



September 8th, 2025

Members Present: Nina Mooney (Chairing), Anthony MacLaurin, Scott Swinarton, Jim Lewis [via Zoom]

Members Absent:

Others Present: Curan VanDerWielen (Village Manager), Donald Brodie (Village Clerk), Terry Findeisen (Zoning Administrative Officer), Brian Maggiotto, Nick Parks

Call to Order: 4:30PM by Mooney.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Motion: To approve the agenda

Motion made by Mooney. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

2. Review of the draft amendments to the Manchester Village Zoning Bylaw.

Mooney asked a procedural question. VanDerWielen clarified the procedure for the public hearing.

Mooney opened the floor to comments and questions from the Board and members of the public present. Brodie expressed support for the draft, as presented, as he believed that it would improve the effectiveness of the Development Review Board (DRB) in the long-term. Mooney asked what specifically would assist the DRB. Brodie stated that he believed the document as a whole was a significant improvement and that nothing stood out as needing revisiting.

MacLaurin added that he believed it was important to adopt certain changes soon given the need to bring local regulations into conformance with the HOME Act of 2023. VanDerWielen clarified that the deadline for completion under the Bylaw Modernization Grant (BMG), which financed the technical assistance for drafting the document, was in December. VanDerWielen added that while it would be absolutely best for the Board to adopt changes bringing local regulations into conformance with statute, it was also possible to not adopt such changes, although any legal challenges or appeals under that basis within the Village's zoning permitting process would almost certainly result in a loss in court.

Swinarton noted that he had spoken with VanDerWielen offline and didn't have any further questions, adding that he trusted his and Brodie's assessments. MacLaurin added that early in the review process he had a difficult time following individual changes to the zones and dimensional standards, but that having spent several meetings with the Planning Commission on the matter, he felt comfortable with the solutions made in those meetings. Specifically, MacLaurin highlighted the massing of several dimensional standards to restrict the sprawl and impact of larger residential development. Mooney asked if any of the parking standards had



changed. VanDerWielen noted that parking standards had largely not been changed, with the exception of the need to items such as requirements for cycling parking, lighting, and screening.

Maggiotto asked if the new dimensional standards aligned with the new guidelines for housing density per recent changes at the statutory level. MacLaurin answered that they did. Maggiotto commented that that was a dramatic increase which could negatively impact the Village National Historic District. VanDerWielen clarified that the changes in statute were not guidelines but changes in law, regardless of Village's adherence to those, within the document. VanDerWielen added that the draft document did adhere to these changes in law as a matter of best practice. VanDerWielen then explained the economic limitations to higher-density residential development within the area and the impact of the massing of layers of regulations within the document, which still greatly limited the design and siting of such projects.

Maggiotto expressed concern about the possibility of the development of a Main Street home being re-developed, citing the Monarch on Main project as an example of multi-unit development underway within the historic district. VanDerWielen clarified that that project had been permitted under the existing standards of the Village Zoning Bylaws, before the passage of the HOME Act. Maggiotto asked if the draft document was any more restrictive than the changes in statutory law. VanDerWielen stated that the draft document adhered to all aspects of state law, but that it did not go any further in relaxing restrictions on residential density relative to what is allowed by statute. MacLaurin added that he believed that once all the dimensional standards within the document had been applied, that the character impact of such a development would be lessened, if such a development were possible.

Swinarton asked about how this would impact Short-Term Rentals (STRs). VanDerWielen clarified that parking and use standards concerning STRs were handled in a dedicated ordinance as a class of commercial activity, not under the land use regulations. VanDerWielen added that it was wholly possible to develop a residential property under the land use regulations, but its future use as a STR was handled under a the STR ordinance entirely. Maggiotto asked if STRs were included as permitted use within the draft document's use standards. VanDerWielen stated that the Village was not regulating STRs under the land use regulations but instead under ordinance, adding that that mostly had to do with the mechanics of statutory law regarding STRs, and that regulating STRs under land use regulations proved to be much more complex than under a dedicated local ordinance, where definitions and enforcement were more controlled at the local level.

Other Business:

No other business was discussed.

Motion: To adopt the draft amendments to the Manchester Village Zoning Bylaw, as submitted.

Motion made by MacLaurin. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

Adjournment: 4:45 PM.



Motion: To adjourn.

Motion made by Mooney. Motion seconded by Swinarton.

Motion approved, unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Curan VanDerWielen
Village Manager

DRAFT