

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, December 6, 2017
5 TIME: 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present:

Victor Sinadinowski, Milton
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Andrew Strniste, Underhill
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Robin Pierce, Essex Junction
Jess Draper, Richmond
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner (via phone)

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

11 Paul Conner called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.
12

13 **2. Approval of November 8, 2017 Minutes**

14
15 Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Victor Sinadinowski, to approve the November 8, 2017 minutes with a
16 correction from Essex under the Act 250 projects: the address should be 251 River Road (not 281). No further
17 discussion. MOTION PASSED.
18

19 **3. Richmond Town Plan - Final Review**

20 The public hearing was opened. No one from the public was in attendance.

21 Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Victor Sinadinowski to close the public hearing. No discussion.
22 MOTION PASSED.
23

24 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the Staff report. She stated that the public engagement for this Plan
25 was excellent; and the format is really interesting. She found the Plan meets statutory requirements with the
26 exception of three required edits: 1. Basin Planning reference – need to specifically mention the Winooski Tactical
27 Basin Plan. 2. Forest Blocks and wildlife connectors – make some edits in that chapter. 3. Define the River Corridor
28 and River Corridor Protection Area.
29

30 The PAC provided the following comments:

- 31 - State designation areas need to be mapped and discussed in the Plan.
- 32 - Elderly & housing needs?
- 33 - Like the format.
- 34 - Having targets is great. Though some of these seem impossible to measure. Is there baseline data and data
35 on how to measure them? No consensus that a lack of baseline data at this point is a problem. Great to work
36 towards this.
- 37 - Lots of action items, with direction on what to do next to prioritize these. Richmond was encouraged to at
38 least identify a lead responsible party.
- 39 - Recommended a top 10 list of implementation items.
- 40 - 100-year flood plain – current nomenclature is the Special Flood Hazard Area. Could put 100-year flood
41 plain in parenthesis if that helps.
- 42 - Future Land Use map – two properties are labeled with landowners instead of land use/business type. No
43 consensus on this being a problem. You could do both, like “Severance Corners Growth Center”.

- 1 - Natural and Working Lands is confusing – what is intended? It isn't clear if this is intended for protection
- 2 or development. Similarly, what's encouraged and what's allowed in Rural Agricultural and Residential
- 3 Areas? There is a concern regarding how this plan is meeting the state planning goal of village
- 4 development surrounded by rural country-side. Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that she thought the Plan
- 5 meets this goal by many of the action items described in the other sections of the Plan (i.e. natural resource
- 6 conservation v. land use section). Perhaps Richmond could reference some of that in the Land Use section
- 7 to be clear that there is an intent to address the 1-acre zoning.
- 8 - Renewable energy targets – Energy Technical Plan Goal #1 and 3. Try to get more aggressive because the
- 9 State goals are much more aggressive.
- 10 - Working Lands/Forest Fragmentation – decrease forest fragmentation rate by 2%? Try to mitigate the loss
- 11 by reducing the rate of loss, not the actual amount of loss.
- 12 - The PAC would like to see some of these suggestions addressed before the plan is adopted, since this
- 13 review is before the PC public hearing.
- 14 - Make sure to leave the door open to better address the fragmentation issues and land use.
- 15 - Really great public engagement.

16 [Sarah left at 4:10pm.]

- 17 - Perhaps the Rural Agriculture and Working Lands are too much in one category.

18
19 Jess Draper explained their timeframe, and explained that they only have one day between the Planning
20 Commission public hearing and submitting this to the Selectboard. The plan needs to go on the Town Meeting day
21 ballot so they don't have much time.

22
23 Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Robin Pierce, that the PAC finds that the draft 2018 Richmond Town
24 Plan, as submitted and with the statutory edits described above (and in bold font in the Staff Report), meets all
25 statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory
26 requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality,
27 CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff
28 determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the
29 PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for
30 approval.

31
32 There was a lot of discussion regarding strengthening the protection of the countryside surrounding the village. Paul
33 Conner made a friendly amendment to add a stronger connection* between the land use and resource pieces to
34 ensure this state goal is adequately addressed in the Plan. This amendment was accepted by Ken Belliveau, and
35 Robin Pierce. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Jess Draper abstained.

36
37 *This stronger connection can be made in two specific locations:

38 Page 13 has a section called "Constraints and Possibilities" which states that some areas in Richmond are already
39 constrained, but says that the town "needs to identify ideal future land uses" for the rest. This could be a good place
40 to explain that actions elsewhere in the plan set up a basis for this, especially the Natural and Cultural Resources
41 technical plan and Economic Development technical plan.

42 Page 17 has the "Taking Action" section for the Future Land Use technical plan. There aren't any actions listed
43 here because all the Future Land Use actions are in other parts of the plan (Natural and Cultural Resources, etc.). It
44 would be helpful to communicate where those actions are in the plan.

47 **4. Municipal Plans and the New 8-year Requirement**

48 Regina Mahony explained that she'd like to discuss what the PAC wants to see in new municipal Plans now that
49 they won't expire for 8-years, instead of 5-years. There was discussion regarding what was promised to the
50 Legislature when this change was requested: need more time implement the plans rather than create the plans; the
51 plans will get more strategic/implementable; and within 8-years we won't 're-adopt' plans like we used to (just re-
52 adopt the exact same plan without updating it). Therefore, should the Plans that are now approved for 8 years be
53 completely up to date, including data, data analysis and includes all new statutory requirements?

1
2 The other part of it is the implementation requirement. The municipalities now need to show how the Plans are
3 being implemented. Regina Mahony suggested that CCRPC needs to confirm the planning process twice in the 8-
4 year period. We will do the first one about 18 to 24 months before the Plan expires; and we think this is when we'll
5 ask how the previous plan has been implemented so far.
6

7 The PAC decided that this should be added to another agenda, with a bit more information about what exactly will
8 be required so that municipalities can react to that. Regina Mahony will add this to another agenda.
9

10 **5. Other Business**

- 11 a. CENSUS – LUCA. If you want CCRPC's help you need to fill out the forms to tell the Census that by
12 December 15, 2017.
- 13 b. ECOS Plan Update – Regina gave an update on where all the ECOS Plan pieces are. The public comment
14 period for the CEDS is still open, and the MTP will go out for public comment in the next two weeks.
- 15 c. Regina Mahony asked for two UPWP Committee volunteers. Ken Belliveau is interested. Regina Mahony
16 will send a note to the full PAC.
- 17 d. Great Resource: Censusreporter.org. It is an interface between the Census and people who want to use the
18 data. Lots of helpful charts that you can embed in other things. Just put our County or your municipality in
19 to see how easy it is.
20

21 **9. Adjourn**

22 The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

23
24 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony