

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, March 9, 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  
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg  
Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Dana Hanley, Essex  
Jacob Hemmerick, Milton  
Clare Rock, Richmond

**Staff**

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

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

10 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m. .  
11

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

13  
14 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall to approve the January 13, 2016 minutes. No  
15 further discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
16

17 **3. ECOS Plan Update**

18 Regina Mahony ran through a quick presentation of the proposed amendments to the ECOS Plan. The PAC  
19 discussed the compatibility with surrounding regions section and suggested adding a note that workers may  
20 also live outside of the County because they want to. There was a discussion about whether our policy would  
21 change if we had data on just how many are living outside of the County because they want to – perhaps in the  
22 rural planning area. Alex Weinhagen also recommended that we add a note regarding the new broadband  
23 definition (higher speeds) from last year and how we are likely no longer 99% covered. The PAC also  
24 discussed the amendments in the facilities section regarding facilities for our aging populations. The PAC  
25 asked if we have information on how much demand we have at the assisted living and independent senior  
26 living facilities. Regina Mahony indicated that we don't have that information and apparently the waitlists  
27 aren't a great indication of need because people are often on multiple lists in a variety of counties and states.  
28 The PAC also asked how many units are being built to universal design standards, and we don't have that  
29 information. We may be able to look into these issues further in the 2018 update. Regina Mahony indicated  
30 that we've received some questions from the State regarding the flood resiliency element, and we may need to  
31 add more. The PAC discussed the challenges with incorporating a lot of detail on all of the sections that are  
32 required to be in these plans, especially when most of the County is already doing flood resiliency work.  
33 Regina Mahony stated that the public hearing is next Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup> and if there are any other  
34 comments to let her know.  
35

36 **4. Statewide Parcel Mapping**

37 Pam Brangan provided the PAC with an overview of proposed legislation that would begin a statewide parcel  
38 mapping program. This is now in one of the transportation bills so it may have some traction. A number of  
39 State agencies have been working to find a way to provide statewide parcel mapping as a lot of areas in the  
40 state have no parcel data. The legislation will push all municipalities to adhere to the statewide standard  
41 (VCGI established these standards previously). It will also include a maintenance program to keep it current  
42 every year. Ken will there be some kind of coordinated cost for flyovers? Pam indicated that was for imagery  
43 data, but perhaps there will be some pooling of funds for the parcel data.  
44

45 The other part of the legislation is to establish an advisory board, and VAPDA will be a part of that Board,  
46 along with the Dept. of Taxes, DHCD, ANR and VTrans. Joss asked about the revenue structure, as he

1 thought the proposal included a per parcel fee for the revenue at some point. Pam Brangan indicated that is  
2 not part of the proposal at this point, and the intent is to start the program with some grants and pilot projects  
3 to understand the best way to implement it. The pilot will test different approaches – local control, or more of  
4 a regional or state approach? Ultimately the goal is to have a consistent statewide parcel data layer linked to  
5 the grandlists.

6  
7 The PAC discussed how their tax maps are updated now, whether they are currently receiving a digital file for  
8 new plats (some are, though some are just collecting a pdf rather than a GIS or AutoCAD file), and whether  
9 new parcels are communicated to the State currently. Most did not think that there is any system in place to  
10 notify the State of new parcels or boundary line adjustments but the assessor's may be communicating that  
11 information when they assign a new SPAN number. Jake suggested that a plat recording surcharge fee may be  
12 the right revenue source. Many municipalities had Judy Bond update their tax maps and she sold her business  
13 to NMERC. Hinesburg got their first update last year and it looked good. Bill Hegmen works with a  
14 consultant to do the updates in Huntington. Shannon does the work in house in Essex and Essex Junction.  
15 Jake Hemmerick suggested that the best method may be a change in the surveying requirements, and the  
16 surveyors could be required to submit new plats to the State; or this could at least set the standards for the  
17 digital plats. There would need to be some municipal oversight so that only the official plats are included in  
18 the State layer.

19  
20 Pam Brangan asked the PAC to let her know if they have any thoughts, ideas or interest. If the grants come  
21 through there will be some pilot projects planned for this summer. Alex Weinhagen suggested that if this goes  
22 through it should not become effective July 1, 2017. Pam Brangan explained that this legislation is just  
23 starting a program, it isn't requiring anyone to do anything right away.

#### 24 25 **5. Discussion of a Planning Commission Workshop**

26 Lee Krohn reminded the PAC that we held a DRB, ZBA and development review Planning Commissioners  
27 Summit last spring, where members from our municipalities were able to participate in a facilitated, open  
28 round table discussion on practices and procedures. It was a successful peer exchange. We are planning to do  
29 something similar this spring for the Planning Commissioners and we'd like some feedback on topics.

30  
31 Joss Besse suggested that we reach out to the Chairs of the Planning Commission with a list of topics that they  
32 can choose from. Clare Rock suggested that we do this on a quarterly basis (DRB, PC, Conservation  
33 Commission, and other Advisory Committees) so there is some continuity so that folks could build it into the  
34 regular schedule. Everett Marshall suggested that a combination of PC and Conservation Commission  
35 meetings could be helpful because these groups are often not talking to each other. Dana Hanley agreed.  
36 Clare Rock added that there isn't much connection between all of the committees within Town, and they don't  
37 have any budget for sending their members to trainings. Dean Pierce stated that regional conversations may  
38 not be the best venue for connecting local committees; and four regional events may be a lot. Alex Weinhagen  
39 also added he has found you really have to bring the trainings to them. It was agreed that finding a 5<sup>th</sup>  
40 Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday would be the best for this workshop as the PC's all meet on different nights of  
41 the week.

