Planning Advisory Committee

Wednesday, November 9, 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 October 12, 2016 Minutes*

2:50 County Population Projections*, Melanie Needle/Regina Mahony
This will be an initial introduction to the topic of future population forecasts. Additional, information, including municipal level projections, will be provided at future meetings.

3:10 ECOS Annual Report - DRAFT Planning Area Growth Indicator*, Melanie Needle/Regina Mahony
Attached you will find the 2015 data associated with the ECOS ‘85% of growth in 15% of the land area’ indicator. While this isn’t 100% complete, and the map is a draft, we wanted to show you where the residential growth has been taking place.

3:20 Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon, Committee Members

3:25 Other Business

3:30 Adjourn

* = Attachment

NEXT MEETING: January 11, 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, October 12, 2016
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
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
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Sarah Hadd, Colchester

Dean Pierce, Shelburne (via phone)
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Karen Purinton, Colchester

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Elect a Vice Chair
Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Everett Marshall, to elect Paul Conner as Vice Chair of the Planning Advisory Committee. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Approval of September 14, 2016 Minutes
Dean Pierce made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the September 14, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

4. Amend Municipal Plan Review Guidelines
Regina Mahony explained that the changes requested at the last meeting were incorporated, and she identified a few additional changes that were made since the packet went out. These included clarification of “readoption” as a full update of a Plan that would bring it up to full compliance with statute and a new expiration date; and the correct terminology for the consistency standard. The PAC discussed whether “upon request” of the municipality, is the right approach for CCRPC review of an amendment. The PAC decided to keep “upon request” as the PC public hearing notice may not always be the best time for CCRPC’s review. As is our usual practice, CCRPC will continue to touch base and communicate with each municipality when an amendment is proposed to figure out the best timing for review.

Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Dean Pierce, to recommend that the CCRPC Board adopt the amendments to the Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

5. Energy Standards
Melanie gave a brief overview of the Draft Determination Standards; and the draft comments from CCRPC Staff. Dana – what analysis do they need to do for the Regional Plan? CCRPC will do everything that is needed for the Regional Energy Plan. Municipalities need not do anything unless you want to do a local plan before we finish the regional energy plan. The PAC provided the following questions/comments:
- Combine Parts II and III.
- Recommend a range of targets, rather than specific targets.
- Recommend flexibility as not all municipalities will be able to follow all of the pathways identified in Part III.
- What can the “other categories” replace in terms of action items (example Page 8, Part 6.a.vi).
Recommend an *optional* pre-application review, so that a municipality doesn’t have to adopt their plan
before learning whether the plan qualifies for a determination of energy compliance.

The Energy Sub-Committee (to the Long Range Planning Committee) and the Board will look at these
comments before submitting them to the State.

## 6. ECOS Accomplishments

Colchester - New Lakeshore district for the Bay, Green infrastructure standards, and larger clean water
initiative with a comprehensive look at the entire Bay area.

Essex – Final stages of adopting a scenic resources overlook district (final PC hearing on 10/27). Thoughtful
growth in Action (came out of H&S) – decided to merge the Planning Commission, and have two different
DRBs. Award winning Comprehensive Plan.

So. Burlington – Adopted Comprehensive Plan and adoption of FBC with inclusionary zoning, city wide
stormwater and energy standards. New collaborative effort to manage stormwater in the Town of Shelburne.

Hinesburg – First affordable family housing project. Completion of draft comprehensive plan.

Huntington – Upgraded a lot of culverts, bridges and ditches – a major accomplishment after many storms and
damage. Making great process on zoning updates. Now have a DRB.

Williston – been updating town plan over last couple of months. SW utility implemented in the last year.

Underhill – Culvert replacements. Looking at revising zoning regulations. Thinking about FBC.

Milton – 60 new affordable senior housing units coming online (Cathedral Sq); in addition to 34 units from the
year before. Also lots of growth in Catamount Industrial Park. Working on unified bylaw (for 2017
adoption).

Shelburne – FBC zoning overlay. SW partnership with So. Burlington.

Rock-lined ditches on two miles of roads. Capital Improvement Plan in development.

