

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, November 12, 2025

3
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Irwin called the meeting to order at 6:01
5 PM.

6
7 ATTENDANCE:

8 Commission: Scholten, Marietta ☒ ; Demars, Howard ☒; Buermann, Robert ☒; Irwin, William; Julia Callan
9 ☒;Yvon Dandurand ☒;

10
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12
13 Guests: Peter Mazurak (*Apex Engineering, LLC for Estate of Phyllis Cassidy*)

14
15 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

16 B. Irwin asked to move minutes to the end of the agenda. The Committee agreed.

17
18 **Public Comment**

19 None.

20
21 **Project Reviews:**

22
23 **Act 250: Estate of Phyllis Cassidy**

24 *Project Details:* A 22-lot, 24-unit residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with a mix of single family and
25 duplex dwellings upon a ±31.69-acre parcel, including a ±24.55-acre Common Lands lot. The
26 project includes roadways, utilities, and stormwater improvements and will be served by shared onsite
27 water supply and wastewater systems. No physical construction is proposed or authorized.

28
29 P. Mazurak noted that the project had been previously approved with a similar layout as a senior housing
30 development. This proposed development is not limited to senior housing and had a more compact layout to
31 protect newly identified wetlands and an archeological site. The project has a proposed common wastewater
32 treatment site and several shared drilled wells. There is an option for the single existing well to be used, but
33 this is not being proposed at this time. The project has a water/wastewater permit and is the process of
34 applying for its stormwater permit.

35
36 B. Irwin asked if the new owner was expected to keep the project design as proposed. P. Mazurak stated that
37 it was expected as most permitting was already complete, any changes would require new permitting. The
38 only likely change could be moving from several drilled wells to using the single existing well on site.

39
40 J. Callan asked if the project had received its local permit. P. Mazurak stated that the project had received final
41 approval from the DRB.

42
43 H. Demars asked why the project had moved from senior housing to housing for all ages. P. Mazurak stated
44 that the applicant felt the project could be marketed to all age demographics. E. Klofft noted local context that
45 the Town was in the process of working with Cathedral Square on senior housing.

1 H. Demars asked about the archeological site. P. Mazurak stated that it would not be disturbed and would be
2 fenced off with split rail fencing. H. Demars asked about the stormwater plan. P. Mazurak stated that the
3 project was in process of receiving a stormwater permit. The stormwater system includes a gravel wetland as
4 well as simple disconnections associated with the house lots which have roughly .25-.5 acres of lawn space
5 each.
6

7 Y. Dandurand asked if this project was the first phase of a larger development or the final expected build-out.
8 P. Mazurak stated that this is the expected final design due to site limitations from wetlands and the
9 archeological resources.
10

11 Y. Dandurand asked if this was in the 50 MPH section of Gore Road. P. Mazurak stated that the project road is
12 located closest to the village in the 35 MPH section.
13

14 E. Klofft reviewed the draft project review sheet. The project is located in the Agricultural Resource Area but is
15 in a locally planned village district. She reviewed the Complete Streets policies for high-density residential
16 clusters in rural areas. The project has a proposed sidewalk for the first several hundred feet by the entrance
17 with a crosswalk connection to an existing walking path. B. Irwin noted the importance of connectivity, P.
18 Mazurak stated that the DRB had considered requiring a sidewalk on the entire development but determined
19 that the 24 foot wide road was sufficient for pedestrians in the remainder of the development. That path will
20 connect to the Highgate Arena and the Lamoille Valley Rail Trail.
21

22 E. Klofft reviewed the definition of substantial regional impact.
23

24 *H. Demars motioned to find that the project is in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of substantial*
25 *regional impact, conditional upon approval of all ANR permits. Y. Dandurand seconded. The motion carried.*
26

27 **Staff Reviews**

28 **Act 250: McCullough Crushing, Inc**

29 *Project Details: 4-year extension of existing quarry facility with no expansion in quarried area or other*
30 *changes to hours, traffic or noise.*
31

32 E. Klofft stated that the project did not include any expansion in area, or any changes such as noise , traffic or
33 hours which could increase the impact to the area or region. The project has a local development review
34 permit. Therefore, she recommended that it be not of substantial regional impact.
35

36 **Minutes**

37 *M. Scholten motioned to approve the minutes of the September meeting. Y. Dandurand seconded. The motion*
38 *carried.*
39

40 **Updates**

41 E. Klofft provided an update on the Howrigan Wind project. The Project Officer for the case released a draft
42 project decision. In that draft decision, there was specific language regarding due consideration that suggested
43 that the level of consideration to the recommendations of the Regional Planning Commission was essentially
44 none. NRPC staff submitted a comment letter disputing this. E. Klofft reviewed the comment letter as well as
45 comment letters submitted by the Department of Public Service and the Town of Fairfield. The Committee
46 expressed concern about the draft decision and requested staff continue to monitor the project.

1
2 **Commissioner Announcements**

3 None.

4
5 **Adjourn**

6 *H. Demars motioned to adjourn. Y. Dandurand seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at*
7 *7:07 PM.*

DRAFT