

## Elmore Planning Commission Meeting

May 7, 2026

### Attendance:

- EPC members: (In person) Dawn Kress, Bruce Olsson, Nancy Davis, Michelle Greeson, Shorty Towne
- Others: See sign in sheet attached

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Minutes approved from late month:** Nancy motions to approve the meeting minutes from April. Dawn seconds, and all EPC members vote to approve minutes.

**Agenda additions:** None

### Agenda Items:

- Nancy started the meeting off by giving an overview to the public of the work that was completed over the last year and a half by the EPC and LCPC in regard to the Town Plan revision.
- **Issue:**
  - **Discussion:** Discussion of changes to the 4/9/26 Town Plan Draft posted on the town website. Including-
    - Municipal plan approved checklist, Chapter 6: Education, Chapter 8: Energy, Chapter 11: Flood Resilience.
      - Nancy has a recommendation to change language in the Energy chapter to, “When it comes time for replacing municipal vehicles, the feasibility of purchasing energy efficient vehicles that will meet operational needs for the Elmore Highway and Fire Department should be explored.”
- **Issue:** Public comments
  - **Discussion: Public comments including elevation language in chapter 2:** Land use chapter, chapter 13, Implementation Chapter.
    - Michelle Greeson (EPC) makes a motion to revert to the previous Town Plan regarding the language in Chapters 2 and 13 in implementation chapter about elevation restrictions in the Forest Reserve District. The language will read “Maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibit development above 1,500 in elevation”.
      - Charlie B. Zoning administrator shows a map of the Forest District and the current homes.
      - Members of the town are given time for public comment and to address the EPC with any questions.
  - **Action Items:** Meghan (LCPC) will make the change of language back to the language from the previous Town Plan.
- **Issue:** Formatting and miscellaneous minor cosmetic (e.g. graph titles) changes.

- **Discussion:**
  - Dawn and Nancy have a few edits to be made regarding map titles and punctuation.
  - Review of written comments that were received from town comments- add electric utility entities that provide to Elmore. Also, language about what the town emergency shelter would currently be 1) fire house 2) town garage
  - “Morristown Emergency Medical Services” verbiage will replace “Morristown Rescue squad”.
- **Action item:**
  - Meghan from LCPC will make all edits discussed
- Bruce motions to move this current version of the town plan (with tonight’s edits) along to the Select Board and Nancy seconds it. All epc members agree.
- Meghan will send the final draft to the Select Board and warn the meeting appropriately.

**Attachments:** Attendance Sheet, comments, timeline

**Meeting Adjourned:** Dawn motions to adjourn at 1835, Nancy seconds the motion, and all ECP members agree.

**Next meeting:** June 18th @5:30pm



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

**Municipality:** Town of Elmore  
**Town Plan Review:** 3/31/26  
**Reviewer:** Meghan Rodier

**Municipal Adoption Date:**  
**Regional Approval:**

### Summary of MUNICIPAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS (under 24 V.S.A., Chapter 117, Subchapter 5)

Required Plan Elements/Maps [§4382(a)] Each of the elements are required in some form for all municipal plans:	Yes or No		Page	Comments (consistency with statutory requirements)	Suggestions (future plan updates)
	Text	Map			
1. Statement of municipal <b>objectives, policies, programs</b> to guide growth and development	Y		5	Meets statutory requirements.	
2. <b>Land use plan (and map)</b> showing present/proposed land areas for forests, agriculture, residence, commerce, public uses, open spaces, floodplain, wetlands, etc; identifies areas proposed for state designation, explains how such designation furthers state planning goals and how the area meets the criteria for designation; indicates forest blocks and habitat connectors, and plans for minimizing forest fragmentation in those areas.	Y	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements. Updated to comply with Act 171. Updated to reference Elmore's latest zoning bylaws/ description of zoning districts.	
3. <b>Transportation plan (and map)</b> showing needed/ proposed improvements	Y	Y	21-27	Added language to reference Municipal Roads General Permit, RCT Micro Transit Service, and updated policies/ recommendations. Added commuting data.	
4. <b>Utilities, facilities, services plan (and map)</b> showing present/proposed facilities, including education, recreation, water, sewer, solid waste, libraries, medical facilities, storm water drainage and recommendations for future needs	Y	Y	28-35, 83-87	Meets statutory requirements. Updated information regarding community facilities and emergency services serving Elmore. Updated siting policies for Communication Towers. Expands on community facilities/services in the Health and Wellness chapter update.	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

