VERMONT
LAND USE REVIEW BOARD
Application #: RPC10-0001
Exhibit #: 114
Date Received: 09-27-2026

From: Peter Hayden
To: regionalplan@trorc.org; Act250 - Board
Cc: Assistant to Tunbridge Selectboard; Bicknell Jonathan; Ruddell Rudi; BELLWETHERFILMS; Amy Frost; brenda field; krstrong@gmail.com; Israel Provoncha; wellsjanet505@gmail.com; shaneyoung339@gmail.com; Mullen Gary; McPhetres Mike; Kathleen Berk
Subject: Comments on TRORC"s proposed changes to the 2026 Draft Regional Plan
Date: Sunday, September 27, 2026 1:35:18 PM

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

Dear TRORC Staff & Board members, and LURB members,

I am a Tunbridge resident and these comments are in response to TRORC's "Suggested Changes to Goals/Policies/Recommendations" to the Draft 2026 Regional Plan found here:

https://www.trorc.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/TABLE-OF-SUGGESTED-POLICY-CHANGES-TO-FIRST-DRAFT-FINAL.pdf

I encourage Tunbridge to vote NO on the specific policy changes unless amended as suggested below. And I encourage Tunbridge to vote NO on any overall revised plan because countless public comments are not addressed or resolved by these proposed changes.

General Comment:

On the introductory page TRORC lists the Policies that received the largest number of comments, however this does not capture the most overwhelming comment which is the use of compulsory language (shall and must) throughout the Policies, and the repeated request that it ALL be changed to suggestive language (should and may). The LURB made the same comment is their response to TRORC's pre-application, and instructed TRORC to either remove the compulsory language, or show public support for it. There clearly is NOT public support for it - quite the contrary - there is significant public objection. So why has all the compulsory language not been removed from all the Policies? Restating that the Policies are only enforceable in an Act 250 preceding is not responsive to the public requests to remove the compulsory language. It simply re-states something we already know, and that is already covered in the draft plan. The repeated public comments request removal of compulsory language. They did not ask when it was applicable, they said to remove it. "Shall" appears in over 40 pages, and "must" in over 80 pages in the draft plan. This extends well beyond the Policies addressed in TRORC's proposed changes. Stop defying your constituents and do as requests. Change all compulsory language to suggestive language. This also includes all the policies not addressed by TRORC's proposed changes. They all need to change too.

Specific Comments:

These reference the draft plan Chapter, Page, and Policy number in the same way as TRORC's document.

Ch 3, Page 3-5, Policy 7; Change "shall" to "should" as requested.

Ch 3, Page 3-9, Policy 6; Change "shall" to "should" as requested.

Ch 3, Page 3-10, Policy 1; What is "residential scale"? Define it, or remove it.

Ch 3, Page 3-12, Policy 1; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Also, what is “residential scale”? It is undefined and will generate endless debate.

Ch 3, Page 3-12, Policy 2; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 3, Page 3-12, Policy 6; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 3, Page 3-15, Policy 2; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 3, Page 3-15, Policy 5; Change “shall” to “should" as requested.

Ch 3, Page 3-15, Policy 6; Change “shall” to “should" as requested.

Ch 3, Page 3-19, Policy 1; Change “shall” to “should" as requested.

Ch 3, Page 3-20, Policy 8; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 3, Page 3-20, Policy 12; Change “shall” to “should" as requested. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 3, Page 3-20, Policy 16; Change “shall” to “should" as requested.

Ch 6, Page 6-22, Policy 1; Including “potential" habitat is overly broad and arguably includes all lands, Delete “...or potential...”.

Ch 6, Page 6-25, Policy 1; This is the purview of State Wetlands Regulations, and that’s what should apply here. Delete Policy 1.

Ch 7, Page 7-6, Policy 1; This should only apply to identified archaeological resources, not possible or potential resources as described in the text for this chapter. Change to read “… loss of an identified archaeological resource.”. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 7, Page 7-,6 Policy 2; Chapter 7 suggests that large swaths of land in river corridors are potential archaeological resources. This policy can obstruct development in these areas, much of which is already developed, even though there is no identified archaeological resource. Delete Policy 2.

Ch 7, Page 7-6, Policy 1; Change “must” to “should” for this scenic resources policy. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 7, Page 7-7, Policy 2; Change “must” to “should”. Delete “subject to Act 250”. It is redundant.

Ch 8, Page 8-15, Policy 9; Public funds may be used for buildings that are not intended to be affordable housing, e.g. Historic Preservation funds may be used to preserve a building. And in any case, how can one ensure “affordability” into the future? And how many years are

"several". Delete Policy 9

Ch 8, Page 8-16, Policy 10; Probably the most common restriction in a conservation easement is a restriction on development. This Policy is in direct conflict with the goals of such an easement, and the other policies for Rural lands where conservation easements are encouraged. Delete Policy 10

Ch 9, Page 9-5, Policy 3; Water and wastewater infrastructure always enables growth. Local land use policies and regulations should guide what development occurs where, not a water and wastewater policy. Delete Policy 3.

Ch 9, Page 9-13, Policy 4; Do not delete this policy, but change "must" to "should".

Ch 9, Page 9-14, Policy 7; Do not delete this policy, but change "shall" to "should".

Ch 9, Page 9-14, Policy 11; Do not delete this policy, but change "shall" to "should".

Ch 10, Page 9-15, Policy 2; This should still be qualified for only five or more off-street parking spaces. Change to read "… developments with parking lots that provide five or more off-street parking spaces should install…."

Peter Hayden
Tunbridge Resident