42  
43 Jake Hemmerick suggested that the training focus on core functions, and not development review (for those  
44 Planning Commissions that do that function). Alex Weinhagen agreed and suggested non-regulatory  
45 implementation of the Plan (not just zoning regulations). Dana Hanley suggested a topic on real economic  
46 development challenges, and appropriately scaled solutions for the rural communities, especially considering  
47 aging populations. Lee Krohn suggested a Planning Commission, Conservation Commission and Land Trusts  
48 event as one non-regulatory implementation tool as a potential separate discussion. Suggestions for other  
49 years or events also included bringing multiple Commissions/Committees together and break out into topic  
50 groups.

51  
52 CCRPC will email out topic suggestions to the PAC, Planning Staff, and Planning Commission Chairs with a  
53 potential date. We'll get their feedback and then send this out to all of the Planning Commissioners.

1  
2 **6. Shelburne Town Plan Amendment**  
3

4 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Plan amendments and CCRPC findings – bike and ped  
5 facilities map (will likely replace Map 24, and/or Map 23 and 24), and amendments for the State Village  
6 Center and Neighborhood designations. We also looked at the Plan to determine if the flood resiliency  
7 element was met and we found that the Plan meets the requirements. Emily Nosse-Leirer also stated that this  
8 amendment will restart the 5 year clock. Dean provided an overview of the amendments and process so far.  
9 Dean Pierce added that the Town’s practice is to retitle to the year the Plan was amended, so yes, this will reset  
10 the five year clock. Shelburne has one of the first Neighborhood Development Area designations which was  
11 driven by a development. They were also intending to do some changes for Section 248 as well, but they’ve  
12 decided to do an ordinance instead. There was some discussion regarding the budget. Dana Hanley asked  
13 CCRPC what we review the budgets for and if we have a standard that municipalities should be striving for.  
14 She stated that it seems like Shelburne’s budget is really low. Dean Pierce stated that the budget does not  
15 reflect the full cost as it doesn’t include benefits and overhead. Regina Mahony stated that we could analyze  
16 what the budgets are per capita in each municipality, but it is unlikely that the Board would want to take that to  
17 a policy level and make recommendations.  
18

19 Alex made a motion, seconded by Ken, that the PAC finds the draft 2016 Shelburne Town Plan, as submitted,  
20 meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all  
21 statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the  
22 municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for  
23 changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for  
24 review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be  
25 forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No discussion. MOTION PASSED.  
26

27 **7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon**

- 28
- 29 • Hinesburg – nothing yet for comment, but may be something on McGee Hill Road.
  - 30 • Milton – nothing new.
  - 31 • Richmond – small subdivision on Palmer Lane.
  - 32 • Essex – nothing new.
  - 33 • Shelburne – Wake Robbins third phase (CCRPC helping with transportation analysis), Snyder  
34 Company is in the early stages of a 100 unit (approximately 40 acres) development on the west side of  
35 Spear Street near the golf course; comprised of cottage and townhouses. A lot of neighborhood  
36 interest. It is within sewer service area.
  - 37 • Williston – Amendments to existing permits including Finney Crossing. Cottonwood Crossing may  
38 be going to Act 250 later this year. The Town will have an application for a new road - Trader Lane to  
39 the west of Route 2A.
  - 40 • Huntington – nothing new.

41 **7. Other Business**

- 42 a. PAC Topic Review for Future Meetings – Regina provided the PAC with a memo of the topics we’ve  
43 heard about so far organized by interest. Joss Besse suggested adding economic development related  
44 topics, including what kinds of jobs are we generating, inventory of industrial lands and how does this  
45 relate to what is being added in Essex. There was some discussion of the findings in the CEDS/ECOS  
46 Plan and where we are in relation to that. Ken Belliveau stated that he’s heard Frank Cioffi indicate that  
47 we don’t have enough ‘move in ready’ space. Clare Rock agreed that this would be a good topic,  
48 particularly recognizing the scales of economic development. How do you grow the small local economy  
49 (and even smaller in Huntington)? Everett Marshall stated that they’ve been thinking about the creative  
50 economy and agriculture in Huntington. Jake Hemmerick added that it would be helpful to learn whether  
51 we do actually have a skills gap, or if it is merely a perception. Regina Mahony stated that we’ve been  
52 looking at some of that in the STEM industry world and can provide some of that information when we  
53 finalize it. Joss Besse also suggested a training topic on Growth Centers and whether they are working.

1 Ken Belliveau offered to present next year when they prepare their 5 year report. Alex Weinhagen would  
2 be interested if it were likely that we'd be adding more Growth Centers, but without a TIF district as an  
3 incentive that isn't likely. Everett Marshall suggested expanding the topic to Village centers. Regina  
4 Mahony suggested that we track where development is happening and we could provide an overview of  
5 where growth is happening in the County.

6 b. Regina showed the PAC the new CCRPC website.

7

8 **8. Adjourn**

9 The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

10

11 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony