

**022613 Planning Commission Meeting  
Follow Up on 020513 Public Hearing: Articles II, III, and Appendix 1  
Meeting opened at 5:07 PM, adjourned at 7:05 PM  
Next meeting: March 5, 2013 5:00 PM**

Planning Commission Members Present:  
Karen Grinold  
Wendy Manners  
Lynne Matthews  
Vincent Rice  
Susan Haughwout, Selectboard liaison

Others Present:  
John Bennett, Windham Regional Commission  
Ben Joyce, Surveyor, Representing The Hermitage  
Bob Fisher, Attny, Representing the Hermitage

**Following up on The Hermitage Corporations request for:**

- **The addition of a resort district**
- **Mapping keeping The Hermitage Corporation within a single district**
- **The ability to convey small parcels of land within an existing PUD while remaining subject to reduced lot size and density of the PUD, so as not to be treated as a “non-conforming property” requiring DRB review.**
- **Flexibility in making minor adjustments to original PUD plans without going back to the DRB**
- **Fewer Conditional Uses and more Permitted Uses, to facilitate development and not inhibit property sales.**

**ADDITION OF A RESORT DISTRICT:**

Ben Joyce provided sample language for a resort district. The sample language will be posted at Town Meeting for public comment and review. (See attachment I)

**MAPPING SUPPORTING THE HERMITAGE CORPORATION WITHIN A SINGLE DISTRICT:**

The Haystack resort was previously in a single district and would like to continue to do so. Ben Joyce provided a sample map indicating how The Hermitage Corporation would like to see the district mapping. This would include the top of Haystack Mountain on Glebe Land that is currently leased to Haystack ski area (but not including the water conservation district), as well as land between Haystack and Coldbrook Road/ Fanny Hill Road. Samples of this will be posted at Town Meeting for public comment (See attachment II).

**CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE EXISTING PUD:**

The Hermitage Corporation currently operates under a DRB approved PUD allowing for increased density of “clustered” development, consistent with the Town Plan. Ben Joyce requested the ability to convey small parcels of land within the PUD, while retaining the increased density and “clustered” development of the PUD on the conveyed small parcel. Under the proposed bylaws any small pieces of conveyed property within a PUD would no longer be covered by the PUD and would become subject to the proposed by-laws as a “non-conforming” property as it would have less than 5 acres and 300 feet of frontage, thus requiring DRB approval for development. Ben Joyce noted that most other commercial properties on Rt 9 or Rt 100 (all but 5 or 6) do not meet those requirements and would become “non-conforming” properties if sold. The Hermitage Corporation feels that going back to the DRB for all approvals as a “non-conforming” property slows development and inhibits sales. They would like ½ acre minimum lot and greater density of development. Ben Joyce submitted a comparison chart of zoning district requirements (see attachment III)

**FLEXIBILITY IN MAKING MINOR ADJUSTMENTS:**

Ben Joyce requested that minor adjustments to the original PUD plan, such as changes in driveway location,

or moving a property line 100-200 feet in either direction, not require returning to the DRB for approval. He felt this too slows development and inhibits sales.

**SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES:**

The Planning Commission had previously agreed to look at the definition of what constitutes “substantial changes” that would trigger DRB review. John Bennett provided copies of his research results on the definition of “substantial changes”. (See attachment IV). (No discussed due to time constraints of the meeting.)

**PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION TOPICS:**

- a. The need to balance ease of doing business and provide development protections consistent with the Town Plan, including the commitment to keep retail development focused on the current downtown area.
- b. The risks and benefits of allowing significant retail development at The Hermitage Corporation and it’s probable impact on the downtown Wilmington area. The overarching goal is of the Planning Commission to not allow The Hermitage to develop retail to the detriment to the downtown. The goal is to support mutually successful development, promoting the success of The Hermitage while simultaneously promoting the success of the downtown area.
- c. The possibility of adopting the Resort District, allowing for retail development at the ski area while placing limits on those types of retail the town seeks to keep in their downtown area. Examples given were grocery stores, pharmacy, and other services the town would like to provide to keep Hermitage customers returning to the downtown area.
- d. The possibility of allowing Uses that are now Conditional, requiring DRB review, to become Permitted so long as they complied with the Performance Standards which are otherwise imposed by the DRB. Only those Permitted Uses not complying with Performance Standards would then have to go before the DRB. This would place fewer cases before the DRB and allow greater speed to approval for town residents. [See Article III section 340]

The Planning Commission feels they need broader input on the above topics and will be inviting members of the DRB and Chamber of Commerce to the next Planning Commission meeting. They will also be providing samples at the Town Meeting Tuesday March 5<sup>th</sup> to solicit public comment.

The Planning Commission would also like to be informed by other models of resort development that have been successful for the surrounding towns, as well as those that have had detrimental impact on the surrounding towns.

Respectfully Submitted  
Wendy Manners, Clerk

ACCEPTED

---

Lynne Matthews, Vice Chair