

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, September 9, 2020
5 TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
6 PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda
7

Members Present:

Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Larry Lewack, Charlotte
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Darren Schibler, Essex
Owiso Makuku, Essex
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
David White, Burlington
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Wayne Howe, Jericho

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
Taylor Newton, Senior Planner
Pam Brangan, GIS Data & IT Manager

Other:

Kyle Fecik, ESRI
Sydney Rich, ESRI
Timothie Biggs, ESRI (our region's account manager)

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

11 Paul Conner called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

12
13 **2. Approval of June 10, 2020 Minutes**

14
15 Eric Vorwald made a motion, seconded by Dean Pierce, to approve the June 10, 2020 minutes. No further discussion.
16 MOTION PASSED.
17

18 **3. ArcGIS Urban Demo**

19 Melanie Needle explained that CCRPC has investigated this tool for 3D visualization of conceptual future
20 development scenarios. The purpose of the demo is to show the PAC what this tool is capable of and to gauge
21 interest. Melanie Needle shared her reasons why CCRPC decided to ask ESRI to conduct an ArcGIS Urban demo for
22 the PAC: may be a helpful tool to help understand buildout of Form Based Codes, Community Viz has not yet
23 updated their platform and so currently that buildout tool is out of date, and the 3D aspect could be very helpful.
24

25 Kyle Fecik from ESRI provided an introduction of the variety of things that can be done in Urban – from sea level
26 rise indicators at a parcel level (Boston example) to public comment tool for various land use scenarios and
27 proposals. When asked about form based codes Kyle indicated that there is a way to account for it, but it isn't fully
28 worked in to the program yet. The tool is best used for traditional zoning – and traditional zoning parameters is how
29 you'd define each zoning district even if it is a form based code district.
30

31 Sydney Rich from ESRI provided a demonstration. Sydney explained that it can be used for plans (comparing and
32 analyzing various land use plan and/or zoning change scenarios), projects (visualize development proposals in front
33 of the DRB), and indicators (metrics to help compare scenarios). The 3D base layer itself can come from a variety of
34 methods: they have partners that develop these layers; from lidar; from sketch up 3D data coming from lidar; etc.
35 Melanie Needle mentioned that we do have lidar data here; and 3D buildings in some areas.
36

37 A few of the interesting features of the tool include: line of sight (can show you views and obstructions), building
38 shadows, use of the tool for public comments, can sketch in buildings (textured or un-textured) and features (like
39 trees).
40

41 **Questions:**

- 42 1. *Can land use types be configured at the parcel level as opposed to the grid square?* Sydney stated that yes,
43 you can.

2. *Is FAR the only input for estimating commercial development? Many of our towns do not use FAR in their zoning regulations.* Sydney showed the parameters that they typically use for zoning: they do use lot coverage and maximum height, setbacks (fixed distance, proportion of building is not currently supported).
3. *Can you set setbacks for both primary and accessory buildings?* Sydney explained that currently the setbacks are based on parcel edges and 1 building per lot; so could only show what an accessory structure would look like by splitting the lot and setting the accessory setback parameters.
4. *How much control is there to set elements such as AADT, water use, or wastewater needs? Can it be adjusted on a per building or development basis? Can you go in and adjust assumptions; and edit the out of the box space use type assumptions?* Sydney showed how you can change the parameters for zoning districts; and assumptions for the indicators.
5. *How much time commitment is there to get this set up and maintain?* Sydney stated that it varies; and she explained what you need for deployment: Filling out the zoning types table per zone takes some time depending on how many zones you want to start with (you can also add sub-zones if there are conditions that change). 3D base map can also take some time to get started. You also need a parcel layer, and boundaries of overlay districts if you have them. If you are talking about using the tool for proposed DRB projects, those take time to get each one set up.
6. *What does the public view look like?* Sydney stated that you can set what is viewable for the public in each plan and project. But the appearance is very similar to the admin/back end.
7. *Do you have any real examples of anyone who has used this and put it into a public plan?* Kyle stated that Boston is starting to get to this point, but not sure if they've used it for public input yet. Ann Arundel and Montgomery County in MD are thinking about it also. The product is only about a year old, so all of the implementation efforts are relatively new.
8. There was a discussion about ESRI's HUB tool for publicly facing websites. A HUB page might be more helpful for public engagement.

Regina Mahony asked the PAC to send any thoughts/feedback via email to CCRPC staff.

