



## **Planning Advisory Committee**

**Wednesday, January 11, 2017**

**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 November 9, 2016 Minutes\***
- 2:50 Bike Parking Best Practices & Bylaw Language, Bryan Davis**  
Bryan Davis will provide an overview of national best practices on bike parking style/type and location, and provide you with some model bylaw language. CCRPC will be seeking 2-3 municipalities interested in working together to refine and incorporate model bylaw language into municipal regulations.
- 3:10 Sharing Skill Sets, Paul Conner & Regina Mahony**  
We have an idea to better facilitate peer learning and skill sharing at the PAC. Have you done a deep dive into a specific topic for a zoning bylaw that others could benefit from? If you are willing to share, we'll have a sign-up sheet at the meeting so we can get these 15 min. presentations added to the agendas going forward. Thanks in advance for your enthusiastic participation.
- 3:25 Building Homes Together Training Topics – Bonus Densities Pt. I, Regina Mahony**  
Review a compilation of the current bonus density provisions for affordable housing; and an initial discussion on the success of these provisions. I hope to get the compilation out to you before the meeting.
- 3:50 Bolton Town Plan Preliminary Review\*, Lee Krohn**
- 4:20 Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon, Committee Members**
- 4:25 Other Business**
- a. Population Forecasts – By Feb. 8th we expect to receive the answers to the current questions on county age cohorts, interim countywide employment, municipal level population, households, and employment forecasts. These will be presented to the Board on Feb. 15<sup>th</sup>, and we hope to have a Board vote on March 15<sup>th</sup>. Would the PAC like to meet for a special meeting on Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> to review these, or would you prefer to receive them via email (and we can point you to the Board presentation), and make your recommendation at your regularly scheduled March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting?
  - b. New PSB website, with searchable [ePSB](#)\*.
- 4:30 Adjourn**

\* = Attachment

NEXT MEETING: February or March 8, 2017 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](mailto:evaughn@ccrpcvt.org), no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, November 9, 2016  
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**

Joss Besse, Bolton  
Ken Belliveau, Williston  
Greg Duggan, Essex  
Jacob Hemmerick, Milton  
Andrew Strniste, Underhill  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
Sarah Hadd, Colchester  
Katherine Sonnicks, Jericho  
Paul Conner, South Burlington  
David White, Burlington

Everett Marshall, Huntington  
Karen Purinton, Colchester

**Staff**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner  
Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Pam Brangan, GIS Data & IT Manager  
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

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

11 Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. and stated that we've added an agenda item regarding  
12 the upcoming ortho-imagery flyover.

13  
14 **2. Approval of September 14, 2016 Minutes**

15  
16 Jacob Hemmerick made a motion, seconded by Ken Belliveau, to approve the October 12, 2016 minutes. No  
17 further discussion. MOTION PASSED. David White abstained.  
18

19 **3. Imagery Data Upgrade**

20 Regina Mahony stated that we've added this topic to the agenda because John Adams just sent an email to the  
21 VPA listserv a few days ago, and we wanted to explain the situation in Chittenden County. Pam Brangan  
22 explained the flyover for the new ortho-imagery is planned for 2018 for the majority of our region, so no  
23 decisions need to be made by December. However, half of Huntington will be flown in the Spring of 2017,  
24 and that decision needs to be made now. Just as last time, there is an option to upgrade the flyover from 30cm  
25 to 15cm. We did buy the upgrade last time, and we'd like to do that again. We will go ahead and put in the  
26 application for Huntington. The overall cost in Chittenden County will be much lower than last time, because  
27 the State is covering the cost in all designations, and in the Census Urban Area. We anticipate the cost to be  
28 \$30-40,000, compared to \$120,000 last time. There is also the option to purchase building footprint  
29 (\$47/square mile) and/or impervious surface (\$99/square mile) data, though we don't need to make that  
30 decision at the start because we can go back and ask them after the imagery is flown (the State is not going to  
31 pay for these). While the December deadline is really just for Huntington, everyone needs to know the FY18  
32 budget numbers now. Pam Brangan estimated a couple \$1,000 at the most for each municipality. The PAC  
33 asked if we can provide each municipality with rough estimates for the upgraded imagery, footprint and  
34 impervious coverage. Joss Besse asked for this information to be sent to himself and Sharon. There was a  
35 question about the new lidar data that we are waiting for – will this be a better quality data set that can be used  
36 for all of these same purposes? If so, there may not be a need to upgrade to the better orthophoto imagery.  
37 Pam Brangan will look into this and provide the information to the municipalities.

38 **4. Population Forecasts**

39 Melanie Needle explained that we are updating the ECOS Plan and specifically need forecasts for the  
40 metropolitan transportation plan (MTP), and the energy plan. The transportation model, used to help update

1 the MTP, requires control totals for households and employment. Forecasts are also needed for modeling  
2 associated with energy planning. Because the energy plan work is part of a state wide effort, VEIC is using  
3 the high ACCD forecast for the modeling. Melanie explained that the consultant forecast that we got for the  
4 transportation model was developed for the State Transportation Plan for the Shumlin administration. This  
5 was a statewide projection that was disaggregated to the County. The PAC reviewed the graphs that showed  
6 the differences between the various forecasts.  
7

8 Ken Belliveau questioned the transportation forecast methodology of disaggregating the state forecast to  
9 Chittenden County considering our growth has been so different than the rest of the State? Charlie Baker  
10 indicated that we'd like to hear any issues that folks have; he explained that we are going to have the Board  
11 approve the forecasts (County and municipal) and would like all of us to be comfortable with these; and  
12 suggested that these numbers are a forecast, not necessarily the goal to strive toward in the plans.  
13

