

Monkton Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom
August 11th, 2025
(Approved: TBD)

Attendance:

DRB Members Present: Stephen Pilcher, Michael Brennan, Mark Boltz-Robinson, Jaime Schulte, Curtis Layn

DRB Members Absent: Scott Gordon, Chris Acker

Others in Attendance: Adrienne Raphael, Ben Raphael, Susan Gulrajani (Zoning Administrator), Mickey Schwarz (Recording Secretary)

1) Call To Order and determine quorum; Review Agenda

- a) The meeting was called to order at 7:32PM by J. Schulte with 4 members present. The 5th joined moments later.

2) Public Comment - Not related to the agenda

- a) No public comment

3) New Business

- a) **Sketch Plan Review #2025-11-DRB of Adrienne Raphael for Conditional Uses at 216 Monkton Ridge in the Pond Overlay District.** Renovations may include a 2nd-floor apartment and 1st-floor general store and cafe, with updated wastewater for commercial use, increased parking, etc.
 - i) C. Layn opened the Sketch Plan review.
 - ii) A. Raphael explained an interest in renovating 216 Monkton Ridge for a First floor General Store and Cafe and Second floor apartment.
 - (1) Met with an engineer to see if renovations were even possible at the property, engineer stated that said renovations were possible.
 - (2) PUD, lot acreage is 1.75 acres.
 - iii) S. Pilcher stated reqs for category 4 Conditional Use would apply.
 - iv) S. Pilcher stated that the Pond Overlay District would require conditional use. Concerns over altering the viewshed.
 - (1) A. Raphael stated that no structures footprint would be altered, therefore not affecting the viewshed.
 - v) S. Pilcher stated the property is currently a duplex, ADU (accessory dwelling unit)
 - (1) C. Layn explained ADU cannot be more than 30% of the size of the primary structure. B. Raphael stated that the ADU would be only for the 2nd-floor apartment.
 - vi) J. Schulte explained the second Conditional Use would need to be for non-residential use.

- vii) S. Pilcher thought the intended renovations would be beneficial for the town of Monkton and that there would be no issues with Conditional Use.
- viii) M. Brennan and S. Pilcher discussed the age of the structure and that it pre-dates current zoning.
- ix) A. Raphael, C. Layn and S. Pilcher discussed a potential use of the grass strip in front of the cemetery for parking for the general store. S. Pilcher stated that the grass strip is directly across from States Prison Hollow Rd intersection and that there would be potential for accidents due to States Prison Hollow being a yield into Monkton Ridge Rd. J. Schulte added that there could be issues with vehicles backing into traffic, depending on sight lines.
- x) The garage structure acts as a section of the fence surrounding the cemetery. This may have been a practical approach at the time.
- xi) S. Pilcher and C. Layn discussed that with the zero-foot setback to the cemetery no changes could be made to this non-conforming (garage) structure. A. Raphael asked if it would be possible to build off the back of the structure if there was a need for more space. S. Pilcher stated that there would need to be a 25-foot setback
- xii) S. Pilcher, C. Layn, M. Brennan and M. Boltz-Robinson explained that a PUD would need 30% set aside and that it would make it difficult to do any additions down the road.
 - (1) C. Layn explained that if A. Raphael wanted to split the lot into a 0.5 acre and 1.5 acre, that a PUD would work
 - (2) C. Layn explained there is currently discussion with the Planning Commission about PUDs and that he suggested waiting on deciding anything until that issue was finalized with the Planning Commission.
- xiii) B. Raphael and C. Layn discussed what the 30% set aside would entail. C. Layn explained that the 70% buildable area describes the structure footprint, septic, well, etc and that the set aside would need to be undisturbed.
- xiv) B. Raphael asked what the next steps would be. S. Pilcher stated that working with S. Gulrajani for necessary permits would be next. C. Layn explained that B. Raphael could come back to the DRB any number of times before actually filing, to have any questions answered.
- xv) B. Raphael asked about the feasibility of using the grass strip in front of the cemetery for parking. C. Layn did not want to say it was a hard no; that there would need to be more investigation. B. Raphael asked about using the grass section within the triangle of the Monkton Ridge Rd - States Prison Hollow Rd intersection for parking instead. C. Layn stated that more investigation would be necessary to see if that was feasible.
- xvi) C. Layn explained that there is no real walkability for Monkton Ridge, no room for sidewalks.

