



Planning Advisory Committee Agenda

Wednesday, November 15, 2023

2:30pm to 4:00pm

Meeting will be held virtually.

Virtual Location: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88912260955>

For those who would prefer to join by phone or those without a microphone on your computer, please dial in using your phone. (For supported devices, tap a one-touch number below to join instantly.)

Dial: +1 646 931 3860; Meeting ID: 889 1226 0955

For supported devices, tap a one-touch number join instantly: [+16469313860](tel:+16469313860), [88912260955#](tel:+16469313860)

Agenda

2:30 Welcome and Introductions, Paul Connor

2:31 Approval of September 13, 2023 Minutes*

2:32 Jericho Town Plan Review, Darren Schibler*

PAC will review updated information from the Town of Jericho about proposed changes to their future land use map and conformance with the ECOS Plan. The draft 2024 Town Plan and maps can be found [here](#).

2:40 Essex Town Plan Review, Sarah Muskin*

The Town is seeking plan approval and planning process confirmation. The draft 2023 Town Plan and maps can be found [here](#).

- a. *Review Staff Summary*
- b. *Open the Public Hearing*
- c. *Accept Public Comment*
- d. *Close the Public Hearing*
- e. *Questions and Comments*
- f. *Recommendation to the CCRPC Board*

3:00 Chittenden County Active Transportation Survey Presentation, Jonathon Weber – Local Motion

Jonathon Weber from Local Motion will present the results of the Chittenden County Active Transportation Survey.

3:30 Vermont Zoning Atlas, Yoshi Bird – UVM Complex Systems

Yoshi Bird, leader of the Vermont Zoning Atlas team, will provide a brief demonstration of the Vermont Zoning Atlas.

3:45 Members Items Open Forum, Members

If anyone has anything they'd like to bring up with the group, please do so.

3:50 Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon - Please email Taylor and Darren information about projects on the horizon.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext 121 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.



3:55 Other Business

1. **ECOS Plan Update.** CCRPC has delayed adoption of ECOS Plan until June 2025. CCRPC staff will spend early 2024 doing engagement specifically with underrepresented communities on the draft ECOS Plan. Staff will also spend the first half of 2024 working on developing municipal housing targets and updates to the regional future land use maps.
2. **HOME Act Studies.** The HOME Act required the development of several studies that are due to the legislature in mid or late December. Drafts of the Regional Future Land Use Map study, the Designation Study, the Act 250 Delegation study, and the Act 250 Location-Based Jurisdiction Study have all been released or will be released imminently. Copies of the Regional Future Land Use Map study and the Act 250 Delegation study have been provided to PAC via email. Please contact Charlie and/or Taylor by Friday, December 1st if you have specific feedback on the Regional Future Land Use Map study or the Act 250 Delegation study.
3. **Updated Regional and Municipal Energy Data and Maps.** CCRPC will municipalize regional energy data and maps by the end of 2023.
4. **FEMA Flood Map and Bylaw Updates.** RPCs have will enter into a second contract with VT DEC to support NFIP map and bylaw updates in municipalities in FY24. Please let RPCs staff know if your municipality is interested in assistance. In addition, CCRPC understands that the release of the draft NFIP Work Map for Chittenden County has been scheduled for release in January 2024.
5. **Housing Dashboard and BHT Dashboard.** Both the [CCRPC Housing Dashboard](#) and the [Building Homes Together Dashboards](#) have been updated to include 2022 housing information.
6. **UPWP Solicitation.** CCRPC will solicit for FY25 UPWP projects in late November 2023. If you have questions about potential projects, please reach out to CCRPC staff.

4:00 Adjourn

* = Attachment

NEXT MEETINGS:

Here are the future PAC meetings so you can hold the time in your calendars. Just keep in mind that sometimes we have to adjust these dates for various reasons:

January 10, 2024 at 2:30 PM – TBD

March 13, 2024 at 2:30 PM – TBD

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

4 DATE: Thursday, September 13, 2023
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

<u>Members Present:</u> Cathyann LaRose, Colchester Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg Zachary Maia, Colchester Eric Vorwald, Winooski Paul Conner, South Burlington Linda Blasch, Jericho Charles Dillard, Burlington Katherine Sonnick, Essex Town Matt Boulanger, Williston Larry Lewack, Charlotte Chris Yuen, Essex Junction Melinda Scott, Williston Cymone Bedford, Milton	<u>Staff:</u> Sarah Muskin, Planner Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Taylor Newton, Planning Program Manager Darren Schibler, Senior Planner Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner <u>Guests</u> Amanda Froeschle
---	---

8 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

9 P. Conner called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

10
11 **2. Approval of August 17, 2023 Minutes**

12 *E. Vorwald made a motion to approve the prior meeting's minutes. Seconded by P. Conner. No further*
13 *discussion. The motion passed unanimously.*

14
15 **153. Draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan**

16 Staff Summary: D. Schibler summarized the formal review of the 2024 Jericho's Town Plan. The Town has
17 completed a substantial rewrite and developed an ambitious and encouraging plan that supports compact
18 development- through investing in villages, infrastructure planning, and capital planning. The plan has lots of
19 community support. D. Schibler states technical corrections are included in the memo. Though overall the plan is
20 in accordance with statute, there are a few necessary changes:

- 21 1) Previously, there was a statement about earth resource extraction- the policy, or a comparable policy,
22 needs to be added back.
- 23 2) Future Land Use Map: there is a significant expansion of village neighborhoods area. CCRPC is
24 supportive of the principle, the areas are inconsistent with the ECOS Future Land Use Map, so the town
25 needs to address how this change will support the goals in the regional plan and must address the
26 compatibility criteria in 24 V.S.A. § 4302(f)(2)(A) –(D).
- 27 3) The Residential Infill map appears to include areas now mapped as Village Neighborhoods on the Future
28 Land Use map. This discrepancy needs to be clarified to ensure that CCRPC understands the Town's
29 intent.

30
31 A. Weinhagen asked for a page number where the extraction resources are discussed in the plan. D. Schibler
32 responded it is in volume 2, but will get back about specific page numbers. A. Weinhagen clarified that it is
33 important to have this policy be thoughtful and specific because it is required. He added people the industry will
34 look for these policies.

35
36 E. Vorwald asked about the comment about the Future Land Use Map and suggested that the ECOS plan
37 incorporate these changes instead of Jericho needing to change. D. Schibler responded that the Future Land Use
38 map will be updated, but Jericho just needs to add some context through the statutory test to make sure the plans
39 support each other.

1 T. Newton stated that the ECOS future land use map is based on municipal zoning. He clarified that when ECOS
 2 and municipal plans are out of sequence, CCRPC needs the municipality to explain why the inconsistency exists
 3 and how, despite the inconsistency, the plans are still compatible. Jericho needs to explain why they are changing
 4 this district. P. Conner summarized that the PAC is being advised that if the Jericho Town Plan explains its
 5 reasoning, and the change is determined to be compatible with the Regional Plan, then the Jericho Town Plan
 6 should be recommended for regional approval. E. Vorwald asked if it is just the map that is the issue. D. Schibler
 7 said that is correct, the map requires additional explanation.

8
 9 A. Weinhagen said he now understands what language is missing and asked to see the area being discussed. D.
 10 Schibler showed the map. L. Blasch explained that the intersection in question is where the Mount Mansfield
 11 Union Highschool is located, which is a major employer and there is a public waterline that goes through this
 12 region towards the southeast. She said that a gas line was also added to this area this summer. Therefore, the
 13 presence of infrastructure, access to village center, and employment opportunities is why increased density is
 14 being pursued. A. Weinhagen asked about other constraints (slopes, wetlands, etc.). L. Blasch said housing
 15 already exists in these areas and that there are some small wetlands, but no large slopes. A. Weinhagen also asked
 16 what areas mapped in yellow stand for. L. Blasch responded that yellow is low-density housing and reminded the
 17 PAC there is no municipal sewer in Jericho. P. Conner suggested that discussion should be added about all areas
 18 that are being changed, not just the highest density.

19
 20 Enhanced Energy Plan: D. Schibler noted there were a few minor comments to address for the enhanced energy
 21 plan, but then noted the required changes:

- 22 1) Table on page 13- does not include the number of fossil fuel vehicles.
- 23 2) A couple of state known and possible constraints have changed, so the accompanying maps need to be
 24 updated.

25
 26 M. Needle commented that the utilities section has constraint language, but that there is a “key take-away box”
 27 with no mention of energy. It would be helpful to include a few bullet points in the key- takeaway box, because
 28 this would be helpful for the Public Utility Commission.

29
 30 *E. Vorwald made a motion to open public hearing at 3:02 pm. P. Conner seconded, and the motion passed*
 31 *unanimously.*

32
 33 There were no public comments on the Jericho Town Plan.

34
 35 *E. Vorwald made a motion to close public hearing at 3:03 pm. P. Conner seconded, and the motion passed*
 36 *unanimously.*

37
 38 T. Newton said CCRPC is recommending that PAC hold off on acting until we see revised language. The Town
 39 Plan will be brought back in November. P. Conner asked if this timeline works for Jericho. L. Blasch said that
 40 lines up with their schedule.

41
 42 **4. S.100 / Act 47 – Overview of Studies and Changes to Municipal Planning & Zoning**

43 T. Newton framed the conversation as discussing some of the thornier issues of S.100 and reviewed the following
 44 topics:

45
 46 Emergency Shelters – T. Newton stated there is now a definition of emergency shelters based on the HUD
 47 definition. There is a distinction between shelters in an emergency (the hotel voucher program) and permanent
 48 shelters for those experiencing homelessness.

49

1 Housing Assistance and Hotels – T. Newton stated the hotel program should be allowed on a legal basis through
 2 this change.

3
 4 Duplexes – T. Newton stated duplexes shall be allowed wherever a single-family unit is allowed and same
 5 dimensional standards apply. The question on everyone's mind is: how does this impact density?
 6

7 C. LaRose believes this provision means that the intention is preserving the housing type (duplexes). She stated
 8 that types should not be conflated with density. She doesn't want this to happen because many regulations talk
 9 about types. The provision is clear that duplexes cannot be prohibited, but has the density discussion been thought
 10 through? She stated lot of capacity questions have not been thought through if this provision does mean density.
 11

12 L. Lewack said he tried to apply all the S.100 changes to Charlotte's bylaws. With this change, one land-use
 13 district now needs to allow duplexes when they were once prohibited and Charlotte's 5 acre lots now need to
 14 allow for the conversion of single unit dwellings to duplexes.
 15

16 P. Conner asked CCRPC staff to refer to the ACCD guidance about this issue. P. Conner believes this guidance
 17 aligns with C. LaRose's interpretation.
 18

19 A. Weinhagen stated it is clear that density and dimensional standards are not the same. T. Newton agreed but
 20 noted that minimum lot size is a dimensional standard, so if you are allowing a minimum lot size for a single unit
 21 dwelling, that you now must also allow the same for a duplex. A. Weinhagen thinks the municipality has the
 22 option to regulate density separately from lot size. There was discussion of how this interpretation applies to the
 23 duplex language in S.100. D. Schibler thinks that the focus of this provision is the regulation of dwelling type /
 24 use, rather than density or lot size.
 25

26 P. Conner pointed out that what we should do and what we are allowed or required to do are not always aligned.
 27 A. Weinhagen asked if our county should take a leadership position state that duplexes should be allowed
 28 regardless of density standards. C. Yuen thinks it's a great idea. P. Conner thinks it is an important discussion and
 29 continued by stating that the concern is with new development, not infill or redevelopment.
 30

31 C. LaRose and E. Vorwald think it is clear that duplexes are now a permitted use, not just conditional use. T.
 32 Newton and A. Weinhagen think the intent was to say allowed (not permitted). T. Newton asked if we should
 33 advocate for statute to define allowed vs. permitted vs. conditional. P. Conner recommended asking a land use
 34 attorney. We will use a polling option next meeting to consider this conversation and see how in/out of alignment
 35 we all are.
 36

37 E. Vorwald and A. Weinhagen discussed ADU's and how they do or do not count as duplexes.
 38

39 Multi-Unit Dwellings – T. Newton continued the discussion and stated that statute now says that in any district
 40 served by water/sewer, multi-unit dwellings shall be a permitted use. P. Conner noted that no density is
 41 referenced. At T. Newton's question, C. Dillard explained that Burlington is currently working on a
 42 Neighborhood Code project that hopes to allow up to 4-unit buildings anywhere in the City. and may even
 43 remove density regulations entirely. E. Vorwald asked if permitted use means it is by-right (whereas duplexes
 44 may be conditional uses outside water and sewer areas). The PAC agreed that this what the statute says, even if it
 45 seems awkward, but P. Conner felt it was implied that duplexes would be allowed by-right outside water and
 46 sewer areas since they cannot be denied based on character of the area under conditional use review anyway. A.
 47 Weinhagen then reiterated that site plan review can still be required for 3-4 unit structures.
 48

1 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) – D. Schibler continued the discussion and said the definition of ADUs have
2 not changed, just moved into definitions section, but the bill clarifies that single unit dwellings with ADU are
3 subject to the same review as single unit dwellings without ADUs.
4

5 A. Weinhagen took over as chair and said we will continue this S.100 discussion next meeting. C. Dillard asked if
6 this could include a concern Burlington has identified about whether fee simple duplexes (i.e., separate ownership
7 of each side of a duplex building) are now prohibited under the language in S.100. He will follow up with
8 CCRPC staff about this afterward.
9

10 **5. Members Items Open Forum**

11 C. Dillard asked if there were any updates on CCRPC TDM study. T. Newton stated he believes procurement is
12 underway, but he will follow up.
13

14 **6. Other Business**

15 1. **Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects on the Horizon** - Please email Darren information about projects.

16 2. **Zoning Atlas Update.** UVM Complex Systems' team continues to finalize work on Chittenden County
17 communities this fall. Planning staff are invited to provide quality control before a draft atlas is presented,
18 likely at the November PAC meeting.

19 3. **ECOS Plan.** T. Newton explained why ECOS plan adoption is being delayed again: 1) outreach to
20 underrepresented communities 2) FLU studies 3) Regional Housing Targets. The People section has been
21 approved by the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) and will be presented to the full CCRPC Board in
22 October for review. Staff is currently finalizing edits to the Place section which will be review by the LRPC
23 in October.

24 4. **Essentials of Land Use Training.** CCRPC is seeking interest from municipalities that would like to host an
25 "Essentials of Land Use" training for municipal board members. Three municipalities have reached out
26 already. The training provides a basic introduction to land use planning and regulation and is particularly
27 aimed at new municipal board members. If interested, please email Taylor and Darren.

28 5. **Updated Regional and Municipal Energy Data and Maps.** CCRPC will municipalize regional energy data
29 and maps in December 2023.

30 6. **FEMA Flood Map and Bylaw Updates.** RPCs will enter into a second contract with VT DEC to support
31 NFIP map and bylaw updates in municipalities in FY24. Please let RPCs staff know if your municipality is
32 interested in assistance. In addition, CCRPC understands that the release of the draft NFIP Work Map for
33 Chittenden County has been delayed until January 2024.

34 7. **Healthy Community, Healthy People: Community Cannabis Policy Toolkit:** A toolkit that prevention
35 professionals and communities working on cannabis related policy improvement can use to help support
36 prevention and public health at a community level is available. [https://pttcnetwork.org/centers/new-
37 england-pttc/2023-rad-fellowship-program-product-healthy-community-healthy-people](https://pttcnetwork.org/centers/new-england-pttc/2023-rad-fellowship-program-product-healthy-community-healthy-people)

38 8. **Brownfields.** D. Albrecht announced that CCRPC received two brownfields grants that can support towns
39 and private developers with environmental assessments for new properties depending on the end uses. Since
40 the early 2000s CCRPC has helped over 30 properties with these assessments.
41

- 1 A. Weinhagen reminded the PAC that the next meeting is November 15th and adjourned the meeting at 3:58pm.
- 2
- 3 Respectfully submitted, Sarah Muskin

Date: November 8, 2023

To: Linda Blasch, AICP, Jericho Town Planner

From: Darren Schibler, CCRPC Senior Planner

Re: Updated Formal Review of the Draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan, Including Enhanced Energy Plan Review

The Town of Jericho has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan; (2) confirm its planning process; and (3) issue an affirmative determination of compliance with the enhanced energy planning standards set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352.

This draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan is a full rewrite of the 2016 Town Plan. CCRPC staff informally reviewed the 2016 plan and provided a memo to Town in November 2022 with recommendations to improve the plan. In addition, CCRPC staff provided a formal review for the September 13, 2023 Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting, noting several changes required for regional approval as well as a list of recommended updates. The Town has revised the plan following the Planning Commission's first public hearing on September 19, 2023; the Selectboard expects to conduct a potentially final public hearing on November 16, 2023. At the time of this review the Town Plan is a final draft, and is posted on the [2024 Jericho Town Plan webpage](#).

CCRPC staff have reviewed the latest draft and find that all the edits required for a determination of compliance with the enhanced energy planning standards have been made. These include:

1. Add the current number of fossil-fuel burning vehicles registered in Jericho, or some other measure of current transportation energy use.
 - a. The number of fossil fuel vehicles in 2015 and 2022 have been added to Volume 2, Chapter 9, page 15, Table 7.
2. Update the list of state known constraints to include confirmed vernal pools, and state possible constraints to include potential and probable vernal pools as well as Vermont Conservation Design Highest Priority Forest Blocks, Physical Landscape Blocks, Surface Waters & Riparian Areas. Make sure Maps 18 and 19 reflect these constraints.
 - a. These updates have been made in Volume 2, Chapter 9, page 22 and Maps 18 and 19.

In addition, CCRPC staff have reviewed the latest draft and find that all the edits required for regional approval have been made. These include:

1. Add a policy on earth resource extraction as required under 24 V.S.A. §4302(c)(10).
 - a. The following language has been added as the last bullet on Volume 2, Chapter 3, page 22:

Manage the responsible extraction of sand, gravel, topsoil, and other earth resources to support community needs, prevent undue environmental harm, and ensure proper site reclamation.

2. Correct overlaps between the Residential Infill and Village Neighborhoods planning areas on the future land use maps in Volume 1.
 - a. Overlapping planning areas have been separated on the maps in Volume 1, pages 57 and 60.
3. Address conformance of the proposed changes to the Village planning areas with the ECOS Future Land Use Map under 24 V.S.A. § 4302(f)(2)(A)-(D).
 - a. The following language has been added to Volume 2, Chapter 11, pages 1-2:

This plan proposes to expand the Village Neighborhoods planning area on Jericho’s future land use map (identified in pink along Packard Road, Browns Trace Road and Morgan Road. The Jericho Village Neighborhoods area encourages high concentration of mixed residential and non-residential uses which are priority areas for development densities without sewer service. On the surface, this would reduce the desired effect of the 2018 CCRPC ECOS Regional Plan by potentially allowing an area identified as “Rural” to have smaller lot sizes and become more densely populated with primarily residential uses outside of the Village Centers. However, this area already contains low-density residential development that doesn’t strictly meet the ECOS Plan’s definition of the Rural planning area. Major employers such as the Mount Mansfield Unified Union High School (MMUUHS), the Ethan Allen Firing Range (EAFR), and the businesses, services and facilities in Jericho Center Village are all within a 1-mile radius and are accessible without a vehicle from this location. Existing infrastructure includes a public water line and a natural gas line (installed in 2023) that serves MMUUHS, EAFR and residents on Packard Road, part of Browns Trace Road, and Morgan Road.

Since removing this land use pattern and restoring the area to a natural or working landscape would reduce housing stock, displace residents, and require significant investment, the only reasonable alternative is to allow for infill here and bring the existing development pattern more in line with the state, regional and local planning goals of compact settlement surrounded by open countryside. These potential changes to Jericho’s land use map are essential to the desired effect of the ECOS Plan as a whole because they advance the following goals and strategies:

- *Goal 13: Land Use - Encourage future growth in the Center, Metro, Enterprise, Suburban, and Village Planning Areas to maintain Vermont’s historic settlement pattern and respect working and natural landscapes.*
- *Goal 14: Housing - Increase the opportunities for safe, decent, energy efficient, affordable, accessible and fair housing for all types of households in all neighborhoods.*
- *Goal 15: Transportation - Provide accessible, safe, efficient, interconnected, secure, equitable and sustainable mobility choices for our region’s businesses, residents and visitors.*
- *Goal 16: Infrastructure - Ensure adequate infrastructure and facilities (i.e. water supply, wastewater treatment, stormwater treatment, broadband coverage and solid waste recovery and recycling) to support areas planned for growth while conserving resources.*

Furthermore, this change would also support the desire of the Jericho Town Plan to allow for new housing that’s affordable to be built on smaller lots in areas where some infrastructure is already in place and provides non-vehicular access to jobs and schools. To mitigate the impact of detrimental effects on the implementation of the ECOS Plan, Jericho will propose zoning changes in that area incrementally over time. Increases in density will follow the presence of utility infrastructure and any expansion of that area will be carefully considered. In addition, Jericho will work with CCRPC during the next update of the Regional Plan to assess if this area should be changed from Rural planning to another future land use planning area.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan and the municipality's planning process meet all statutory requirements for CCRPC regional approval.

The PAC also finds that the draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan will meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning standards ("determination") set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process. If staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.

Date: October 26, 2023

To: Katherine Sonnick, Town of Essex Community Development Director

From: Sarah Muskin, CCRPC Planner

Re: Formal Review of the Draft 2024 Essex Town Plan

The Town of Essex has requested, per 24 V.S.A §4350, that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (1) approve its draft 2024 Essex Town Plan; (2) and confirm its planning process.

This draft 2024 Essex Town Plan is a full rewrite of the 2016 Town Plan. CCRPC staff informally reviewed the 2016 plan and provided a memo to Town in October 2022 with recommendations to improve the plan. At the time of this review, the Town Plan is a substantially complete draft. The only anticipated edits before the Planning Commission's first public hearing on November 16, 2023, will be in response to this formal review.

