

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee

Draft Minutes

Monday December 17, 2019

4:00 – 5:15 pm

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602

Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dara Torre, Chair
<input type="checkbox"/>	Julie Potter, Vice Chair
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Potter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ron Krauth – on phone
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marcella Dent

1
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Staff: Clare Rock

CALL TO ORDER

D Torre opened the meeting at 4:05pm.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minor corrections identified by R Krauth: correction re word on page 2 line 29. Page 3 line 6.

M Dent made a motion to approve the November 19, 2019 meeting minutes, with minor changes made by R Krauth, seconded by L Hill-Eubanks. All in favor. Motioned carried.

REGIONAL PLAN: AMENDMENTS TO CURRENT PLAN

a. Housing Section

Staff provided an overview of the changes, and referred to the track changes version of the document with contains a record of the text changes and a lot of formatting-type changes. The track changes version is available to people if they'd like to see all the changes. The pdf version contained in the packet did lose some formatting when it was converted from the word version.

Discussion followed about the formatting and what can be done to tidy up some of the minor formatting issues, such as changes in sizes of font and column alignment. Additional comments included:

- Adding a list of past amendments and adoption dates to the cover or first interior page;
- Better alignment of the list of municipalities and respective Commissioners;
- Ensure there are no mid paragraph hyphens; and
- Moving last bullet on page 19 to page 21 so the sentence isn't broken across pages.

1
2
3 The committee recognized some of the challenges related to formatting due to the age of the original
4 documents and how it has been updated and transferred to different software over time. Committee
5 requested staff do their best in making formatting changes.
6

7 L Hill-Eubanks made a motion to recommend the amendments to the Housing Chapter to the Board for
8 approval, seconded by M Dent, all in favor. Motion carried.
9

10
11 b. Future Land Use Map
12

13 Staff provided an overview of the proposed changes and responded to clarifying questions about the
14 boundary change. Discussion followed regarding the Terrace Street area and the presences of steep
15 slopes. Steep slopes (and other environmental constraints) may exist in the growth center or Regional
16 Center and that any future development in this area would still be required to conform to any regional
17 plan policy, state or local permit requirement. The land use are is the designation of an area in which a
18 particular type/scale and intensity of development is encouraged and additional development standards
19 may apply. In the future, R Krauth suggested the committee should evaluate the presence of constraints
20 in the designation of future land uses. It was also noted that in the materials packet the statement on
21 page 44 regarding “Crestview” should read “an un-developed large tract...” (Not “an developed large
22 tract...”)
23

24 M Dent made a motion to recommend the amendment to the Future Land Use Map (with the new
25 proposed CVRPC Regional Center boundary) to the Board for approval, seconded by L Hill-Eubanks, all in
26 favor. Motion carried.
27

28 **REGIONAL PLAN: NEW PLAN**
29

30 A brief discussion commenced on the new plan. Staff queried the committee on the inclusion of a vision
31 statement for the new plan. A vision can help set a direction for the plan and be used to evaluate
32 proposed policy statements. A vision statement can also highlight the unique aspects of the Central
33 Vermont and this can also be used to guide more meaningful policies and actions. The vision statement
34 as developed in the Plan Central Vermont process was quite generic – it restated the State Planning
35 Goals. The committee agreed it would be a good exercise for the Board to engage in a Vision process for
36 the new plan and this would help people inform people of the process and get buy in at the beginning.
37

38 Staff also recommended not using any personal pronouns in the plan (we, us, them, our...) and suggests
39 making the language neutral. Committee discussed this and agreed the plan language should be neutral.
40

41 **ADJOURNMENT**
42

43 L Hill-Eubanks made a motion to adjourn, seconded by M Dent, all in favor. Motion carried.
44

45 **Next meeting Date: 1/21 (3rd Tuesdays)**
46