

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, August 7, 2019  
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:**

Matt Boulanger, Williston  
Larry Lewack, Bolton  
Eric Vorwald, Winooski  
Meagan Tuttle, Burlington  
Cathyann LaRose, South Burlington  
Dean Pierce, Shelburne  
Dana Hanley, Essex  
Michael Burris, Milton

Marty Gilles, Colchester Intern  
Sean Cannon, Colchester  
Andrew Strniste, Underhill  
Daryl Arminius, Charlotte

**Staff:**

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Senior Planner  
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner

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

11 Regina Mahony called the meeting to order at 2:41 p.m.  
12

13 **2. Approval of May 8, 2019 Minutes**

14  
15 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Dana Hanley, to approve the May 8, 2019 minutes. No further discussion.  
16 MOTION PASSED. Daryl Arminius and Jessica Draper abstained.  
17

18 **3. Comprehensive Plans – General Topics**

- 19 a. Implementation of Plans: The PAC asked to discuss the expectations of Plan implementation/accountability at  
20 a PAC meeting outside of a specific Plan review, including whether CCRPC should review the Plans earlier  
21 than 24 months before they expire. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided some background information on this topic  
22 including an overview of the requirements of §4350. The Staff recommendation is to follow our normal plan  
23 review process, with a few changes: 1. As a part of the 18 to 24 month (before Plan expiration)  
24 review/consultation, staff will review whether the Plan has been implemented or not, the planning process of  
25 the municipality and if the municipality is maintaining efforts to provide funding for municipal and regional  
26 planning. 2. We will include these reviews on the PAC agendas to meet the public notice requirement, and to  
27 allow the PAC to weigh in on these early reviews/consultations. Emily indicated that staff would ask the  
28 municipalities for a self-assessment on Plan implementation before CCRPC prepares the review. Emily asked  
29 the PAC for thoughts and comments on this strategy. The PAC generally agreed that a check-in on Plan  
30 implementation is a great idea, and the self-assessment would make sense because it won't be possible for  
31 CCRPC to know all the ways the Plan has been implemented (and the Planners don't necessarily know either  
32 as other Departments and Committees are responsible for parts of the Plan). Members of the PAC added that  
33 this is either something that they are already doing in house already; or will help with annual reporting and  
34 Committee workplans at the municipal level. Several municipalities wondered whether CCRPC could help  
35 provide data on various indicators included in their plans as part of this review process. Regina said that  
36 CCRPC could possibly help with this on a case-by-case basis. There was a suggestion that Charlie add a plan  
37 implementation reminder into the annual discussions that he has with the legislative bodies. Regina thanked  
38 the PAC for the feedback and stated that Staff will play this out for a year or two before making a formal  
39 change to the Plan Review Guidelines.
- 40 b. Plan Amendment in early stages of the 8-year cycle: Emily Nosse-Leirer explained that CCRPC has received  
41 a question about whether a Town can restart the clock with a Plan amendment, if they are still meeting all  
42 statutory requirements. The issue is that while all elements and goals may be met, the data will begin to get  
43 stale and out of date. This particular municipality adopted their Plan in 2017 (so the data is largely from the  
44 2014 ACS and the 2010 Census); and they want to amend the Plan for energy planning. For all other purposes  
45 the plan meets all statutory requirements, so the question is whether they can amend the Plan and start a new 8  
46 year clock. The PAC had a lengthy discussion about this. The discussion included:

- i. Suggestions about alternatives to data analysis and updates so it in and of itself doesn't hold up a Plan amendment or update.
- ii. Concerns that if a municipality does small amendments along the way on a chapter or two, eventually other parts of the plan will be stale and very much out of date. This is not just a potential data issue, but a public engagement and policy issue as well.
- iii. Acknowledgement that if all statutory requirements are met, the data is not too outdated, and the municipality asks for a new 8-year clock, CCRPC should be able to approve that.
- iv. Understanding of the challenges of determining when data is outdated. It was stated that municipalities are supposed to update the information on which the plan is based; and the Regional Plan should be clear about new municipal plan updates so everyone is clear on the policy that we are operating under. Another member added that we should be flexible because statute doesn't say that all the data needs to be updated right away.
- v. Regina added that this is tied back to the change from 5 year plans to 8 year plans, and the idea that with an 8 year plan there would be less re-adoption of older plans with outdated data. Dana added that the planning community did make a lot of promises during those discussions. There was a suggestion that perhaps an amendment within the first year or two would be okay for a new 8 year clock.

Ultimately, it was acknowledged that this needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis. It is up to the municipalities to make the ask for whatever they want. If there is an ask for a new 8 year clock, then it will be on Staff to decide what the recommendation is to the PAC (from the standpoint of data, public input, policies, etc.).