## 7. Colchester Town Plan Amendment

Regina Mahony explained this is a Plan amendment, and as discussed at the last meeting this is on the agenda
for informational purposes. Sarah Hadd described the background and purpose of this amendment to their
2014 Town Plan. They’ve looked at West Lakeshore Drive holistically considering the water quality
relationship with the Bay. The Fire District been working with Burlington on bringing municipal sewer
service to this area; and DEC needs language in Town Plan about sewer expansion and the associated land use
to make sure the Town is properly planning for it. This effort is supported by the Integrated Water Resources
plan that helped the Town understand the inputs to the Bay and the improvements needed to help improve the
water quality. The Town Plan will still expire in 2019. Joss Besse asked if the areas to be served by sewer are
already developed or new areas for growth? Sarah Hadd described the areas as follows: Hineburg Prim –
existing strip development with a plan for infill mixed use/walkable development; West Lakeshore Drive –
summer/seasonable but also strip. East Lakeshore Drive – more dense than current zoning would allow for
and onsite septic systems are failing. The proposal is for 150,000 gallons of wastewater treatment which will
just serve existing development with some infill. The area is currently all served by on onsite wastewater.
Especially concerned about best fixes on East Lakeshore Drive. Ken Belliveau asked how the cost will be
borne and by who. Sarah Hadd explained that part of the work the Town is doing is figuring out if it is
economically viable. Including costs of improvements once the roads are replaced; and mandatory hook-ups.
8. Williston Comprehensive Plan (public hearing included)

Joss Besse opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Regina Mahony explained that this is a plan re-adoption – a complete update and incorporation of all new statutory requirements. Staff found that the Plan includes all the requirements, with the exception of a compatibility statement. The Town has indicated that they are still working on this, and it will be incorporated into the final plan. The PAC provided a number of comments/questions, including:

Paul Conner asked about the build out analysis and if that number is still accurate and/or conceivable. Ken Belliveau stated that some of the assumptions are no longer the same including the base density. In addition, the farther out from the growth center the less likely applicants are to build out to the full density of the lot (for example, they are building 1 unit/5 to 8 acres when 1 unit/2 acres is allowed). There was a question about whether CCRPC would consider doing another County wide build out? Regina Mahony stated that they would consider it if they can get it into the UPWP.

Joss Besse asked Ken if he has looked at adjacent municipalities, and if he anticipates any issues with surrounding Towns? Ken Belliveau indicated that they don’t anticipate any issues. The borders are largely rivers and rural to rural with the exception of the airport and IBM (on both sides of the river).

Alex Weinhagen asked if there has been any thought about housing for our changing demographic, and particularly more universal design? Ken Belliveau stated that they haven’t set goals to build to the older demographic per say, however their concentrated multi-modal development is all focused toward that (Finney Crossing as an example). One story living is being built in many of their developments. Alex Weinhagen suggested that it may be helpful to make mention of this in the Plan.

Sarah Hadd stated that the Town Plan does a great job of balancing growth areas with non-growth. She asked if the Town has considered adding River Corridors; and suggested that many of the MS4 municipalities are already doing this work and the River Corridor concept could be a nice way to re-package the existing effort. Ken Belliveau indicated that they have an existing 150’ buffer on some rivers that has been in place for quite some time. In the past they lessened the setback on Lake Iroquois which gave an incentive to upgrade onsite septic systems.

Joss Besse asked about the working lands and the need for working lands diversification, and noted that he would be interested to see how this will look in the zoning regulations. Joss Besse also noted that the implementation matrix is about 15 pages long, and he asked if the Town has thought about focusing up that list. Ken Belliveau stated that they look at the list every time they update the Comprehensive Plan to see what they are going to do, what they weren’t able to get done. They also look at it on a regular basis for work programming. Unless it involves a state agency they have had general success at getting through the tasks. Dana Hanley noted that the matrix was helpful and easy to understand.

Sarah Hadd made a motion, seconded by Jacob Hemmerick, that the draft 2016-2024 Williston Comprehensive Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, with the exception of the statement of compatibility, and that the municipality’s planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan, with the required statement of compatibility, 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 with a condition that the statement of compatibility be included in the final plan. No further discussion. Ken Belliveau abstained. MOTION PASSED.

