

**Comprehensive Survey of Municipal Historic Preservation
and Design Review Bylaws in the State of Vermont**

Zachary Salman, Intern

Vermont Division for Historic Preservation

August 2023

Contents

2	Introduction
2	Methodology
3	Municipalities with Design Review
7	Municipalities with Partial or Incomplete Implementation of Design Review
10	Municipalities with Adaptive Reuse Sections
14	Miscellaneous History-Related Bylaws
16	Sources and Websites Used

Introduction

Among Vermont's over 280 incorporated cities, towns, and villages, a patchwork of zoning bylaws has been adopted over the last half century. One of the many concerns these bylaws have been intended to address is the preservation of valuable historic resources. The most conventional method is by instituting design review, whereby a designated board (an appropriate municipal panel) is empowered to judge a proposed construction project based on prescribed aesthetic justifications. Some towns have adopted more unusual provisions, such as zones allowing more uses in a rehabilitated historic building than a non-historic building, especially defunct agricultural structures, i.e. barns. These solutions have spread around the state to some degree by towns "copying each other's homework" in preparing and revising their bylaws.

However, these more unusual bylaws, along with flawed implementations of design review, pose potential legal tripping hazards for the municipalities and may lead the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation or the National Register of Historic Places to become involved in ways that are not intended and run against normal procedure. The Vermont Division for Historic Preservation has not been kept up to date with these changes, necessitating this comprehensive study to determine their current status and to aid in resolving problematic bylaws.

Methodology

The primary sources for the data herein were the municipalities' respective websites, where links to the server locations of their zoning bylaw documents were accessed. When information about zoning could not be found, Town Plans were consulted to find specific claims about the municipality not having zoning. If this could not be found, the website of the Vermont Attorneys Title Corporation was consulted (<https://www.vermontattorneytitle.com/town-clerk/townname/>), giving a yes/no answer for whether the municipality has zoning, in nearly all cases the answer being no.

In most cases, the municipalities did not need to be contacted. However, Sandgate's zoning bylaw document could not be found on their website; a link to it was sent in a reply from their zoning administrator. Only two towns have some remaining uncertainty about their zoning bylaws or lack thereof:

- Jamaica appears to have zoning only in the form of flood regulations and nothing else, though they have not responded to a request for clarification.
- Lemington has a zoning document from 1990 posted online, and they have not responded to a request to clarify whether they are really using a 33-year-old document or whether a newer version exists.

Otherwise, definitive information about every other incorporated municipality in Vermont was obtained. The results were compiled into an Excel spreadsheet for the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation to keep.

Municipalities with Design Review

More than 40 municipalities in Vermont have some type of design review, whether focused on preserving historic buildings or keeping check on the design of new buildings or both. In a well-implemented design review system, the town's zoning bylaw specifies an overlay district within which the design review will apply, and/or maintains its own list of contributing historic structures to be protected from unsympathetic renovation. While a National Register of Historic Places historic district can serve as a basis for the municipality to implement such an overlay district or contributing structures list on its own level, it is important not to rely on the NRHP directly, as this creates a procedural issue whereby the municipal law is being controlled by a federal program.

The following municipalities in Vermont have fully-implemented design review as of 2023:

- Barre City – applies in one overlay district; a second overlay, the Historic Structure Overlay District, requires design review for contributing structures in an NRHP historic district; reviewed by the Design Advisory Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Bennington Town – applies in six overlay districts; reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- North Bennington Village – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Development Review Board.
- Old Bennington Village – applies to every property in the entire village; reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- Bradford – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Planning Commission, though the bylaw states that this would change to a Development Review Board if one were to be established in the town.
- Brattleboro – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Bristol – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Downtown Design Review Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Burlington – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Advisory Board which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Calais – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Advisory Board which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; includes a specific clause about the demolition of structures included in the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey and the National Register; the bylaw uses the terms “design review” and “design control” interchangeably.
- Charlotte – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Danville – uses term “design control;” applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Development Review Board.

