

Monkton Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom
November 13th, 2023
(Approved:)

Attendance:

DRB Members Present: Jaime Schulte, Scott Gordon, Stephen Pilcher, Chris Acker, Mark Boltz-Robinson

DRB Members Absent: Curtis Layn, Philip Russell, Vicky Stern (alternate)

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

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

Regular Business

1. Review Agenda - no changes made
2. Review Meeting Minutes - postponed until later in the meeting.
3. Zoning Administrator Update
 - a. Gospoderek Application - clarified whether a site plan is needed as part of this potential Conditional Use application. Discussed that the DRB has the option to ask for one on a more complex project, but a good drawing can be sufficient for something uncomplicated, such as placing a shed on an established residential property. We need to be sure we understand the location, scale, setbacks, etc.
4. Questions and Comments from the Public Not Related to Agenda - None offered

Old Business

5. **Conditional Use Application #23-303 Chris Hopwood, Kimball Butler & Cal Hopwood for an extension to primary dwelling and an accessory use building located at 237 White Lane (Parcel ID 05.225.010.002) in the RA-5 zoning district, subject to the Ridgeline ordinance.**
 - a. Discussed the application, parcel, setbacks, etc.
 - b. Reviewed the Conditional Use checklist.
 - c. Looked at the parcel on the town zoning map. We will need the more complete map seen during the Sketch Plan review on 10/23 to be included with a completed Conditional Use checklist.
 - d. **S. Pilcher moved to approve the the Conditional Use Application #23-303 of Chris Hopwood, Kimball Butler, and Cal Hopwood for an extension to the primary dwelling and an accessory use building located at 237 White Lane, subject to having a complete application on file that meets the requirements of the Conditional Use checklist before issuing a building permit. S. Gordon seconded. There was no further discussion. All were in favor (5-0-0).**

6. Continuation: 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 Sketch Plan was approved at our last meeting, but at the conclusion of that discussion members of the DRB described needing to review the UPD further on the question of whether 7 units/buildings are possible as part of a Planned Unit Development. There was admittedly confusion on that point and this continuation was to fully resolve that question, as we would be unable to eventually approve a Preliminary or Final Plat that did not meet requirements of the UPD, regardless of Sketch Plan approval.
- c. To summarize tonight's discussion:
 - i. Discussed the definition of a Dwelling Unit (a living space for one family) vs. a Dwelling (a building).
 - ii. The RA-5 LD zoning district of this parcel allows for up to 2 Dwellings on this 10.6 acre parcel (Parcel ID #05.215.021.000). These can be either single-family or duplex Dwellings for a total of either 2 or 4 Dwelling Units inside those two Dwellings. Potentially these two buildings could be multi-unit buildings by Conditional Use.
 - iii. The 50% density bonus in the PUD for affordable housing units would allow for one additional Dwelling on this parcel with either one or two additional Dwelling Units. The 25% density bonus for energy efficiency doesn't add up to a 4th Dwelling, but could add a 7th Dwelling Unit.
 - iv. The result being that this PUD could have up to 3 Dwellings that contain up to 7 Dwelling Units. The 3 bonus Dwelling Units are not required to also be affordable. J. Olesky indicated that S. Pomarico will want all units to be affordable and likely for all structures to be of the same type. This might mean three duplexes. He will discuss how to proceed with S. Pomarico.
 - v. We reviewed a proposed map of the 50% Set Aside for the property. There is just enough area to reach 5.3 acres of Set Aside separate from building envelopes, infrastructure, and the VELCO easements. J. Olesky asked the board to confirm that this meets the open space standards for PUD Set Asides in the UPD. The discussion was that it does satisfy the requirement to not have infrastructure on the open land (septic, utilities, etc.). The UPD's guidance is also to maintain usable blocks of land, although this is challenging with the VELCO easement through the center of the parcel. J. Schulte: the proposed Set Aside is the best and only arrangement available on this parcel. It protects the wetland areas. It isn't ideal in terms of habitat connectivity (described in the UPD as "other unique features or natural areas within the open land."), but does mostly avoid the main connector identified across this parcel by Arrowwood Environmental's new mapping.
 - vi. We did not take an additional vote here on the Sketch Plan, but did restate and confirm the understanding of all present regarding up to 3 buildings for this project that would contain a total of 3 to 7 units.

Minutes

S. Pilcher moved to approve the minutes of October 23rd, 2023 as written. S. Gordon seconded. There was no further discussion. **So voted (5-0-0).**

Adjournment

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