xvii) A. Raphael stated there would need to be a new septic built for the proposed general store. C. Layn stated the process could begin with a proposed septic, without first spending money to build the new septic system. C. Layn reiterated that the parking situation and new septic would be the hardest pieces of the process to get approved.

b) **Sketch Plan Review #2025-10-DRB of Curtis Layn for a 2-lot subdivision at 485 Hardscrabble Rd.**

- i) C. Layn recused himself and moved to the other side of the table. J. Schulte opened the Sketch Plan review.
- ii) C. Layn explained the proposal for subdividing an existing residence with a couple of acres from the larger Layn Farms parcel by drawing a line between two existing pins.
- iii) S. Pilcher asked if land was currently owned by Layn Farms. C. Layn confirmed.
- iv) S. Pilcher asked if both subdivided lots had access, what other concerns were there. C. Layn explained there would need to be a change to the right-of-way for Sugarhouse Rd to change the lot ownership to the newly subdivided lot.
- v) S. Pilcher stated he saw no issues with the Sketch Plan for subdividing the lot and the Board appeared to be in general agreement.
- vi) S. Pilcher asked if there was currently a road use agreement on Sugarhouse Rd, C. Layn confirmed.
- vii) C. Layn is OK to proceed to a Preliminary Plat hearing.

4) **Regular Business**

a) Zoning Administrator Update

- i) Upcoming projects & schedule
 - (1) 1 Zoning permit
- ii) Other updates
 - (1) No action taken

b) Review Meeting Minutes

- i) Minutes of July 28th, 2025
 - (1) **S. Pilcher moved to accept the minutes of July 28th, 2025 as written. M. Brennan seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0.**

5) **Old Business**

a) Clarification from the Planning Commission on lot lines

- i) S. Pilcher met with the Planning Commission and asked if, as part of a PUD made up of two adjacent lots with existing buildings, if the existing internal lot boundary/line could be moved significantly. The Planning Commission said that internal lines in adjacent parcels under the same ownership can be reconfigured as part of a subdivision (which includes a PUD).

- b) DRB feedback to the Planning Commission on the UPD
 - i) S. Pilcher stated that for ACT 151 the Regional Planning Commission is working on a land use map. The Tier 3 piece of that, State Significant wildlife corridors, etc., is not clear yet, but a developer may need to go into ACT 250 to develop any of that. S. Pilcher stated that Adam Lougee asked the Planning Commission about having the 1-acre zone match the Village District map.
 - ii) S. Pilcher stated his view that a 30-50% Set Aside could be onerous for a developer, depending on the size of the lot.
 - iii) C. Layn stated there would not be a large change in Monkton Ridge, due to the area being built up already. C. Layn suggested there to be a minimum acreage for a PUD.
 - iv) S. Pilcher and C. Layn discussed a needed change to the density bonus for affordable housing over how long the property would need to remain affordable to qualify for the bonus.
 - v) S. Pilcher requested if anyone had anything specific to bring to the Planning Commission for them to send the information to him.
 - c) Decision letters
 - i) There was discussion over the use of AI to generate the decision letter for #2021-03-MAJ for Caulfield and for #24-901 for Pomario. This seems beneficial to getting the initial draft, but some issues were seen.
 - ii) J. Schulte requested a scrub of both decision letters for approval at the 08/25/2025 DRB meeting.
 - d) DRB Clerk role
 - i) J. Schulte explained a need for generation and filing of decision letters.
 - ii) S. Gulrajani stated she was in the process of going through the files.
 - iii) S. Pilcher stated that the DRB has been organized to structure filing of projects by the year of initial project formation.
 - iv) C. Layn stated that there should be files for all processes throughout the project.
 - v) M. Boltz-Robinson reiterated that the project number convention should stay the same, while the files for the project would be moved forward into the current year if the project continued into said year.
 - e) State ethics training due for all members of quasi-judicial boards (DRB) by 9/25
- 6) **Adjournment** - S. Pilcher moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:20PM. M. Brennan seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0.

Minutes taken by Mickey Schwarz