

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

4 DATE: Wednesday, March 10, 2021
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:

Joss Besse, Bolton, Chair
Eric Vorwald, Winooski
Ravi Venkataraman, Richmond
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg
Cymone Haiju, Milton
Wayne Howe, CCRPC Representative
Paul Conner, So. Burlington
Darren Schibler, Essex
Owiso Makuku, Essex
Matt Boulanger, Williston
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Larry Lewack, Charlotte

Katherine Sonnick, Jericho
Sarah Hadd, Colchester (left at 3:32pm)
David White, Burlington (left at 3:20pm)

Staff:

Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Jason Charest, Senior Transportation Planner
Taylor Newton, Senior Planner
Charlie Baker, Executive Director

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

11 Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.
12

13 **2. Approval of February 10, 2021 Minutes**
14

15 Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Alex Weinhagen, to approve the February 10, 2021 minutes. No further
16 discussion. MOTION PASSED.
17

18 **3. I-89 Study Update & Input**

19 Eleni Churchill and Jason Charest provided an update on the I-89 2050 Study with a focus on design concepts,
20 metrics and results of the Exits 12B, 13 and 14 evaluations. Please go to the [Envision89](#) website for comprehensive
21 information on this study.
22

23 There was quite a bit of discussion of Exit 13 SPDI. Could the land where the former eastbound I-189 lane have the
24 opportunity for redevelopment and/or return to the UVM Eastwoods natural area; or could it be used as a bike path?
25 While it's possible this study won't be able to determine if these areas could be re-purposed. There was a question
26 about how this design would work for folks travelling northbound on 89 and trying to get on to Shelburne Road
27 during pm peak? Depictions of the traffic impacts for the interchanges evaluated can be found [here](#).
28

29 There was quite a bit of discussion on Exit 14 DDI. With the removal of the clover leaf ramps, there could be a
30 potential for redevelopment in those areas. While this study won't go into that level of detail (won't be able to know
31 if VTrans and FHWA would allow for the land to be sold); there was a question about whether that redevelopment
32 potential could be scored in some way in the matrix? It seems like it would be valuable. Jason stated that it may be
33 hard to evaluate that at this stage. He stated that the Board asked to have impervious surface added as an evaluation
34 criteria; which is somewhat related in the sense of impervious surface potentially being removed in this design. There
35 was a suggestion by three members to make the multi-use path in the center of the DDI 20' wide in this design.
36

37 There was another question about whether it's possible to put the pedestrian and bike paths under the ramps at Exit
38 14 to keep them completely separated from the vehicle traffic. Staff will take that question back to the consultant
39 team.
40

41 Eleni and Jason asked the PAC to take a look at the interchange evaluation matrix after the meeting, as there wasn't
42 much time to review these in detail. Staff stated that we are trying to make sure we have this evaluation stage done

1 thoroughly and correctly. Question – has there been any discussion about weighting the evaluation criteria? Some
 2 might be more important than others (for example 1 acre change of impervious surface impact may be a lot less
 3 important than vehicle miles travelled). Right now, every goal and metric is scored equally. Paul Conner suggested,
 4 in that case, maybe there should be a review of the metrics within each goal to make sure that there are equivalent of
 5 bigger and smaller criteria.

6
 7 Eleni explained that there has been a significant amount of outreach, including focus groups with New Americans
 8 and typically underrepresented populations, business community and workshops in South Burlington. By May the
 9 plan is to have a decision on which interchanges to move forward into the I-89 corridor bundles for evaluation.

10
 11 **4. FY22 UPWP Overview**

12 Regina Mahony gave the PAC an overview of the land use projects that were submitted for the FY22 UPWP. Regina
 13 Mahony explained that Staff is working on allocating staff hours in the draft. This will go to the UPWP Committee
 14 for their final review at the end of March.