5. Statement of municipal policies on <b>preservation of rare and irreplaceable natural areas, scenic and historic features</b> and resources	Y	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements including Act 171, Forest Integrity Act. The Natural Resources section is incorporated into the Land Use chapter.	
6. <b>Educational facilities plan (and map)</b> and statement of present/projected uses	Y	Y	39-41	Needs reference added to childcare facilities and services in Elmore and neighboring towns. Brief mention of this in the Health and Wellness chapter on page 84 but no reference to where local childcare facilities are located that Elmore residents can access. There are no links provided to where you can find local Childcare services such as providing a link to Building Brighter Futures.	
7. <b>Implementation program</b> for the plan's objectives	Y		88-92	Meets statutory requirements and identifies future funding opportunities to implement plan recommendations.	
8. Statement of <b>how plan relates</b> to development trends/plans for adjacent municipalities, areas and the region	Y		76-77	Meets statutory requirements.	
9. <b>Energy plan</b> , including analysis of resources, needs, scarcities, costs, problems, and opportunities for conservation and renewable energy	Y	Y	46-69	Follows Act 174 Enhanced Energy Planning Standards. Updated LEAP information and targets/analysis and mapping. Addressed statewide energy goals and updates to comply with the latest Act 174 standards including adding an equity and energy planning section in the Energy Chapter.	
10. <b>Housing element</b> , including program for addressing affordable, safe/adequate housing needs, and housing targets per Act 47/ Act 181	Y		70-75	Meets statutory requirements including Act 47 and Act 181. Includes a new section on housing targets. Promotes a diversity of housing options. Recognizes the need for safe and affordable housing. Updated narrative and charts/graphs with the latest	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

			Census data and Housing Needs Assessment data.	
11. <b>Economic development</b> element that describes present economic conditions and the location, type, and scale of desired economic development, and identifies policies, projects and programs necessary to foster economic growth.	Y	42-45	Meets statutory requirements. Discusses Village Center Designation and tax credit benefits. Supports local and home-based businesses. Updated employment information. Added a section on the Village Center Designation obtained in 2019 for Elmore Center.	
12. <b>Flood resilience</b> element that identifies flood hazard and fluvial erosion hazard areas, based on river corridor maps, and designates those areas to be protected; recommends policies and strategies to protect the areas identified and designated to mitigate risks to public safety, critical infrastructure, historic structures, and municipal investments. (Note: may reference an approved existing local hazard mitigation plan approved.)	Y	78-82	Meets statutory requirements. Includes reference to Act 121, new River Corridors Legislation. Incorporated recent flood data. Updated policies and recommendations considering recent flooding events. Expanded on the Flood Resilience section to meet the latest statutory requirements.	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

<b>B. Consistency with Broad State Goals</b> [§4302] Plans must show consideration/evidence of a continuing planning process that includes:	Y / N / P	Pages	Comments (consistency with statutory requirements)	Suggestions (future plan updates)
1. Coordinated, comprehensive planning process	Y	2-3	Meets statutory requirements.	
2. Citizen participation at all levels of the planning process	Y	2-3	Meets statutory requirements	
3. Consideration of use of resources, consequences of growth to region and state	Y	7-20	Yes, addressed in the Land Use chapter.	
4. Working creatively with other municipalities to develop, implement plans;	Y	76-77	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Regional Impact Statement.	
<b>C. Consistency with Specific State Goals</b> [§4302] Plans must make substantial progress towards attainment of the following goals (*or explain why goal is not applicable):	Y, N, P (progress)	Pages	Comments (consistency with statutory requirements)	Suggestions (future plan updates)
1. To plan development so as to maintain the historic settlement pattern of compact village and urban centers separated by rural countryside:	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Land Use Chapter.	
(i) Intensive residential development should be encouraged primarily in downtown centers, village centers, planned growth areas, and village areas as described in section 4348a of this title, and strip development along highways should be avoided. These areas should be planned so as to accommodate a substantial majority of housing needed to reach the housing targets developed for each region pursuant to subdivision 4348a(a)(9) of this title.				
(ii) Economic growth should be encouraged in locally and regionally designated growth areas, employed to revitalize existing village and urban centers, or both.	Y	42-45	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Economic Development chapter.	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

(iii) Public investments, including the construction or expansion of infrastructure, should reinforce the planned growth patterns of the area.	Y	28-35	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Utility and Facility Plan.	
(iv) Development should be undertaken in accordance with smart growth principles as defined in subdivision 2791(13) of this title.	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in land Use chapter.	
2. Provide a strong and diverse economy	Y	42-45	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Economic Development chapter.	
3. Broaden access to educational and vocational training opportunities	Y	39-41	Need to discuss vocational training opportunities in the Education Chapter.	
4. Provide for safe, convenient, economic, and energy efficient transportation systems	Y	21-26, 46-69	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in the Transportation and Energy Chapters.	
(i) Highways, air, rail, and other transportation means should be supported and integrated	Y	21-26	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.	
5. Identify, protect and preserve important natural and historic features of the Vermont landscape, including	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements including Act 171, Forest Integrity Act. Natural Resources section is incorporated into the Land Use Chapter.	
(i) Significant natural and fragile areas	Y	7-20	“ “	
(ii) Outstanding water resources, including lakes, rivers, aquifers, shorelands, and wetlands	Y	7-20	“ “	
(iii) Significant scenic roads, waterways, and views	Y	7-20	“ “	
(iv) Important historic structures, sites, or districts, archaeological sites and arch. sensitive areas	Y	35-37	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Historic and Archaeological Resources Chapter.	
6. Maintain and improve the quality of air, water, wildlife, forests and land resources	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements including Act 171, Forest Integrity Act. Natural Resources section is incorporated into	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

			the Land Use Chapter.	
(i) Vermont's air, water, wildlife, mineral and land resources should be planned for use in a development according to 10 VSA §6086(a)	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements. Natural Resources section is incorporated into the Land Use Chapter.	
(ii) Vermont's water quality should be maintained according to the policies and actions developed in the basin plans.	Y	7-20	Add reference to the Lamoille River Tactical Basin Plan in the Natural Resources section of the Land Use chapter or Flood Resilience chapter and add the following recommendation: to "explore funding opportunities to implement priority water quality and flood resiliency projects in the Elmore Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and Lamoille River Tactical Basin Plan."	
(iii) Vermont's forestlands should be managed so as to maintain and improve forest blocks and habitat connectors.	Y	7-20	Meets statutory requirements including Act 171, Forest Integrity Act. Also see Priority Forest Blocks map in the Land Use Chapter.	
7. Encourage the efficient use of energy and the development of renewable energy resources	Y	46-69	Meets Act 174 Enhanced Energy Planning Standards.	
8. Maintain and enhance recreational opportunities for residents and visitors, including identifying, providing, and protecting public access to noncommercial outdoor recreational opportunities, where applicable	Y	Throughout Plan	Recreation addressed in multiple chapters: Introduction/Community Profile, Statement of Objectives, Utility and Facility Plan, Economic Development, Transportation, Land Use, and Health and Wellness. Promotes trail networks and connections to existing neighboring trail networks for walking and biking (Economic Development Chapter).	
(i) Growth should not diminish outdoor recreation activities	Y	Throughout Plan	" "	
(ii) Public access should be identified, provided, and protected where appropriate	Y	Throughout Plan	" "	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

9. Encourage and strengthen agricultural and forest industries, including:	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Agriculture and forestry addressed in the Land Use Chapter.	
(i) protection of long-term viability of agricultural and forest lands and maintenance of low overall density	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Agriculture and forestry addressed in the Land Use Chapter.	
(ii) encouraging the manufacture and marketing of value-added agricultural and forest products	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Agriculture and forestry addressed in the Land Use Chapter.	
(iii) encouraging use of locally-grown food products	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Agriculture addressed in the Land Use Chapter.	
(iv) encouraging sound forest and agricultural practices	<b>Y</b>	<b>78-88</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Agriculture and forestry addressed in the Land Use Chapter.	
(v) Public investment should be planned so as to minimize development pressure on agricultural and forest land.	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Natural Resources section incorporated into the Land Use chapter.	
10. To provide for the wise and efficient use of Vermont's natural resources and to facilitate the appropriate extraction of earth resources and the proper restoration and preservation of the aesthetic qualities of the area.	<b>Y</b>	<b>7-20</b>	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Natural Resources section incorporated into the Land Use chapter.	
11. To ensure the availability of safe and affordable housing for all Vermonters:	<b>Y</b>	<b>70-75</b>	Meets statutory requirements including Act 47 and Act 181. Includes a new section on housing targets. Promotes a diversity of housing options. Recognizes the need for safe and affordable housing.	
(i) Housing should be encouraged to meet the needs of a diversity of social and income groups in each Vermont community, particularly for those citizens of low and moderate income, and consistent with housing targets provided for in subdivision 4348a(a)(9) of this title.	<b>Y</b>	<b>70-75</b>	“ “	
	<b>Y</b>	<b>70-75</b>	“ “	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

