

Monkton Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom
October 23th, 2023
(Approved: 11/13/2023)

Attendance:

DRB Members Present:Jaime Schulte, Scott Gordon, Stephen Pilcher, Philip Russell, Mark Boltz-Robinson

DRB Members Absent: Curtis Layn, Chris Acker, Vicky Stern (alternate)

Others in Attendance: Lynne Caulfield, Cal Hopwood, Kimball Butler, Chris Hopwood, Steven True (Monkton Zoning Administrator), Jeff Olesky (Catamount Consulting)

The meeting was called to order at 7:30pm by J. Schulte.

Regular Business

1. Review Agenda
 - a. Noted that there was no meeting on October 9th, due to a lack of quorum.
 - b. Added introductions and a brief discussion of ZA and DRB workings. Steven True is our new Zoning Administrator. He is willing to take on the DRB Clerk role as well.
2. Review Meeting Minutes
 - a. Postponed until later in the meeting.
3. Questions and Comments from the Public Not Related to Agenda - None

Old Business

1. Continuation: **Preliminary Plat Application #2020-04-MAJ of Lynne Caulfield for a 2-lot subdivision located at 886 Bristol Rd (Parcel ID 05.103.017.001) in the RA-2/RA-5 Zoning Districts.**
 - a. There was no meeting on 10/9, so this hearing defaulted to 10/23.
 - b. Reviewed the criteria for approval of Preliminary from our August 28th meeting. There is an updated plat from LaRose, but it still needs some of the corrections described in the minutes of 8/28/2023. The address still needs to be corrected from 866 to 886 on the plat.
 - c. The major item remaining is to separate the project from the existing stormwater permit. Discussed that L. Caulfield will need to work with an attorney on that. Given the history of the project we will want to see all outstanding items completed before warning a Final Plat hearing.
 - d. **S. Pilcher moved to approve Preliminary Plat #2020-04-MAJ of Lynne Caulfield for a 2-lot subdivision located at 886 Bristol Rd subject to the**

following conditions, to be satisfied before hearing the Final Plat:

- e. Letter from an engineer certifying that a new stormwater permit is not needed for the 2 lots, due to the limited amount of impervious surface.**
- f. An approved revision to the current stormwater permit to separate this subdivision from the existing permit (4229-9050) and those covenants.**
- g. A final plat, to be reviewed for completeness before the Final Plat hearing is warned, and including remaining updates to lot numbers, abutting landowner names updated, address updated, etc.**
- h. All other preparations for a Final Plat completed (notices sent to abutting landowners, wastewater permit applied for, etc.)**

S. Gordon seconded. There was no further discussion. All were in favor (5-0-0).

New Business

4. Sketch Plan of Pomarico for a subdivision at approximately 325 Pond Rd

- a. Jeff Olesky of Catamount Consulting joined to represent the applicant.
- b. This is an update to a Sketch Plan reviewed in April 2023 for the same parcel. At that time the plan was for a few multi-tenant structures, but the revision would be to construct a small community off of Pond road, with 7 homes on an area of common land. ~700 sq ft footprint each. Understood that all 7 would need to meet the affordable housing requirements.
- c. Full wetland delineation was done. Reconfirmed in the northeast corner of the parcel. This clarified the developable areas in the east and west end of the parcels. Septic capacity is adequate to treat the units.
- d. Would like to continue as a PUD with density bonuses: 50% for affordable housing and 25% for energy efficiency. The parcel is 10.6 acres in 5ac zoning. Would 7 units be possible? This was discussed the first time and we concluded it was possible as a PUD.
- e. S. Pilcher asked about the septic force main line crossing the VT Gas pipeline to reach the proposed septic location. J. Olesky said they have been in contact with VT Gas and there are no concerns. Likely the septic line would go well under it through directional drilling.
- f. J. Schulte asked about the 50% set-aside needed for the project. J. Olesky said he thinks there are enough acres to work with. There was some discussion of what could be included in the Set Aside (land with infrastructure is not eligible).
- g. M. Boltz-Robinson brought up that the driveway standards need to be met (and might be). Proposed driveway is 18' wide.
- h. J. Schulte had concerns about homes being located exactly 50' from the property line. This would not allow for a tool shed behind the house or some

other normal residential uses. The layout on the buildable land is perhaps too dense to be practical, in his view.

- i. J. Schulte noted that he will give the PUD language a more thorough read ahead of Preliminary, to make sure the number of units is allowed with density bonuses, etc. It is somewhat confusing.
- j. **S. Gordon made a motion to approve the Sketch Plan and move toward Preliminary. S. Pilcher seconded.** There was no further discussion. **All were in favor (5-0-0).**
- k. J. Olesky asked to clarify that this was approving 7 units as realistic. S. Gordon replied that we can't guarantee that yet... would need to see a full Preliminary Plan (Set Aside, etc.), but we think it is feasible. J. Schulte said it might be a stretch and might not quite fit, but we'll see. J. Olesky's goal for tonight was to clarify 7 units.

5. Sketch Plans of Cal Hopwood and Chris Hopwood for a Conditional Use at 237 White Lane

- a. S. True described the Conditional Uses and recommended that we consider the applications together. There are two proposed Conditional Uses on the same parcel. One would be an approximately 900sqft addition to the existing home (Chris Hopwood / Kimball Butler). The other would be an accessory building to be used for an office space (Cal Hopwood). No additional septic would be needed on the property.
- b. The current version of the UPD allows for accessory structures, but doesn't mention expanding existing structures. This was discussed at some length in terms of what the UPD allows, the purpose of the Ridgeline district, recent changes to the definition, etc. The consensus appeared to be that the impact of expanding an existing structure is generally similar to or less than creating a new accessory structure, in terms of the developed area of the parcel and impact on the district. Another way to look at it is that the effect of this is probably not greater than a request for two accessory structures, which the UPD would seem to allow by Conditional Use. S. Pilcher spoke somewhat to the Selectboard's thinking on this language, which was to give the DRB some flexibility through Conditional Use.
- c. This location is not visible from anywhere nearby, which mitigates the scenic aspect of Ridgeline. Possibly from the area of Davis Rd a couple of miles away.
- d. Discussed whether to hear the Conditional Uses together or separately. We can proceed as one application and S. True will work with the applicants to move as quickly as possible toward a Conditional Use application being warned. The board did not take a vote on the Sketch Plan, but is aligned with the approach and expects to hear the Conditional Use application at our next meeting.

Minutes

S. Pilcher moved to approve the minutes of September 25th, 2023 as written. S. Gordon seconded. There was no further discussion. **So voted (4-0-1)**, with P. Russell abstaining.

Adjournment: S. Pilcher moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:49pm. So Voted (5-0-0).