



## TOWN OF WARREN

### PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

50 Cemetery Road, Warren, Connecticut 06754  
phone: 860.868.7881 email: [landuse@warrenct.org](mailto:landuse@warrenct.org)

Regular Meeting Agenda  
Tuesday, April 13, 2021 at 7:30 p.m.

*Via Zoom Videoconference (see below for recording)*

**Call to Order and Designation of Alternates.** Jack Baker, Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30pm. Present were Dr. Victoria Sahadevan Fossland (Vice Baker), John Papp, alternate Debora Ouellette (seated for Phil Good), alternate Mike Zimet (Seated for Andy Carollo) and alternate Ruth Schnell (seated for Derek Westfall).

**Approval of Minutes.** Mr. Papp made a MOTION to approve the minutes of March 9, 2021, Ms. Schnell SECONDED the motion; all were in favor. The MOTION CARRIED. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland made a MOTION to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2021 special meeting, Mr. Baker SECONDED the motion; all were in favor. The MOTION CARRIED.

**Items to be Added to Agenda.** None.

### Old Business

**ZPA #21-14** / Elliott Davis of 5 Mine Hill Road, Roxbury, Connecticut / **152 Curtiss Road**, Map 7, Lot 15-1 / Construction of 3-bedroom single family dwelling, pool, and extension of existing non-permitted driveway. (Date of receipt by Land Use Officer 3/4/2021, Date of Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer's 'Agent Determination', based on map revisions exhibiting non-jurisdiction of Inland Wetlands Commission 3/24/2021.)

Mr. Baker stated that after review at the last meeting there were questions from the commission, as well as the public and there were updates on a wetlands permit and Torrington Area Health permit. Ms. Hodza stated that as the inland wetlands duly authorized agent she made a determination subsequent to last meeting after a modification was handed to her after last meeting by the applicant that the updated upland review area, based on new data that the wetlands area was now reduced (the upland review area). Ultimately, the wetlands had no jurisdiction so therefore the permit has been satisfied as they have no jurisdiction. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if there was an update on the driveway. Mr. Szymanski stated that with respect to wetlands, the way the upland review area is calculated is that it is 100ft however it can go up to 200ft based on a slope (if it's a steeper slope it expands up to 200ft). Initially they had made the assumption it was 200ft without close examination of topography. Then they examined the slopes in detail which determined that all the development and grading activity is outside of the review area. With respect to the driveway, Mr. Szymanski stated he had misspoken on the radius in the previous meeting. The radius is now a 60ft minimum and the house and pool have rotated slightly, however the driveway grading itself is less than 10% in its entirety and therefore can remain gravel. There is a pull-off approximately half way up the driveway and Mr. Davis has had conversations with the selectman. Mr. Davis stated he spoke with Mr. Angevine and will be meeting with him tomorrow to get the driveway permit. Mr. Davis stated that the other modification that was made out of an abundance of caution the house has been shifted further away from the set back line. Mr. Davis stated that the sanitarians approval had been received. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if the maps online of the driveway going along the property line are what would

be approved. Ms. Hodza stated that one permit that is required for a driveway is a zoning permit, then there is a driveway ordinance which does not speak to zoning requirements rather speaks to the safety requirements. The permit Mr. Davis is receiving tomorrow is an application for a driveway permit, when the bond is placed a conditional approval is given, however the applicant must build the driveway according to the zoning approval. When the driveway is constructed, the applicant is to tell the first selectman who is the authorized issuer of the permit per say, to go and inspect it. The selectman is accompanied by the highway director. Their interest is in the apron; that the drainage is controlled and that the first 20ft is paved from the roadway. Ms. Hodza stated the first selectman cannot issue the application for the permit until the zoning approves the application for the driveway, the application itself asks for the zoning permit number. Ms. Schnell asked if the driveway met the grade regulations for emergency vehicles. Ms. Hodza stated that it did. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland stated that she had brought it up as it was a non-conforming driveway, there is a section of the driveway that cuts through the side yard setback and runs along the pin, and she wondered if there was a new map which corrected that. A discussion was held on how to locate the most updated maps. Ms. Hodza stated that Dr. Sahadevan Fossland is referring to the point where the driveway comes closest to the property line, and asked how far away it was. Mr. Szymanski stated it was 12ft and the limit of disturbance was 5-6ft. Mr. Zimet asked the width of the driveway, Mr. Szymanski stated 10ft. Ms. Hodza asked if the driveway would be left alone except to put in the anti-tracking pad, Mr. Szymanski stated that was correct. Chairman Baker asked if driveways were allowed in the setback, Ms. Hodza stated within 5ft that was correct. Chairman Baker asked that it be assured that to the driveway it was 5ft by the engineer. Mr. Szymanski confirmed that it exceeds 10ft at a minimum from the edge of the driveway to any point of the property line except where it intersects with Curtis road. Ms. Hodza asked if this was an A2 survey, it was confirmed that Roy submitted a survey and Mr. Szymanski utilized said survey. Mr. Zimet stated was viewing a map looking at the gradient lines as well as the new ones proposed. Mr. Zimet stated it appeared there to be 1200 cubic yards of fill to raise the driveway to level, as there would be slope created on the downside of the driveway that would be 1.2 to 1 estimated, when the minimum is 3 to 1. Mr. Szymanski state that along the edge of the driveway its 3 to 1 and at certain points its 2 to 1, that section of the regulations that retaining walls and erosion control blankets need to be utilized which are used on 2 to 1 slopes with great success. Mr. Zimet asked if that was for vegetation or for stabilization for the actual hill you are creating; Mr. Zimet stated he read that particular regulation as you require a retaining wall to hold gravel back over time so it will not seek its level, as in the actual slope of the driveway coming off the edge. Mr. Szymanski stated that 9.2.1 speaks to the respect of the slope of the actual driveway itself, which is why it states if it exceeds 10% it must be paved and cannot exceed 15%. Mr. Zimet read the regulation for the record, noting that "Unless retaining wall or other stabilization methods are provided." Mr. Zimet stated he believed this meant it was not in reference to erosion, but in reference to retaining the actual slope being built. Mr. Szymanski asked, then why is there section 9.2.1 restricting the actual slope of the driveway itself and requires paving if exceeding 10%. Mr. Zimet stated that was in reference to the top of the driveway, not the side of the driveway. Mr. Szymanski stated that would be vegetated. Mr. Zimet stated he did not read the regulation in that way, not in regard to vegetation but in stabilization of the actual driveway. Mr. Davis stated that the driveway has been widened to have a 60 degree radius, from where the existing driveway to where it is now is either level or a foot, to a foot and half. Mr. Davis stated so there is no outward pressure of thousands of yards of fill. Mr. Zimet state that he looked at the slope and hill that exists which is about 20% based on the geological lines on the screen, and a 12ft rise from the existing is what is proposed. Mr. Davis made a statement regarding the proposed slope of the driveway. Mr. Zimet explained how he mathematically determined the 20 degree change in grade and the cubic feet of fill he had suggested would be necessary. Mr. Davis stated that they would not be filling the down-slope, they would be grading a driveway for a wider radius. Mr. Zimet asked how they would be getting from the lower grade to the higher grade without Mr. Davis stated they would not be changing the grade, save the one corner of the wider radius and therefore would not be changing the grade except in the uphill curve of the driveway. Mr. Szymanski stated that Mr. Zimet is correct that there is fill required for 10ft of fill for 50ft long and quickly tapers down. There is required a large amount of fill for a small amount of space. Ms. Hodza stated that there exist Mr. Zimet

asked how much fill is to be brought in. Mr. Szymanski stated that in cutting for the house itself and cutting for the tree will be utilized for the driveway. Mr. Zimet asked, based on this being a gravel driveway, what will the base of the hill and covering be and, from an erosion standpoint, what will exist? Mr. Szymanski stated that the slope is to be vegetated and any slope greater than 3 to 1 is to be controlled with erosion control blanket, which is a weaved straw blanket that last a year to 18 months as the vegetation establishes itself. Ms. Hodza asked if cutting was the same as excavation. Mr. Szymanski verified. Ms. Hodza asked if 1.4 acres was the total of disturbance, Mr. Szymanski verified. Ms. Hodza asked how much fill would be brought in, for both the septic and the driveway. Mr. Szymanski stated that not much is required for the driveway. Mr. Davis stated that the sanitation report stated not much fill was required. Mr. Szymanski stated no fill was required. Ms. Hodza asked how much would be brought in regarding reseeded. Mr. Szymanski stated none would be required for the yard as they would reutilize what exists. Ms. Hodza stated that section 22.0 in speaking of excavation and grading, states that if grading less than 20,000 square feet you do not require a special exemption, conversely if grading more than 20,000 square feet despite the fact that it is a single family home, the project requires a special exemption. Mr. Szymanski asked for the regulation to be repeated. Ms. Hodza reiterated that a special permit is required under letter G of Section 22.2 anything over 20,000 square feet of grading/disturbance a special exemption would be required. Mr. Szymanski verified if that is in exception of a house, septic or driveway. Ms. Hodza states that this is true in the case of a build that has a valid building permit, in other words one that has been approved at the time the regulations were written, and Mr. Szymanski and Mr. Davis do not have one. Mr. Szymanski stated that he could not recall a zoning permit application in 5 years that did not have 20,000 feet of disturbance. Ms. Hodza stated she could not recall any person who accurately read the zoning regulations in that time. Mr. Davis stated that they were not changing the grade except the corner of the driveway radius. Mr. Davis reiterated the proposed build and excavation, stating that they would not be grading or excavating save the one corner of the driveway. Ms. Hodza stated there exists a definition of grading in the regulation. Ms. Hodza read the definition for the record. Mr. Davis stated that cutting trees and stumping does not change the grade. They would only be digging the septic, so the only grade change is the half basement and the curve of the driveway. Ms. Hodza stated also the pool. Mr. Davis stated the pool would effectively be above ground and setting into the slope. Mr. Davis stated that the grade changes on the site are merely the one corner of the curve and the half basement; there exist no other grade changer. Zimet stated that in looking at the original geological survey lines and the proposed map, there is proposed grading all the way from the house to the driveway. Mr. Davis stated the driveway at grade today is less than 10% and they would not be disturbing anything. Mr. Zimet asked how there could be no disturbance if the original mapping showed 560ft and the proposed mapping is 568ft. There must be fill added in some way. Mr. Zimet stated even off to the proposed section on the right there is a differential of 4-6ft. Mr. Szymanski stated that the green lines are proposed topography in relation to the grey lines as the existing topography. The green lines are changes from what currently exists. Mr. Davis stated nothing would change on the right side of the driveway. Mr. Davis stated that they are not changing the grade to the right of the driveway and asked Mr. Szymanski to confirm. Mr. Szymanski stated there had to be a change of grade to be able to blend into what is there. Mr. Davis stated they would not be blending into the forest or down the hill to the abutting neighbor and that these slopes would not change. Mr. Szymanski stated that there is no grading in the set back that is correct. Mr. Davis stated nothing between the 60 degree radius is not moving at all. Mr. Zimet stated he was not referring to setbacks, rather the area of disturbance within the proposed silt fences and the silt fence itself, the elevation changes between 2 and 12ft going from the bottom of the property to the house, and nearly up to the well. Mr. Zimet stated that there must be fill being added. Mr. Davis stated that the surveyor took the existing driveway and the cut, at grade today it is less than 10%. Mr. Zimet stated the slope of the driveway is not what he is speaking about rather about how much area is being disturbed. Mr. Davis stated that the green lines are not going to change. Ms. Hodza stated that perhaps they move on, as this is a committee hearing not a debate between a member and an applicant. Ms. Hodza asked Mr. Szymanski to explain how they would access the septic system are for construction. Mr. Szymanski stated there was frontage on mountain lake road which is where they would access and bring materials. Ms. Hodza stated that was a steep location.