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

- South Burlington – Larkin Terrace, 60 units to replace extended stay hotel.
- Milton – none
- Underhill – none
- Williston – 70,000 sq.ft., 175 dwelling units, Cotton Wood II (Cotton Wood I was approved but nothing came from it), former driving range on Williston Road (in the growth center). Also 40 units of senior housing in Blair Park. There may be some more catch up permits with the new owners of Tafts Corners.
- Hinesburg – none
- Huntington – none
- Bolton – none
- Colchester – none

10. **Other Business** - none

11. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
Issue

The November PAC meeting will be the initial introduction to the topic of future population forecasts. Additional information, including municipal level projections, will be provided at future meetings.

Vermont Statute requires that all plans shall be based upon surveys of existing conditions and probable future trends, and shall be made in the light of present and future growth and requirements (24 VSA §4302(d)). Therefore, CCRPC has historically prepared future demographic projections for the Regional Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. As we prepare for the 2018 update of the ECOS Plan, we need to yet again set the County’s population, housing, and employment projections. More specifically, projections are needed as inputs to the Energy Plan and the update to the Travel Demand Model which will have implications for the MTP.

In previous iterations of approving projections, the CCMPO/CCRPC have agreed that forecasts should describe the future as we expect it to be, not as what we want it to be. Essentially, projections are a necessary planning tool, but we don’t necessarily need to be tied to the specific future that they prescribe.

We have recently contracted with RSG to update our model and they have subcontracted with Economic & Policy Resources (EPR) for the purpose of updating the demographic forecast that feeds into the Travel Demand Model.

At the same time, we are starting work on the Regional Energy Plan which is using a different population projection. Both of these projections are different from our ECOS Plan projections (see next page).

As seen in the table below, the projection estimates are different due to the types of methodology employed to arrive at these estimates. EPR’s initial forecast is derived statistically from the June 2016 Vermont Statewide Population Consensus Forecast Prepared by the Legislative Joint Fiscal Office–Shumlin Administration that was employed in the most recent VTrans Long-Range Transportation Plan update. ACCD’s projections are based on the mortality, birth rate and migration rate from 1990 to 2000. A complete methodology for the ACCD projections can be found here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
<th>2015¹</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>156,545</td>
<td>161,382</td>
<td>163,569</td>
<td>166,837</td>
<td>169,537</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEIC/ACCD</td>
<td>165,690</td>
<td>171,718</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186,890*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹-Census Population Estimate
* - VEIC extended the ACCD projections out to 2050. The estimate for 2050 is not part of the actual ACCD projection estimate.
For your information, our current ECOS Plan projections are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>156,545</td>
<td>164,170</td>
<td>184,694</td>
<td>205,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>61,827</td>
<td>65,693</td>
<td>74,987</td>
<td>83,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>122,248</td>
<td>133,864</td>
<td>151,854</td>
<td>171,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2013 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, 2011 Woods and Poole Forecast for Chittenden County- Adopted by CCRPC 9/2011

**Staff Recommendation:**
There is no recommendation at this time.

**For more information, contact:**
Melanie Needle
mneedle@ccrpcvt.org or 846-4490 ext. *27
The attached is an initial population forecast for Chittenden County. The initial forecast is derived statistically from the June 2016 Vermont Statewide Population Consensus Forecast—Legislative Joint Fiscal Office–Shumlin Administration that was employed in the most recent VTrans Long-Range Transportation Plan update. As such, the Chittenden County population forecast has not been judgmentally modified, nor have any “add-factors” (for external factors or developments) been applied to the straight statistical algorithm. The County forecast employed a statistical shares approach, where trended shares were applied to the statewide consensus forecasts in total and by age grouping. These two approaches were then brought to convergence to produce the results in the table below.

The data in the table indicate that the total population in Chittenden County is expected to grow at a very moderate pace, expanding from an estimated 161,382 people in 2015 to 169,537 people in 2040 – an average annual rate of 0.20%. This rate of growth is similar, but slightly higher, than the trend forecasted at the state level, with the total resident population of the State of Vermont expected to expand at an average annual rate of 0.17% during the same period. The Chittenden County population projections attached to the memo show the breakdown across age cohorts, indicating similar moderate growth trends, though showing a slight decline in population in the aged 20 - 24 years and aged 25 - 44 years age cohorts from 2015 to 2040.

