

Monkton Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom
November 10th, 2025
(Approved: TBD)

Attendance:

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

DRB Members Absent: Chris Acker

Others in Attendance: Mark Burns, Lisa Burns, Susan Mahony, Sue Stasny, Kathleen Bushey, Mickey Schwarz (Recording Secretary), Susan Gulrajani (Zoning Administrator)

1) Call To Order and determine quorum; Review Agenda

- a) The meeting was called to order at 7:32PM by J. Schulte with 6 members present. Going through the Agenda out of order and hearing the Final Application #2025-10-DRB Layn Farms first as Applicant (Curtis Layn) may be called out again to help with cars off the road in his role as Fire Chief.

2) New Business

- a) **Final Application #2025-10-DRB Layn Farm.** 3984 Bristol Road (Parcel ID 08.103.059.000) Minor Subdivision. 2-lot subdivision at 485 Hardscrabble Road.
 - i) Curtis Layn moved across the table to join the board as Applicant. J. Schulte called the hearing to order.
 - ii) S. Pilcher went through the Final Application Checklist to check for completeness.
 - iii) The board reviewed Wastewater Permit WW-9-1526-1.
 - iv) C. Layn and the board discussed right of way access along Sugarhouse Rd.
 - v) J. Schulte went through the conditions set during the Preliminary Application from the 9/22/2025 DRB Meeting to check if all conditions were met. These were satisfactory.
 - vi) S. Pilcher read aloud comments from a neighbor pertaining to issues with potential impacts on surrounding wildlife from the subdivision and related land degradation from a wildlife perspective.
 - vii) C. Layn explained that the way the abutters letter was worded may have contributed to the concern that additional construction would be happening as a result of the subdivision. In this case the project is only to separate the existing house on Hardscrabble from the rest of the Layn Farm parcel. No new construction is proposed/expected from this project. No new building lots are created, etc.
 - viii) Board members understood the neighbor's bigger picture concern over potential wildlife impacts from a subdivision, but did not agree that there would be any further land degradation as a result of this particular subdivision application.

- ix) **S. Pilcher moved to accept the Final Application #2025-10-DRB Layn Farm. M. Boltz-Robinson seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0. C. Layn did not vote as he was the Applicant.**

3) **Public Comment** - Not related to the agenda

- a) Susan Mahony - questions about a 2-lot subdivision or PUD project she is considering.
 - i) Susan Mahony joined the board to get questions answered about a 2-lot subdivision or PUD project for a potential 5-acre lot that they are considering for her daughter.
 - ii) S. Mahony asked if a subdivision could be created from land on both sides of a Class 4 road, Stillson Ln. S. Mahony further explained that the current condition of Stillson Ln is impassable and that's why she wanted to know if land from both sides of Stillson Ln could be combined to create a 5-acre lot. Yes.
 - iii) S. Mahony asked if they deeded their daughter 3-acres, could a house be built. S. Pilcher noted that a PUD would need to be applied for in that instance, as the parcel is in 5-acre zoning.
 - iv) S. Pilcher stated that he had asked the Planning Commission for further clarification on what was allowed with PUDs. The board discussed the Planning Commission clarification that a PUD can be designated on a portion of a parcel and does not need to include the entire parcel. This was to encourage their use for landowners with larger parcels. The point of the PUD is dimensional flexibility and/or density in exchange for protection of some open land, particularly protecting natural resources.
 - v) C. Layn suggested figuring out the well and septic placement before determining how the lot will be subdivided.
 - vi) S. Pilcher stated that next steps would be to either come back at a later meeting date during public comment or with a Sketch Plan.
- b) Mark Burns and Lisa Burns - questions about putting up a garden shed less than 100-sq-ft, but located within 50-ft of a property line.
 - i) Mark Burns and Lisa Burns joined the board to get clarification over the possibility of putting up a garden shed within 50-ft of a property line.
 - ii) C. Layn stated that if you are under 100sqft and the structure is not fixed to the ground, you do not need a permit.
 - iii) S. Pilcher reviewed the UPD over property line setbacks and found that movable structures could not be placed within the setback.
 - iv) J. Schulte stated that applying for a Waiver might be the next step forward.
 - v) The Board and Burns' looked at the Town of Monkton AxisGIS map with contour lines on and saw challenging topography on most of the parcel, likely limiting where a shed could be located. It would be important to do a site visit.

