

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee
Draft Meeting Minutes
August 4, 2026

29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602
Remote Access Via Zoom

Committee Members:	
X	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Representative, Chairperson
X	Doug Greason, Waterbury Representative
	John Brabant, Calais Representative
X	Alice Farrell, Berlin Representative
	Brittany Butler, Cabot Representative

Staff: Brian Voigt, Christian Meyer, Kari Pelletiere, Lorraine Banbury

Public: Stephen Whittaker

A. Peal called the meeting to order at 4:01.

Adjustments to the Agenda

No adjustments to the agenda.

Public Comment

S. Whittaker asked for clarification of when public comment could be made on agenda items.

Chair A. Peale clarified that the Executive Committee had approved an amendment to the Code of Conduct expanding public comment to be given on individual agenda items, rather than only at the beginning of a meeting. Comments must be directed to the Chairperson, who has discretion as to the length of time.

Approval of Minutes

D. Greason moved to approve the July 7, 2026 minutes. A. Farrell seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Land Use Review Board Pre-Application Site Visits and Meeting

The Land Use Review Board held a meeting on July 23, 2026, with site visits in the morning that included 2 stops each in Berlin and Northfield, driving through Barre City including passing the Prospect Heights property, and stops in Plainfield and in Montpelier at the Country Club Road site.

1 In the afternoon there was a Land Use Review Board meeting. In attendance at the meeting
2 were Regional Plan Committee members D. Greason and A. Farrell; other CVRPC
3 Commissioners; staff members B. Voigt, C. Meyer, L. Banbury and K. Pelletiere who presented
4 and answered questions; as well as other CVRPC staff and members of the public. The meeting
5 was characterized as positive overall. A formal written response is expected by September 7th.
6 Greason noted the Land Use Review Board complemented the CVRPC outreach program and
7 level of attention to detail. A. Peale noted the outreach to Planning Commissions and Select
8 Boards [and City Councils]. A. Farrel noted too that it was important to acknowledge that the
9 Regional Future Land Use Map was not the work product of one person and included public
10 engagement. A. Peale added that the Regional Plan Committee has been reviewing the Future
11 Land Use Map as work on it has progressed.

12
13 The staff takeaway was that CVRPC is on the right track; and expected mostly
14 recommendations which can be incorporated in the 2027 plan, as well as some mandatory
15 revisions. Both staff and Committee members have been following the Land Use Review Board
16 process with other RPCs to inform how best to proceed.

17 18 **Future Land Use Map**

19 The Committee reviewed specific requests about changes to the Future Land Use Map.
20

21 **Barre City: Prospect Heights**

22 There has been ongoing planning work on this parcel, and the request was made to change its
23 classification from Rural General. The Committee reached general agreement supporting this
24 reclassification.

25 26 **Barre Town: Richardson Road**

27 In discussion with the Barre Town Zoning Administrator, a request was made to change the
28 classification of this area from rural general to Village Area to reflect the presence of
29 water/wastewater. This is in keeping with a similar area to the east of Barre City classified as
30 Village Area. The Committee reached general agreement supporting this reclassification.

31 32 **Warren: Sugarbush South/Lincoln Peak**

33 The Warren Planning Commission requested to have the Resource-Based Recreation area near
34 the base station to Village Center, with a possibility of workforce housing. There was discussion
35 of the limited amount of land in Warren that is not subject to flood hazard, and that this
36 location is not. Also discussed were the presence of mass transit part of the year, and
37 investment in multi-modal transportation; and use for some civic activities. One alternative
38 discussed was a change to Transition/Infill, which is how area around Killington was classified.
39 There was discussion about the role of Act 250 to specifically address development at resort
40 areas. The Committee decided to discuss it further with more members present before making
41 a recommendation/decision and asked staff to bring further details to the next meeting.

Special Use Resilient Classification

Staff presented three options for parcels within mapped flood hazards adjacent to existing downtowns (legacy downtown/village designations remain grandfathered regardless of flood status): (1) a broad new "special use resilience" category applied regionwide to all river corridor/flood hazard land; (2) a targeted version applied only to parcels that would otherwise qualify for a Tier 1-eligible class; (3) no new category, folding qualifying parcels into existing Tier 1 classes and leaving the rest as Rural Conservation. Land Use Review Board's informal reaction at the pre-application meeting was mixed. After discussion including the RPC's discretionary ability to create new special use Future Land Use as in the statute, the Committee reached consensus supporting the broad version (Option 1), to be brought to the Land Use Review Board for reaction.

Adjournment

S. Whittaker asked about public comment, but the Committee had a hard stop at 5:30. A. Farrell moved to adjourn; D. Greason seconded. Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Tuesday, September 1 at 4:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by L. Banbury