

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, December 12, 2018
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7

Members Present:

Jessica Draper, Richmond
Joss Besse, Bolton
Matt Boulanger, Williston
Larry Lewack, Bolton
Darren Schibler, Essex
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Everett Marshall, Huntington
Ravi Venkataraman, Shelburne

Other:

John Adams, VCGI

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Pam Brangan, GIS Data & IT Manager

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

11 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

12
13 **2. Approval of November 7, 2018 Minutes**

14
15 Everett Marshall made a motion, seconded by Darren Schibler, to approve the November 7, 2018 minutes. No further
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED.

17
18 **3. Neighborhood Development Area**

19 John Adams provided the PAC with an update on the State's project to create and regularly update parcel data to
20 meet state standards. Project information can be found here: <http://vcgi.vermont.gov/parcels>. Parcel data is the most
21 searched for data set on the VCGI website. Most of Chittenden County is in a good place with this program. All but
22 Colchester and South Burlington have and will be done in Phase 1 and 2. The data is on the Interactive Map Viewer
23 where you can see the parcel data linked to the grandlist (maps.vermont.gov/vcgi). With parcel data, the State (and
24 others) can do more value added products, including the 3D value by parcel maps ([https://vcgi.github.io/value-per-](https://vcgi.github.io/value-per-acre)
25 acre).

26
27 There was a discussion regarding maintenance going forward. Surveyors are on board with the concept of a single
28 statewide survey library for digital copies of surveys. It would allow surveyors to upload new surveys and it would
29 provide an option for municipalities to confirm the approval of an actual new subdivision and add information like
30 the deed reference. The idea of verification at the municipal level for subdivisions and lot line changes after the
31 surveyor submits seemed to have merit for some PAC members, because there are scenarios when the surveyor
32 doesn't know the status of the plat after they've completed it and sometimes the landowner decides to not record it.
33 There are also many surveys that don't need approval from the Town; and the surveyors or landowners for those
34 don't necessarily want to make them public. The survey library will help to keep the digital information in a useful
35 place; however the actual parcel updates still need to be done.

36
37 There was a suggestion that CCRPC and/or Planners advocate for continued funding for this program going forward.

38
39 **4. 2018 Richmond Town Plan – Energy Review**

40 Joss Besse opened the public hearing at 3:14pm; hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

41
42 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the staff report for Richmond's enhanced energy plan. The PAC has
43 reviewed this Plan a few times; and the Plan was adopted on November 6. Post-adoption, the town is seeking a
44 Determination of Energy Compliance. Emily recommended that the PAC approve the motion and this will be added
45 to the full Plan motion and forwarded to the Board as a recommendation to approve both.

1
2 Thoughts/comments from the PAC:

- 3 • There was a discussion about the energy plans in general, not just in relation to Richmond's Plan. The
4 discussion was about whether the Plans are going far enough to ensure that real changes will happen to meet
5 the State's energy goals. Particularly because this is an incentive based program where a municipality is
6 given the ability to say no to a renewable energy project at the Public Utility Commission, but only because
7 they've committed to meeting the State's goals like energy use reduction. The PAC discussed that there are
8 only so many things that a municipality can influence in this realm. Land use density is within a
9 municipalities control. There was a discussion about checking in on implementation of the Plans, and that
10 this is the first round of energy plans and we'll know a lot more over the coming years as we implement the
11 Plans and as we re-write them in the next round. For Winooski they don't need to switch direction; but for
12 a rural town they really need to go in a different direction to put a park and ride in, or densify, etc.

13
14 Specific comments on Richmond:

- 15 • Great that the information from CCRPC has been incorporated.
- 16 • Concern that there is no way to actually measure and evaluate success. There are a number of good actions,
17 but no way to know whether it will actually meet the goals or not. If transportation energy is the real
18 problem, tightening up land use might be the real solution. Like for a park and ride is there a target portion of
19 the Richmond residents that will use the park and ride? There is only so much that a municipality has control
20 over and the causality is challenging to match up. It is more than likely that gas prices will impact use of the
21 park and ride. The hope is that a municipality is not preventing desired effects, and they've done what they
22 can.

23
24 There was an ask to discuss the implementation/accountability topic on another PAC meeting agenda outside of a
25 specific Plan review, including whether CCRPC should review the Plans earlier than 24 months before they expire.