(ii) New and rehabilitated housing should be safe, sanitary, located conveniently to employment and commercial centers, and coordinated with the provision of necessary public facilities and utilities.				
(iii) Sites for multifamily and manufactured housing should be readily available in locations similar to those generally used for single-family dwellings.	Y	70-75	Meets statute per Act 47.	
(iv) Accessory dwelling units within or attached to single-family residences that provide affordable housing in close proximity to cost-effective care and supervision for relatives, elders, or persons who have a disability should be allowed.	Y	70-75	Meets statute per Act 47 and promotes ADUs.	
12. To plan for, finance, and provide an efficient system of public facilities and services to meet future needs.	Y	27-34, 83-87	Meets statutory requirements. This Plan update further elaborates on community facilities and services available by updating the Health and Wellness chapter.	
(i) Public facilities and services should include fire and police protection, emergency medical services, schools, water supply, and sewage and solid waste disposal.	Y	27-34	Meets statutory requirements. Addressed in Utility and Facility Plan.	
(ii) The rate of growth should not exceed the ability of the community and the area to provide facilities and services.	Y	27-34	Meets statutory requirements.	
13. To ensure the availability of safe and affordable child care and to integrate child care issues into the planning process, including child care financing, infrastructure, business assistance for child care providers, and child care work force development.	Y	38-41	Need to add a section on childcare facilities and services.	
14. Encourage flood resilient communities:	Y	78-82	Meets statutory requirements. Includes reference to Act 121, new River Corridors Legislation in Flood Resiliency chapter.	



## Municipal Plan Approval Checklist

## Lamoille County Planning Commission

(i) ) New development in identified flood hazard, fluvial erosion, and river corridor protection areas should be avoided. If new development is to be built in such areas, it should not exacerbate flooding and fluvial erosion and should meet or exceed the statewide minimum flood hazard area standards established by rule by the Agency of Natural Resources.	Y	78-82	“ “	
(ii) The protection and restoration of floodplains and upland forested areas that attenuate and moderate flooding and fluvial erosion should be encouraged.	Y	78-82	“ “	
(iii) Flood emergency preparedness and response planning should be encouraged.	Y	27-34	Emergency response and preparedness discussed in the Utility and Facility Chapter.	
<b>D. Compatibility with Municipal, Regional Plans</b> [§4350] Plans must be:	Y / N	Pages	<b>Comments (consistency with statutory requirements)</b>	<b>Suggestions (future plan updates)</b>
1. Compatible with other regionally approved municipal plans	Y	76-77	Includes a section on compatibility with the region and surrounding communities. Includes Regional Impact Statement.	
2. Compatible with the Regional Plan	Y	76-77	“ “	

## Comments per LCPC Town Plan Checklist Review (Required Town Plan Elements)

The following are suggested changes to meet statutory Town Plan requirements (Title 24, Chapter 117, Subchapter 5) and address revisions flagged in the 2026 Elmore Town Plan Review. Below you will also find a few simple recommendations to address Act 174 requirements (Enhanced Energy Planning Standards) flagged in the Elmore Town Plan Review. Please see below for suggested changes to the Education, Energy, and Flood Resilience Chapters.

### Suggested Changes:

#### **Education Chapter**

- Add a recommendation that supports childcare services such as “Support local business owners looking to open/provide childcare services in Elmore.”
- Add a Childcare Facilities paragraph to the end of the Education chapter. Suggested language is below.

##### **Childcare Facilities**

Early education is critical to the future success of children in school. There are a limited number of early educational and childcare opportunities available in and around Elmore, especially for those with infants and toddlers. The availability of childcare is a critical concern and challenge for parents and caretakers in the workforce. Building Bright Futures, a program of the Vermont Department of Children and Families operates an online childcare directory ([www.brightfutures.dcf.state.vt.us](http://www.brightfutures.dcf.state.vt.us)) to help residents locate a suitable local childcare facility. The Vermont Department of Children and Families Services also provides financial assistance to qualifying households to help pay for childcare and early education.