14 Ken Belliveau further explained that the ACCD projection seems more credible as it is based off of cohorts. It  
15 does seem that the current ECOS projection is very high and unrealistic. The ACCD model seems sensitive to  
16 what is really happening on the ground in Williston; and it did appear to show that the County was different  
17 than the other Counties. Ken Belliveau further added that we may want to include the forecast as a range.  
18

19 Joss Besse asked if we are hoping to use the same projections for both ECOS, MTP and Energy Plan? Charlie  
20 Baker stated that we'd ideally like to. Though, the out years for each of the forecasts is different and currently  
21 we are stuck with VTrans using one projection, and the state wide energy planning effort using another.  
22

23 Paul Conner asked about the fact that ACCD is basing its forecast on 1990 to 2000 growth rate, while EPR is  
24 basing their forecast on 2000 to 2010, so it makes sense that the results would be very different. Ken  
25 Belliveau suggested that it may make more sense to build the forecast off of a longer history. David White  
26 added that these two decades are a peak and a valley so they are two extremes. Paul Conner has suggested that  
27 we look at actual numbers rather than rates, especially when looking back over 10 years because it doesn't  
28 compound. Paul Conner stated that the forecast they had done in South Burlington also showed no new  
29 population growth.  
30

31 Charlie Baker stated that while the ACS survey is not a great source, it has shown a growth of 8 to 900 people  
32 per year. Does that seem right? Williston has seen an increase in population and housing. They are seeing  
33 twice the regional growth rate. South Burlington is seeing 140 housing units/year, however the forecast  
34 indicates that the population will remain flat for 10 years due to demographic shifts. Paul indicated that while  
35 this was based on a sound methodology it is still hard to believe. Sarah Hadd explained that the State no  
36 longer compiles birth and death rates, and asked if Paul's consultant did this work. Paul Conner didn't have  
37 the information in front of him, and isn't sure. Sarah Hadd's sense is that Colchester is staying flat, but it is  
38 really hard to know without the birth and death rates. However, there still seems to be a demand for more  
39 housing units and particularly multi-family. Greg Duggan indicated that it feels like Essex is closer to  
40 Williston, but haven't investigated. Jake Hemmerick stated that they haven't investigated in Milton lately, but  
41 based on actual parking needs it doesn't appear that the household sizes are shrinking, at least in the  
42 townhouse units. Jericho doesn't seem to be growing. Burlington may very well grow if everything in the  
43 pipeline goes through. There is no one from Winooski here, but it appears that there is quite a bit of growth in  
44 Burlington and Winooski.  
45

46 Charlie Baker indicated that we will bring these questions back to the consultants, and will share figures with  
47 you when we get them.  
48

#### 49 **5. ECOS Annual Report – Planning Area Growth Indicator**

50 Regina Mahony stated that we wanted to share the data from the ECOS Housing Indicator since we just put it  
51 together. Melanie Needle gave a brief overview of the housing data. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the new  
52 housing units occupied in 2015 are in the areas planned for growth. We've always met the 80% goal since  
53 we've been tracking, but this is the highest percentage that we've seen since we've been tracking this. Paul

1 Conner stated that the map is great, but it would be helpful if the multi-family dot was larger so you could  
2 clearly see that those contain a higher number of units than the single family houses. Ken Belliveau stated that  
3 Williston did some mapping based on number of units, and the density really jumps out to you that way.  
4 Regina Mahony asked for everyone to let us know if the Planning Area boundaries have changed so we can  
5 reflect that in the updated ECOS Plan, though we hope there won't be any shifts into the rural planning area.  
6 Melanie Needle asked the PAC if it would be okay to ask for the 2016 development data in December and  
7 receive it in January. The PAC would prefer for the ask to come in January.  
8

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

10 So. Burlington – 109 Cider Mill approved now, but the applicant wants to go to 170.  
11

12 Milton – nothing for Act 250, however they recently received an application for an access permit for a 120'  
13 tall telecommunication tower in the public road ROW. South Burlington, Colchester and Williston have also  
14 heard from this company - Mobility co. out of the Atlanta area. They build one 120' utility pole so you need  
15 less. Colchester and South Burlington have denied the access permits.  
16

17 Underhill – one act 250 amendment to move a building envelope in a quarry.  
18

19 Essex – hearing started last week for the quarry and conservation areas in Saxon Hill. The Indian Brook 9 lot  
20 subdivision got denied, so they are going back. They only have to go to Act 250 because a co-applicant was  
21 signed onto an application in So. Burlington. The Town would receive a good amount of conserved land out  
22 of that subdivision. Another application for 30 units in Essex/Essex Junction.  
23

24 Williston – Cotton Wood II is the only big project on the horizon.  
25

26 Huntington – there is an Act 250 application to upgrade a ski trail.  
27

28 Colchester – going to get a 50 unit building in the spring in growth center so won't trigger act 250.  
29

30 Burlington – section 248 rooftop solar in south end Flynn ave. There is a public hearing for re-zoning for  
31 Cambrian Rise (old orphanage) on 11/28. After that they will be able to submit application. Downtown Mall  
32 project is exempt from Act 250 with 274 units.  
33

34 **10. Other Business** - none  
35

36 **11. Adjourn**

37 The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.  
38

39 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony