



LAND USE REVIEW BOARD

10 Baldwin Street
Montpelier, VT 05633-3201

LAND USE REVIEW BOARD

MEETING MINUTES

12/1/2025, 2:00 p.m.

Physical Location:	Online Location:
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission 110 West Canal Street #202 Winooski, VT, 05404	Microsoft Teams

Attendance (in-person or via Teams)

Board Staff: Pete Gill, Rebecca Chalifoux, Jenny Ronis, Stephanie Monaghan, Kaitlin Hayes, Rachel Lomonaco, Adriene Katz

Public: Kate McCarthy, Taylor Newton, Charles Baker, Melanie Needle, Cathyann LaRose, Jen Mojo, Zachary Maia, Pam, Kati Gallagher, Annette Smith, Lindsay Kahn, Patty Davis, Anne Miller, Evan Langfeldt, Bryan Davis, Cheryl Van Epps, Aaron Denamur, Jacki Murphy, Paul Conner, Chris Shaheen

A. 2:00 p.m. Call to order and Board member roll call

The Land Use Review Board (LURB) convened at 2:00 p.m., Vice Chair Hadd.

Board Member	In-Person	Microsoft Teams	Absent
Janet Hurley, Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sarah Hadd, Vice Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Brooke Dingleline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kirsten Sultan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alex Weinhagen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B. Explanation of preapplication process

Vice Chair Hadd provided an overview of the preapplication process required by Act 181 of 2024. She described the Board’s role in reviewing draft regional plans and future land use maps before an RPC formally applies for approval and Tier 1B designations. She noted that Tier 1B provides limited Act 250 exemptions for eligible housing projects, and Tier 1A can be pursued only after an approved regional plan is adopted. She summarized the public notice process, the posting of materials on the Board’s website, and the ongoing public comment period. The purpose of the meeting was to receive CCRPC’s presentation and conduct virtual site visits before hearing questions from the Board, state agencies, and the public.

C. Overview of draft regional plan and Tier 1B request, NRPC

CCRPC staff presented an overview of the regional plan update and the mapping of future land use designations. They described the extensive municipal collaboration and

public engagement conducted across Chittenden County, emphasizing the long-standing regional partnerships that informed the plan's structure.

Staff explained the methodology used to translate local plans into the statewide land use categories required under Act 181, including downtown centers, village centers, planned growth areas, rural areas, and conservation areas. They outlined the region's housing needs assessment, local housing targets, and the projected development capacity within designated areas. They also discussed transportation considerations, employment centers, natural resource protection, and areas of long-range planning focus.

Board members asked clarifying questions about the mapping approach, local decision-making, transportation corridors, forest block connectivity, and the distribution of growth areas across the region. CCRPC staff highlighted the role of municipal plans, utility infrastructure, existing and planned transit service, and the region's economic development priorities.

D. Virtual Site Visits

CCRPC staff guided the Board through major proposed growth areas, village and downtown centers, enterprise areas, and locations proposed for Tier 1B. Staff reviewed aerial imagery, zoning layers, existing development patterns, and infrastructure capacity for each location. Discussion focused on areas with large redevelopment potential, mixed-use growth corridors, and long-term planning initiatives such as South Burlington's City Center, Essex growth areas, Williston's commercial centers, and Burlington's core neighborhoods.

Board members asked questions throughout the presentation regarding land use boundaries, municipal rationale for designations, potential for infill development, areas with limited wastewater service, and the distinctions between planned growth areas and enterprise areas. CCRPC staff provided additional detail on how municipal priorities and regional trends influenced each designation.

E. Questions from Board members

Following the virtual site visits, Board members offered additional questions. Topics included: how CCRPC evaluated the appropriateness of enterprise areas; how housing and employment centers were balanced in the plan; the treatment of large mixed-use development areas such as Kennedy Drive and Kimball Avenue; and the differences among downtown, village center, and planned growth area designations for purposes of Act 250 exemptions.

Board members also discussed long-term regional transit planning, anticipated growth corridors, and the integration of new development patterns into older commercial districts. CCRPC staff clarified the statutory definitions of land use categories, the joint

RPC statewide methodology, and how CCRPC deferred to municipalities in determining the appropriate designation for each area.

F. Questions and comments from state partner agencies

The Board received questions from state agencies. Representatives from the Agency of Natural Resources noted they were reviewing both designated and rural areas and would submit written comments. The Agency of Transportation had no additional comments at that time.

G. Questions and comments from public participants

Public participants offered comments and questions. Several residents of Essex expressed concerns about the pace of development, impacts on natural resources, housing affordability, and transportation planning. Speakers highlighted issues such as wetland loss, deer wintering areas, and the need to consider population trends when planning for housing.

Other participants expressed appreciation for CCRPC's engagement and responsiveness and discussed local traffic concerns, roadway classification statutes, truck routes, and safety issues. CCRPC and Board members provided procedural clarifications and directed participants to appropriate municipal and agency contacts for issues outside the Board's authority.

Representatives from the development community asked questions regarding the differences between village and downtown designations under Tier 1B, interactions with the state's Community Investment Program, and potential Act 250 implications for mixed-use projects. Chair Hurley and LURB staff explained the distinctions between Tier 1A and Tier 1B, the relationship between regional plan approval and future municipal applications, and which exemption pathways each designation would support.

Additional public comments were offered by municipal representatives, including the City of South Burlington, who discussed regional collaboration, economic development planning, and future growth areas such as Kimball Avenue, Tilley Drive, and South Burlington's eastern and southern growth corridors. Comments referenced the relationship between planned growth areas, enterprise employment areas, and multimodal transportation planning.

Cheryl Van Epps:

Cheryl expressed concerns about the current development trends not meeting housing needs while destroying critical natural resources. She referenced Vermont population data indicating a decline and questioned the rush to build expensive homes that are unaffordable for many, including herself. Cheryl urged regional and local planning commissions to consider this data and focus on meeting the needs of the homeless population. She also highlighted the destruction of wetlands and deer wintering areas due to development.

Land Use Review Board Approved Minutes
12/1/2025

Patty Davis:

Patty thanked the board for their responsiveness and expressed concerns about the designation of Lower Sand Hill as a truck route. She cited a highway statute requiring evaluation of alternate routes and requested a pause on any designation until compliance review is completed.

Evan Langfeldt:

Evan inquired about the differences between downtown and village designations in terms of ACT 250 review processes. The board clarified that both designations are treated the same under Tier 1B, but the municipality's decision on Tier 1A or 1B affects the process.

Paul Conner:

Paul highlighted the collaboration between municipalities and the importance of planned growth areas and enterprise areas. He discussed the development potential in South Burlington and the need for infrastructure to support growth.

H. Adjourn

Motion:	Adjourn
By:	Janet Hurley
Second:	Alex Weinhagen

Voting Board members	Ayes	Nays	Abstain	Absent
Janet Hurley, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sarah Hadd, Vice Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Brooke Dingedine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kirsten Sultan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alex Weinhagen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Result	Motion approved, unanimous
---------------	-----------------------------------

Meeting ended at 5:55 p.m.