Public pre-kindergarten opportunities continue to expand for families with children ages three to five years old. The Vermont legislature passed Act 166 in 2014, which entitles all three-, four-, and five-year-olds not enrolled in public pre-kindergarten to ten hours per week of publicly funded pre-kindergarten education (pre-K) for the thirty-five week school year, if enrolled with a pre-qualified program.

- Add reference to vocational training opportunities in the area. Suggested language is below.
  - Vocational training opportunities are available via attending classes at the three **Green Mountain Technology & Career Center**. Locations are at the Lamoille Union High School in Hyde Park, or on site for Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems in Cambridge, and Forestry and Land Management in Hardwick.

## Energy

- Add the following recommendations to the Energy chapter:
  - “To support exploring funding opportunities for energy efficiency improvements in municipal buildings in Elmore.”
  - “When it comes time for replacing municipal vehicles, encourage the purchase of energy efficient vehicles that meet operational needs for the Elmore Highway and Fire Department.”

## Flood Resilience Chapter

- Add reference to the Tactical Basin Plans in the Flood Resilience chapter by adding the following recommendation:
  - “To explore funding opportunities to implement priority water quality and flood resiliency projects in the Elmore Local Hazard Mitigation Plan and the Lamoille and Winooski River Tactical Basin Plans.”

## LCPC Proposed Recommendations in the Land Use Chapter Based on Public Comments

Based on the public comments received on draft 2026 Elmore Town Plan, the LCPC proposes the following to address concerns regarding language in the Elmore Town Plan around development above 1,200ft in the Forest Reserve District:

Change the current recommendation on page 14 from “Maintaining existing regulations limiting development in higher elevations above 1,200ft in accordance with the Elmore Zoning Bylaws” to the following:

“Maintain existing regulations limiting new development above 1,200ft and prohibit development above 1,500ft in the Forest Reserve District.”

The statement above matches what the Elmore Zoning bylaw actually says. Your Town Plan serves as the policy base for your local zoning bylaws. If the bylaws are amended, in the future you can amend the Town Plan to mirror the bylaw update.

The LCPC also recommends you add the following recommendation in the Land Use Chapter: “Review provisions of the Forest Reserve District to ensure they are implementing the goals of the Town Plan.”

Public Comments on Draft 2026 Elmore Town Plan

Meghan

Please see additional information below from Bob Burley regarding the Worcester range wildlife corridor

Thanks  
Glenn Schwartz

---

**From:** robert burley <[rbrt\\_burley@yahoo.com](mailto:rbrt_burley@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 25, 2026 5:52 PM  
**To:** Glenn Schwartz <[gschwartz@elmorevt.org](mailto:gschwartz@elmorevt.org)>; Warren West <[warrenkwest@gmail.com](mailto:warrenkwest@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Worcester range wildlife corridor

worcester range wildlife corridor  
google.com



Disregard iPhone auto-spell.

In my view, for Chapter 2, the Plan should not be mandating in its requirements and should be illustrative of the citizenry's interests. The latter revisions to the zoning requirements can achieve that, if desired. Further, given that some development already exists above 1200 and future use is already being discussed and applied for, a proscriptive ban should not be written into the Plan. Personally, I am good with conditional use being allowed at any height provided that the use does not alter a neighbor or downstream party of the use of their property. In those cases, conditions should be established that address any such identified issues.

In reading the Plan, I did notice the Energy section only superficially covered actions like solar and wind. While I appreciate the diversity nature of those resources, generation resources influencing our supplies will be made by MWL and other serving utilities, and having no discussion in the Plan about interactions with them, the Plan seems to lacking in this regard. I would, at least, suggest the Plan include any plans for interaction and or involvement with the utilities to ensure adequate reliability and resilience services are integral to the welfare of the Town.

Thank you.

Brian Evans-Mongeon

Hi Dawn, Meghan,

I saw a couple posts regarding changes to the town plan on FPF and saw that today is the last day to submit feedback. I've been working on grants for the Elmore Fire Department and have not had time to review the latest town plan and changes to it, but the one change that was identified was eliminating the 1200' elevation restriction for building construction on Elmore Mountain and the Worcester range. I do not agree with this change for a number of reasons:

1 - It is stated on the Elmore website that *The Elmore Planning Commission works diligently to assure that the character and quality of living in this "Beauty Spot of Vermont" will continue well into the future.* By eliminating the elevation restriction, the 'beauty' of the "Beauty Spot of Vermont" will be diminished and this goes against your goal. According to the FPF post, that one reason was to get more development on Elmore Mountain Road. Although the west side of Elmore Mountain does not have the beauty of a lake, it does have majestic beauty as seen by more people than on the east side as it is viewed from Stagecoach Road, Rt 100, Randolph Road, Elmore Mountain Road, and many interconnecting roads.

2 - So why does there need to be more development on Elmore Mountain Road? Is this a request or pressure from land owners on that road, perhaps ones that purchased their land knowing that there was a building restriction, but now want to build? Or is this a desire to get more property tax for the town?

3 - Any construction higher up the mountain impacts wildlife and further reduces their living area. It also causes more water damage to downhill areas.

4 - As a firefighter on the Elmore FD, any construction at higher elevations is irresponsible as we have to provide water using our own tankers as well as tankers from neighboring towns. Navigating these higher roads and driveways is difficult and dangerous and puts our firefighters and vehicles at risk as well as property owners and their structures. And in winter and spring it can be nearly impossible at times.

I realize you all put a lot of effort in these updates but for some issues such as the building elevation restriction, perhaps these changes should be part of town meeting where more people have a voice.

Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,  
Don Zukswert

**To the Elmore Planning Commission,**

I am writing as a concerned resident of Elmore to formally comment on the current draft of the updated Town Plan. Specifically, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed removal of protective language for forestland located above 1,200 feet of elevation.

Since 2000, Elmore has maintained strict regulations that have kept our ridgelines and hillsides pristine. This protection is a core part of what makes Elmore a unique and special place. Removing this language—particularly in the Forest Reserve District and surrounding the Worcester Ridge—sets a dangerous precedent that could lead to development that forever alters our town's character.

A town plan should reflect the collective vision of its community. Any change of this magnitude, which moves away from decades of conservation, deserves a transparent discussion involving the entire community, rather than being driven by a desire for expanded development on specific roads.

**I respectfully request that the Planning Commission reinstate the following specific language into Chapter 2 of the Town Plan:**

*"Maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibiting it above 1,200 feet."*

Preserving our high-elevation forestland is essential to "Keeping Elmore, Elmore." I look forward to discussing this further at the upcoming public meeting on May 7th.

Sincerely,

Dave and Eva Merriam

80 Worcester Ridge

Elmore, VT

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Members of the Elmore Planning Commission and Selectboard,

My name is Hannah, and my partner and I moved to our home on Elmore Mountain Road approximately a year and a half ago. Like many residents, we were drawn to this community by its unique character, defined largely by its pristine mountain landscapes and uninterrupted ridgelines.

I am writing to express my strong support for the regulations that currently limit development above 1200 feet. These protections have been a vital driver in maintaining Elmore's rural "feel" and ensuring that our hillsides remain undeveloped for the benefit of the entire community.

To ensure the long-term protection of Elmore's natural charm and scenic beauty, I respectfully request that the following specific language be reinstated in Chapter 2 of the Town Plan:

**"Maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibiting it above 1200 feet."**

Preserving these standards is essential for safeguarding the environmental and aesthetic integrity of our town.

Thank you for your time, your hard work, and your dedication to Elmore's future.

Sincerely,

Hannah

To the Elmore Planning Commission,

It is vital that we protect our forestlands, steep slopes, and ridgelines in Elmore. In the Draft 2026-2034 Elmore Town Plan, please revise the language in Chapter 2, under Forestland recommendations, pages 13-14, to read as follows: " Maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibit development above 1500' in elevation." This exact language is in our current Town Plan and should be carried over.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Craig Richardson, Elmore

Elmore Planning Commission,

I have been informed that:

The Elmore Planning Commission (EPC) has been working on an updated town plan for over a year now.

One of the changes being proposed is removing the protective language that keeps no new development in the Forestland above 1200 feet of elevation in Elmore in "The Forrest Reserve District". This Forestland protection language has been on the books since 2000.

As a home owner in Elmore, I disagree with removing the development rights above 1200'.

I am asking that the specific language be put back in chapter 2 of the town plan: "maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibiting it above 1200 feet".

Thanks

Allison Turkowski

Elmore Resident

To Elmore Planning Commission,

I have been informed that:

The Elmore Planning Commission (EPC) has been working on an updated town plan for over a year now.

One of the changes being proposed is removing the protective language that keeps no new development in the Forestland above 1200 feet of elevation in Elmore in "The Forrest Reserve District". This Forestland protection language has been on the books since 2000.

As a home owner in Elmore, I disagree with removing the development rights above 1200'.

I am asking that the specific language be put back in chapter 2 of the town plan: "maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibiting it above 1200 feet".

Thanks

John

John Turkowski

Re: Elevation Language

Hello ,

I am concerned that the elevation language was removed from the town plan to encourage more development. This is an issue the entire community should be involved in. Please put the language back in the town plan and offer an opportunity for dialogue. Thank you . JoAnne Pereira

Sent from my iPad

Good morning,

I am emailing with regards to the change to the proposed Lake Elmore town plan that would allow development above 1,200 foot elevation. I am adamantly opposed to this change. It's important for us to protect our ridgelines and the habitat that they provide. If we require more housing in our town, it makes much more sense to have that development done closer to the village and at lower elevations where it would have less environmental impact.

Sincerely,

Ken Haggett

To whom it may concern,

I would like to see the following language maintained and not removed.  
-protective language that keeps no new development in the Forestland above 1200 feet of elevation in Elmore.

Respectfully,  
Joe Kelly

Tell them that you want to put this specific language back in chapter 2 of the town plan:  
"maintain existing regulations that limit development in higher elevations and prohibiting it above 1200 feet".

I see no reason to change this  
Keep Elmore natural  
Elizabeth Kelly

Sent from my iPhone  
Meghan

Please see the email below from Bob Burley regarding the 1200 ft restriction.

Thanks  
Glenn

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** robert burley <[rbrt\\_burley@yahoo.com](mailto:rbrt_burley@yahoo.com)>  
**Date:** April 17, 2026 at 9:19:58 PM EDT  
**To:** Glenn Schwartz <[gschwartz@elmorevt.org](mailto:gschwartz@elmorevt.org)>  
**Subject:** Worcester wild life corridor

I hear EPC will propose eliminating the 1200' construction restriction in the Forest Reserve District to open it up for residential building. That will run afoul of VT ANR, USFS and animal conservation organizations. The Worcester Range is 1 of only 4 identified critical N-S wildlife migration corridors for all animals and birds. It affects ALL species. That was the reason for the zoning limitation of 1200 feet MSL which aligns with the flora, fauna and deciduous forests essential to feed, forage and shelter migratory and indigenous species. In addition to the corridor, the slopes will create erosion and runoff problems.

Hi Meghan and All,

I have reviewed the Elmore Town Plan 2026-2034 and have these comments:

1. I concur with Glenn's suggestion On Page 14 language in the second bullet should read "Maintain existing regulations in higher elevations above 1200 ft,. In accordance with Elmore Zoning bylaws".
2. On page 30 Under "Emergency Shelters" I think it should be clarified whether the Fire Station and Town Garage are both to serve as emergency shelters for catastrophic events? There has been discussion @ SB meetings regarding lack of access to FD facility in the incidence of an emergency involving flooding?
3. On page 44 Under Short Term Rentals consider changing "There are a few short -term rentals available in the town of Elmore for visitors to stay..." to remove the words "a few" . It's unclear how many actual short-term rentals exist in Elmore, but I believe it is much greater than a few.
4. On page 85 Under Mental Health/Recovery Services Add a bullet including "LRC-Lamoille Restorative Center"

Those are my comments for discussion and consideration. This Elmore Town Plan is such a comprehensive document representing many hours of work! Thanks to all who participated in this project!

Sharon Fortune, Elmore Selectboard Member

Meghan

I have completed my review of the Elmore Town plan 2026-2034 and have the following comments

1. I propose changing the language for the second bullet on page 14 to read " Maintain existing regulations in higher elevations above 1,200 ft in accordance with the Elmore zoning bylaws."
2. Under Chapter 4 on page 28 should the acreage in the first paragraph (1831 acres) equal the total in Figure 3 (1,806 acres)?
3. I sent a text to George and Dawn Kress to check the paragraph under emergence rescue on Page 30. I am not aware of the Lamoille rescue squad doing anything for the Town of Elmore.