- Dorset – applies in two overlay districts, one of which matches the boundaries of an NRHP historic district; reviewed by the Design Review Board which gives recommendations to the Planning Commission.
- Essex – uses term “design control;” applies in two overlay districts; reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- Essex Junction – applies directly to one zoning district; has special requirements for structures listed or eligible for listing in the State or National Register; reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- Guildhall – applies to all properties in a municipally-designated “Historical District;” reviewed by the Planning Commission; very limited number of design guidelines for review, consisting of only four bulletpoints.
- Hartford – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Committee and approval given by both the Committee and the Planning Commission; demolition of structures contributing to the White River Junction NRHP historic district required to be reviewed.
- Jericho – applies in one overlay district (“character-based zoning district”); reviewed by the Development Review Board.
- Manchester Town – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Advisory Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Manchester Village – uses term “design control;” applies to all development in the entire village; reviewed by the Design Advisory Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Montpelier – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; Montpelier also has a Historic Preservation Commission.
- Morristown – applies directly in five base zoning districts and pertaining to particular uses and street frontages; reviewed by the Development Review Board; the bylaw also contains specific requirements for preserving or reconstructing a particular set of structures contributing to the NRHP historic district, but these properties are named specifically and individually by the bylaw.
- Peru – applies in one overlay district; many of the requirements refer specifically to a set of 12 historic buildings and three cellar holes of former buildings, identified by the Peru Townscape Preservation Board in 1988; reviewed by the Townscape Preservation Board which makes recommendations to the Planning Commission.
- Plymouth – applies in one overlay district; guidelines are limited and very broad; reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- Randolph – applies in one zoning district; reviewed by the Randolph Center Design Review Panel which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Ripton – applies in a locally-designated historic district, which appears to be a base zoning district rather than an overlay; reviewed by the Historic District Commission which approves or denies applications.

- Rockingham – applies in one overlay district with three sub-districts; reviewed by the Development Review Board; demolition of structures listed on the National Register is specifically prohibited unless approved by the Development Review Board.
- Rutland City – uses term “design control;” applies in a design control district that encompasses multiple base zoning districts; reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee which approves or denies applications; review by the Development Review Board is not needed after review has already been conducted by the Architectural Review Committee.
- Saint Albans City – applies in four overlay districts; reviewed by the Design Advisory Board, which approves or denies applications; the Development Review Board is able to override a denial by the Design Advisory Board; includes a section of standards specifically for the treatment of “historic” structures, though it is not quite clear how widely this applies.
- Saint Johnsbury – uses term “design control;” applies in one overlay district; review criteria are limited and very broad; reviewed by the Development Review Board.
- Shelburne – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Shelburne Historic Preservation and Design Review Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; includes particular standards for historic structures, which the bylaw defines by referencing a municipal survey dated 2000, the National Register, and the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey.
- Shoreham – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
- Shrewsbury – applies in four town-designated historic districts; reviewed by the Development Review Board; guidelines focus mostly on preserving existing architecture.
- Springfield – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Downtown Design Review Advisory Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; the overlay district is named with the term “design control” but elsewhere the term “design review” is used.
- Stowe – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Stowe Historic Preservation Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Thetford – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Thetford Hill Historic Preservation Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Waterbury – applies in one overlay district with two sub-districts; reviewed by the Development Review Board; the bylaw has distinct preservation and demolition requirements specifically for structures listed in the National Register.
- Westminster – applies in one overlay district, which is referred to as a locally-designated historic district; reviewed by the Historical Review Board which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; the guidelines are limited and broad in wording; the bylaw includes separate demolition guidelines for properties that are contributing or noncontributing to the National Register historic district.

- Williston – applies in one overlay district and separately applies directly in a base zoning district; reviewed by the Historic and Architectural Advisory Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Wilmington – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Development Review Board; the bylaw also includes a section of non-required design guidelines for outside the overlay district.
- Windsor – applies in one overlay district with two sub-districts; reviewed by the Design Review Commission which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board; the Windsor Historic Preservation Commission also gives recommendations.
- Winooski – applies to every base zoning district except one; reviewed by the Development Review Board; demolition of a structure on the National Register requires approval from the VDHP or consultation with an architecture historian.
- Woodstock Town – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Board which gives recommendations to the Town Development Review Board.
- Woodstock Village – applies in one overlay district; reviewed by the Design Review Board which gives recommendations to the Village Development Review Board.

Additional findings:

- Derby abolished design review on June 28, 2021.
- Dover has provisions for implementing design review in the future.
- Monkton has provisions for implementing design review in the future.
- Salisbury uses the term “design review” to refer to subdivision review.
- Shelburne’s bylaws are being revised by a consultant at the time of this study in 2023.
- Stowe’s historic overlay district section was rewritten in 2022.
- Winooski removed some references to the VDHP in 2017, along with the entire Section 4.4 (D) which was replaced with the former Section 4.4 (E), but some references to the VDHP remain, and some references between the sections were not updated properly when the section was removed and now do not make sense.

Municipalities with Partial or Incomplete Implementation of Design Review

A number of municipalities were found to have requirements for architectural design, including but not limited to the retainment of historic character-defining features, but not a full design review procedure. Generally these requirements are found within the base zoning districts instead of overlay districts and are reviewed by the zoning/development review board without input from an advisory committee. These requirements can be legally problematic as there is not a fully established procedure for the zoning board to fairly and consistently judge the architectural designs presented. Especially with the use of nebulous terms such as “New England architectural character,” there is no basis for defense against an argument that the board’s judgment is arbitrary and capricious. Likewise, a simple requirement for the retainment of historic architectural features or compatibility of new construction may be broadly and inconsistently interpreted without more specific guidelines.

Municipalities with such design requirements or historic structures guidelines:

- Berlin has architectural requirements for new construction applying within all of its base zoning districts.
- Bethel requires subdivision plans to retain or “enhance” historic sites and does not allow their unnecessary destruction; the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.
- Braintree requires subdivision plans to retain or “enhance” historic sites and does not allow their unnecessary destruction; the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.
- Bridport requires commercial buildings to “blend harmoniously” with their surroundings and prohibits franchise architecture in some districts.
- Chester requires “New England Architectural Character” and does not elaborate further.
- Colchester has a historic preservation overlay district for Fort Ethan Allen in which the Development Review Board must evaluate the historic value of structures and the impact of proposed development on those structures.
- Elmore has architectural guidelines for buildings containing conditional uses within the Village District.
- Hinesburg has a relatively comprehensive list of architectural design standards but applies them to their base zoning districts as part of their regular development review process.
- Hyde Park Town has comprehensive architectural design standards that apply directly to their base zoning districts and are reviewed as part of their regular development review process; franchise architecture is prohibited.
- Hyde Park Village has comprehensive architectural design standards that apply directly to their base zoning districts and are reviewed as part of their regular development review

process; franchise architecture is prohibited; this is a separate but very similar bylaw to the one used by the town.