Regulating Trails and Trail Parking	Bolton
Bolton Land Use and Development Regulation Amendments	Bolton
Zoning Administrator Ticketing Bylaws	Bolton
Transportation Impact Fee Study – Revision & Expansion	Burlington
Planned Unit Development Update (not transportation program eligible)	Jericho
Climate Action Plan, Transportation Component	South Burlington
Planning Technical Assistance	South Burlington

15
 16 **5. Town of Bolton Plan Amendment**

17 The Town of Bolton is considering a Town Plan amendment to their future land use map. See the attached letter from
 18 Staff acknowledging this amendment and indicating that CCRPC’s original plan approval still stands. Question about
 19 allowing more mixed uses, but they are so small lots. And the Town is open to commercial. Lots of steep slope and
 20 streams. Awkward to solve the problem by changing to the zoning district; and set back allowances. Could have been
 21 an overlay.

22
 23 There was some discussion about where exactly the change is proposed for because the two maps submitted are very
 24 similar. Larry Lewack clarified since he was still in Bolton when this first came about. There was also discussion
 25 about changing the rural district to a village district to accommodate small lots. This would allow for mixed uses in
 26 addition to simply accommodating the lot sizes. It may be better to employ an overlay district to simply allow for a
 27 change in setbacks. Larry Lewack stated that they did discuss the fact that more uses would be allowed, but the lots
 28 are so small and there are significant steep slopes so the area really wouldn’t lend itself to commercial.

29
 30 The PAC did not have any objections to the letter as drafted.

31
 32 **6. Members Items Open Forum**

33 Joss Besse asked if any members had any items to discuss with each other.

34
 35 Larry Lewack explained that there were four zoning changes on the ballot: two passed - on farm accessory
 36 businesses, and obsolete bylaw language; and two associated with the East Charlotte village failed. It would have
 37 changed 5 acre to 1 acre zoning in a commercial/village area. Need to foster a community conversation about the
 38 need and benefit of a diversity of housing types. Want to engage in a conversation with CCRPC for assistance in
 39 these conversations. There was some discussion from municipalities with experience in zoning amendments that go
 40 to the voters – Westford used to do that. Alex Weinhagen suggested that ACCD’s new zoning guide could be helpful:
 41 <https://accd.vermont.gov/sites/accdnew/files/documents/CD/CPR/CPR-Z4GN-Guide-Final-web.pdf>
 42 Richmond still does that, and are still working on addressing amendments that failed in 2012. They are trying to front
 43 load the conversations with the public as much as possible.

1
2 Taylor Newton asked if Charlotte ever voted to be a ‘rural town’ even though it is over 2,500 people? There was
3 some discussion over the statutory authority to vote by Australian ballot when over 2,500.
4

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

6 Regina asked the PAC to email Regina and Taylor any Act 250/Section 248 updates.
7

8 **8. Other Business**

- 9 a. Permitting Helipads and Airstrips – [Letter](#) from the Vermont Transportation Board to Municipal Manager’s
10 and Planning Commissioners. Regina Mahony asked the municipalities if they’ve seen any of these in their
11 municipalities. Paul Conner: They’ve only received a question rarely, but the So. Burlington PC does want to
12 address it, as it certainly could happen. Cymone Haiju – there are two locations in Milton now; and the PC
13 does want to take this up. Dean Pierce: Similar boat as South Burlington. Have only heard whispers so far;
14 but it could definitely happen. Darren Schibler asked the PAC about not defining it as a use, and then it
15 would be reviewed as a conditional use, and likely wouldn’t pass because it wouldn’t be able to meet the
16 criteria. Alex Weinhagen said that likely wouldn’t happen in Hinesburg because they have three use types:
17 permitted, conditional and accessory and the accessory uses are very broad. Someone could make the
18 argument that they are an accessory use; and they wouldn’t have any standards to judge it against. Regina
19 thanked the PAC for their input.
20 b. Cannabis APA magazine article*
21 c. Chittenden County Housing Convening – Monday, March 29th at 6pm. Agenda will go out soon. Regina
22 Mahony asked the members to let her know if they have any suggestions on the equity topic for this
23 convening.
24 d. Community Wildlife Program at VT Fish and Wildlife is hosting a webinar on Starting Your Town
25 Conservation Fund next Thursday, March 11th at 1:00pm-2:00pm. Registration information is [here](#).
26

27 **9. Adjourn**

28 Meeting adjourned at 4:01pm.

29
30 Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony
31