

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, January 11, 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

Joss Besse, Bolton

Greg Duggan, Essex

Jacob Hemmerick, Milton

Andrew Strniste, Underhill

Paul Conner, South Burlington

Dana Hanley, Essex

Meagan Tuttle, Burlington

Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg

Everett Marshall, Huntington

Karen Purinton, Colchester

Cathyann LaRose, So. Burlington

Jeff Castle, Milton

Staff

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager

Charlie Baker, Executive Director

Lee Krohn, Senior Planner

Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

Bryan Davis, Senior Transportation Planner

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

Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

11
12
13 **2. Approval of November 9, 2016 Minutes**

14
15 Karen Purinton made a motion, seconded by Jacob Hemmerick, to approve the November 9, 2016 minutes.
16 No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.
17

18 **3. Bike Parking**

19 Bryan Davis provided the PAC with a presentation (see attached) on bike parking. Bryan showed a variety of
20 bike racks that don't work particularly well. Generally you want a rack where you can lean the bike up to it
21 and securely lock both the frame and at least one tire. U racks work well, but you can definitely get creative
22 with it. You also want to make sure the racks are sited in the right location – distance from a building, easily
23 found, etc. Bryan provided the leading guidance documents on bike parking. Bryan indicated that we have
24 the ability to assist a few towns with bike parking bylaw language and asked if there was any interested. We
25 know Williston is working on this now. South Burlington and Burlington expressed interest. If any other
26 municipalities are interested, please let us know.
27

28 **4. Sharing Skill Sets**

29 Regina Mahony introduced this topic, and credited Paul Conner for the idea. The idea is to better facilitate
30 peer learning and skill sharing at the PAC. Each of you has likely done a deep dive into a specific topic for a
31 zoning bylaw that others could benefit from. We thought we'd set aside 15 minutes on your agendas for folks
32 to give a presentation on a zoning bylaw that you've researched, so that others are aware of the latest local
33 research, and can look to each other for input when they do an update on a similar topic. Paul Conner gave an
34 example that he talked with Alex Weinhagen when they were starting to look at energy efficiency regulations
35 because Alex had done quite a bit of research on this topic for his bylaw amendment. Initial topic ideas
36 include:
37

38 Energy Efficiency

39 Low Impact Development Stormwater Standards

40 PUDs – topic request from Greg Duggan. South Burlington has done some work on this lately.
41

42 Paul Conner suggested that everyone send Regina one sentence description in next two weeks or so, and then
43 we'll send the list of topics out to the group to vote on, so we are sure that there is interest in the topics.
44

1 Meagan Tuttle asked if we have done these types of presentations to multiple planning commissions and do
2 something a little more in depth? Paul Conner mentioned that they have done that and it could work as well;
3 however, you could also ask another Planner to come to your PC to talk with them directly. Alex Weinhagen
4 stated that it would probably help to start here at the PAC. Could be challenging to gather more than one
5 planning commission in a room.

6
7 Regina Mahony added that CCRPC is required to host four trainings this year as well, so stay tuned for those.
8

9 **5. Bonus Densities**

10 Regina Mahony showed the PAC some initial data that she collected from each of the municipal bylaws on
11 housing bonus densities (though she also made note if bonuses are allowed for other reasons as well). There is
12 quite a range on the level of bonus density allowed (400% in Essex Center to 25% or none), and the
13 requirements for receiving the bonus. Many of the bonus provisions are associated with PUDs, but not all.
14 The method of calculation/process is also quite varied. In addition, Burlington, South Burlington and
15 Hinesburg have an inclusionary zoning provision. There was a good amount of discussion about getting the
16 base density correct, rather than issuing bonuses; and whether or not the bonuses are targeted to growth areas
17 are allowed in all districts. The PAC members described whether applicants have made use of the bonus
18 densities, and if not, why not:
19

20 **Burlington** – Meagan Tuttle explained that Burlington has bonus densities for two reasons: 1. Bonuses that
21 help a developer accommodate the inclusionary requirement; and 2. Additional bonuses for those that go
22 above and beyond the inclusionary requirement (or other public benefit reasons). Most of the bonuses are not
23 economically worth it for the developer – they don't get enough in return for having to incorporate the
24 required elements in their project. Under the Form Based Code, the bonus densities will go away and the
25 density will be set by right. Also, there has been a consultant looking at Burlington's Inclusionary Housing
26 provision and they are expecting the results in a couple of months.

27 **Milton** – Jacob Hemmerick stated that no one has used it in the last three years. His thought is that it would
28 make more sense to get the base density correct.

29 **Underhill** – Andrew Strniste indicated that they have one application that is trying to take advantage of a
30 bonus right now – from 1 unit to 2 units. The DRB isn't clear on how to apply the bonus density so it's been a
31 challenge.

32 **Essex** – Greg Duggan described that it has been used in the Town Center (and there is some debate about
33 whether the 400% bonus can be used for multi-family outside of the Town Center). Throughout the rest of
34 Town, they only allow a 25% bonus, which are tied to PUDs (which are a mess). Dana Hanley stated that they
35 are starting to look at zoning updates for the Town Center area.

36 **Colchester** - Karen Bates indicated that onsite septic is a huge limitation in Colchester and lots of times people
37 can't do more than the base density due to septic limits. S.D. Ireland wanted to do a bonus density at
38 Severance Corners, but couldn't meet the open space/buffer requirements associated with the PUD application.
39 This was part of the reason the Town moved to a FBC system for Severance Corners.

40 **Huntington** - Everett Marshall indicated that they have bonus densities in their current and proposed
41 regulations, however, to his knowledge they haven't been used. Fell through the one time that it was
42 proposed.

43 **Bolton** – Joss Besse stated that they don't have a bonus density, but don't see a lot of development.

44 **South Burlington** - Paul Conner explained that it has been used in the So. Village master plan (bonus of 30 or
45 40 units out of 350 overall); on Farrell Street a building or two took advantage of a bonus density a few
46 years ago; and Kirby cottage also got a bonus (which is now slated for buy-out by the airport). Those worked
47 fairly well, but they don't often see them requested where they allow both residential and commercial because
48 there is a residential cap, but not a commercial cap. Cathy LaRose added that they've seen a few other one
49 offs here and there. The paper work and legal work associated with it doesn't seem worth it. Partnering with
50 CHT sometimes doesn't work b/c it doesn't often fit into CHT's model (as an example, CHT doesn't want to
51 take on 2 units in a building).

52 **Hinesburg** - Alex Weinhagen described that Hinesburg's density bonus is varied and you can get a bonus for a
53 lot of reasons. It is a confusing provision that requires a lot of explanation. Have had one person take

1 advantage. Two others thinking about it right now. In Village area available to any kind of a development
2 (not just PUDs), only PUD outside of Village for 25% by right – you don't need to give anything to get
3 anything except the amount of open space that is needed. 25% just isn't enough especially when the base
4 density is really low. The ones that have worked are the easy ones – small unit size b/c it works for multi-
5 family. And that is something the Town really wants to see which has some real validity.
6

7 Lee Krohn asked if it would make more sense to flip the system on its head and write the bylaws to build what
8 you want rather than establish a complicated system to allow waiver from the standards. Paul Conner
9 indicated that they are in phase 2 out of 3 of a project to revise their PUDs (these are located based). He would
10 be happy to share this work. Cathynn LaRose added that they find PUDs too easy, not too difficult as Jacob
11 Hemmerick described in Milton. Karen Purinton agreed that Colchester's PUDs are the same (too easy rather
12 than too hard/complicated).
13

14 Regina Mahony added that Ferrell Madden (the national FBC Consultants that worked on the Winooski Form
15 Based Code) indicated that most bonus provisions don't give the developer nearly enough of a bonus to
16 incentivize them to include affordable housing in their project. There will be more to come on this topic.
17

18 **6. Bolton Town Plan**

19 Joss Besse asked Paul Conner to run this part of the meeting since he is the Bolton Rep. Paul Conner indicated
20 that this Plan is still in draft form, so we are doing an initial review and will see the Plan again before making a
21 recommendation to the CCRPC Board. Emily Nosse-Leirer is the principal author of the Plan and didn't do
22 the Staff review but she provided an overview of where Bolton is on the process and some of the basic
23 concepts of the Plan. Lee Krohn did the CCRPC Staff review and found that while not all required provisions
24 are included yet, most are and he found the Plan to be consistent with the state requirements and the ECOS
25 Plan. He further described the Plan as thoroughly researched, incredibly encyclopedic presentation of
26 information about the community, and representative of a significant effort. Lee Krohn added that there
27 is a question about the consistency between the proposed West Bolton Hamlet and the Rural Planning Area as
28 described in the *ECOS Plan*. The West Bolton Hamlet is an effort to match the zoning with the traditional
29 development pattern of the area, while also expanding the development capacity of the area. It makes good
30 sense at the local level, and with this change there is still only 4% of the land area in Bolton that is
31 developable, so it's very small scale. There was a discussion about how we could resolve the differences
32 between the two plans – potentially by including a commitment by CCRPC to update the ECOS Plan in
33 accordance with the West Bolton Hamlet in their Resolution (and then CCRPC would officially amend update
34 the ECOS planning area map in June 2018 when the Plan is updated). Paul Conner suggested that the scale of
35 the West Bolton Hamlet is so small that perhaps it is consistent with the Rural Planning Area.
36

37 Comments from the PAC included:

- 38 • Alex Weinhagen asked how the Plan components will fit together in the final form, and specifically
39 asked where the actions will end up. Emily Nosse-Leirer described that the goals and objectives will
40 be further up front (as you can see in the graphic mock-up), while the actions will be in a table in the
41 back. Alex Weinhagen suggested that perhaps the actions, what you are actually going to do, should
42 be in front. He added that he liked the design mock-up but there could still be a lot less words, and
43 more pictures.
- 44 • Paul Conner indicated that the Bolton Valley is described as a major economic driver for the Town,
45 however the action is simply to increase the relationship. He suggested that it may be more effective
46 to get more specific about how the Town is planning to do that.
- 47 • Paul Conner asked Lee Krohn to ensure that the communication back to the Bolton Planning
48 Commission include a robust introduction about how great the Plan is.
- 49 • Meagan Tuttle described that she really liked how the format of the Plan is around the three core
50 values rather than 12 chapters based on the required elements of the Plan. Meagan prefers that the
51 actions are all in one chart, and perhaps a one or two page summary of the Plan could be drafted that
52 accompanies the action table as a quick reference.
- 53 • Dana Hanley stated that this is a really great job.

1
2 CCRPC Staff will get these comments over to Bolton's Planning Commission, and the Plan will come back to
3 the PAC again further down the road.
4

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

- 6 • Essex – 32 unit PUD
- 7 • Colchester – Nothing new
- 8 • Underhill – nothing
- 9 • Huntington – nothing
- 10 • So. Burlington – This won't go to Act 250, but they have received their first application for a bldg. in
11 the FBC (3,600 sf).
- 12 • Bolton – small development in West Bolton, probably won't trigger Act 250
- 13 • Richmond (as reported by Joss Besse) – Creamery project headed to Act 250. Mixed Use, 30,000 sf
14 and 40 housing units. No senior component.
- 15 • Hinesburg – Nothing new
- 16 • Burlington – Burlington Town Center not going to Act 250 (currently reviewing under DRB);
17 Cambrian Rise currently under DRB review and will go to Act 250, Pine St & Flynn Ave at Act 250,
18 City Market.
- 19 • Milton – nothing new.
20

21 **8. Other Business –**

- 22 a. Joss Besse stated that White Burke is working on an ask to the Legislature for more TIF districts, and
23 looking for support for this ask.
- 24 b. Regina Mahony explained that we expect to receive the answers to the current questions on county age
25 cohorts, interim countywide employment, municipal level population, households, and employment
26 forecasts in time for a February PAC meeting. However, these will also be presented to the Board on
27 Feb. 15th, and we hope to have a Board vote on March 15th. Regina Mahony asked the PAC if they
28 would like to meet for a special meeting on Feb. 8th to review these, or would you prefer to receive
29 them via email (and we can point you to the Board presentation), and make your recommendation at
30 your regularly scheduled March 8th meeting? The PAC would prefer to meeting in March, no need for
31 a special meeting in February.
- 32 c. The PSB has a new website, with searchable [ePSB](#).
- 33 d. An email will be coming from Melanie Needle shortly to request the 2016 development data.
- 34 e. We will be sending out the Planning Area map soon to ask you to double check that the areas match up
35 correctly with your zoning. We don't anticipate any changes, except a minor tweak in Colchester, and
36 potentially Bolton.
- 37 f. We will be doing municipal level technical assistance as part of one of the Energy contracts. We are
38 planning to work with Colchester, Shelburne and Winooski. Let us know if there is any other interest in
39 this.
- 40 g. Once the population forecast is set, that will be allocated down to the TAZ level for use by the
41 Transportation model. We will run that distribution by you for a quick cross check to ensure that it
42 makes sense from the municipal perspective. Expect this request in April.
43
44

45 **9. Adjourn**

46 The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

47
48 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony