



Planning Advisory Committee Agenda

Wednesday, January 10, 2024

2:30pm to 4:00pm

Meeting will be held virtually.

Virtual Location: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83943188440>

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: +1 309 205 3325; Meeting ID: 839 4318 8440

For supported devices, tap a one-touch number join instantly: [+13092053325,83943188440#](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83943188440)

Agenda

- 2:30** **Welcome and Introductions**, *Paul Conner*
- 2:31** **Approval of November 15, 2023 Minutes***
- 2:32** **UPWP Committee Update**, *Taylor Newton*
- 2:35** **Vermont Zoning Atlas**, *Yoshi Bird – UVM Complex Systems*
Yoshi Bird, leader of the Vermont Zoning Atlas team, will provide a demonstration of the Vermont Zoning Atlas.
- 3:10** **Housing Target Methodology**, *Darren Schibler**
Regional housing targets are expected to be released in Spring 2024 as a part of the Vermont Housing Needs Assessment. Per the HOME Act, CCRPC is required to disaggregate the regional housing target into municipal housing targets. CCRPC staff has begun to develop an initial methodology for setting municipal targets and is soliciting PAC feedback.
- 3:30** **HOME Act Studies**, *Charlie Baker*
Charlie will review the final recommendation of the HOME Act studies related to Regional Future Land Use Coordination, Necessary Updates to Act 250, Downtown Designation Reform, and Municipal Delegation of Act 250 Review.
- 3:40** **Climate Pollution Reduction (CPRG) Act**, *Melanie Needle*
Melanie will give a short preview of the work RPCs are beginning with the Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) to create a state Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP). The PCAP is a necessary step that will enable Vermont to apply for additional funds to support implementation of the GHG reduction measures identified in PCAP.
- 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. **FEMA Flood Map and Bylaw Updates.** RPCs have entered 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.
3. **Development Activity Report – 2023.** CCRPC Staff will be sending out an email request for housing and commercial development built in calendar year 2023 soon.
4. **UPWP Solicitation.** [FY25 UPWP project applications](#) are due on January 19, 2024. 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:

February 14, 2024 at 2:30 PM

March 13, 2024 at 2:30 PM

April 10, 2024 at 2:30 PM

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

DATE: Thursday, November 15, 2023
TIME: 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
PLACE: Virtual Meeting via Zoom with link as published on the agenda

<u>Members Present:</u> Joss Besse, Bolton Paul Conner, South Burlington Cathynn LaRose, Colchester Katherine Sonnick, Essex Town Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg Aaron DeNamur, Shelburne Eric Vorwald, Winooski Charles Dillard, Burlington Chris Yuen, Essex Junction Keith Osborne, Richmond Zachary Maia, Colchester Larry Lewack, Charlotte Matt Boulanger, Williston	<u>Staff:</u> Sarah Muskin, Planner Ann Janda, Senior Energy Planner Taylor Newton, Planning Program Manager Darren Schibler, Senior Planner Melanie Needle, Senior Planner Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner Bryan Davis, Senior Planner <u>Guests</u> Yoshi Bird Jonathon Weber, Local Motion
--	---

1. Welcome and Introductions

P. Conner called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. He shared that there will be an additional agenda item at the end to discuss in person gatherings.

2. Approval of September 13, 2023 Minutes

E.Vorwald made a motion to approve the prior meeting's minutes. Seconded by A.Weinhagen. No further discussion. A.DeNamur abstained from voting, Otherwise the motion passed unanimously.

3. 2024 Jericho Town Plan Review

D. Schibler reminded the PAC that last month Jericho had a full formal review and PAC identified a few things that Jericho needed to address before PAC could recommend Board approval. D.Schibler updated the status of the formal review memo and reviewed the three changes that Jericho made to get regional approval (need to update data for energy use and development constraints; earth resource extraction; and future land use map changes).

CCRPC staff recommended that the PAC find that the 2024 Jericho Town Plan meets requirements for regional planning and enhanced energy planning and send the plan for approval by the board.

J.Besse asked for clarification on how PAC wants to deal with changes to what areas are planned for growth. He asked if in this case Jericho had documented the need for an additional growth area. He stated that he hopes that municipalities don't expand areas planned for growth without demonstrated need. P.Conner responded that in this case that the area in question is already residential, so it is destined for infill.

P.Conner commented that the added paragraph includes some equivocating language. P.Conner questioned if this is informing a background plan without making a policy statement. D.Schibler responded that Jericho is looking to adopt zoning changes, but hasn't yet which is why some of the equivocating language exists.

J.Besse asked about the implementation schedule and where the zoning changes fall in that schedule. D.Schibler stated he believes it is within the 1-3 year timeframe. D.Schibler also clarified that some intent is to add infill housing to these areas to address a housing need in these areas (Jericho wants to reach their housing targets).

T.Newton clarified the convoluted process of when future land use maps and zoning maps get changed on the regional vs municipal level and in what order. He also summarized J.Besse's concern about backsliding into

1 sprawl, and P.Conner’s concern about equivocating language. He mentioned Jericho does have a need to meet
2 housing goals.

3
4 P.Conner summarized that the plan states this area is in an in-between area and Jericho wants to move it towards
5 being in a village. P.Conner asked how CCRPC and PAC should deal with the circular problems of maps relying
6 on each other that T.Newton raised above for the future. T.Newton stated he expects the legislature to change how
7 we conduct future land use planning at the regional level. P.Conner said that if the Regional FLU Map was a
8 stronger statement of regional policy, the municipality would need to advocate stronger to make changes as
9 opposed to how it currently stands.

10
11 A.Weinhagen described the specific area and suggested that if Jericho is going to encourage an area to grow, this
12 is the logical location to do so. D.Schibler shared the map. A.Weinhagen also stated that Jericho has a really good
13 natural resource overlay, so this seems to be a conscious choice, not accidental sprawl.

14
15 P.Conner requested that they change some of the equivocating language and add some more firm policy statement
16 of intent surrounding sewer service areas, etc. D.Schibler stated that some of these policy statements are already
17 in the plan in Volume 1. P.Conner suggested Jericho can better reference these policy statements.

18
19 C.LaRose suggested it is hard to have this conversation without Jericho being present and suggested we don’t
20 vote without them being present. D. Schibler clarified that Jericho’s first Selectboard public hearing will be
21 tomorrow, and the second hearing is scheduled for December 19th. A.Weinhagen stated he is more comfortable
22 with the plan than others are suggesting. P.Conner pointed out it is the sentence directly prior to the bullet points
23 that he wants changed before PAC recommendation.

24
25 T.Newton hopped off the call to see if L.Blasch could join. T.Newton was unable to reach her.

26
27 J.Besse proposed that if a major change is going to be proposed that the municipality proposing the change should
28 be more clear from the start of the process of plan re adoption.

29
30 P.Conner asked if generally the PAC was leaning to: 1) approve 2) approve with removing the word “Proposed”
31 3) not approve yet. Most members in the “approved in some camp.” C.LaRose wanted to have a dialogue with
32 Jericho.

33
34 **A.Weinhagen made a motion that:**

35
36 *The PAC finds that the draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan and the municipality’s planning process meet all statutory*
37 *requirements for CCRPC regional approval. With additional verbiage as per page 3 in D.Schibler’s memo, and*
38 *with the proviso that the “potential” and “proposed” verbiage be changed to be more definitive. The PAC also*
39 *finds that the draft 2024 Jericho Town Plan will meet the requirements of the enhanced energy planning*
40 *standards (“determination”) set forth in 24 V.S.A. §4352. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by*
41 *the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process. If*
42 *staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review.*
43 *Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the*
44 *CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an affirmative determination of energy compliance.*

45
46 **E. Vorwald seconded. All in favor.**

47
48 P.Conner requested T.Newton and D.Schibler follow up with Jericho about the contents of this meeting.
49

1 **4. 2024 Essex Town Plan Review**

2 *a. Review Staff Summary*

3 S.Muskin provided an overview of the staff memo. Recommended changes include addressing the HOME Act
4 and compatibility with adjacent towns. She also noted that there are some proposed changes, all within the Town
5 Center, to the future land use map that don't fully align with the current ECOS Future Land Use Map boundaries;
6 however, the Essex Town Plan does address conformance with the ECOS Plan due to these changes on page 5.
7

8 K.Sonnick stated that this plan does NOT include an enhanced energy plan since the prior plan was shared with
9 Essex Junction, which is not possible now due to the separation of the municipalities, but the Town expects to
10 return with amendment once it has completed a separate enhanced energy plan.
11

12 *b. Open the Public Hearing*

13 **P.Conner made a motion, seconded by J.Besse, to open the public hearing. The motion passed**
14 **unanimously.**
15

16 *c. Accept Public Comment*

17 There were no public comments.
18

19 *d. Close the Public Hearing*

20 **P.Conner made a motion, seconded by J.Besse, to close the public hearing. The motion passed**
21 **unanimously.**
22

23 *e. Questions and Comments*

24 A.Weinhagen noted he did not have time to fully review the plan, and asked K.Sonnick whether there are any
25 significant policy changes besides the separation of the Town and City. K.Sonnick said there are not, but
26 acknowledged that the major policy within the plan is to further develop the Essex Town Center Master Plan
27 (ETC|NEXT), including higher density and pursuit of state planning designations. She also noted that they heard
28 a lot from the community about connections, both physical (bicycle-pedestrian) as well as programmatic
29 connections.
30

31 P.Conner asked whether the passage of Act 47 has led to Essex Town having to change its thought process
32 regarding suburban areas of the community. K.Sonnick said that the Town generally wants to see growth within
33 its sewer service core, particularly the Essex Town Center and the Susie Wilson Road corridor. There is no desire
34 to expand development outside the sewer core, and even some areas within that will not be developed due to
35 capacity constraints.
36

37 E.Vorwald asked whether the joint Town-Village enhanced energy plan is usable at all for the Town. K. Sonnick
38 responded that the issue is that the energy data was not specific to the Town vs. Village, so this will need to be
39 developed. M.Needle noted that when CCRPC originally completed the joint enhanced energy plan, the Village
40 adopted it as part of their 2019 comprehensive plan, but the Town did not since it didn't want to open the Town
41 Plan for an amendment until the 2024 plan was up for readoption. In addition, the Department of Public Service
42 now requires that updated enhanced energy plans must use the latest available statewide and regional LEAP data,
43 which was just published this year. CCRPC plans to municipalize the LEAP data, which provides analysis and
44 targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions, by late winter 2023 / early spring 2024. T.Newton added that
45 CCRPC is expecting funding from the Vermont Climate Action Office to help Essex Town write its own
46 enhanced energy plan this spring, along with several other municipalities.
47

48 *f. Recommendation to the CCRPC Board*

49
50 **E. Vorwald made the motion as written in the staff memo included below, seconded by C. Yuen. The**
51 **motion passed unanimously (K. Sonnick abstained).**
52

1 *The PAC finds that the draft 2024 Essex Town Plan meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC regional*
 2 *approval and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation.*
 3 *Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any*
 4 *information relevant to the confirmation process. If staff determines that substantive changes have been made, the*
 5 *materials will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise, the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the*
 6 *municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval, confirmation, and an*
 7 *affirmative determination of energy compliance.*

9 **5. Chittenden County Active Transportation Survey Presentation**

11 B.Davis introduced Jonathon Weber with Local Motion. J.Weber thanked CCRPC and Bryan. Local Motion is
 12 Vermont's advocacy group for walking, biking, etc. They provide technical assistance, support for local
 13 bike/walk groups, and help connect communities to funding opportunities.

15 J.Weber reviewed the data Local Motion gathered to capture insights on public opinions to inform decisions
 16 walk/bike policies, conditions, and improvements:

- 17 • Most people in Chittenden County are car-dependent
- 18 • Many more people walk in Burlington compared to other towns
- 19 • Secondary modes of transportation: walking (50%), none (26%), bike (21%)
 - 20 ○ 22% of POC report using GMT as secondary; some low-income groups use ridesharing more
 - 21 than in other income groups (possibly due to not having another option, or younger people using
 - 22 it to get home safely after drinking).
- 23 • Barriers to biking: 1) destinations are too far away, 2) lack of bike ownership, 3) lack of safe bike
 24 infrastructure
 - 25 ○ Burlington is an outlier again
- 26 • E-bikes: overall only 6% e-bike ownership- there is a gap in interest and ownership- due primarily to
 27 cost. Other barriers include distance to destination, weather, infrastructure, etc.
- 28 • 50% of the population would bike in the winter IF the streets had safe and well-maintained bike
 29 infrastructure

31 Key points in summary:

- 32 • Most Chittenden County residents are car dependent, but less so in Burlington.
- 33 • Marginalized communities are more likely to rely on non-driving transportation options.
- 34 • Changes to land use that increase access to bikes are key.

36 A.Weinhagen asked if the survey addressed bike theft, which is a real issue in Burlington. J.Weber didn't think it
 37 was asked and wasn't mentioned much in the "other" responses. However, this was a question for e-bike
 38 ownership.

40 C.Dillard asked if information on where people live was collected. J.Weber responded that only Burlington as a
 41 whole was split out from the rest of the data.

43 P.Conner asked how transportation was defined for respondents or asked about in the survey. J.Weber said that
 44 the survey did not define transportation for the respondents.

46 J.Weber proceeded to present results around Active Mobility Perspectives:

- 47 • Support for investment in walking/biking infrastructure was very high among people of color (82%), as
 48 well as Burlington residents, women, and low-income respondents.
- 49 • People understand the connection between walk/bike and the vitality of businesses on the street
- 50 • Respondents were asked to rank priorities for street design; the overall results are as follows:
 - 51 ○ Safety
 - 52 ○ Sense of place

- 1 ○ Cost
- 2 ○ Parking
- 3 ○ Reduced driving delay
- 4 ○ Reduced walking delay
- 5 ○ Bike parking
- 6 • 66% overall support for protected bike lanes, but this flipped when people were asked about adding
- 7 protected bike lanes to key roads if doing so reduced parking/travel lanes

8

9 A.Janda asked about NIMBY-ism in the field of walk/bike in Shelburne specifically, where residents opposed a

10 project because it would bring “those people” into their community. J.Weber said the survey didn’t really allow

11 space for reasons to be against bike infrastructure. He also added that those who are most polarized show up at

12 meetings. J.Weber also pointed out that major roads like Route 7 still don’t have bike/ped infrastructure and that

13 there really needs to better bike/ped connection between municipalities. Right now people aren’t feeling the true

14 benefit of having bike/ped infrastructure on local streets due to the lack of connection to a regional network.

15

16 P.Conner requested the full results be shared with PAC to distribute.

17

18 **6. Vermont Zoning Atlas**

19 P.Conner announced that this presentation will happen at the next meeting. He also announced that A.Weinhagen

20 will take over as chair for the remainder of the meeting.

21

22 **7. Members Items Open Forum**

23 L.Lewack noted that the cannabis business standards to the Charlotte land use regulations have passed. Charlotte

24 is the first community to adopt specific cannabis standards and he will make the standards available to anyone

25 who wants to review.

26

27 C.Yuen stated that Essex Junction is talking to state legislators about cannabis legislation and municipal control.

28 Essex Jct. is advocating that municipalities can control outdoor cannabis use in areas served by water and sewer.

29 He acknowledged that this seems to be an Essex Junction specific problem due to a case that will be seen by the

30 Vermont Supreme Court soon.

31

32 A.Weinhagen verbalized the need to give CCRPC staff a heads-up for Act 250 projects on the horizon.

33

34 **8. Other Business**

35 T.Newton walked through the following list for PAC:

- 36 1. **ECOS Plan Update.** CCRPC has delayed adoption of ECOS Plan until June 2025. CCRPC staff will spend
- 37 early 2024 doing engagement specifically with underrepresented communities on the draft ECOS Plan. Staff
- 38 will also spend the first half of 2024 working on developing municipal housing targets and updates to the
- 39 regional future land use maps.
- 40 2. **HOME Act Studies.** The HOME Act required the development of several studies that are due to the
- 41 legislature in mid or late December. Drafts of the Regional Future Land Use Map study, the Designation
- 42 Study, the Act 250 Delegation study, and the Act 250 Location-Based Jurisdiction Study have all been
- 43 released or will be released imminently. Copies of the Regional Future Land Use Map study and the Act 250
- 44 Delegation study have been provided to PAC via email. Please contact Charlie and/or Taylor by Friday,
- 45 December 1st if you have specific feedback on the Regional Future Land Use Map study or the Act 250
- 46 Delegation study.
- 47 3. **Updated Regional and Municipal Energy Data and Maps.** CCRPC will municipalize regional energy data
- 48 and maps towards the end of 2023 or beginning of 2024.
- 49 4. **FEMA Flood Map and Bylaw Updates.** RPCs have will enter into a second contract with VT DEC to
- 50 support NFIP map and bylaw updates in municipalities in FY24. Please let RPCs staff know if your
- 51 municipality is interested in assistance. In addition, CCRPC understands that the release of the draft NFIP
- 52 Work Map for Chittenden County has been scheduled for release in February or March 2024.

- 1 5. **Housing Dashboard and BHT Dashboard.** Both the [CCRPC Housing Dashboard](#) and the [Building Homes](#)
 2 [Together Dashboards](#) have been updated to include 2022 housing information.
- 3 6. **UPWP Solicitation.** CCRPC will solicit for FY25 UPWP projects in late November 2023. If you have
 4 questions about potential projects, please reach out to CCRPC staff. Initial applications will be due in Mid-
 5 January
- 6
- 7 S. Muskin reminded the PAC that they had wanted to discuss meeting format (in-person vs. virtual).
- 8
- 9 A. Weinhagen suggested using virtual / hybrid model for regular meetings, and then meet in person for the off-
 10 month time to discuss special topics or compare notes. L.Lewack agrees that in person meetings have benefits to
 11 have more in-depth conversations and also to develop relationships.
- 12
- 13 E.Vorwald would be in favor of going back in person for PAC meetings. However, he expressed concern for
 14 “open” in person meetings every other month. He suggested that if they were topic specific that would be helpful
 15 and that it is important to consider what meeting every month would entail.
- 16
- 17 M.Boulanger and C.Dillard supported being in person every so often. C.Dillard suggested maybe every other
 18 meeting. E.Vorwald advocated for every other PAC meeting in person, but suggested that PAC avoid hybrid
 19 meetings.
- 20
- 21 D.Schibler raised the question of the statutory requirement for public hearings needing to have an in-person
 22 option. This will go back into effect in January 2024.
- 23
- 24 A.Weinhagen asked if it would be possible to map the meetings out for the year, or if the schedule would need to
 25 be responsive to municipality needs. T.Newton asked what members would prefer. A.Weinhagen said to book
 26 meeting on the calendar regardless.
- 27
- 28 A.Weinhagen asked if we should just go back in person entirely? C.Yuen suggested maintaining a hybrid option,
 29 but strongly discourage folks from using it.
- 30
- 31 J.Besse asked if CCRPC could set up a poll for what topics the PAC could discuss. T.Newton will follow up.
- 32
- 33 A.Weinhagen asked if anyone is opposed to in-person meetings. C.LaRose appreciates the flexibility because
 34 sometimes she needs the time that otherwise would be spent commuting to work.
- 35
- 36 Consensus: PAC will try to get back to in-person, but maintain a hybrid option for extenuating circumstances.
- 37
- 38 A.Weinhagen adjourned the meeting at 4:04pm.
- 39
- 40 Respectfully submitted, Sarah Muskin & Darren Schibler

DRAFT CCRPC Regional Housing Targets Methodology

January 10, 2024

Background

The HOME Act (Act 47 of 2023) introduced new requirements for the housing element of regional and municipal plans (see [full relevant language](#)). This includes creating targets for housing that will result in an adequate supply of code-compliant homes where most households spend <30% of their income on housing and <15% on transportation. The Vermont Statewide Housing Needs Assessment (VT HNA) will include statewide and regional housing targets or ranges.

The responsibilities of RPCs for the regional plan housing element under 24 V.S.A. § 4348a(a)(9) are to:

1. Gather required data, including consultation of:
 - a. the Statewide Housing Needs Assessment;
 - b. current and expected demographic data;
 - c. the current location, quality, types, and cost of housing;
 - d. other local studies related to housing needs;
 - e. data gathered pursuant to municipal plan requirements in 24 V.S.A. § 4382, including:
 - i. Population characteristics and distribution, including income and employment – § 4382(c)(1)
 - ii. The existing and projected housing needs by amount, type, and location for all economic groups within the municipality and the region – § 4382(c)(2)
 - iii. Existing and estimated patterns and rates of growth in the various land use classifications, and desired patterns and rates of growth in terms of the community's ability to finance and provide public facilities and services – § 4382(c)(3)
 - iv. Data on year-round and seasonal dwellings – § 4382(a)(10)
2. Estimate total needed housing investments in terms of price, quality, unit size or type, and zoning district as applicable
3. Disaggregate the regional housing targets / ranges by municipality
4. List recommended actions to satisfy established needs

This document focuses on item #3 and the methodology to disaggregate regional housing target to municipal housing targets.

Process

CCRPC staff proposes to analyze five “lenses” before determining a method to disaggregate regional housing targets to municipalities. Each lens is intended to provide a different perspective about how the regional housing target could be disaggregated based on existing infrastructure, policy, or regulatory conditions. The proposed lenses include:

- A **Current Share Lens** whereby a municipalities’ current share of regional housing stock is maintained into the future;
- A **Planning Lens** based on regional future land use areas and the regional goal of 90% of new housing in areas planned for growth;
- A **Zoning Lens** that models maximum theoretical buildout per municipal zoning;

- A **Constraints Lens** that models maximum buildout excluding areas with protected natural resources; and
- A **Capacity Lens** that models housing potential based on existing reserve municipal wastewater (and water) allocation/capacity.

The data provided by each lens will provide the basis for CCRPC to develop a logical and equitable method for disaggregating the regional housing target. CCRPC staff anticipates that this method will include a combination, and/or weighted average, of these lenses based on discussion with PAC and other CCRPC stakeholders.

Current Share Lens

The Current Share Lens relies upon past development patterns instead of developing municipal housing targets based on regional planning goals. The Current Share lens divides the regional housing target among municipalities according to each municipality’s current share of the regional existing housing stock.

For example, if the regional housing target is 10,000 units:

Burlington currently has 25.34% of the current regional housing stock.

$10,000 \text{ units} * 0.2534 = 2,534 \text{ new housing units in Burlington.}$

Planning Lens

The Planning Lens represents strategy 2 of the ECOS Plan which calls for a minimum of 90% of new housing units in Chittenden County to be built in areas planned for growth (Center, Metro, Village and Suburban) and the remaining 10% of housing to be built in the rural planning area. The Planning Lens will be used to reflect this goal by allocating housing targets based on regional planning goal geography:

- (1) The regional housing unit target will be split 90/10 based on planning areas.
- (2) Each municipality’s share of the regional areas planned for growth and share of rural areas (by acreage) will be calculated as a percent of the county total.
- (3) Each total will be multiplied by the regional housing target for areas planned for growth and regional housing target for rural areas, respectively.

For example:

Step 1: Regional target is 10,000 units. 90% (9,000 units) will be allocated to growth areas, 10% (1,000 units) will be allocated to non-growth areas.

Step 2: Municipality “A” has 5% of the regional area planned for growth and 10% of the regional rural area.

Step 3: Multiply the regional target by the municipal share of planning areas:

5% of the growth area target (9,000 units) = 450 units

10% of the rural area target (1,000 units) = 100 units

$450 \text{ units} + 100 \text{ units} = 550 \text{ municipal housing targets}$

Zoning Lens

The Zoning Lens will allocate housing units based on maximum unit buildout possible under current municipal zoning. CCRPC's region-wide ArcUrban GIS model will provide the basis for determining maximum zoned density for each zoning district and maximum potential housing units:

$$\text{Zoned density (units / acre)} * \text{parcel area (acres)} = \text{total buildout (housing units)}$$

Buildout potential will be tallied up for each municipality and the region. It is anticipated that buildout potential will likely exceed the regional housing target.

Since this approach does not account for environmental or infrastructure constraints it cannot be the sole input to determine municipal housing targets. However, CCRPC staff believes that is valuable to understand where housing development is already enabled legally. This lens may also inform municipal zoning recommendations to better align with state, regional, and local goals.

Constraint Lens

The Constraint Lens will assess zoning buildout with consideration for the limitations of the physical landscape (e.g., steep slopes, floodplain, river corridors) and other environmental constraints (specifically the known constraints under Act 174). CCRPC's ArcUrban GIS model will modify buildout potential by removing constrained area from the buildable area or reducing the effective density on a parcel.

Capacity Lens

The Capacity Lens takes into account the existing sewer reserve capacity for serving additional housing with infrastructure. This approach will allocate housing units based on the limitations of municipal wastewater treatment capacity, and accounting for both sewer capacity to non-residential uses and different rates of usage by different housing types (e.g., single-unit detached vs. large multi-unit, etc.). This will provide CCRPC and PAC with an understanding about how much housing can be accommodated with existing municipal sewer capacity and service areas.

CCRPC understands that water supply is relatively unlimited for areas connected to the Champlain Water District (CWD). However, there are parts of the region with non-CWD municipal water supply systems. In these areas, CCRPC will consider an approach similar to the sewer analysis to model housing potential based on the capacity of municipal water supply system provided CCRPC can obtain accurate information about the capacity of these systems.

The Capacity Lens may highlight where planning policies could be adjusted to better reflect where infrastructure investments have already been made and inform where future infrastructure investments should be made to meet planning goals.

Next Steps

The above lenses will provide CCRPC staff and PAC with a good understanding of how the regional housing target can be disaggregated based on existing infrastructure, policy, or regulatory conditions.

Once this work is complete, CCRPC staff will work with PAC to determine how these lenses can be synthesized into a singular method to disaggregate the regional housing target to the municipal level. This synthesis may involve combining lenses and/or assigning different weights to different lenses.

Currently, CCRPC staff envisions basing municipal housing targets primarily on the Planning Lens, yet remains open to other options provided that they are reasonably consistent with what seems possible or appropriate under the other lenses. CCRPC staff is also open to the idea of using the Current Share Lens to establish a minimum municipal target that must be met if other lenses produce a smaller target. This will ensure that growth is not overly concentrated in some municipalities while other municipalities are provided with a relatively low housing target.

CCRPC seeks guidance from PAC about the approach to developing a methodology. CCRPC staff can continue to work internally and provide a synthesized approach(es) at the March PAC meeting. CCRPC is also open to working with a subcommittee of PAC members in January and February to more cooperatively develop a synthesized approach.

