

# CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## Project Review Committee

February 26, 2026

*Remote Participation via Zoom*

### Draft Minutes

#### Project Review Committee Members

X	Lee Cattaneo, Orange Commissioner
X	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner
X	Bill Arrand, Worcester Commissioner
X	Peter Carbee, Washington Commissioner
X	Robert Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner
X	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Commissioner

1 Staff: Christian Meyer, Lorraine Banbury, Reuben McMartin, Sam Lash

2

3 Public: Mike Miller, Commissioner from Montpelier, Steve Whittaker, Montpelier

4

5 L. Cattaneo called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

6

#### 7 **Public Comment**

8

9 Steve Whitaker stated that his objection to the Country Club Road project is to the planning process and  
10 framework that is being followed.

11

#### 12 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

13 None

14

#### 15 **Approval of Minutes**

16 P. Carabee moved to approve the 1/22/26 meeting's draft minutes, R. Wernecke seconded, all in favor,  
17 motion carried unanimously.

18

#### 19 **Downstreet Northbranch Apartment Project Letter of Compatibility**

20 C. Meyer presented a draft letter affirming that Downstreet's Community Development Block Grant –  
21 Disaster Recovery (CBDG-DR) application was in compliance with the Central Vermont Regional Plan.  
22 The proposal involves flood resilience improvements to several existing buildings in 4 locations: 87 Elm  
23 Street, 89 Elm Street, 47 Barre Street, and 6 Monsignor Crosby Avenue, representing 45 apartments in  
24 total. At the time the request for the letter was made, it was unclear if there would be an increase in  
25 the number of housing units, triggering Committee review . It was later determined there were to be no  
26 new units.

27

28 The project is currently in a feasibility stage and no additional housing units are proposed. Possible  
29 resilience strategies under evaluation include elevating structures, vacating flood-prone first floors,  
30 floodproofing buildings, or other measures that would reduce risk of future displacement. In some  
31 scenarios, first-floor residential units could be converted to non-residential uses, or residents could be  
32 relocated if units are removed.

1  
2 R. Wernecke moved that the project has been found compatible and that the letter of February 26 to  
3 Patrick Shelve be signed and sent. P. Carabee seconded, all in favor, motion carried unanimously.  
4

5 **City of Montpelier Utilities Expansion and Highway Improvements US Route 2 and Country Club Road**  
6 **Letter of Compatibility**

7 C. Meyer presented a draft letter affirming that the City of Montpelier's CDBG-DR application was in  
8 compliance with the Central Vermont Regional Plan. The application was to: install new sewer lines for  
9 the US Routes 2 & 302 roundabout to the intersection of Country Club Road and up Country Club Road  
10 to the prospective future development site; elevate US Route 2 at Country Club Road by 2 feet to match  
11 the elevation of Country Club Road; and to reconstruct Country Club Road with a lower grade.  
12

13 P. Carbee moved that the Committee approve the letter as compatible with the Regional Plan. R.  
14 Wernecke seconded. Discussion was opened.  
15

16 J. Brabant asked how the Committee can weigh in on projects that could have Substantial Regional  
17 Impact if they are not going through Act 250. L. Cattaneo clarified that, unless a project is before the  
18 committee, there is no avenue for submitting feedback, as there is no body to whom to appeal. The two  
19 avenues for Committee input that exist are Act 250 case review and letters of compatibility.  
20

21 Staff summarized that the proposed infrastructure improvements included installation of new water and  
22 sewer lines from the US Route 2 / Route 302 roundabout to the project site, raising the elevation of  
23 Route 2 to better align with Country Club Road, reconstructing Country Club Road to improve grade and  
24 safety, and adding a bicycle lane and sidewalk.  
25

26 Extensive discussion occurred regarding traffic conditions and the interpretation of traffic data  
27 presented in staff materials from the Transportation Advisory Committee. R. McMarten shared data and  
28 explained that current conditions along Route 2 operate at Level of Service B or better during most  
29 times of day based on current traffic data. There was also discussion about Act 250 triggers for  
30 municipal projects.  
31

32 J. Brabant raised concerns about ensuring the committee's approval is clearly limited to the  
33 infrastructure elements described and does not constitute approval of future development impacts such  
34 as increased traffic volumes or potential signalization at the intersection. J. Brabant proposed a friendly  
35 amendment to clarify that the letter would not address future traffic flows or traffic signal installation. A  
36 Peal seconded the proposed amendment.  
37

38 R. Wernecke and P. Carbee indicated they did not support the amendment, stating that the letter should  
39 focus on what the committee is approving rather than specifying what it does not approve. As the  
40 original motion makers did not accept the amendment, it was withdrawn.  
41

42 Rollcall vote on the motion was taken: P. Carbee – aye, R. Wernecke – aye, A. Peal – abstain, J. Brabant –  
43 aye, with the understanding that the minutes state that statement of compatibility was limited to the  
44 items in the letter, L. Cattaneo – aye. Motion carried.  
45

46 \*Note: with all other Committee members present, alternate Commissioner B. Arrand did not vote.  
47

48 **Act 250 and Section 248 Updates**

S. Lash presented a brief update of small-scale distributed energy generation projects under Section

1 248. Staff reported that approximately 143 small solar projects were proposed during the past year  
 2 across the region, with an average size of roughly 11 kilowatts and a combined total capacity of about  
 3 1.6 megawatts. Staff noted that these smaller residential-scale projects are tracked to provide  
 4 information. Staff shared that, currently, there is no requirement to submit a formal notice upon project  
 5 completion.

6 S. Lash providing the following 248 updates:

- 7 • one new solar project in Montpelier is a 100kW rooftop project and qualifies automatically as a  
 8 preferred site, so no letter was requested.
- 9 • GMP Irasville Substation Upgrade project (25-2468-PET): Agency of Agriculture, Food, and  
 10 Markets submitted comments and found that there would not be undue impact on primary  
 11 agricultural soils.
- 12 • 2 De Minimis Cases reviewed (and met criteria).
- 13 • Moretown T-Mobile Tower Petition (25-3123): Moretown Selectboard filed comments  
 14 requesting the shedding of the existing monopine be addressed.
- 15 • Marshfield Tower Petition (25-1543): noted a comprehensive summary of the Aesthetic &  
 16 Orderly Development Analysis Report commissioned by the Department of Public Service was  
 17 provided in the memo and highlighted key points including Quechee Test Part I and II  
 18 evaluations (adverse impacts but not undue adversity); steps taken to mitigate and minimize  
 19 aesthetic and visual impacts while providing essential wireless telecommunications services;  
 20 complies with most local bylaw standards and subject to state standards; meets substantial  
 21 deference to municipal and regional plans. Updated on additional testimonies on behalf of  
 22 intervenors and slight schedule change.

23  
 24 Staff shared follow-ups from 1/23/26 meeting: [H.527](#) was recently passed by the House and now in the  
 25 Senate Committee on Finance as of 2/18/2026. H. 527 is an Act relating to extending the sunset of 30  
 26 V.S.A. §248a (similar bill S.159 hasn't moved out of the Senate and is in the same Finance committee).  
 27 Additionally, there is H.751, which proposes to change the process for siting telecommunications  
 28 facilities to require facilities to receive a permit from District Commissions- this bill has not moved since  
 29 its introduction. Full Bill hyperlinks:

- 30 • H.527 <https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2026/H.527>
- 31 • S.159 <https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2026/S.159>
- 32 • H.751 <https://legislature.vermont.gov/bill/status/2026/H.751>

33  
 34 L. Banbury shared that there were no new Act 250 applications for Committee review. The application  
 35 for the Barre City garage in Barre Town was submitted, but deemed incomplete.

### 36 **Conservation Easement in Plainfield**

37 A letter of notification was submitted to CVRPC about a permanent conservation easement on a parcel  
 38 on Country Club Road in Plainfield. This easement is consistent with the area's rural designation under  
 39 the Future Land Use map, and so no conflict was found.  
 40

### 41 **Next Meeting**

42 The next meeting will be on Thursday, March 26, 2026.

### 43 **Adjourn**

44 P. Carbee moved to adjourn. R. Wernecke seconded. All in favor, motion carried unanimously. Meeting  
 45 adjourned at 5:42 pm.

46 *Respectfully submitted by L. Banbury and S. Lash*  
 47