- Johnson has “form-based codes” including architectural requirements.
- Leicester requires new construction to be compatible with nearby historic buildings and for projects on historic structures to retain character-defining features.
- Middlebury reviews development involving structures on the State or National Register and/or contributing in an NRHP historic district, with the principal guideline being to follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; reviewed by Design Advisory Committee which gives recommendations to the Development Review Board.
- Monkton requires the appearance and context of historic structures to be preserved.
- Newport City has architectural design guidelines that mostly use the word "should."
- Norwich prohibits franchise architecture and requires historic buildings to be preserved and new construction to complement nearby historic buildings.
- Plainfield requires the development review board to consider the compatibility of proposed changes to National Register sites or within an NRHP historic district.
- Pomfret has a requirement for retaining historic character-defining features.
- Rupert requires development to take historic resources into consideration, stating that “historic features, such as buildings and stone walls, should be preserved and integrated into project design to the greatest extent feasible;” the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the National Register, or included or eligible for inclusion in the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey.
- Sandgate requires architectural design to complement surrounding land uses, including building shape, material and colors, and moldings.
- Starksboro has architectural requirements for its High Density Residential & Commercial District, including “compatible with Vermont vernacular architecture” among other more specific guidelines.
- Stockbridge has architectural requirements that are reviewed by the Development Review Board and prohibits franchise architecture.
- Swanton requires developments to be designed around historic features including “stone walls and cellar holes” as well as historic structures identified by the Town Plan or by the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation.
- Vergennes requires the retainment of historic character-defining features or the sympathy of added new features.
- Waltham has architectural design requirements for a commercial zone.
- Weybridge requires exterior appearance and visual context of historic buildings to be retained.
- Whitingham requires buildings to be “compatible with New England style architecture” and requires a limited palette of exterior siding materials in their Village District.

Lincoln’s bylaw encourages projects to preserve historic structures and contribute to the character of their surroundings, but does not have any specific requirements except for “the

burden shall be on the applicant to demonstrate why any significant features... are being concealed or eliminated.”

Orwell’s bylaw says new structures “should” be “compatible and harmonious” with contributing structures in the historic district, seemingly a suggestion rather than a requirement.

Municipalities with Adaptive Reuse Sections

A significant quantity of municipalities in Vermont have adopted codes that allow for more uses of a structure if it is historic and is being or has been rehabilitated. Usually there is no locally-maintained listing of which properties this applies to, creating a procedural problem when the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation and/or the National Park Service end up being used to determine where this municipal law applies.

In most cases, this is applied in the form of “Adaptive Reuse of Historic Barns” or “Adaptive Reuse of Agricultural Structures” etc. In a smaller number of cases, adaptive reuse may be applied in other ways, such as being listed as a “conditional use” within the town’s zoning districts.

In some cases, the word “historic” is not used. This condition has also been noted for further reference.

The following municipalities have adaptive reuse codes:

- Barre City includes an Adaptive Reuse Overlay District in which additional conditional uses are allowed; the term “historic” is not used.
- Barre Town allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused agricultural building; the term “historic” is not used.
- Bennington allows additional uses in an adaptively reused structure included or eligible for inclusion in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey.
- Bolton allows additional uses in an adaptively reused structure at least 50 years old and included or eligible for inclusion in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey, or determined by the Development Review Board to have significance to the town; the bylaw recommends the Development Review Board consult the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation.
- Bristol, concerning a home business, states “The adaptive re-use of existing agricultural buildings is encouraged” but does not elaborate further and does not use the term “historic.”
- Burke allows additional uses in an adaptively reused structure 50 or more years old and listed or eligible for listing in the “state register of historic sites and structures.”
- Burlington’s Article 5 includes a whole *Historic Buildings & Sites* section and a *Historic Inns* section that apply to structures listed or eligible for listing in the State or National Registers.
- Calais lists “historic barn reuse” as a conditional use in five zoning districts, referring to Section 4.7 for more information. However, Section 4.7 is about campgrounds and makes no mention of historic barns, and no other section relating to historic barn reuse exists.
- Charlotte has site plan review standards for the adaptive reuse of structures 50 or more years old and included or eligible for inclusion in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey, or have been determined significant to the town by the Development Review Board.