Confirming and Approving the Municipal Plan

Following the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission's (CCRPC's) *Guidelines and Standards for Confirmation of Municipal Planning Processes and Approval of Municipal Plans (2018)* and the statutory requirements of 24 V.S.A. Chapter 117, CCRPC staff have reviewed the draft 2024 Essex Town Plan to determine whether it is:

- Consistent with the general goals of §4302;
- Consistent with the specific goals of §4302;
- Contains the required elements of §4382;
- Compatible with the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan* (per §4350); and
- Compatible with approved plans of other municipalities (per §4350).

Additionally, CCRPC staff have reviewed the planning process requirements of §4350.

Staff Review Findings and Comments

1. The draft 2024 Essex Town Plan is consistent with the general goals of §4302. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
2. The draft 2024 Essex Town Plan is consistent with the specific goals of §4302, See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
3. The draft 2024 Essex Town Plan contains the required elements of §4382. See the attached Appendix A submittal that describes how the Plan is consistent with these goals.
4. The draft 2024 Essex Town Plan is generally compatible with the planning areas, goals and strategies of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the *2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan*.

5. The draft 2024 Essex Town Plan is compatible with the municipal plans for Colchester, Westford, Jericho, Williston, Essex Junction, and South Burlington.
6. Essex has a planning process in place that is sufficient for an approved plan. In addition, Essex has provided information about their planning budget and CCRPC finds that Essex is maintaining its efforts to provide local funds for municipal and regional planning.

Additional Recommendations:

CCRPC recommends the following edits to address requirements more directly, help clarify parts of the plan and improve readability. These recommendations are not required for CCRPC to grant regional approval of the plan:

1. The passage of Act 47 in 2023 led to changes in municipal planning and zoning to promote housing and municipal plan elements should be addressed in this update. While the Essex Town Plans discusses actions to address housing needs, specifically for low- and moderate-income persons, the plan should also include an action to update bylaws in accordance with Act 47.
2. Relatedly, the plan should include additional housing data on both year-round and seasonal dwellings in the Town to align with new Act 47 requirements.
3. In the section discussing plan compatibility with Colchester's Plan, though the plan states further development of the industrial zone is unlikely, please provide a clearer explanation about when incompatibility might occur, and what the process would look like for addressing it.
4. Please add adjacent town labels to the Future Land Use Map (Map 1).
5. The plan should at least link to the full-size pdf maps on the town website from the plan. Most of the incorporated maps are difficult to read because they are too small and the legends are blurry.
6. In 'Chapter 1: The Action Plan,' consider providing a broad definition of what timeframe is meant by "short-, medium-, or long-term" for clarity and accountability.
7. On lines 48/49, consider including "land use" and "housing" in the list of plan sections.
8. Consider updating Goal 4d. to be: "*All residents... have access to **affordable** housing on a non-discriminatory basis.*"
9. In "Economic Sector Breakdown" be specific about what is meant by average wage. Perhaps just add a definition of wage as opposed to income. Or explain why wage and average annual income may be different numbers.
10. In the discussion on Age demographics, considering addressing public health implications or add the term public health to the "insights" on line 1508.
11. You are welcome to keep these sections, but you do not need to discuss consistency with municipalities that Essex shares a corner point with (e.g. Milton).
12. There is a typo on Line 2359 related to a date (20223)
13. As stated in CCRPC's initial plan review, the following edits could be made, including:
 - Including the following data in the appropriate subsections within Energy:
 - Transportation is responsible for 40% of the State's greenhouse gas emissions.
 - Thermal (heat and cooling) in buildings is responsible for 34% of the State's greenhouse gas emissions.
 - Considering adding a goal in the Government section, to create an [Energy Revolving Loan Fund](#) to pay for renewable energy and decarbonization projects and consider a goal to have the Town work with Vermont Clean Cities Coalition to get free help with fleet analysis and prepare a [long-term vehicle capital plan](#).
 - Consider including a goal about improving air quality (perhaps in the transportation section).

- Consider adding a discussion about transportation demand management (TDM), or induced demand as an alternative means of addressing traffic solutions other than continued infrastructure/capacity expansion.
- The plan could more clearly identify the “present land use map” required by statute.

Proposed Motion & Next Steps:

PROPOSED MOTION: The PAC finds that the draft 2024 Essex Town Plan meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC regional approval and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.

Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process. If staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise, the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.