Planning Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 11, 2016
2:30pm to 4:30pm
CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal Street, Winooski

Agenda

2:30 Welcome and Introductions, Joss Besse

2:35 Approval of March 9, 2016 Minutes*

2:50 Supporting the STEM Industry and Young Professionals in Chittenden County, Emily Nosse-Leirer
This white paper explains the important role that the STEM cluster and young professionals play in the county’s economy; examines the current conditions of the STEM cluster and young professionals in Chittenden County; explores the building blocks necessary for growing the STEM cluster economy; and offers suggestions for future work that can be undertaken by the CCRPC to help support the STEM economy. This paper calls for CCRPC to promote housing development, and lead a regional housing conversation.

3:20 Building Homes Together Campaign, Charlie Baker
While CCRPC was beginning to develop an approach for a regional housing conversation, Housing Vermont and Champlain Housing Trust have been exploring what a campaign to produce more housing would look like. The three organizations have decided to jointly reach out to stakeholders, request feedback and ask for support. We will provide some background on this effort, and invite you to participate.

3:40 Legislative Review, Regina Mahony
We will lead a discussion on bills that we’ve been tracking (H.249 – Intermunicipal Services, S.230 – Energy Siting and H.367 – VPA’s Planning Bill). Please come prepared with any other bills that you’d like to discuss with the group.

4:10 Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon, Committee Members

4:20 Other Business
   b. CCRPC’s 50th Anniversary Annual Meeting on June 15th.

4:30 Adjourn

* = Attachment

NEXT MEETING: July 13, 2016 at 2:30pm to 4:30pm.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext 21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
DATE: Wednesday, March 9, 2016
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

2. Approval of January 13, 2016 Minutes
Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall to approve the January 13, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. ECOS Plan Update
Regina Mahony ran through a quick presentation of the proposed amendments to the ECOS Plan. The PAC discussed the compatibility with surrounding regions section and suggested adding a note that workers may also live outside of the County because they want to. There was a discussion about whether our policy would change if we had data on just how many are living outside of the County because they want to – perhaps in the rural planning area. Alex Wein Hague also recommended that we add a note regarding the new broadband definition (higher speeds) from last year and how we are likely no longer 99% covered. The PAC also discussed the amendments in the facilities section regarding facilities for our aging populations. The PAC asked if we have information on how much demand we have at the assisted living and independent senior living facilities. Regina Mahony indicated that we don’t have that information and apparently the waitlists aren’t a great indication of need because people are often on multiple lists in a variety of counties and states. The PAC also asked how many units are being built to universal design standards, and we don’t have that information. We may be able to look into these issues further in the 2018 update. Regina Mahony indicated that the public hearing is next Wednesday, March 16th and if there are any other comments to let her know.

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

The other part of the legislation is to establish an advisory board, and VAPDA will be a part of that Board, along with the Dept. of Taxes, DHCD, ANR and VTrans. Joss asked about the revenue structure, as he
thought the proposal included a per parcel fee for the revenue at some point. Pam Brangan indicated that is not part of the proposal at this point, and the intent is to start the program with some grants and pilot projects to understand the best way to implement it. The pilot will test different approaches – local control, or more of a regional or state approach? Ultimately the goal is to have a consistent statewide parcel data layer linked to the grandlists.

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

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

5. Discussion of a Planning Commission Workshop

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

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

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

CCRPC will email out topic suggestions to the PAC, Planning Staff, and Planning Commission Chairs with a potential date. We’ll get their feedback and then send this out to all of the Planning Commissioners.
6. Shelburne Town Plan Amendment

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

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

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

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

7. Other Business

a. PAC Topic Review for Future Meetings – Regina provided the PAC with a memo of the topics we’ve heard about so far organized by interest. Joss Besse suggested adding economic development related topics, including what kinds of jobs are we generating, inventory of industrial lands and how does this relate to what is being added in Essex. There was some discussion of the findings in the CEDS/ECOS Plan and where we are in relation to that. Ken Belliveau stated that he’s heard Frank Cioffi indicate that we don’t have enough ‘move in ready’ space. Clare Rock agreed that this would be a good topic, particularly recognizing the scales of economic development. How do you grow the small local economy (and even smaller in Huntington)? Everett Marshall stated that they’ve been thinking about the creative economy and agriculture in Huntington. Jake Hemmerick added that it would be helpful to learn whether we do actually have a skills gap, or if it is merely a perception. Regina Mahony stated that we’ve been looking at some of that in the STEM industry world and can provide some of that information when we finalize it. Joss Besse also suggested a training topic on Growth Centers and whether they are working.
Ken Belliveau offered to present next year when they prepare their 5 year report. Alex Weinhagen would be interested if it were likely that we’d be adding more Growth Centers, but without a TIF district as an incentive that isn’t likely. Everett Marshall suggested expanding the topic to Village centers. Regina Mahony suggested that we track where development is happening and we could provide an overview of where growth is happening in the County.

b. Regina showed the PAC the new CCRPC website.

8. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony