

A VIDEO RECORDING OF THE MEETING IN ITS ENTIRETY IS AVAILABLE THROUGH VERMONTCAM.ORG. THE WRITTEN MINUTES ARE A SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING. MOTIONS ARE AS STATED BY THE MOTION MAKER. MINUTES SUBJECT TO CORRECTION BY THE SHELBURNE PLANNING COMMISSION. CHANGES, IF ANY, WILL BE RECORDED IN THE MINUTES OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION.

**TOWN OF SHELBURNE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
July 27, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jaime Heins (Chair); Jason Grignon, Dick Elkins, Kate Lalley, Andrew Everett, Asim Zia. (Perry Gagliard, and Graham Byers were absent.)
STAFF PRESENT: Dean Pierce, Planning Director.
OTHERS PRESENT: Ellen McShane, Steve Baietti, Gail Albert, Jerry Storey, Melanie Noodle.

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes (7/13/17)
4. Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest
5. Open to the Public
6. Comprehensive Plan Update
7. Commissioner Questions/Comments
8. Other Business/Correspondence
9. Adjournment

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jaime Heins called the meeting to order at 7 PM.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Kate Lalley, **SECOND** by Dick Elkins, to approve the agenda as presented. **VOTING:** unanimous (6-0); motion carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 13, 2017

MOTION by Dick Elkins, **SECOND** by Kate Lalley, to approve the minutes of July 13, 2017 with the following correction(s)/clarification(s):

- Page 2, bullet beginning “Mixed Use Area...”, sentence reading “The town aspires this area to feature....” – insert “for” before “this area”, and in the sentence reading “The code uses targeted approaches...” – end the sentence after the word “development” and delete “and seeks to leverage underutilized existing assets such as parking lots that are empty or half full, high vacancies, and leftover pieces of land”.

VOTING: unanimous (6-0); motion carried.

4. DISCLOSURE OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

5. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

None.

6. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Parks and Recreation

Following discussion the Planning Commission agreed to the following edits to Parks and Recreation:

- Opening paragraph, 2nd sentence – change “have come to be enhanced” with “have been enhanced”.
- Add Objection #7 to read: “Ensure that existing roads and houses are not impacted adversely by future path connectivity.”
- Recommended Action #1, 4th bullet – rewrite to read: “In consultation with Shelburne Natural Resources and Conservation Committee identification of future park lands, trails, and greenway and wildlife corridors.”
- Recommended Action #1, 7th bullet – add to end of sentence “with input solicited from landowners and taxpayers impacted by the proposed amenities”.
- Recommended Action #5 – rewrite to read: “Continue to expand the path and trail network that connects key destinations and residential areas while ensuring impacts of future paths to existing roads and home sites are minimized.”

COMMENTS

Ellen McShane, 743 Bay Road, said safety is an issue that must be looked at with any proposal. Andrew Everett pointed out safety is implicit with building a path separate from the road for bikes and pedestrians.

Jaime Heins expressed concern about people contending a negative impact by a path crossing their property when the town goal is to enhance safety. Dean Pierce noted safety of the design is addressed in the Transportation section of the plan.

Gail Albert, Pierson Drive, suggested defining a distance so people are not randomly say there is a negative impact.

Asim Zia said there could be criteria for determining impact, such as noise pollution.

Energy

Melanie Noodle, CCRPC, reviewed proposed language in the Energy section of the town plan to meet Act 174 standards on transportation (alternate fuel vehicles, alternate modes of transportation), concentrated development, energy efficiency (buildings, appliances, streetlights), and policies and planning to meet the state goal of 90% energy from renewables by 2050. If the town’s plan meets the Act 174 standards then substantial deference is given to the plan in Public Utility Commission proceedings.

Andrew Everett observed the state is asking for their goals to be met, but are not rewarding. Melanie Needle said Green Mountain Power gives incentives for electric car purchases because there is a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions.

Asim Zia asked about towns that do not include Act 174 standards in their plan. Melanie Noodle said CCRPC has a process of review of town plans and works with municipalities

to ensure the town plan is compatible with the regional plan. Asim Zia asked if the renewables considered are just solar and wind. Melanie Noodle said the town can determine how to meet the regional target with renewable technology. Asim Zia mentioned incentives for energy conservation such as smart meters.

Kate Lalley said the emphasis is on energy generation, but adding sidewalks everywhere could provide the largest energy reduction and avoid having to install wind farms and solar arrays. There should be more integration of modes, not just a focus on cars. Melanie Noodle said transportation is the largest contributor of greenhouse gases. There is language in the Energy section about paths and transit. The data analysis is about generation and getting to the energy goal. Dean Pierce pointed out having a network of sidewalks is good, but having sidewalks does not necessarily mean people will use them. The plan needs to show an increase in the generation of renewables.

Jaime Heins asked how rigid the certification analysis of the comprehensive plan is by CCRPC and whether emphasis on conservation and smart development count. Melanie Noodle said Act 174 standards are the criteria which consider total energy, transportation alternatives, and land use patterns. Regional Planning will use these at a policy level. If a town cannot meet Act 174 standards then the town must provide the rationale for this. With non-applicable standards the town has some flexibility.

Asim Zia asked about performance metrics and the baseline. Melanie Noodle said Regional Planning using a long range energy alternative planning tool to get total energy across sectors (transportation, heating) for consumption and generation. Efficiency Vermont is providing the actual data.

Melanie Noodle advised the town to look at the standards the Public Utility Commission considers and make sure the plan addresses these in the appropriate sections. There should be specific policies with wording such as “must avoid” and “shall not impact”. Look at land use measures, natural resources sections, and renewable energy generation.

Andrew Everett asked if there is a goal with residential solar versus industrial, and if the target would be met if every house had solar. Melanie Needle said Shelburne’s potential for rooftop solar is 8,000 megawatt hours out of the energy generation goal for the town of 23,000 megawatts.

Jason Grignon said wind has the largest potential, but there are changes at the state level. Melanie Needle said CCRPC has not received any guidance from the Public Service Department yet on wind.

Kate Lalley asked if there are any data on increasing connectivity or multi-modality and smart growth. Melanie Noodle said CCRPC is working with the travel demand model for reduced vehicle miles traveled, but this is not new generation of renewable energy which is the objective. The ECHOS plan looks at vehicle miles traveled, but the Act 174 framework does not have a vehicle miles traveled framework. There will be a suite of data (lightbulbs, vehicles, heat pumps, transit use, miles of sidewalk). CCRPC will do an

upfront planning process with municipalities so the state goals can be met and the towns can get substantial deference from the Public Utility Commission.

Asim Zia said it appears there is a disconnect between supply and demand with the focus on renewable energy generation versus consumption. Market intervention plays a role. Some towns may have better siting than others for solar, for example. Melanie Noodle said the regional targets are portioned out by population and electricity consumption. The mapping looked at potential from an acreage perspective and compared that to the target to see if a town had enough resource to meet the target.

Future Lane Use – Growth Area II

The edits previously presented by Kate Lalley were incorporated into the text.

Review at 8/10/17 Meeting

- Rural District with the Natural Resources Committee
- Transportation and Energy
- Childcare

Quarries and Mining will be discuss under Natural Resources.

7. COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS/COMMENT

Jaime Heins said outreach will be done to fill the vacancy on the housing subcommittee.

8. OTHER BUSINESS/CORRESPONDENCE

Meeting Schedule

August 10, 2017 is the only Planning Commission meeting in August.

Form Based Code Focus Group

The meeting with the focus group on Version 2.0 of form based code was productive. Some prescriptive details were learned, such as forcing mixed uses may be off-putting, and there is need for flexibility and letting the market drive demand. Developers are interested in the potential to add housing, and want to know upfront if fire access with shared parking on a smaller footprint is acceptable to the fire department. Finally there is the state storm water regulatory process so a local process is not needed.

Shelburne Day

Shelburne Day is August 19, 2017. Volunteers are needed to staff the town table.

Public Hearing on Zoning Changes

The Selectboard warned a public hearing on ordinances relative to vaping establishments and sale of cannabis, truck traffic in town, and storage/transport of hazardous materials.

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Kate Lalley, SECOND by Jason Grignon, to adjourn the meeting.

VOTING: unanimous (6-0); motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 PM.

RScty: MERiordan