

MONKTON SELECTBOARD PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES
Tuesday, August 30, 2022

The informational meeting took place from 7pm to 8pm.

Members in attendance: Stephen Pilcher (chair), Paul Low, Bill Martin, John McNerney

Members absent: Marikate Kelley

Others in attendance: Jessica Demeritt (recording secretary), Jaime Schulte

Stephen Pilcher called the Select Board hearing on the Unified Planning Document for Monkton to order at 8pm.

L. Farrell submitted an email with the following recommendation:

Section 230.K. "RLA - Ridgeline Overlay District: ...

I recommend adding this same sentence that has been added into Section 230.G "CON-P" to Section 230.K (and inserting a period before that sentence in 230.G) "Any Conditional Use review must be in consultation with the Monkton Conservation Commission..." In both places it is advisable to correct the "or The Monkton Tree Warden" to **"and The Monkton Tree Warden"**

S. Pilcher read some notes from a review of the UPD at the DRB:

Section 420.A.2.a.1.a, screening material for ground solar, change "should" to "shall". There was also a concern that the state's threshold for impermeable surfaces was 43,560 square feet, while the proposal in the UPD adds requirements for anything over 10,000 square feet. Something as simple as putting in a driveway could trigger this section.

Section 584, persistent repetitive noise, DRB thought the document should mention that general maintenance of property – such as mowing the lawn or taking down a tree - was ok. J. Schulte supported 584A, and noted other towns had noise ordinances. He said this section should not preclude the Selectboard creating a noise ordinance that goes further than what is in the UPD. We don't have a lot of experience in this area, and may need to make further adjustments.

S. Pilcher said section 595, erosion control, DRB noted the zoning administrator would send people with issues to the state which is a straightforward process.

Section 596, stormwater management, DRB wondered if a driveway change required a new permit from the ZA.

Section 597, riparian buffers, is a definition of water dependent structure necessary?

How does the DRB get involved in some of these new sections since they are making a lot of the decisions?

Section 598, wetlands, DRB thought the section was informational, not instructional. Should the UPD be informational or regulatory?

Section 905D2a2, distinction between open land and open space was confusing to the DRB.

S. Pilcher adjourned the hearing at 8:12pm.

These minutes were respectfully submitted by Jessica Demeritt.