VERMONT
LAND USE REVIEW BOARD
Application #: RPC03-0001
Exhibit #: 079
Date Received: 10-28-2026

**Gott, Catherine**

**From:** Stephen Whitaker <whitaker.stephen@gmail.com>
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2026 1:00 PM
**To:** Act250 - Board
**Cc:** Dingledine, Brooke
**Subject:** Docket RPC03-0001 (Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission): how the Board will treat items added to the application after objections are filed (Docket Entry No. 076)

**Categories:** Pending, Catherine

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Stephen Whitaker

Montpelier, Vermont

October 28, 2026

Land Use Review Board

10 Baldwin Street, Montpelier, VT 05633-3201

By email: Act250.Board@vermont.gov

cc: Board Member Brooke Dingledine

**Re: Docket RPC03-0001 (Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission): how the Board will treat items added to the application after objections are filed (Docket Entry No. 076)**

Dear Chair Hurley and Members of the Board:

I write to ask the Board to state a rule. This letter is not a supplement to my October 23 objection. It follows my October 24 letter and my comments of October 26 and 27, and it does not repeat them.

**The question**

CVRPC adopted its plan and Future Land Use map on October 20. My objection was filed October 23. On October 27, a document titled "Description of Changes to Regional Future Land Use Map Changes" was docketed as No. 076, the seventh day after adoption.

Both periods run from the date of adoption and end on November 4. I do not read 24 V.S.A. § 4348(h)(1) or § 4348(i)(1) to give the Board authority to extend either one, and I do not ask it to. That cuts both ways. If CVRPC may add to its application through November 4, a report or description filed on November 3 or 4 would reach the docket when no objector could respond to it. On October 8 the Chair told me that an objection "must be fully submitted within 15 days following plan adoption." I ask the Board to say which rule it intends: either that nothing CVRPC adds after objections are filed will be considered part of its application, or that objectors may respond to any such addition.

**Why it matters here**

No. 076 compares "the 2024 map" with "the draft 2026 FLU Map." It does not give the date of the 2024 map, and it attaches no map. It is the kind of addition an objector would want to address. For Montpelier it has three entries: the downtown area, the southeastern corner near Gallison Hill Road, and Northfield and Berlin Streets. None mentions the City-owned Country Club Road parcel, more than 133 acres. The 2024 map shows it Rural. It was outside the legacy growth center on December 31, 2025: the Community Investment Board approved an expansion on September 23, 2024 and revoked that approval on October 28, 2024. CVRPC's September 19 summary now places the entire parcel in the Planned Growth Area (p. 4). Country Club Road is one example. I have not tried to list every omission, and I raise it only to show that there is something to respond to.

**What I am asking**

I would be grateful for the Board's answers, in writing and on the docket, if possible by Thursday, October 29, so that I know how to proceed before November 4:

1. Which rule applies to items CVRPC adds to its application after objections are filed: that they will not be considered part of the application, or that objectors may respond to them?
2. Which item required by § 4348(h)(1) does the Board regard No. 076 to be?
3. What is "the 2024 map" that No. 076 uses as its baseline, and does No. 076 describe the map adopted on October 20? I read it to mean the 2020-amended map readopted July 9, 2024, which CVRPC's website calls the "2024 Regional Future Land Use Map," but No. 076 does not say.
4. My October 24 letter asked the Board to withhold a notice of completeness until the § 4348(h)(1) report is filed. Has a notice issued, and if so, what did the Board treat as the report and as the description of changes?

Thank you for your attention to this. I will gladly supply anything that would help.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Whitaker

Montpelier, Vermont