That is all. Otherwise looks good. A great job by all!

Glenn

All

As our recent Town Plan update is staged for adoption and specific language surrounding development in the Forest Reserve District has come under scrutiny, I feel compelled to provide comment. I've spent a good deal of time on both sides of Elmore Mountain and the Worcester Ridge, from the State Park to the North down to our border with Worcester in the South. It is very rugged country. In my opinion, no one has any business settling up there for the simple fact of access to services. The infrastructure required for fire and rescue to reliably and efficiently access homes in high elevation, last mile locations would be substantial. Even if the cost of such infrastructure were shouldered by homeowners, how would its maintenance be ensured? Who would be liable for this? Who would be liable for lack of maintenance?

Furthermore, the development of adequate access infrastructure at such elevation and steep grade would have vast storm water implications that would inevitably lead to an increased demand on our road crew.

I understand we're talking about the Town Plan here and not legally binding Zoning Bylaws. However, this plan sets the tone for future bylaw development. I believe it important to enshrine our understanding of our environment and the implications of our uses of it as a guide for future generations and the legacy of past stewardship. Thank you.

- Colin Reynolds

**Elmore Town Plan Adoption Schedule (Current Town Plan Expires on 9/12/26)**

February	2026	Elmore Planning Commission Review of full draft plan
February	2026	Addressed comments per Elmore PC review, provided clean copy for public hearing, warned public hearing for Elmore PC
March	2026	Elmore Planning Commission Public Hearing was warned on March 5, 2026. (This included notification to the adjacent communities and statutory parties)
April	2026	Elmore Planning Commission Public Hearing was held on April 9th, 2026
April	2026	Documented public comments on draft 2026 Elmore Town Plan
May	2026	May 4th, 2026 the Elmore Selectboard meets to review the Town Plan Review checklist/ public comments. Elmore Planning Commission meets on May 7th, 2026 to review Town Plan Review comments from LCPC and public comments documented.
May	2026	LCPC assists Elmore PC with draft Town Plan revisions.
June	2026	Elmore Planning Commission meets on June 4th, 2026 to approve the revised draft Town Plan and forward it onto the Selectboard for adoption.
June	2026	Warn Elmore Selectboard Public Hearing by June 7th, 2026
July	2026	On July 8th, 2026 the Selectboard holds a Public Hearing on the draft 2026 Elmore Town Plan. If no further substantial changes need to be made to the Town Plan the Selectboard can vote to adopt the Plan after the close of the hearing. If substantial changes are still needed the Selectboard will need to hold a second hearing at least 30 days from their 1st public hearing.
July	2026	Post Town Plan adoption, the Elmore Selectboard Chair emails LCPC to request regional approval and confirmation of the municipal planning process and to obtain an updated determination of energy compliance certificate per Act 174 (for the Enhanced Energy Plan).

August	2026	LCPC warns public hearing on Elmore Town Plan Regional Approval by August 21st, 2026.
September	2026	LCPC holds public hearing for regional approval of the adopted Elmore Town Plan on September 22nd, 2026.

**Please note this Town Plan Adoption schedule is subject to change based on the outcome of the above listed public meetings/ public hearings.**



Town Of Elmore  
Meeting Attendance Record

ENTER MEETING DATE:	5/7/20
ENTER MEETING NAME:	Elmore Planning Commission

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY REASON FOR ATTENDING
--

Reason for Attendance

YOUR NAME (printed)	Observer	Interested Party	Principal Party	Expert or Consultant	WHY ARE YOU ATTENDING?
Warren Woff					Concerned Citizen
Mike Furst					
C BURNHAM					ZA
ROGER MURPHY					Zoning/Town Plan
Craig Richardson ✓					Town Plan draft
ROBERT BUZLEY				X	WITNESS & EXPERT
John Turkowski					Concerned Citizen
JAMES LOCKHART		X			concerned citizen
Ronda Beane		X			" "
Mary Woodhouse		X			concerned citizen
Meghan Rodier	X				LPC attending to assist Elmore PC
Trevor Brann	X				ESB
Eva Herriman		✓			concerned citizen
<del>Jim Munroe</del>		X			concerned citizen
George Jones	X				INTERESTED PARTY
June Olyphant		X			concerned cit