26
27 Darren Schibler made a motion, seconded by Ravi Venkataraman, that the PAC finds that the 2018 Richmond Town
28 Plan with the draft energy amendments, as submitted, does meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning
29 standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352. The PAC recommends that the Plan should be forwarded to the CCRPC
30 Board for an affirmative determination of energy compliance. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

31 32 **5. 2019 Winooski Master Plan & Enhanced Energy Review**

33 Joss Besse opened the public hearing at 3:44pm; hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

34
35 Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of the staff report for the Winooski Plan. The Plan was reviewed for both
36 the municipal plan approval and confirmation, as well as the enhanced energy component. Emily indicated that the
37 format of the Plan was very good. The Plan only needs to address resource extraction for Plan confirmation, though
38 there are a few other suggested recommendations as well.

39
40 Eric Vorwald thanked CCRPC for their work on the Plan. Eric explained that the last Plan was really done in 2004,
41 so this is a major re-write based on the City's vision. The City has been working on a number of more specific
42 studies over the last few years, so this Plan is a summary, overarching document and many of the actions live in the
43 more specific plans. The implementation component of the Plan is purposefully at a pretty high level, so the City can
44 pivot as necessary going forward.

45
46 There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the Enhanced Energy Plan. The City isn't certain they are going to
47 officially request the determination because there is a concern that the State's constraint maps include resources that
48 the City doesn't view as a development constraint (namely agricultural soils). Generally speaking the PAC felt that
49 Winooski is a leader in energy efficiency based on its land use density and multimodal transportation options and that
50 should be the focus of the energy plan; rather than a lack of land area for renewable energy generation.

51
52 Other questions/comments from the PAC:

- 1 • Like the format and the identity of what Winooski is and what it's becoming. The City has been able to
- 2 define that better than other municipalities.
- 3 • Maps don't have a legend and so it is difficult to understand. Talked about having a separate appendix so
- 4 these can be full size with a legend.
- 5 • There was a discussion regarding the future land use map and the areas identified as "city park zoned
- 6 commercial or industrial". There are three areas in the City that are owned by the City and currently used as
- 7 parks but zoned as commercial and industrial. There was a recommendation that the Land Use map
- 8 disconnect from the actual zoning, and make the future use of these areas more clear in the map if the City
- 9 has clarity on what they want to do with them.
- 10 • Recommendation to be more clear in the intent of the Implementation Section, such as: The way in which we
- 11 are implementing this Plan is by making commitments in these specific plans and we are taking our actions
- 12 from those.
- 13 • There are a number of grammar/typos.
- 14 • Recommendation to think about requiring EV charging in the City's building code (essentially ensuring the
- 15 conduits are in place to allow for future charging stations) and consider requiring the stretch energy code.
- 16

17 There was a discussion about whether the PAC was ready to make a motion to recommend approval with conditions
18 (to include addition of resource extraction, clarify future land use map, be more intentional in the implementation
19 section, and clarify if the City is seeking enhanced energy planning or not), or whether there was time to see the Plan
20 again before making a motion. There is time for the PAC to review another version of the Plan, however there
21 wouldn't be enough time for another round of PAC comments to be addressed by the City.

22
23 Alex Weinhagen made a motion, seconded by Darren Schibler, to table this to another meeting. No further
24 discussion. MOTION PASSED. Eric Vorwald abstained.

25 26 **6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

27 Essex: none

28 Shelburne: none

29 Huntington: none

30 Williston: none

31 Bolton: none

32 South Burlington: New hotel in City Center. Preliminary Plat for 160 housing units application. 2 little PUCs projects
33 on UVM. Fed Ex in review for 140,000 sq.ft. building by the whale's tails.

34 Hinesburg: Nothing

35 Richmond: Nothing new. Creamery re-development is moving slower than originally planned.

36 Winooski: 24 unit multifamily going to Act 250 for an amendment.

37 38 **7. Other Business**

- 39 a. Williston 2018 Amendment to 2016 Comprehensive Plan – the packet included a letter from CCRPC
- 40 indicating that previous approval and confirmation are not affected by Williston's adopted Plan
- 41 amendments.
- 42 b. Regina indicated that there may not be a need for a January PAC Meeting – Wednesday, January 9th
- 43 c. CCRPC Board member communication – Regina indicated that Staff will be cc'ing our Board
- 44 Representatives when doing municipal projects in the respective municipalities; particularly when going
- 45 to a PC or SLB meeting so that the Board members can be kept abreast of our work and participate if
- 46 they'd like.
- 47

48 **8. Adjourn**

49 The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

50
51 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony