

Montpelier Planning Commission Meeting
March 12, 2018

Subject to review and approval

Present: Leslie Welts, Kim Cheney, Barbara Conrey, Ariane Kissam, Kirby Keeton, John Adams, Michael Miller.

Call to order by the Chair: The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Leslie Welts.

Approval of the agenda: The agenda was deemed approved.

Comments from the Chair: Kirby ran the last meeting in Leslie's absence, so she asked him if he had anything to say. She also thanked him for doing that. The Regional Energy Plan will be voted on tomorrow.

General business (comments from the public about something not on the agenda):

Master Plan update discussion (Mike). We have decided to do one chapter first to set out a model for others to follow. That chapter will be Housing. We are inviting members of the Housing Task force to the March 26th Planning Commission meeting. In advance, the Commission needs to discuss: City Plan is the name that was agreed to, but it's a paradigm shift since it's been called the Master Plan for years. Mike brought different housing elements from different areas in the state. The ideal is to have short informational pieces with links to data.

a) What is our expectation from the committees? What are they expected to provide the Commission? Should we provide them a framework?

Mike gave some general discussions of housing chapters including providing a few options for the Commission to consider. Middlebury had a good framework where they had based theirs around a few principles. Stephanie had emailed Leslie with some thoughts including having committees evaluate current conditions, set goals (10 years), assess capabilities (options) and recommend an implementation plan. Leslie liked Stephanie's suggestions and discussions by the commission surrounded how to compile current conditions and capability assessments in the plan. John felt starting with the goals would help define what is written in the City Plan (rather than writing the plan and doing the goals last). John supported the idea of thinking about attributes that could be tracked through a matrix. Mike supported John's idea and that a digital/ web plan is the way of the future and a framework like John's describes feeds well into that concept. Kirby asked about the previous discussions of what we want to maintain, evolve or transform. Mike commented about on the previous outline of how to structure implementation tools into permits, programs, projects, plans, and policies is a possible framework for an implementation plan. Those would be described as new, amended, or continue depending on the status of whether we are already doing something or if it would be a new idea. John suggested using technology to have an open process to be editable by multiple people.

b) What process should we expect them to use? How much outreach do we expect them to provide?

The committee should come up with goals and then have their own outreach meetings to have feedback. They can take the feedback and revise their goals before presenting that to the Commission.

c) We should have a message of support and explain the Commission's role. Committees will provide a proposed plan for their element, but the Commission reserves the right to amend to balance with the other chapters in the plan. How do we express that in a way that is supportive?

Committees should emphasize the development of goals, policies, and recommendations. Leslie and Kirby will put together a letter to send to the various committees on what the Commission's expectations will be. It will be sent out for review.

Consider minutes from February 26, 2018: Kim made a motion to approve the minutes, John seconded. Barbara was listed as present, but she wasn't. The motion passed on a 6-0 vote.

Sarah McShane is leaving and going to Stowe. Kim wanted to go on the record thanking her for her work and knowledge.

Adjournment: Kim made a motion to adjourn, Kirby seconded.

Respectfully submitted,

Tami Furry
Recording Secretary