Mr. Szymanski stated those galleries are concrete and can be offloaded and brought up with a skid steer and excavator; there is no need for trucks to enter. Ms. Hodza stated if the application were approved she would like to see a condition placed on not allowing access apart from dropping off the galleries. Mr. Szymanski asked if a small crane for drop off would be approved. Ms. Hodza stated yes, apart from dropping off the galleries, she would suggest to the commission an orange fence installed to prevent trucks from going in and out of the access point from mountain lake road would be beneficial. Chairman Baker asked if there were further questions from the commission. Ms. Hodza asked for estimation for the length of the project. Mr. Davis stated that one of the ways they are working to accelerate the project is by using a timber frame construction, cut off site and able to be erected rapidly. Mr. Davis stated he would like to see it move as quickly as possible. Ms. Hodza asked what the foundation would be. Mr. Davis stated there were frost walls, a half basement with a slab, a crawl space and slab. Ms. Hodza asked if there would be blasting. Mr. Davis stated there should be little to no blasting as they utilize the slope to their advantage and only creating a half basement. Ms. Hodza asked where the roof leaders, splash blocks and footing drains were. Mr. Davis stated there were splash blocks on each corner, Mr. Szymanski stated on the right side of the driveway as approaching the house. Mr. Davis stated that due to this being a 3 bedroom house the roof drainage is minimal. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if to the satisfaction of the zoning officer the question on grading and excavation was settled. Ms. Hodza stated that section 22 regulations would have to be interpreted by the commission, while it has more than 20,000 square feet of disturbance, or grading at least, apart from that it is important the commission consider the erosion and sedimentation controls that are in place and how they be maintained due to the steepness of the location and the lack of jurisdiction within IWC. Ms. Hodza stated it would behoove the commission to perhaps place a bond as seen fit and require silt fencing beyond the one line proposed. Mr. Szymanski suggested while the site is open and the area is disturbed photographs be provided weekly and in an event of ¼ inch of rain. Mr. Davis stated he would comply with such request and stated that the house is on a flat plateau, pushed back toward the woods and the first half of the driveway has been installed for 6 years. Ms. Hodza stated she would like to have access to investigate the property during construction. Mr. Davis stated that he was happy to provide ongoing visual record and allow Ms. Hodza on the property at any time. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if there was a more proactive way of preventing erosion, rather than reactive after an event. For example a double silt fence or hay bales in critical areas. Mr. Szymanski stated on the down gradient side of the driveway where it says 25 foot side yard, where that silt fence starts and carries down the slope parallel to the property a row of staked hay bales would be prudent. The rest of the area Mr. Davis owns down gradient and Mr. Szymanski stated he was not concerned about that area as it has a distance of 200ft. Ms. Hodza stated a bond would be necessary in the event of a washout. Chairman Baker asked what the customary bond would be. Ms. Hodza stated the applicants engineer should be asked to estimate the bond. Mr. Davis asked if this bond was above and beyond the bond for the driveway. Ms. Hodza verified as the driveway bond would be between 2 and 3 thousand, while the bond for the construction would protect the town in case it has to itself remedy any erosion and sedimentation. Chairman Baker asked for a recommendation. Ms. Hodza stated that it could be pending Mr. Szymanski recommendation. Mr. Szymanski stated that due to the ledge there is little potential for soil movement, but he would estimate no more than a few hundred feet of hay bales would be several grand to be conservative. Ms. Hodza reminded the commission that they could hire an outside engineer to make an estimate. Chairman Baker asked if there was a motion. Mr. Zimet asked, If when a pool is approved, is it approved overall as a pool? or does the size matter, because in the proposal the size has changed. Mr. Davis stated the pool had changed in size in that it is smaller. Ms. Hodza stated at this time the Torrington Area Health District approved the pool and that the contractor of the pool would have to request a permit. Ms. Hodza stated that if it changes as of tonight after approval, a modification application would have to be made. Mr. Davis stated that it would not change. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if they could approve the house plan with the conditions discussed and require a complete pool application with final dimensions be submitted. Ms. Hodza stated that often a site plan is submitted and pool plans change and the applicant would have to come back with a request for modification of the pool. Mr. Davis noted that the pool would not be changed. Ms. Ouellette clarified that in the excavation and grading piece be summarized in regards to requirements. Ms.

Hodza stated that the driveway grades are within the regulations. Ms. Hodza stated that in no place the driveway exceeds 15% grade, in other words it's an approvable driveway. Ms. Ouellette asked if the grading regulations are being met. Ms. Hodza stated that the way the regulations are written, section 22.22 the following activities, should not require a special permit that has a valid building permit, (in accordance to grading within 20,000 feet) Ms. Hodza stated that the writing seems to insinuate to allow a single family dwelling, however it can read to determine it requires a special permit for more than 20,000ft of grading. Mr. Zimet reiterated that it can be interpreted in different ways, depending on whether you read it as "and" or "or". Mr. Zimet stated the regulation is difficult to interpret. Ms. Hodza stated that the regulation states less than 1 acre of grading is allowable in the regulation as read, and in this proposal it requires much more than such, however as Mr. Szymanski pointed out not many applications required less. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland asked if in Ms. Hodza's interpretation the application would require public hearing. Ms. Hodza stated yes, and that was true as to why this was before this commission as this time. Mr. Davis asked if any other house had gone to public hearing before under this regulation. Ms. Hodza stated that she was unsure it was possible that other applications did not read the regulation appropriately or perhaps they did not disturb more than 20,000ft. Chairman Baker stated that continuing the debate on the same topic does not move along the discussion and suggested crafting a motion for or against would be appropriate at this time. No motion was made. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland stated that while it was a difficult call, it would likely be necessary to be brought to a public hearing based on the regulations. Mr. Szymanski stated that in regards to 21 Arrowpoint Road, they were granted approval with 40,000 square ft. of disturbance wherewith a special exception was not required even with a disturbance greater than 20,000 square feet. Ms. Hodza stated that after the commission decided not to vote on that application, she and Mr. Szymanski worked together on. Ms. Hodza stated that that particular application was requested for the zoning officer to independently approve or not approve. Mr. Davis asked if it was equitable to follow the Arrowpoint erosion control methods, if it is fair to follow the same bond and erosion control methods, would such be equitable and follow precedent set from Arrowpoint. Mr. Davis asked if they could propose posting a bond based on this approved application. After no motion was made post discussion, Chairman Baker asked each member of the commission to discuss the reason they have or have not made a motion to approve or deny the proposal. Mr. Zimet stated in looking at the gradient lines and the new ones that were proposed, he estimated that 1200 cubic feet of fill would be required to level the driveway, due to this, it would be creating a slope. Dr. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland reminded the applicant that the public hearing and application requirements of special exceptions are not actually separate. Ms. Schnell stated that there are too many issues that need to be clarified that she believed it should be tabled until the next meeting. Ms. Ouellette stated that she was not comfortable approving the proposal with conditions or denying it. Ms. Ouellette stated she would prefer time to review further. Ms. Hodza asked for more specific information on what the hitch is. Ms. Ouellette stated that she was concerned about what the wetlands approved and due to the many alterations being done to the area, i.e. fill being brought in and being removed, the location of the septic tank etc. Ms. Hodza stated that the wetlands commission has no jurisdiction, meaning there are no wetlands near enough to this property that the water quality would be affected. In other words, the wetlands commission could not even weigh in on this proposal, as there is no engineer that can determine what would happen to the water beyond 200 ft.

Mr. Zimet stated his only hang up is the interpretation of regulation 22.2 which then would set a precedence moving forward. Mr. Zimet stated that its important to ensure enough erosion control is in place, even in a special exception not a lot would change other than that its protected and interpreted properly. Mr. Zimet state that the commission may need to come up with the motion for or against together. Mr. Papp stated that the amount of area being graded exceeding 20,000 square feet was due to the fact that the regulations require the 60 ft. radius. Mr. Papp stated that any and all side slopes should be at least 3 to 1, however it can be achieved, a bond, if Mr. Szymanski put together a worst case scenario. Mr. Papp stated that the area being graded does exceed 20,000 ft. and in the case that the land was newly graded section 22.2 for as long as Mr. Papp had been on the commission. That being said, the majority of the grading that is happening is that the swill lines are being requested by the planning and zoning committee. Mr. Papp stated that he also read the 2 to 1 slope similarly the Mr. Zimet, however a retaining system can be

put in place to ensure erosion controls and that having a public hearing would not control anything. Mr. Papp stated that a bond would be necessary and beneficial however the applicant has the right to build on the property. Ms. Hodza asked why Mr. Papp had not made a motion at this point as he has spoken soberly on the conditions of the applications. Mr. Papp reiterated he was working through the possibilities of the motion. Mr. Papp stated that worst case scenario of the bond should be proposed to create a bond number. Ms. Hodza stated that the commission can only bond for erosion and sedimentation, nothing more. Mr. Papp stated he was aware of that. Mr. Papp began a motion with a number of conditions including, a snow fence to prevent construction access from Mountain Lake Road; a bond amount to be determined; erosion and sedimentation controls; weekly site visits from the ZEO; photographs sent to ZEO after rain of more than ¼ inch. Mr. Papp made a MOTION to APPROVE the application with the conditions, Ms. Ouellette asked about the 3 to 1 side slope or an engineered alternative. Mr. Papp AMENDED the motion to include the 3:1 side slope conformance, Ms. Ouellette SECONDED the motion.

Ms. Sahadevan Fossland asked why Chairman Baker did not make a motion to approve, and stated that she would abstain from voting as she felt the process would require them to go to a public hearing. Chairman Baker stated that due to his having recused himself from the proposal based on his conflict of interest.

The question was put to VOTE. The Chairman was not voting; there were 2 affirmative votes and three abstentions. The MOTION was deemed NOT to CARRY by a vote of 2 due to the interpretation of the regulations, namely that the proposed disturbance of the land is greater than what is allowed without a special exception.

Mr. Szymanski had to explain to the commission why the MOTION CARRIED. A quorum was present and there was a simple majority of 2 affirmative votes to NO negative votes. All those who abstained are simply not counted.

Mr. Martin Connor, AICP, and occasional land use consultant for the Town of Warren, was consulted. He stated that the MOTION indeed CARRIED, but that the Commission had the ability so put the question to another vote since the decision had not been legally noticed by publication.

Mr. Papp restated the previous MOTION. Ms. Ouellette SECONDED. The vote was 2 ayes, and 3 nays. The MOTION CARRIED. The APPLICATION WAS DENIED. (Mr. Papp and Ms. Ouellette voted “yay”, Dr. Sahadevan Fossland, Mr. Zimet, and Ms. Schnell voted “nay”).

Dr. Sahadevan Fossland made a MOTION to set a date for the public hearing for special exception regarding property on 152 Curtiss Rd, on Tuesday April 27th at 7:30pm; Ms. Schnell SECONDED the motion, all were in favor. The MOTION CARRIED.

## **New Business**

ZA #21-10 / Paul Szymanski, P.E., on behalf of the Gally Family Irrevocable Real Estate Trust of 100 Newbury Court, Concord, MA / 39 Arrow Point Road, Assessor's Map 41, Lot 4 / Proposed installation of a stationary dock, stairs, boat lift and swim platform with related appurtenances and removal of specific trees at shoreline. (Date of receipt by Land Use Officer 2/4/2021, Date of Denial by Land Use Officer 3/10/21, Date of Approval by Inland Wetlands Commission 3/25/2021)

Mr. Szymanski presented the application, the proposal functions as a dock but does not meet the definitions of a dock as in regulations. The dock sits with ‘caterpillar feet’ on the ground, technically unattached to the shoreline. The application was denied noted as recreation equipment, Mr. Szymanski stated that in noting the item as recreation equipment, it begs the question of denying any other recreational equipment to be on individual's property for example a fire pit, or tree stand. Ms. Hodza stated that the issues she had with the ‘dock’, it is not a float, as it is not 5ft from shoreline; side note- wetlands approved the application. Ms. Hodza stated that after meeting with the builder of the product, they are more popular as they have minimal impact.

Ms. Hodza stated that because the dock is not attached there is discrepancy of it can be defined as a struc-

ture, however in the perspective of the zoning officer the application was denied because the use that Mr. Szymanski was proposing is an accessory use, a secondary use, to the use of the property as residential use. Under no circumstances, would a garage for example be able to be built on a property without a residence. The dock would exist on the property without residence, the application has to do with maintaining the properties as is Mr. Szymanski read Ms. Hodza's denial letter for the record. Mr. Szymanski made the point that if Mr. Szymanski respectfully withdrew the application.

## **Budget for FY 2021-2022**

After a discussion that was continued from the Special Meeting of April 6. The NHCOC would be charging \$75 per hour to assist the Commission in writing its regulations. Mr. Zimet stated that a mere 10 hours would burn through \$750 and it may not be just the NHCOC, but lawyers and other professionals.

Dr. Sahadevan Fossland stated that on April 29th there will be a discussion on use of land for farms titled form on zoning to address new uses on farms. This is a free training, the information should have been received by all commission members and it is open to the public. Chairman Baker stated that this is a very hot topic in surrounding towns as while everyone wants farms to succeed there are concerns about use and neighbors and compliance with regulation etc. Ms. Hodza stated that she has already been approached regarding use of farms in Warren and the regulations do not address some of the questions that have come up. Dr. Sahadevan Fossland stated that the because of the work with COG, Ms. Mullen and Ms. Ayer, to continue to have guidance ,input, member training, assistance writing by laws and addressing POCD goals, as well as reviewing current zoning regulations.

Mr. Baker made a MOTION to request \$14,000; Mr. Zimet SECONDED, Mr. Papp abstained since his wife is a Selectman. Ms. Schell, Ms. Ouellette, and Dr. Sahadevan Fossland all voted to approve. The MOTION CARRIED.

## **Plan of Conservation and Development (PoCD) Subcommittee Report**

Dr. Sahadevan Fossland stated that the subcommittee had shifted its focus to writing by-laws and regulations since the carrying out of the PoCD was dependent on them.

**Zoning Enforcement Officer's Report.** Ms. Hodza reported on recent applications that she had approved and certain applications that she was expecting based on Wetlands approvals. No new violations had been issued.

**Correspondence Received.** None.

**Opportunity for Public Comment.** Both Mr. and Mrs. Tammen of 50 Curtiss Road made comments. Ms. Hodza of 236 Brick School Road also made a comment.

**Adjournment.** The Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m. until the Special Meeting and Public Hearing, set for Mr. Davis, April 27, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. via Zoom.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Woodward,  
Recording Secretary  
Town of Warren

[Click for audio](#)