

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Project Review Committee

March 25, 2024 4:00pm

Remote Participation via Zoom

Draft Minutes

Project Review Committee Members

x	Lee Cattaneo, Orange Commissioner	1
x	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner	2
x	Bill Arrand, Worcester Commissioner	3
x	Peter Carbee, Washington Commissioner	4
x	Robert Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner	5
	Ron Krauth, Middlesex	6

7

8 Staff: Christian Meyer, Will Pitkin (in person)

9

10 L. Cattaneo called the meeting to order at 4:02pm.

11

12 **Public comment**

13 No public comments

14

15 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

16 None

17

18 **Public Comment**

19 No members of the public

20

21 **Act 250 / Section 248 Applications & Projects of Substantial Regional Impact**

22 a) Consider significant regional impact and conformance with regional plan for the following
23 projects:

24

25 Discussed the Act 250 application for Stonewall Meadows Phase II housing development in Montpelier.

26 The draft Act 250 permit for the current phase would allow the applicant to subdivide 72-acre lot into

27 two parcels of open space totaling approximately 52 acres and 31 parcels on which 21 single-family

28 housing units and 10 quadplexes are intended to be constructed. This draft permit would allow

29 applicant to construct infrastructure but not housing units, which would require subsequent Act 250

30 permit amendment(s) before construction.

31

32 Discussed CVRPC’s requirement to comment on the application: CVRPC’s contract with the VT Agency of

33 Commerce and Community Development does not require comments on minor Act 250 applications;

34 however, the regional plan states that CVRPC should comment on projects with substantial regional

35 impact. Since the application is to construct infrastructure for a proposed 61-unit housing development

36 and the regional plan’s definition of substantial regional impact includes developments of 30 or more

37 housing units, the committee agreed that this application had substantial regional impact and CVRPC

38 should comment.

39

1 J. Brabant asked how to ensure that the designated 52 acres of open space will remain open after the
2 project's completion. W. Pitkin stated that he had not seen any such assurances in the application or
3 draft permit. Committee discussed whether it should seek to limit future development on those 52 acres
4 given the housing shortage and the site's possible suitability for development.

5 *[Unbeknownst to attendees, during the meeting, the applicant emailed the District Environmental*
6 *Commission to clarify that those 52 acres of open space were intended for future development, though*
7 *any future development would require additional Act 250 permitting.]*
8

9 J. Brabant asked how CVRPC could have the Natural Resources Board bump this application from a
10 minor to a major application. R. Wernecke disagreed that the application should count as a major. A.
11 Peal thought this project might qualify as major and questioned whether this project would contribute
12 to Montpelier's combined sewer overflows. A. Peal also expressed concerns about possible impacts on
13 other municipal services beyond wastewater. L. Cattaneo wanted clarification on what CVRPC is asked
14 to comment on. C. Meyer stated that the questions are: is the project of substantial regional impact? Is
15 the project in conformance with the regional plan?
16

17 Committee discussed whether lot would be subdivided, referred to planned subdivision in application.
18

19 J. Brabant moved that a letter to the District Commission include: clarifications on how to ensure open
20 space remains open and a request that project be considered a major. Seconded by W. Arrand.

21 R. Wernecke opposed the motion because he does not believe that there is a reason to oppose the
22 project and does not want to create more barriers to development.
23

24 Committee voted on the motion: L. Cattaneo – no. J. Brabant – yes. W. Arrand – yes. P. Carbee –
25 abstain. R. Wernecke – no. Motion did not pass.
26

27 L. Cattaneo stated that he wanted any letter to the District Commission to emphasize that the CVRPC
28 wanted solid assurances on the status of the remaining open space land. R. Wernecke disagreed that
29 CVRPC should oppose future development on the 52 acres of the site that are not currently proposed for
30 development as this area is served by municipal water and sewer. J. Brabant stated that there exist
31 mechanisms to ensure preservation in perpetuity if we want to pursue them.
32

33 C. Meyer asked how to submit comments and proposed that staff send committee members a draft
34 letter of comment to committee members who will then individually submit any edits to L. Cattaneo for
35 approval and incorporation into the final letter to the District Commission.
36

37 P. Carbee moved to submit a letter with comments as described above. J. Brabant seconded.
38

39 W. Pitkin summarized recent movements on other Act 250 and Section 248 projects.
40

41 C. Meyer asked the committee what would be helpful to include in future committee memos.

42 J. Brabant: NRB rules on what determines major or minor applications. R. Wernecke: the application
43 itself.
44

45 **Adjournment**

46
47 *J. Brabant moved to adjourn, P. Carbee seconded. All in favor. So moved.*