- vi) J. Schulte brought up that the actual surveyed property lines may not necessarily match what is on the AxisGIS map.
 - vii) C. Layn suggested for Mark and Lisa Burns to determine the exact position of the property line, which is not marked in the proposed location, to see if the desired shed location is actually within 50' of the line. If so, applying for a waiver would be necessary.
- c) Sue Stasny - Co-Chair of the Conservation Commission - joined the board to offer the support and partnership of the Conservation Commission (CC)
- i) Sue Stasny wanted to ask how the CC could better support the DRB in terms of looking at applications and comparing them with the various natural resources layers in the maps done for the town by Arrowwood Environmental.
 - ii) J. Schulte stated that the CC, of which he is also a member, has a number of roles defined in Vermont Statute, including education, stewardship, and an advisory role in Development Review. Having a list of wildlife concerns related to a lot during the permitting process would be helpful and possibly take some work off of the DRB's plate.
 - iii) S. Pilcher brought up that the CC should talk to the Planning Commission (PC) as the PC is currently generating new zoning regulations based on Act 181 and Act 171.
 - iv) S. Stasny stated that there is some capacity from the CC to do more in terms of an advisory role to the DRB.
 - v) S. Pilcher asked if sending permit applications to the CC would be what S. Stasny is asking. C. Layn brought up that it would not be helpful to send the applications to the CC as the applications do not include enough context as to what the permit is for, until a specific map for the project has been created.
 - vi) J. Schulte stated that supplying the Property ID to the CC would allow them to understand any potential issues with how the lot relates to the various online maps.
 - vii) The board discussed when in the application process having the CC input would be helpful and it was determined that prior to the Preliminary Application would be the best time to get that input.
 - viii) S. Gordon asked about the purpose of the CC having input to projects. J. Schulte and S. Stasny stated that the goal would be to offer information on how to improve projects from a natural resources/wildlife perspective. The information would be an advisory input to the DRB, who would determine how or whether to act on it.
 - ix) S. Pilcher suggested the CC review the public project folders on the town's Google Drive as a starting point.
- d) Kathleen Bushey - questions about renting her woodworking shop
- i) Kathleen Bushey joined the board to get clarification about what steps to take in order to rent out her woodworking shop.
 - ii) C. Layn asked if there was a change of use or conditional use.

- iii) J. Schulte stated that it would not necessarily be a change in use, but maybe the first time the shop would be permitted for this Conditional Use.
- iv) J. Schulte and S. Pilcher reviewed the UPD and determined that this would fall under a Conditional Use permit.
- v) J. Schulte and C. Layn suggested that K. Bushey apply for a Conditional Use Permit and to not limit the types of light manufacturing that might happen at the shop, in case subsequent tenants want to change the use from a woodshop to something else.
- vi) K. Bushey indicated urgency around the project, due to the timeline of her tenant. C. Layn suggested for K. Bushey to work with Susan Gulrajani (Zoning Administrator) to get the map and documentation required for the Conditional Use Permit and to work quickly to meet the deadline for the permit to be warned (11/17/2025) in time for the DRB meeting on 12/08/2025.
- vii) C. Layn further stated that the map does not need to include the entire property, just what is necessary for the shop use.

4) Regular Business

a) Zoning Administrator Update

i) Upcoming projects & schedule

- (1) The Zoning Administrator got an email from a person wanting to purchase the property at 3825 Silver St. as a residence and erect a 25-foot radio tower that can be extended to 55-feet during use, and a 43-foot tall, 2-inch diameter vertical antenna next to the tower, attached to the ground. The individual is a licensed amateur radio operator. The board briefly discussed what the zoning rules say about towers.
 - (a) Sections 551 and 554 in the UPD state that no telecommunications structures in excess of 35 feet may be erected unless a Site Plan has been approved by the DRB after a public hearing.
 - (b) The board stated that the current owner would need to apply for a Conditional Use for the radio towers as the prospective buyer does not own the property yet.
 - (c) The question from the prospective buyer was whether the town would allow him to erect these towers/antennae after the purchase. The Board asked the ZA to communicate that the current owner would need to go through the Conditional Use process to get that answer. Approval of a Conditional Use would depend on the public hearing, proposed hours of operation, viewshed, etc.
- (2) The ZA is going to meet with the Selectboard tomorrow night (11/11/2025) to discuss increasing her hours due to workload exceeding available time. She also would like to request support

from the Selectboard for site visits to properties to evaluate complaints, such as a recent complaint received from Mike Casey.

- (a) S. Pilcher stated that no action should be taken on complaints until the ZA has the complaint in writing. Once the ZA has a written complaint a site visit would be possible. S. Gulrajani would want a third party present on those site visits. Not for reasons of safety, but more for accountability.
- (b) C. Layn explained that the process of a complaint cannot start with the DRB, because the DRB is the appeal step from a decision of the ZA.
- (3) The board has not heard back from The Nature Conservancy or the lawyer for the estate of Beverly Latreille over the apparent loss of access to the 10-acre contiguous lot (Parcel #05.114.002.000). C. Layn clarified that the third option described in J. Schulte's email to J. Binhammer (TNC) is not satisfactory from his perspective as it still leaves the parcel unresolved and creates a problem for the future. J. Schulte to follow up with TNC/Latrielle. The project has been warned for Final on 11/24.
- (4) For the 12/08 hearings we expect BEVO, Riverflow, and Chris Acker for a boundary line adjustment. The ZA plans to warn these on 11/17/2025.
- ii) Other updates
 - (1) S. Pilcher relayed additional information he gathered from the Planning Commission about small existing lots. Putting buildings on them is allowed, as long as setbacks and other requirements are met (24 VSA 4414).
- b) Review Meeting Minutes
 - i) Minutes of 10/27/2025
 - (1) **S. Pilcher moved to accept the minutes of October 27, 2025 as amended. S. Gordon seconded. The vote passed 6-0-0.**

5) Old Business

- a) Decision letters
 - i) Postponed to next meeting (11/24/2025)

- 6) **Adjournment** - S. Pilcher moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:10pm. M. Brennan seconded. The vote passed 6-0-0.

Minutes taken by Mickey Schwarz