The driving age population in Chittenden County (which is defined to include residents aged 16 – 84 years) as a share of its total county population is projected to increase slightly, by approximately 0.4 percentage points in 2040 relative to 2015. The same driving age cohort at the state level is expected to reduce its share of the total population by almost three percentage points by 2040. The county level growth in residents in driving age population appears to be the result of added residents in the older age cohorts as the county’s population ages, with the addition of almost 16,000 residents in the aged 45 – 64 years and aged over 65 years cohorts from 2015 to 2040. The contrast in the growth in share of total population composed of eligible drivers between the state and Chittenden County shows that while on the whole the population is expected to grow older on average over the 2015-2040 period, Chittenden County appears to be able to offset the population that is no longer able to drive with in-migrants and younger residents reaching the age where they are eligible to drive.
### Population—Chittenden County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Over 65 Years</th>
<th>Total Under 65 Years</th>
<th>Total 0-4 Years</th>
<th>Total 5-19 Years</th>
<th>Total 20-24 Years</th>
<th>Total 25-44 Years</th>
<th>Total 45-64 Years</th>
<th>Total 16-84 Years</th>
<th>Driving Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>161,382</td>
<td>22,049</td>
<td>139,333</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>29,738</td>
<td>18,117</td>
<td>40,556</td>
<td>42,946</td>
<td>131,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>163,569</td>
<td>30,271</td>
<td>133,298</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>30,264</td>
<td>14,915</td>
<td>32,729</td>
<td>48,325</td>
<td>133,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>165,326</td>
<td>30,479</td>
<td>134,847</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>30,653</td>
<td>15,398</td>
<td>33,149</td>
<td>48,487</td>
<td>135,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>166,837</td>
<td>30,266</td>
<td>136,570</td>
<td>7,248</td>
<td>30,975</td>
<td>15,577</td>
<td>33,133</td>
<td>49,639</td>
<td>136,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>168,175</td>
<td>30,162</td>
<td>138,013</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>31,229</td>
<td>15,706</td>
<td>33,393</td>
<td>50,347</td>
<td>137,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>169,537</td>
<td>30,230</td>
<td>139,307</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>31,527</td>
<td>15,806</td>
<td>33,807</td>
<td>50,757</td>
<td>138,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Over 65 Years</th>
<th>Total Under 65 Years</th>
<th>Total 0-4 Years</th>
<th>Total 5-19 Years</th>
<th>Total 20-24 Years</th>
<th>Total 25-44 Years</th>
<th>Total 45-64 Years</th>
<th>Total 16-84 Years</th>
<th>Driving Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>626,042</td>
<td>109,893</td>
<td>516,149</td>
<td>30,408</td>
<td>110,275</td>
<td>47,168</td>
<td>142,298</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>506,969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>633,337</td>
<td>130,399</td>
<td>502,939</td>
<td>31,248</td>
<td>106,814</td>
<td>43,414</td>
<td>149,150</td>
<td>172,312</td>
<td>513,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>639,122</td>
<td>150,149</td>
<td>488,973</td>
<td>31,434</td>
<td>106,316</td>
<td>41,590</td>
<td>154,134</td>
<td>155,499</td>
<td>516,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>644,123</td>
<td>164,754</td>
<td>479,368</td>
<td>31,091</td>
<td>106,866</td>
<td>40,751</td>
<td>155,486</td>
<td>145,175</td>
<td>515,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>653,458</td>
<td>166,954</td>
<td>486,504</td>
<td>30,297</td>
<td>109,001</td>
<td>42,117</td>
<td>151,709</td>
<td>153,380</td>
<td>510,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached map. Here is it broken out by town. I could not fit it in on the map. Also, you’ll notice that there are null values for the DU type in Jericho on the map. I will follow up on that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Essex</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Junction</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesburg</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Burlington</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westford</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winooski</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>787</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not included in planning area analysis.

Melanie Needle
Senior Planner
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404
(802) 846-4490 ext. *27
www.ccrpcvt.org
Charlotte and St. George will be included at a later date. Information is forthcoming.

November 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>New (2015) dwelling units</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>