- c. Forest Integrity: CCRPC has received feedback from ANR on some of the Act 171/forest integrity plans we've been writing, and we'd like to discuss this feedback with the PAC. Emily Nosse-Leirer provided an overview of ANR's feedback on the Huntington Plan. Essentially, the forest connectivity block data does not include wildlife connectivity data and should not be used as a surrogate for wildlife connectivity. Act 171 does have "habitat connector" requirements in addition to forest block requirements. Therefore, it is a good idea to get in touch with ANR for your own town plans (and bylaw work) for advice on what data to use for wildlife connectivity. Jens Hilke is really great at providing assistance and mapping potential habitat connector areas when he can.

#### **4. Building Homes Together**

Regina Mahony explained that we are finalizing the 2018 data for the third year of this campaign. This year the Building Homes Together team would also like to report all the municipal work that has been going into housing (i.e. housing committees, housing trust funds, inclusionary zoning, density improvements, development review process improvements, ADU improvements, etc). Regina emailed a spreadsheet about this information last week; and passed it around for PAC members to fill in. Melanie also sent the final 2018 housing construction numbers a few days ago for one last review. Regina asked the PAC to take a look at that data one last time, as it will be finalized next week.

#### **5. Census Update: PSAP and New Construction**

Melanie Needle indicated that there is no update on the PSAP yet, as CCRPC has not heard back from the Census on the proposed changes that were submitted. Melanie Needle explained that the New Construction Program is intended to have an accurate count as possible by Census Day, 4/1/20. The purpose is to capture housing construction that began after 3/1/18 that would not have been submitted to the Census Bureau through any other program. The deadline for submitting addresses is 11/22/19. Regarding the new construction program, Melanie stated that for those municipalities that registered as CCRPC doing the work (Essex, Essex Junction, Hinesburg, Jericho, Milton, Richmond, Shelburne, Underhill, Westford and Williston). CCRPC needs your data by September 30th. The data needed is: zoning permit info from 2018 that didn't close; and 2019 zoning permit data. While CCRPC staff do not yet know the exact information and methodology that will be needed to submit this information to the Census (the webinars are supposed to be scheduled in September), the deadline for submittal is November 22nd. Therefore, CCRPC needs the data in enough time to work with it. For those towns that didn't register as CCRPC doing the work, VCGI is going to do this work for you. They will submit new construction data to the Census from e911 and DMV data. VCGI will take more local data from municipalities if you want to provide them with it as well. Bolton and Colchester are participating in the program on their own.

#### **6. ACCD's Zoning for Great Neighborhoods project**

1 *Regina Mahony* stated that ACCD is leading a project to help municipalities throughout Vermont improve housing  
2 options in walkable places by updating land use regulations. Information about it can be found [here](#). Regina indicated  
3 that Center for New Urbanism is the consultant for this work, and they've done a similar project in Minnesota. CNU  
4 is asking the RPCs to identify *common and/or typical* existing local zoning barriers to housing and neighborhood  
5 walkability, and the specific regulations that determine these barriers. This is supposed to be typical barriers not a  
6 complete assessment of each municipality's regulations. Also, the RPCs need to suggest potential case study towns.  
7 These towns will receive specific recommendations and will be asked to participate in a charette in November.  
8 However, there will only be four case study towns selected in the entire state, and the issues need to be replicable to  
9 other towns in Vermont. Regina asked the PAC to let her know if there is any interest in being a case study town.

#### 10 11 **7. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon**

12 Milton: Several residential projects have been proposed in Milton, but local review is still preliminary and no Act  
13 250 applications have been submitted yet.

14 Williston: just more phases of Finney Crossing and Cottonwood.

15 Underhill: nothing.

16 Shelburne: 63 units at the Yankee Doodle motel site (most significant FBC project so far). Other potential projects on  
17 Rte. 7. Kwiniaska development now held up by neighbors.

18 Richmond: Creamery project. Mobile home reconstruction on Rte. 2.

19 Bolton: Nothing Act 250 related.

20 Essex: New warehousing/storage in Saxon Hill.

21 South Burlington: FedEx proposal in Tech Park; Dorset Meadows development.

22 Winooski: A wall sign at VSAC needs to go to Act 250 for approval.

23 Colchester: Nothing new.

24 Burlington: A couple of projects under re-design. New Act 250 – proposed multi-family on Riverside for 50 units.

25 Local permits expired, so they need to come back through for permitting.

26 Charlotte: Nothing new.

#### 27 28 29 **8. Other Business**

30 a. As in past years, the Vermont Department of Housing and Community Development is issuing [this memo](#) to  
31 inform municipal planning and development officials of changes in statute.

32 a. Future Meetings are anticipated for: September 11, 2019; October 9, 2019; December 11, 2019. Note the  
33 NNECAPA conference conflicts with the second Wednesday in November.

34 b. MPG Grants due October 1<sup>st</sup>...let us know if you want our help, or want to discuss a potential MPG/UPWP  
35 application.

#### 36 37 **8. Adjourn**

38 The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

39  
40 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony