels if they aren't in the town's
40 grandlist, attached to a parcel data or have an assigned SPANS. NMERC is one of the 10 vendors. Some town's
41 have good contractor relationships already. Future updates will need to be done at the local level so some
42 municipalities will want to continue to work with their own contractors, since the state isn't fully taking over
43 updates into the future.

44

45 **8. Other Business**

- 46 a. Any interest in RLUIPA workshop from Dwight H. Merriman, Robinson and Cole LLP. They offered to
47 come up and give a presentation for free. Let us know if anyone is interested.
 - 48 b. Let's Talk Progress Speaker Series: <https://letstalkprogress.org/events/>. Emily Talen is coming on 9/21 and
49 recordings of the previous talks are on the website. It has been a great speaker series.
 - 50 c. Housing Summit – ½ day workshop idea. Regina Mahony will follow-up via email with this idea.
 - 51 d. Potential October 11th PAC Meeting for Comprehensive Plan Reviews. The PAC has no objections if this
52 meeting is needed.
- 53

1 **9. Adjourn**

2 The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

3

4 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony