



APPROVED MEETING MINUTES - June 18, 2026
TOWN OF GREENSBORO PLANNING COMMISSION
Greensboro Free Library and via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kent Hansen, Christine Armstrong, Alexis Mattos, Janet Patterson, Sheila Dillon, Bob Youngman

OTHERS PRESENT: JoAnn Hanowski (4 PM), Jens Hilke, VTF&W, (4 PM - 4:40), Tim Brennan, Mike Metcalf (3 PM - 3:30 PM)

1. CALL TO ORDER: (2:06 PM)

2. DISCUSSION about the logistics of moving the Town Plan forward: Kent noted he reached out to a business to obtain a quote for putting the Plan document together which was well out of the GPC's budget. Discussion with Alexis about her submission of a proposal to put the Plan together. Alexis noted a proposal she just submitted. Christine made a motion to hire Alexis to collate the preliminary Town Plan. Seconded by Bob. Approved by all. Alexis recused herself. Alexis will recuse herself from the Commission or resign should there be a conflict of interest.

3. GLOVER HOUSING PROPOSAL: Discussion about utilizing a portion of town land in Glover for housing; land donation vs a low dollar transaction vs market value to transfer a portion to an affordable housing opportunity. Kent noted he was interested in procuring an SB endorsement to proceed with exploration of details of this proposal. Appraisal and survey would be first steps. What is the value and the time line for future gravel extraction? Discussed a community process and initial Glover input. Kent noted there will be a need for an application for a MPG with a required town match. Discussed the need for solid, timely information for the community.

Mike arrived and brought a copy of the history of SB communication with Glover* about this parcel. The SB Clerk collated minutes from the historic SB meetings for a summary. [*Added to the meeting folder.] Mike noted the value of the gravel was significant and increased the raw land value of the land. He noted that test borings may be helpful to accurately assess this property/idea. Mike noted his support for housing. However, he was skeptical about giving up land, a town asset, which could provide valuable gravel to our taxpayers. Tim noted it would be ill advised to steal from the future. Tim wondered why housing in Glover? He noted the idea of giving away a taxpayers' asset may not be well received and is a separate question. Tim notes the GPC will have an uphill sell for this concept given the preliminary SB opinion and noted public commentary. Kent notes the GPC would not likely pursue it if the SB is not on board. Kent maintains there is a lot of stone that is not being quickly mined. ANR website indicates it's all gravel soils. How much would soil analysis cost? That would be important information to give the SB. Kent notes the Town has significant reserves from FEMA funds.



The first step is understanding what is there. Then the more costly steps of survey and appraisal. An independent evaluation of the site is essential.

Discussion. While there was no real interest in this idea expressed by the SB reps—the gravel pit should be thoroughly evaluated to know what we have as an asset and to see if any part of it would be poor for gravel but may be ok for housing. The GPC will write a limited proposal to understand the site better.

Discussion about the new town administrator position.

4. CONSERVATION OVERLAY: Jens Hilke discussed habitat corridor protection—balancing growth and development with natural resource protection. He notes he has no regulatory authority—he is a scientist who provides technical assistance. He recommends that the town add protection for habitat corridors even with Act 181, Section 8c given the vital role Greensboro holds.

New England is a pinchpoint for all continental migration. Greensboro has a unique and critically important role in the network of forested connections—the Wooster to NorthEast Highlands linkage. There are 3-4 pinchpoints in Greensboro that funnel all wildlife in the Wooster - NE Highland linkage. If one develops near the pinchpoints it threatens the entire migration of wildlife in the Wooster-NE Highlands linkage. He presented a map with these pinchpoints identified in red and secondarily important areas in orange, strongly recommending against any development in the identified 'red' areas. 70% of Gboro is covered by forests now but was 100% forested at one time. ~30% is conserved. Current Use is a high %.

Wildlife road crossings are central to this pattern. Sprawl development along rural roads is pinching the network corridor—Forest blocks are being absorbed/undermined by rural development. There is a profound reorientation of where the forests are and how they are being connected. Exurban sprawl is the most significant threat to wildlife migration. Fragmentation negatively impacts ecological connection. The goal is a connected pattern of large forest blocks, small stepping stone plots and micro connectors of wildlife road crossings and stream networks.

Jens proposed a map which excludes the Resource Zones (these areas are already well protected) and looked at Rural Lands while strongly recommending development only in the Village Centers.

Discussion: Is the minimum lot size of 10 acres too small? He notes that minimum lot size does not guarantee less development but that setting a density quota—residences per acre – is another tool with which to protect the habitat corridor. (See Waitsfield's zoning). Consider max setbacks instead of/in addition to minimum setbacks to prevent long driveways.

Jens notes it is possible to consider the Caspian watershed in the new Conservation Overlay District.

Discussion that current use and conserved land landowners may not object to zoning changes.

Maps will be helpful for public understanding.

5. ADJOURNED: by consensus at 5:00 PM.

The next regular GPC Meeting is scheduled for July 7, 2026.

C. Armstrong, Clerk