

**Town of Warren
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, September 26, 2022**

Members Present: Camilla Behn, Mike Bridgewater, Jenny Faillace, 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 7:35 pm.

Public Comment

Nobody was present requesting to provide comments.

Sugarbush Review

Margo, Brandy, and Ruth had worked together on some of the areas of concern raised by Sugarbush, and the PC reviewed the document resulting from that work session. The following points were addressed during the meeting:

- It was agreed to exempt Forest Service lands development from review by the Town, as this has been the practice. Brandy will add appropriate language to Section 1101.
- Brandy had made changes to section 3203.A regarding worker housing density, to not require that all worker housing be on resort property, but that only housing located on resort property is exempt from density requirements. The PC agreed; Margo felt that this is workable as water/wastewater requirements will likely limit density as well.
- For section 3203.A.(4)(a), Margo expressed understanding of the concept of having uses other than employee housing reviewed by the DRB.
- Sections 3203.A(5) and (6) – Brandy had made a change to the language to allow for a portion of a congregate housing structure to be occupied for longer term than the stated limit, and changed the limit of these structures to 180 days from 150.
- Brandy suggested using standard dictionary definitions for terms such as ‘dormitory,’ ‘bunkhouse,’ and ‘congregate housing.’
- It was explained that the requirement of ‘not more than two’ unrelated occupants only comes into play after 180 days of occupancy, and Margo indicated that the limiting to two unrelated occupants would thus not create a problem.
- The change to 3203.A(7), including the addition of ‘small’ personal items, was accepted.
- Margo expressed concerns with the language indicating that a master plan must be submitted, found in section 3215.D. Brandy explained why that requirement exists, and noted that the section references section 3403, which speaks to general vs specific plans. She noted that once a specific plan is approved, it should allow for review of permits that fall within that plan.
- Brandy explained that section 3304 outlines acceptable sources of info for environmental data; it was agreed that this section should be cross referenced in the master plan section.

- Margo indicated that she understood the need to require the master plan, but felt that there is remaining contradictory language regarding requirements, between contiguous property and all property owned. Brandy explained that in some of these cases there is a rationale for the difference; she has changed the language in some places and pointed out there were some still to discuss.
- It was confirmed that section 3215.E(2), requiring that a resort offer recreation and lodging, does not preclude the resort's contracting out to provide lodging, as the language refers to functions/services commonly owned or managed.
- There was a discussion regarding the parameters outlined in section 3215.E(1), with Margo requesting that the percentage allowed for development be increased, or that the Forest Service land be included in the total acreage upon which to base the calculation. It was generally agreed to change the percentages allocated, and Brandy will work on providing clarifications in the language.
- It was agreed to change the term 'snowlifts' to 'aerial and surface lifts' where applicable.
- Questions regarding services businesses referred to in section 3215.E(4) had been clarified by Brandy's proposed edit.
- Margo will follow up with data regarding employment numbers for the placeholders in section 3215.E(5); there was some discussion regarding which year's numbers to use, or to get an approximate number based on several years of non-pandemic-influenced data.
- Margo requested that the language related to public safety agreements be changed from 'must' to 'may.' PC members explained that an agreement does not necessarily mean an expense, and decided to leave the language as it stands.
- Margo requested that the cost of transportation impacts outlined in 3215.F(3) be shared by the Town; PC members agreed that this can be discussed with the DRB/Selectboard on a case-by-case basis, and to leave the language as it stands.
- The edit provided by Brandy to section 3403.D was accepted.
- 'National Forestry Service' had been corrected to 'U.S. Forest Service.'
- The minimum renewal period for an approved master plan was extended to ten years.
- The renewal period will be reset when an amendment is finalized, and the timing will be retroactive to existing approval dates for plans.
- Margo withdrew her request to specify that notification under 4202.F(3) be in writing.
- The PC agreed to allow permit extensions to be granted for up to two years.
- Margo was advised to bring any concerns regarding zoning fees to the Selectboard.
- Margo was satisfied with the details/explanations offered regarding sign limitations (allowing directional signs on the resort campus).
- Brandy noted that she had included cross-reference information in section 4311.C(2), and that abutters do not need to be notified of site plan review.
- The 60-day limit between deeming an application complete and a scheduled DRB hearing was explained as being based upon statutory requirements.
- It was clarified that the DRB may continue to deliberate in open session if desired.
- Section 5003.O, referring to passive recreation, was discussed. Brandy is still working on refining related language, and indicated that definitions will likely be based upon alteration of underlying land. It was agreed that terrain parks would be removed from the 'active outdoor recreation' category.

LUDR Finalization

This will be finalized next meeting and will have a final draft available for review.

New & Other Business

Camilla raised questions regarding the establishment of E911 addresses, wondering if this can be included in zoning regulations. Brandy explained that this matter is not in the realm of zoning regulations, but that some towns do have ordinances in place which set time limits for applying for E911 addresses.

Jim reminded the group about the Housing Summit scheduled for October 12, explaining that the PC will have a table at which materials may be presented.

The meeting adjourned at 10:07 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Chamberlin, Recording Secretary
Planning Commission

Jim Sanford date

Camilla Behn date

Jenny Faillace date

Dan Raddock date

Michael Bridgewater date