- Chester has guidelines for the adaptive reuse of any existing building, including following the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, regardless of age or whether designated as historic.
- Duxbury waives some district requirements for adaptively reused buildings built before 1970.
- Elmore, in two zoning districts, only allows storage facilities to be located inside historic barns, and does not define “historic.”
- Enosburg Falls Village allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused structure at least 50 years old and listed in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey, or determined to be significant to the town by the Development Review Board, recommending consultation by the DRB with an architect, architecture historian, or the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation.
- Fairfax allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused structure at least 50 years old and listed in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey or determined to be significant to the town by the Development Review Board, recommending consultation by the DRB with the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation or the Fairfax Historical Society.
- Hardwick allows additional conditional uses and waives some requirements for structures at least 50 years old and determined by the Development Review Board to be historic.
- North Hero grants density bonuses to projects incorporating the adaptive reuse of historic structures; the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.
- Hinesburg has provisions for farm worker housing, including the adaptive reuse of farm structures to be used as farm worker housing.
- Huntington allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused structure at least 50 years old and listed in the Vermont Historic Sites & Structures Survey, or determined historic by the Development Review Board.
- Jericho allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused structures built before (not including) 1955 and are demonstrated “to the Town” to have historic significance.
- Leicester’s bylaw states several times that it encourages adaptive reuse, both farm structures and historic structures; the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as at least 100 years old OR listed in the State or National Register.
- Lincoln encourages “adaptive renovations” but there are no specific requirements or benefits listed.
- Manchester has codes applying specifically to the adaptive reuse of non-residential structures into residences, and any such structures that are on the State or National Register or contributing in an NRHP historic district must be preserved according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
- Montpelier City’s Rural District only allows self-storage facilities to be placed inside adaptively-reused historic barns that retain architectural integrity from public view; the

bylaw's "definitions" section defines "historic site or structure" as listed on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or deemed historic by the VDHP or state advisory council.

- East Montpelier allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused barn or carriage house at least 50 years old and listed in the State or National Register, or determined by the Development Review Board to be historic.
- Moretown allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused historic barns, applying "to all barns listed on the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey as being eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places."
- New Haven allows cannabis facilities to be operated in adaptively reused structures at least 25 years old and determined by the Development Review Board to be historic; consultation with the VDHP to determine historic value is recommended.
- Newbury allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused structures "that are at least 10 years old, but that are larger or different in some other aspect from permitted structures in the district."
- Norwich reviews adaptive reuse as a conditional use in some districts but does not elaborate on how it should be reviewed.
- Richmond allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused structures that are at least 50 years old, are at least 4,000 square feet, and have "historic or architectural significance to the town," not elaborating on how such significance should be defined. Richmond also allows exterior façade illumination only on structures with such significance.
- Rupert waives district dimensional standards for adaptively reused structures that are listed on or eligible for the National Register.
- Saint George waives district dimensional standards for adaptively reused agricultural structures if they will still be used by a "farm-based business" according to the bylaw's own definition.
- Swanton reviews the adaptive reuse of barns, buildings, and commercial buildings (defined separately) as conditional uses, applying to barns at least 25 years old or listed or eligible for listing in the "state register of historic sites and structures;" buildings listed or eligible for listing in the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey or the National Register of Historic Places; and any commercial building "whose primary use has not been residential."
- Underhill allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused structures that are at least 50 years old and either included or eligible for inclusion in the Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey or deemed significant to the town by the Development Review Board or Town Plan.
- Waitsfield allows additional conditional uses in any adaptively reused farmstead with frontage on Vermont Route 100 and includes its own guidelines for such adaptive reuse.
- Warren allows additional conditional uses in a structure at least 50 years old and with a minimum floor area of 800 square feet that is included or eligible for inclusion in the

Vermont Historic Sites and Structures Survey or already listed on the National Register; being eligible for listing in the National Register is seemingly missing from the text.

- Westford allows additional conditional uses in adaptively reused barns that are at least 60 years old and certified in writing by the Vermont Division for Historic Preservation or the Westford Historical Society to be listed or eligible for listing on the “State register of historic sites and structures” and historically significant to the town.
- Williston allows additional conditional uses in an adaptively reused barn that is listed on the State or National Register.
- Windsor allows additional conditional uses in any building that was built for a purpose or is a size that no longer meets its district’s regulations.

Miscellaneous History-Related Bylaws

Some municipalities have codes relating to historic structures and historic preservation that do not fit the previous categories or are hard to categorize. Often the definition of “historic” is not clearly defined or the bylaw uses a generic definition in its “Definitions” section.

These bylaws are as follows:

- Barnet includes “Historic buildings and sites” as a conditional use in every district and defines it only as “Structures or places of local historical significance, where buildings or objects of history may be stored, preserved, or displayed.”
- Cabot requires that government bodies be given first option to purchase historic properties and for site plans to incorporate the preservation of historic structures; there is no definition given for “historic.”
- Enosburgh Town requires developments to protect historic resources “of all classes;” a development review checklist includes “historic structures including cellar holes, stone walls, earthworks and graves;” the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.
- Monkton requires the alteration of any structure on a historic register to be reviewed as a conditional use; the bylaw defines a historic structures as “a structure listed or eligible for listing on the National or State Register of Historic Places.”
- Plainfield requires development to preserve historic structures listed on the State or National Register or in an NRHP historic district.
- Plymouth requires development to preserve and integrate “historic features, including stonewalls... where practical.”
- Shaftsbury requires its zoning administrator to inform the historical society about permit applications concerning historic sites named in the Town Plan.
- Stockbridge requires development to reserve “any recognized historic sites or structures;” the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.
- Thetford requires development to use historic structures “to the maximum extent reasonable;” the bylaw also prohibits franchise architecture and prohibits exterior façade illumination except when approved by the Development Review Board for buildings with “symbolic or historic significance.”
- Weathersfield grants variances and waivers to the zoning regulations for historic structures; the bylaw’s “definitions” section defines “historic structure” as listed or eligible for listing on the State or National Register, contributing in an NRHP historic district, or included in a local inventory by a community with an approved historic preservation program.

- Westminster’s bylaw requires subdivisions to be planned “in harmony with the natural, scenic, archeological, and historical assets of the Town... the DRB may impose special restrictions to insure that this provision be met.”
- Whitingham’s flood regulations require obtaining documentation from the Secretary of the Interior or the State Historic Preservation Officer to demonstrate that following a flood code would cause a structure or district to be removed from the State or National Register.
- Windam requires obtaining documentation from the Secretary of the Interior or the State Historic Preservation Officer to demonstrate that following a bylaw requirement would cause a structure or district to be removed from the State or National Register, for the purpose of making the minimum necessary exemption to keep the structure’s historic designation.
- Woodstock Town allows owners of barns to hold up to four fundraising events for the maintenance of the barn per year, at least 30 days apart; the barn must be at least 800 square feet and at its location for at least 50 years, and all revenue must go to the maintenance of the barn; the term “historic” is not used.

Sources and Websites Used

Accompanying Excel spreadsheet cites specific sections and includes URLs for bylaws.

Zoning & Land Use bylaws published by municipalities:

- Addison, adopted November 27, 2007
- Andover, adopted September 12, 2016
- Arlington, amended November 4, 2019
- Bakersfield, adopted March 7, 2017
- Barnard, adopted November 6, 2012
- Barnet, effective August 14, 2018
- Barre, amended October 11, 2022
- Barre City, effective January 7, 2020
- Barton, amended August 21, 2018
- Bennington, amended May 23, 2022
- North Bennington, adopted March 4, 2013
- Old Bennington, amended April 7, 2020
- Benson, amended April 16, 2018
- Berkshire, adopted February 18, 2019
- Berlin, amended June 6, 2022
- Bethel, amended June 12, 2023
- Bolton, effective November 7, 2022
- Bradford, adopted December 12, 2019
- Braintree, adopted March 4, 2010
- Brandon, adopted July 27, 2020
- Brattleboro, amended August 15, 2023
- Bridgewater, adopted September 25, 2018
- Bridport, approved November 13, 2006
- Brighton, date not given
- Bristol, adopted November 3, 2020
- Brookfield, amended April 12, 2010
- Brunswick, adopted March 7, 1989
- Burke, revised April 30, 2015
- Burlington, effective February 15, 2023
- South Burlington, amended June 5, 2023
- Cabot, amended March 5, 2019
- Calais, amended March 7, 2017
- Canaan, revised March 6, 2018
- Castleton, adopted February 22, 2021
- Charlotte, amended November 8, 2022

- Chelsea, adopted November 7, 2017
- Chester, effective October 26, 2022
- Clarendon, adopted February 14, 2011
- Colchester, amended August 1, 2023
- Concord, effective April 26, 2022
- Cornwall, effective February 26, 2008
- Danville, effective June 9, 2022
- Derby, amended June 27, 2022
- Dorset, approved August 28, 2013
- Dover, amended March 5, 2013
- Dummerston, amended April 6, 2022
- Duxbury, amended March 1, 2022
- Elmore, effective February 11, 2020
- Enosburgh, effective January 7, 2019
- Enosburg Falls, effective December 19, 2017
- Essex, amended February 28, 2017
- Essex Junction, effective December 13, 2016
- Fair Haven, date not given
- Fairfax, effective September 5, 2011
- Fairfield, amended February 10, 2020
- Fairlee, amended July 11, 2023
- Fayston, amended May 10, 2023
- Ferrisburgh, adopted March 2, 2021
- Fletcher, adopted March 19, 2018
- Franklin, effective January 7, 2013
- Georgia, effective February 27, 2023
- Goshen, adopted April 11, 2008
- Grafton, amended March 16, 2020
- Granby, amended December 27, 2011
- Grand Isle, amended October 25, 2021
- Greensboro, amended March 1, 2022
- Groton, amended May 3, 2023
- Guildhall, edited September 21, 2012
- Halifax, adopted March 1, 2016
- Hardwick, amended October 6, 2022
- Hartford, date not given
- West Haven, amended November 14, 2006
- North Hero, approved August 26, 2014
- South Hero, effective September 13, 2021
- Highgate, adopted March 5, 2015
- Hinesburg, effective May 10, 2023

- Hubbardton, adopted June 20, 2019
- Huntington, approved March 7, 2023
- Hyde Park Town, effective June 15, 2022
- Hyde Park Village, date not given
- Ira Town Plan, adopted April 21, 2020
- Jamaica Flood Hazard Area Regulations, effective September 7, 2007
- Jay, adopted May 22, 2023
- Jericho, effective February 10, 2022
- Johnson Form Based Code, date not given
- Killington, amended January 23, 2023
- Kirby, adopted November 8, 2022
- Landgrove, adopted June 8, 2017
- Leicester, effective April 10, 2017
- Lemington, amended November 6, 1990
- Lincoln, adopted March 1, 2011
- Londonderry, adopted December 2009
- Lowell, effective May 25, 2009
- Ludlow, adopted September 15, 2008
- Lyndon, effective October 20, 2022
- Maidstone, date not given
- Manchester Town, effective June 1, 2022
- Manchester Village, effective July 28, 2014
- Marlboro, revised March 6, 2018
- Marshfield, amended July 1, 2019
- Mendon, approved March 2, 2010
- Middlebury, effective September 13, 2022
- Middlesex, approved March 7, 2023
- Milton, amended January 3, 2023
- Monkton, adopted March 7, 2023
- Montgomery, amended November 2018
- Montpelier, amended April 13, 2022
- East Montpelier, amended July 12, 2022
- Moretown, amended March 7, 2023
- Morgan, revised December 17, 2012
- Morristown, revised December 5-7, 2022
- Mount Holly, adopted March 3, 1998
- New Haven, amended May 16, 2023
- Newbury, adopted October 11, 2017
- Newfane, adopted February 19, 2015
- Newport, adopted May 3, 2018
- Newport City, effective April 17, 2023

- Northfield, amended December 21, 2017
- Norton, revised July 1, 2014
- Norwich, amended July 1, 2009
- Orwell, adopted March 5, 2019
- Panton, adopted July 11, 2017
- Pawlet, adopted January 3, 2017
- Peacham, adopted February 28, 2017
- Peru, amended May 19, 2010
- Pittsford, effective April 11, 2019
- Plainfield, working draft October 2021
- Plymouth, effective June 10, 2013
- Pomfret, adopted May 6, 2020
- Poultney, approved May 27, 2014
- Pownal, adopted August 12, 2021
- Proctor, adopted March 13, 2017
- Putney, amended May 22, 2021
- Randolph, amended July 8, 2021
- Reading, amended July 8, 2019
- Readsboro, effective July 14, 2021
- Richmond, amended May 23, 2022
- Ripton, adopted October 8, 2018
- Rochester, adopted September 28, 2009
- Rockingham, amended November 5, 2019
- Rupert, effective September 13, 2011
- Rutland Town, no date given
- Rutland City, effective December 8, 2020
- West Rutland, effective January 10, 2023
- Ryegate, adopted January 9, 2017
- St. Albans Town, effective September 29, 2022
- St. Albans City, amended May 29, 2023
- St. George, adopted September 19, 2019
- St. Johnsbury, amended October 13, 2020
- Salisbury, adopted May 12, 2015
- Sandgate, amended February 18, 2013
- Shaftsbury, revised March 7, 2023
- Sharon, revised October 11, 2016
- Shelburne, amended June 14, 2022
- Sheldon, effective March 16, 2015
- Shoreham, amended May 22, 2019
- Shrewsbury, effective December 7, 2022
- Springfield, effective November 14, 2022

- Stamford, effective October 23, 2020
- Stannard, amended May 11, 2009
- Starksboro, effective January 28, 2020
- Stockbridge, effective November 6, 2018
- Stowe, effective June 13, 2022
- Strafford, amended January 10, 2007
- Stratton, effective March 1, 2016
- Sudbury, adopted January 10, 2022
- Sunderland, adopted August 3, 2020
- Sutton, amended April 26, 2018
- Swanton, effective October 13, 2021
- Thetford, effective October 17, 2011
- Tinmouth, amended 2018
- Troy, amended May 31, 2022
- Underhill, amended March 3, 2020
- Unified Towns & Gores of Essex County, revised September 12, 2011
- Vergennes, effective June 14, 2022
- Vershire, amended March 6, 2008
- Waitsfield, amended September 28, 2020
- Wallingford, readopted August 17, 2015
- Waltham, adopted September 9, 2019
- Wardsboro, amended September 2008
- Warren, effective April 15, 2008
- Washington, amended December 4, 2007
- Waterbury, amended May 16, 2016
- Waterford, date not given
- Weathersfield, amended April 5, 2021
- Westfield, adopted January 13, 2010
- Westford, adopted June 10, 2021
- Westminster, adopted July 12, 2017
- Westmore, effective November 10, 2020
- Weston, amended March 3, 2015
- Weybridge, adopted October 3, 2019
- Whiting, adopted December 29, 2005
- Whitingham, effective November 10, 2021
- Williston, amended October 4, 2022
- Wilmington, amended September 20, 2022
- Windham, amended February 26, 2019
- Windsor, amended April 11, 2023
- West Windsor, effective January 1, 2018
- Winhall, approved March 6, 2018

- Winooski, effective August 30, 2022
- Wolcott, amended November 8, 2016
- Woodbury, amended March 24, 2006
- Woodford, approved July 15, 2020
- Woodstock Town, amended October 7, 2020
- Woodstock Village, date not given

Northern Vermont Development Association, <https://www.nvda.net/>.

Rutland Regional Planning Commission, <https://www.rutlandrpc.org/town/townname/>.

Vermont Attorneys Title Corporation, CATIC, <https://www.vermontattorneytitle.com/town-clerk/town-name-with-hyphens/>.