

**Town of Monkton
Development Review Board
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 14th, 2021 7:30pm**

Regular Meeting in-person at the Monkton Town Hall – 92 Monkton Ridge

Board Members Present: C. Johnston (Vice-Chair), Phil Russell, Jaime Schulte, Chris Acker

Board Members Absent: Scott Gordon (On Leave), Betsy Brown (Chair), Curtis Layn, Joshua Giard (Alternate)

Others Present: Julie Martin, Jordan Jiskra

C. Johnston called the meeting to order at 7:36pm.

The minutes of July 27th, 2021 were reviewed. **J. Schulte moved to approve the minutes of July 27th, 2021 as written. P. Russell seconded.** No additional discussion. **All were in favor (4-0-0).**

The minutes of August 24th, 2021 were reviewed. C. Acker noted a correction that it was stated a wastewater permit is needed before signing the mylar for the Rose project. **C. Johnston moved to approve the minutes of August 24th, 2021 as amended. C. Acker seconded.** No additional discussion. **All were in favor (4-0-0).**

There was no public comment.

At 7:45PM: Waiver Application #2021-02-WAV of Julie Martin to construct a 14'x26' prefabricated shed within the required 50' setback requirement, 53 Hogsback Drive.

C. Johnston called the hearing to order at 7:45pm.

J. Martin described the proposed project to locate a shed approximately 24' from the property line due to it being the logical location relative to the house, garage and driveway. There is a level existing gravel pad in place. The structure would be on pressure treated skids and would not have power/water or a foundation. The parcel was reviewed using Google Earth to orient the board on the existing landscape and structures.

Discussed whether the criteria for a waiver are met. An additional outbuilding is in character for the neighborhood. The immediate neighbors, Jeff and Rhonda Hoag, have submitted a letter in support of the waiver. That seems to speak to the question of impact to neighbors. Our review also did not show likely/significant impact to neighbors. Discussed the purpose of setbacks and whether the shed could be located anywhere else. There is adequate land to the west inside the setback, but sitework would apparently be needed there due to the grade of the property. That location also partially blocks the view to the west from the home. Other locations would be too far from the house/garage to be practical for most uses.

The main discussion point was then whether a setback waiver is contrary to the goals of the Town Plan. Searched the Town Plan document and it makes little mention of setbacks. The UPD also does not address the purpose of setbacks. Discussed that they would seem to be to keep structures separated and from impacting a neighbor. The Town Plan does look to generally cluster development and preserve open space, which the proposed location would do better than the alternative site to the west. J. Schulte noted that vegetated property lines can be useful for animal and plant movement and 50' setbacks do tend to provide some connectivity across the landscape. This property line is partially vegetated, but no clearing is needed for the proposed project.

C. Acker moved to approve waiver application #2021-02-WAV. J. Schulte seconded. P. Russell suggested a site visit to clarify if the structure could be reasonably located to the west. Reviewed the slope of the site using

Google Earth and the location to the west appears to slope several feet downhill away from the driveway. J. Schulte mentioned that he supports site visits for nearly all projects, but it probably wouldn't help resolve the basic question here of whether to allow a setback waiver for the most practical site or insist on the use of a less suitable site. C. Acker noted that setbacks can be waived for PUD projects to promote density and we do so. J. Schulte plans to ask that the Planning Commission clarify the purpose of setbacks generally and when it is appropriate to waive them. The board seems in agreement that we would not waive setbacks for a new development project (except as a PUD) or for a new residence in a minor subdivision, because it would more obviously impact neighbors, but waiving the setback for an additional outbuilding seems like the area that needs clarification.

With no further discussion C. Johnston proceeded to a vote. **All were in favor (4-0-0).**

J. Martin expressed appreciation for the board's deliberations on a complicated topic rather than quickly approving or rejecting the project.

There was no old or new business.

P. Russell moved to adjourn. C. Acker seconded. All were in favor (4-0-0). Meeting adjourned at 8:28pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime Schulte
DRB Member