

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Regional Plan Committee

Special Meeting

Draft Minutes

April 15, 2025 4:00 – 5:30 pm

29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602

Remote Access Via Zoom

Committee Members:

X	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Alternate Rep
	Vacant
X	Doug Greason, Waterbury Rep
X	Mike Miller, Montpelier Alternate Rep
X	John Brabant, Calais Rep

Staff: Christian Meyer, Brian Voigt, Eli Toohey, Will Pitkin (in person)

James Crafts, Warren Rep

Public: Stephen Whitaker, Montpelier; Renee Carpenter, East Montpelier; Celina Barton, East Montpelier

A. Peal Called the meeting to order at 4:03PM

Adjustments to the Agenda

No adjustments to the agenda.

Public Comment

S. Whitaker commented on the importance of CVRPC's role in assisting permit application review and suggested that CVRPC re-examine its triggers for participation in such reviews, especially as exemptions are introduced for certain state permits. S. Whitaker also expressed concerns with the City of Montpelier's plans to facilitate housing development on Country Club Road and how the Regional Plan might impact those plans. S. Whitaker expressed concern for potential conflicts of interest with members of the committee who also work for member municipalities. C. Meyer noted that all commissioners agree to abide by CVRPC's conflict of interest policy and that the Regional Plan Committee is an advisory committee. J. Brabant further noted that

Approval of Minutes

M. Miller requested clarification of one discussion item in the draft 4/1/2025 minutes related to grey areas in how to map certain rural areas on the Regional Plan Future Land Use Map. The draft minutes read "Committee members generally expressed a preference for keeping farming and agricultural lands that are also conserved as mapped under the Rural – Conservation category instead of Rural – Agriculture and Forestry when lands fall into a grey area in the mapping methodology." M. Miller asked whether that accurately reflected the sentiment of the committee's discussion; A. Peal stated that she

1 remembered the discussion in question leaning toward mapping those areas as Rural – Conservation in
2 order to maximize conservation protection but that the committee did not reach any definitive
3 conclusions on the matter and could revisit the question at a later date.

4
5 D. Greason moved to approve the draft 4/1/2025 meeting minutes, J. Brabant seconded, all in favor,
6 motion carried.

7 8 **Short-Term Rentals**

9 A. Peal commended E. Toohey’s summary of short-term rental regulations at the state and municipal
10 levels in VT and noted several additional options available to municipalities, including capping the
11 number of allowable guests per unit at two guests for each bedroom in municipal regulations.

12
13 D. Greason suggested modifying the strategy related to short-term rentals in the draft Housing Chapter
14 to include technical assistance to municipalities to help draft short-term rental-related ordinances in
15 addition to helping create short-term rental registries. The committee discussed how municipalities
16 have successfully developed regulations, including the roles played by the Vermont League of Cities and
17 Towns, consultants, and regional planning commissions and whether such regulations were more
18 effective as standalone ordinances or as part of zoning bylaws.

19
20 The committee discussed whether a regional short-term rental regulation would make sense given
21 municipalities’ varying stances on short-term rentals; B. Voigt noted that the authority to regulate short-
22 term rentals is at the municipal and state levels, not the regional level.

23
24 Discussion turned to short-term rental registries. The committee discussed the most appropriate fees
25 for short-term rental registries; the committee noted that such fees could help cover the costs to
26 municipalities for using the software that the registry would be based on and potentially help defray
27 other costs to the municipalities, but registry fees are not an effective deterrent to the conversion of
28 permanent housing units to short-term rentals.

29 30 **Infrastructure and Construction Costs for Housing Development**

31
32 This discussion item was tabled until a future committee meeting because E. Toohey had to leave to
33 attend another meeting. E. Toohey encouraged committee members to read H. 479, a bill currently in
34 the legislature that attempts to address many issues related to infrastructure and construction costs for
35 housing development.

36 37 **Updates on Future Land Use Map**

38
39 A. Peal asked B. Voigt to reiterate his explanation from the 4/1/2025 meeting of why he was starting by
40 mapping the most rural land use categories then moving in increasing order of development. B. Voigt
41 stated that this approach would maximize conservation of high-priority areas by setting those aside first
42 before determining areas where CVRPC wants to focus development. C. Meyer added that the mapping
43 approach was really starting with the highest-priority areas for conservation and the highest-priority
44 areas for development then converging somewhere in the middle, and that the Regional Plan
45 Committee and representatives of member municipalities will have a large role in determining how to

1 map those areas that are somewhere in the middle (i.e. neither critical for conservation nor for
2 development).

3
4 B. Voigt and staff answered several questions from the committee, including whether parcels that are in
5 the current use program will be mapped in the Rural – Ag and Forestry category and the relationship
6 between Act 181 and the VAPDA Future Land Use Mapping Methodology.

7
8 Staff also discussed upcoming outreach related to the FLU Map and sought the committee’s input on
9 how to approach municipalities that may seek Tier 1B status for portions of their municipalities but may
10 not have the municipal capacity to perform the necessary due diligence to thoroughly review permit
11 applications.

12
13 Committee and staff shared concerns about whether land use regulation would still be sufficient after
14 more Act 250 exemptions take effect. M. Miller noted that the intent of Act 250 exemptions was not for
15 municipal governments to step in and perform the exact same review that the LURB District Commission
16 currently performs in Act 250 application review but, instead, to provide sufficiently stringent review in
17 the areas that are identified as appropriate for less stringent review.

18 19 **Updates on Community Outreach Survey**

20
21 B. Voigt stated that the survey had received approximately 100 responses to date and summarized
22 several trends. S. Whitaker provided feedback on the survey structure.

23
24 W. Pitkin promised to share the link to the spreadsheet where committee members can suggest topics
25 for further discussion, and a man is only as good as his word [https://cvrpc-
26 my.sharepoint.com/:x:/g/personal/voigt_cvregion_com/ETyp2PyBWr9lqmUxS1qjpBsBbNaoDfn2aJ7kQs
27 FW3hdcvg?e=k1xdZ4](https://cvrpc-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/g/personal/voigt_cvregion_com/ETyp2PyBWr9lqmUxS1qjpBsBbNaoDfn2aJ7kQsFW3hdcvg?e=k1xdZ4)

28
29 J. Brabant moved to adjourn, D. Greason seconded, all in favor.

30
31 A. Peal adjourned meeting at 5:36 PM

32
33 *Respectfully submitted by W. Pitkin*