4. 2019 Housing Data

Melanie Needle presented the final 2019 housing data by type, municipality, and planning area:

2019 Year Built, 2019 Demo Built												
TOWN	AU	CS	GQ	MF	MH	SF	Demolitions	Total				
Bolton	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	-1	2	Areas Planned for Growth	89%	
Burlington	6	0	0	218	0	2	-4	222	Rural Planning Area	11%		
Charlotte	1	0	0	0	0	9		10				
Colchester	5	0	0	40	7	41	-11	82				
Essex	1	0	0	4	0	11		16	Planning	2019		
Essex Junction	2	0	0	47	0	5	-7	47	Center	35%		
Hinesburg	0	0	0	9	0	7		16	Metro	38%		
Huntington	0	0	0	0	0	1		1	Suburban	9%		
Jericho	1	0	0	7	0	4	-1	11	Village	7%		
Milton	3	0	0	6	0	5	-2	12	Rural	11%		
Richmond	0	0	0	10	0	7		17	Enterprise	0%		
Shelburne	0	0	0	3	6	10	-10	9	Total	100%		
South Burlington	3	0	0	78	0	30	-1	110				
St. George	0	0	0	0	0	2		2				
Underhill	3	0	0	2	0	8		13				
Westford	0	0	0	0	1	3	-2	2				
Williston	1	0	0	132	1	30	-2	162				
Winooski	0	0	0	45	0	0	-2	43				
Grand Total	26	0	0	601	17	176	-43	777				

Melanie Needle also described the affordable housing production numbers. There were 169 perpetually affordable homes added in 2019; this is above the 140/year goal. However, when looking at all four years of the Building Homes Together campaign the affordable goal has not been met. Regina Mahony also added that the results of the housing bond showed up a little bit in 2018, but mostly in 2019. The bond was essentially used up on projects in 2019 so we don't anticipate that we'll meet the goal in 2020.

Melanie Needle also presented the data in a map: <https://arcg.is/zuCii>

1
2 There was a question about a greater percentage being in the Metro Planning than the Center Planning Area – do we
3 have a more specific goal than “within areas planned for growth” v. “rural”. Regina Mahony stated that the MTP
4 scenario did have a tighter land use scenario – potentially within the Center and Village Areas. Also, starting next
5 fiscal year we will likely take a look at the areas planned for growth for the next ECOS Plan update because currently
6 the areas are not necessarily well connected to transit corridors.
7

8 **5. Future PAC Meeting Topics**

9 Regina Mahony showed the PAC a list of topics for future meetings. She stated that she will send the list out to the
10 PAC and would appreciate if each member could get back to her with feedback. Regina also asked the PAC to add
11 topics to the list that they may like to share/present to each other. Regarding municipal plans: there won't be too
12 many coming up for review, so we'll have time to discuss other topics.
13

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

15 Regina asked the PAC to email Regina and Taylor any Act 250/Section 248 updates.
16

17 **7. Other Business**

- 18 a. a. The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the [Congress of the New](#)
19 [Urbanism](#) (CNU) is pleased announce the completion of [Enabling Better Places: A Zoning Guide for](#)
20 [Vermont Neighborhoods](#). This how-to manual promotes practical, small steps that Vermont's cities, towns
21 and villages can take to address widespread regulatory barriers that limit the choice of conveniently located
22 homes available at prices Vermont's people can afford.
- 23 b. CCRPC Funding Directory – now live and searchable on the website: <https://www.ccrpcvt.org/funding->
24 [opportunities/](#).
- 25 c. New building energy codes are in effect as of 9/1/2020. Here is the webpage with more details:
26 <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/building-energy-standards-update>
- 27 d. The VT DEC issued General Permit 3-9050 (The “3-acre General Permit”). The new general permit will go
28 into effect on December 1, 2020. The Final GP 3-9050 is available here:
29 <https://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/stormwater/9050>.
- 30 e. [NNECAPA and STAR Initiative Lessons in New Ruralism](#): Read [Lessons in New Ruralism - Fall 2020](#) to
31 learn about some of the key ingredients of successful grassroots initiatives and lessons shared.
- 32 f. [NNECAPA 20/20 Vision Check: Lessons in Hindsight, Planning with Foresight](#). September 30th & October
33 1st.
- 34 g. The November PAC meeting should be moved to avoid Veteran's Day.
35

36 **9. Adjourn**

37 Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.
38

39 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony