

**Town of Warren
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, September 12, 2022**

Members Present: Camilla Behn, Mike Bridgewater, Dan Raddock, Jim Sanford, Chair.

Others Present: Ruth Robbins, Zoning Administrator, Lisa Miserendino, Brandy Saxton (PlaceSense), Margo Wade (Sugarbush), Carol Chamberlin (Recording Secretary, online).

Agenda:

1. Public Comment
2. Final review with Sugarbush concerns
3. LUDR Finalization
4. New & Other Business

The meeting was called to order at 7:36 pm.

Public Comment

Nobody was present requesting to provide comments.

Sugarbush Review

The following points were brought forth by Margo:

- Not all the maps are accessible on the website yet, Margo asked that the missing ones be posted
- Currently the Town does not exercise jurisdiction on Forest Service lands, but Margo's interpretation of the draft LUDRs is that this will change
 - Brandy explained that the Town can regulate private use of public lands, but not use for governmental purposes, and indicated that if the PC does not want to include regulation of Forest Service lands, it should be explicitly stated
 - Information was not available regarding how other ski areas in this situation are regulated by the Town in which they are located
 - Brandy indicated that it might be beneficial to have plans for public lands included in a Master Plan, but possibly not regulate these activities if the Town has been satisfied with Federal and State coverage
 - There was mention of the redundancy involved if projects are regulated by three entities, and the balance that might be needed to ensure that all activities are known to the Town so that the extent of their impact can be understood
 - Brandy will provide language related to this matter for PC review
- It was confirmed that no date is yet set for passing the draft LUDRs to the Selectboard, although the PC members indicated their desire to do so as soon as possible
- Margo expressed concern regarding Section 3203.3.B regarding workforce housing density on non-contiguous parcels owned by the Resort.
 - Brandy explained that the 'contiguous' requirement is only in effect if there is a request to be exempt from the density requirement for the associated District.
 - Margo understood, but indicated that she would like to review this further in conjunction with the Resort's intended plans for housing on non-contiguous properties which they own.

- Margo raised questions regarding Section 3203.4.A, referring to use limitations, particularly whether Sugarbush employee housing could be rented to another employer, or made available as general lodging, during the portion of the year that the housing was not needed by the Resort.
 - Brandy explained that, under the current draft language, the development would need to be approved as a rooming and boarding house in order to do so
 - Margo indicated that the Resort would be able to work with this section, as other uses could be allowed if the development was appropriately permitted
- The potential conflict between Sections 3203.5 and 3203.6 have been resolved, with both being limited to 180 days. Margo asked how the limitation would apply to an RA, whose job required that they reside in the employee housing.
 - It was agreed that this could be addressed in a number of ways, likely through a proposal presented to the DRB during development review
- The limitation of two unrelated adults per bedroom was discussed; Margo indicated that some employees are willing to bunk with more than one other person in order to reduce their living expenses. This applies to both employee housing and rooming and boarding units.
 - Brandy pointed out that this is only in effect once occupancy is greater than 180 days.
 - It was agreed that Brandy will provide language related to square footage per person for review by the PC.
- The language related to personal item storage in dormitories had been adjusted to designate ‘personal items;’ Margo requested that this be modified to be ‘small personal items’ in order to avoid needing storage for bulky items such as skis/snowboards or bicycles. This change was agreed upon.
- Margo sought clarification regarding language related to Master Plan requirements.
 - Her understanding of the draft language is that completed projects may still need a permit. Ruth pointed out that while some projects have been approved by the DRB, specific permits related to those projects have not yet been issued. Brandy also pointed out that some prior PUD approvals were ‘partial’ and the decisions specifically reference portions of the regulations which have changed as well as speaking to not having full plans in place. She indicated that unresolved issues in a specific 2011 decision mean that a zoning permit cannot be issued for the related development.
 - Brandy explained that a new principal building would trigger the Master Plan requirement under the proposed regulations, and she also explained the choice available between a general or specific Master Plan review.
 - Brandy clarified that the Master Plan covers all resort operations, not just those at the Lincoln Peak Base Area, but that a more specific Master Plan review could be opted for when reviewing proposed development at the Base Area.
 - It was confirmed that the Forest Service Plan currently under development/review includes all Sugarbush holdings, and so could be used as the basis for a Plan submitted to Warren.
- The allowed uses outlined in section 3215.E have been clarified by Brandy, and Margo does not foresee any problems in meeting those definitions.
- Margo next asked about Section 3215.E.1, where the land development percentage calculation explicitly excludes Forest Service lands. Brandy provided some clarifications, and PC members indicated that the percentage might be adjusted if it is not in line with what currently exists. Margo will do more detailed calculations to determine where Sugarbush stands in this regard.
- Margo requested that the term ‘snow lift’ be changed to ‘surface lifts and chair lifts’ where applicable.

- Margo asked for clarification regarding the language around ‘service businesses.’ Brandy explained the intent behind limiting these businesses to ensure that a shopping center isn’t developed as part of the resort, and will provide recommended language changes to clarify and distinguish between services customarily provided by the resort and other, add-on, business types.

Jim asked that Margo work with Ruth and Brandy to expedite further review of the points she would like to make regarding Sugarbush’s response to the draft LUDRs, as the PC plans to finalize the document at the next PC meeting.

LUDR Finalization

This is scheduled to take place at the next PC meeting.

New & Other Business

No other business was addressed at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:39 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Chamberlin, Recording Secretary
Planning Commission

Jim Sanford date

Camilla Behn date

Jenny Faillace date

Dan Raddock date

Michael Bridgewater date