

**Town of Warren
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, July 26, 2021**

Members Present: Camilla Behn, Mike Bridgewater, Jenny Faillace, Randy Graves, Mike Ketchel, Dan Raddock, Jim Sanford (Chair).

Others Present: Ruth Robbins (ZA), Wayne Mackie, Brandy Saxton (PlaceSense), Stan Walker and Carol Chamberlin (Recording Secretary).

Agenda:

1. Public comments
2. PC/PlaceSense discussion of recent public feedback
3. New/Other business

The meeting came to order at 7:34 pm.

Public Comments

Wayne Mackie was present to follow up on his conversation at the last meeting regarding the zoning boundaries on his Burnt Mountain Road property.

Feedback/District Reconsideration Requests Discussion

Conservation Area Boundary

Brandy explained that the line for the Forest Reserve District in the current LUDRs is at the 2000' line, and the decision was made earlier in the LUDR review process to establish the Conservation District line approximate to 2000' yet as much as possible along property lines along the Northfield ridge. Some other locations in Town have a different delineation, such as the streamline along the Lincoln Gap Road. The group looked at the several properties in the Roxbury Road area that have been split due to segments of the boundary line following contour instead of property lines. Brandy reminded the group that at the point these were outlined, there was concern that the 2000' line was not low enough along the ridge to offer the protection desired. It was agreed that the purpose of the Conservation District should be kept in mind during this discussion, and that both protection of sensitive areas and prevention of visual impact of ridgeline homes are included in the District's purpose. Brandy explained that, while not consistent with following a contour line, using the stream as a boundary in the Lincoln Gap area is beneficial, and that the land on the far side of the stream is for the most part undevelopable. She also noted that using the property lines might become problematic when subdivisions occur. It was questioned whether the upper or lower elevation property line should be used for outlining parcels which are bisected by the 2000' property line. The previous Forest Reserve boundary was drawn on an older (pre-Lidar) depiction of 2000'. Along the ridge, the newer 2000' line runs a little east (above) the older line – in general, there is an approximately 600-foot difference. Using the 2000' contour line across the ridge would result in there being less acreage in the Conservation District than is currently in the Forest Reserve in that area of town.

Some members expressed a desire to ensure that the method chosen to depict the District be consistent across the ridge, while others expressed that some anomalies could be included as long as the decision was well-considered. Most members agreed that using property lines was the preferred approach, and that the

three properties in the Roxbury Road area could be completely included in the Rural District by having the line consistently follow property boundaries; but there was some discussion regarding how to place a line at the Kathan property further to the south, which extends from Senor Road to the eastern town line. The possibility of using contour lines, with language that allows for the shifting of boundaries by 50 – 100 feet when the line bisects a parcel, was raised. Brandy explained that with more accurate lidar mapping now available, this type of regulatory provision is being removed when updates are proposed.

It was decided that the Conservation District line should be left as currently proposed except for the three properties which are currently divided. Those entire parcels will be included in the Rural District. The Kathan property will remain as currently proposed, with the line going straight between the parcel lines to the north and south.

Conserved parcels as part of Conservation District

There was a discussion regarding the parcels in Town which have private conservation easements attached to a portion of the property. Most of these properties have some development on the portion that is not conserved. These have been placed in the Conservation District, regardless of elevation, and some questions have been raised regarding diminished future development potential on these lots. Brandy explained that for most of these properties there is no ability to designate exactly where development exists or is allowed per the easement, as these agreements are usually negotiable in terms of future development location(s). For a situation such as the Maclay property, it is easy to define outlines, and the parcels which are part of the PUD there could be removed from the Conservation District. For the other properties in question, the limits of development potential are already locked in, so those parcels could be included in the Rural District with no effect on general conservation goals.

It was requested that Brandy provide a map depicting these properties as Rural for future discussion. She reminded the group that there are also other lower elevation properties in the Conservation District as currently outlined that do not have conservation easements attached, but were included after considering requests from the Conservation Commission.

Brandy will create a map with private conserved lands depicted.

Brandy outlined the differences in development allowances between Conservation and Rural Districts, and asked that the PC members attempt to determine exactly what the concerns are for those who have inquired about their property being in the Conservation District. There may be some people who are satisfied now that they understand that development is not prohibited in this District, but that there are standards to follow when constructing a house, etc.

It was agreed to include the two narrow properties between the cemetery and Brook Road in the Village District.

There was some discussion of an already-subdivided property at the end of Plunkton Road which is currently in the Conservation District, with some concerns voiced that the development restrictions for that District might be unreasonable for those lots. It was noted that the area is the only east-west connection point of the Conservation areas; consideration of including this property in the Rural District was tabled.

Another couple of issues that had been raised in comments regarding the LUDRs were briefly mentioned. Brandy pointed out that the use of the matrix developed by PlaceSense would be beneficial in performing a thorough review of the issues to be considered. She recommended that the next meeting be a work session to address the rest of the 22 zoning issue items/requests.

When looking at maps for these discussions, the information Margo provided about acreage in the Sugarbush area should be available.

Ruth pointed out that there is a procedural issue in the LUDRs regarding applications being reviewed for properties in the Meadowlands/Ag Soils District. This will be discussed at a future meeting.

New/Other Business

Dan reminded the group that the MRVPD is working on cross-town solution, and emphasized this is what they are seeking rather than a town-by-town approach.

Minutes of the July 12 meeting were signed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:33 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Chamberlin, Recording Secretary

Planning Commission

Camilla Behn date

Mike Bridgewater date

Jennifer Faillace date

Randy Graves date

Mike Ketchel date

Dan Raddock date

Jim Sanford date