

**Town of Warren
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, February 9, 2023**

Members Present: Camilla Behn, Jenny Faillace, Macon Phillips, Dan Raddock, Jim Sanford, Chair.

Staff Present: Ruth Robbins, Zoning Administrator, Carol Chamberlin (Recording Secretary, online)

Others Present: Paul Brogna, Brooke Dingleline, John Egan

Agenda:

1. Public Comment
2. PC “prep” for Select Board Public Hearing on proposed LUDRs

The meeting was called to order at 6:48 pm.

Public Comment

Paul Brogna confirmed that his letter had been received, and added that of the 114 acres in question, about 100 has been set aside through the land trust. PC members indicated that the conservation easement for the larger portion of the property is likely what led to its inclusion in the Resource Protection District. It was suggested that a site plan for the previously designed development be provided, and that Paul present this information at the Selectboard hearing on February 14 in order to make his request to that Board, which is now reviewing the proposed LUDRs.

Brooke Dingleline, representing John Egan, spoke of a presentation she will be hosting around the proposed regulations regarding telecommunication tower siting which she has drafted. These have been presented to both the PC and the Selectboard.

LUDRs – Review Selectboard Comments

PC members reviewed comments which had been provided by Selectboard members, and the following was noted:

- The intent behind requiring a permit for the bringing of five or more truckloads of material is to ensure that the Town is aware of potential impactful changes to the grade of a property
- A truckload is a standard dump truck, approximately 15 yards
- Going forward, all development proposed at three units or more will require a site plan. The requirement for a permit related to landscaping is applicable to proposed development, not existing
- Abandoned development language is also directed at development going forward from the adoption of the LUDRs
- The intent behind narrower road widths is the limitation of impervious surface and subsequent prevention of stormwater runoff. Input was received during development of the LUDRs regarding the importance of reducing impervious surfaces where possible
- Negative grade requirements for driveways access from Town roads is applicable, but the language may need to be restructured to eliminate confusion
- In order to ensure that construction of new dwellings is based upon a safe and reliable foundation, the DRB is required to review homes with pier foundations, although these types of foundations are not prohibited
- Work within property setbacks that may affect a neighboring property is not allowed, hence grade work within these areas is not permitted
- PC members expressed that – with the possible exception of knotweed contamination – road ditch fill may be considered uncontaminated natural soil. Ruth expressed that she should be informed when road fill is being provided to a property

- Swimming pool ladders must be 'capable of' being removed
- Different levels of workforce housing are treated differently. Without an on-site person responsible for the building, the occupancy limit is 36, lower than other types of congregate housing included in the regulations
- The threshold for Sugarbush employee housing provision is based upon growth from current staffing numbers; the Resort's work force will need to grow significantly before this requirement kicks in
- The LUDRs may be amended at any time, and if EV charging stations need regulations at some point, they may be added
- The requirement for vehicle maintenance and repairs to take place inside is for contractor's yards, and is intended to ensure proper handling of hazardous materials
- The three types of PUDs are for different zoning districts, where densities and uses vary. The purpose of each is described in the LUDR language
- Section 4205.A is meant to be a 'may,' as the ZA does not need to inspect every development project as it is underway
- PC members expressed that many of the changes in the proposed LUDRs are directly based upon goals set in the Town Plan, including those related to providing a strong and diverse economy, while keeping pertinent balancing of impacts in mind
- LUDRs are not a prescriptive document, but rather serve to enable certain types of development
- The points made in the letter from Bob Ackland will require further PC review at upcoming meetings

There was further discussion of telecommunication, including a potential broadening of the conversation to include public discussion of the siting of towers, including more specificity regarding the identification of important viewsheds and the balance between service coverage and natural resource protection.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Chamberlin, Recording Secretary

Planning Commission

Jim Sanford date

Camilla Behn date

Jenny Faillace date

Dan Raddock date

Michael Bridgewater date

Macon Phillips date