

**Town of Warren
Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, January 8, 2024**

Members Present: Michael Bridgewater, Jenny Faillace, Dan Raddock, Jim Sanford, Adam Zawistowski
Staff Present: Ruth Robbins, Zoning Administrator, Carol Chamberlin (Recording Secretary)
Others Present: None

Agenda:

1. Public Comment
2. PC Priorities Subcommittees
3. LUDRs Discussion
4. New and Other Business

The meeting was called to order by Dan Raddock at 7:04 pm.

Public Comment

Nobody offered comments at this time.

Agenda Changes

No changes were made to the agenda.

PC Priorities discussion

Members briefly planned their updates for the Selectboard related to the priority categories being addressed.

LUDRs discussion

Dan spoke about the intent of the LUDR rewrite as partially to codify safety measures and also as an attempt to allow the ZA to handle more applications without needing to schedule DRB review. One topic he noted as up for discussion is a requirement for distance between buildings in the village areas, explaining that this might have been included as a fire safety matter. Camilla agreed, but also pointed out that some of the language is complicated/cumbersome, and should be made more straightforward where possible. Jim noted that DRB members have requested more specificity so that historical knowledge/intuition can factor less in their review. He also pointed out that having distance between buildings has not historically been a design feature, with barns often attached to homes; and that shared walls between dwelling units can lead to impactful cost savings. Ruth reminded the group that PlaceSense had pointed out that 85% of what is included in the draft LUDRs was already in the current regulations, although at times in a different format, and with some new specificity added. She also indicated that she had conversations regarding fire safety with Jeff Campbell and others and that there are no fire safety guidelines regarding distances between buildings; noting that the distance requirement is more of an aesthetic guideline and actually leans toward implementing design standards.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding ADUs, including how to determine what is meant by 'subordinate' and whether that restricts the size of the building in which an ADU is housed, and how many ADUs might be allowed for each primary residence. This led to some discussion of the possibility of allowing for two primary residences on one parcel.

Further review of the Selectboard's comments took place:

- Trash/dumpsters
 - Scale of impact important consideration
 - Potentially use 'commercial' or 'dumpster' as threshold for bearproofing
 - Dumpster might need definition – construction waste different from household waste (food)
 - Potentially not try to regulate trash storage at all
- Cell towers
 - Will be discussed further as necessary with consultant
- Density bonus for Conservation PUD
 - Bonus to allow for conservation of larger portion of acreage
- 4305.C (2)(b) – 500 square feet should be 5,000 confirmed
- Map change for Potato Road Association
 - Potential to move bigger lots into Residential, this was based on lot size when Brandy drew lines
 - Meant to preserve existing development pattern, but nobody at this meeting felt that this is necessary with these parcels
- Commercial at base of Access Road
 - Brook, slopes, wetland – not much developable land
 - Jim thinks if too built up, will become sprawl
- Congregate housing
 - Selectboard notes indicate potentially removing 3203 #7 and #8, as this may discourage development of worker housing
 - PC members point out that this type of regulation necessary for health, safety, livability
- Sugarbush should not be called out specifically in the regulations (3215.E)
 - Potential for some requirements (employee housing) to be based on number of employees rather than type of business (resort)
- Resort Mixed Use and Resort Residential, specifically in Golf Course Road area
 - Again, some district boundaries set up to preserve current use/parcel size
 - Some discussion around potential for making lot sizes smaller/larger as appropriate for what is preferred for future use

MRVPD STR Memo

Dan explained that the quote for software provided by MRVPD was originally for \$14K, but there has been further discussion of administration of the information, and the vendor has provided a quote of \$27K to include tracking of data, follow through to STR owners, and other administrative tasks. He noted that the registration fees generated will cover the cost of the full package.

New and Other Business

Minutes were approved and signed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 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

Adam Zawistowski date