

**Monkton Development Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom**  
**May 18th, 2026**  
(Approved: TBD)

**Attendance:**

DRB Members Present: Michael Brennan (Vice-Chair), Scott Gordon (Chair), Mark Boltz-Robinson, Stephen Pilcher, Jaime Schulte

DRB Members Absent: Chris Acker, Curtis Layn

Others in Attendance: Mickey Schwarz (Recording Secretary), Susan Gulrajani (Zoning Administrator), Mike Casey, Mark Guillemette, Anne Guillemette, Gerry Guillemette, Rebecca Kerr, Cassandra Guillemette

- 1) **Call To Order and determine quorum; Review Agenda**
  - a) The meeting was called to order at 7:30PM by S. Gordon with 5 members present.
  
- 2) **Public Comment** - Questions and Comments from the Public Not Related to Agenda
  - a) None offered
  
- 3) **New Business**
  - a) **Continued Appeal of Guillemette Decision, property address 35 Twin Maple Road, by Michael Casey**
    - i) **J. Schulte moved to make M. Boltz-Robinson the Chair for purposes of the hearing. S. Pilcher seconded. The vote passed 4-0-1. M. Boltz-Robinson abstained.**
    - ii) M. Boltz-Robinson reviewed the administrative rules for the hearing.
    - iii) M. Guillemette asked a question about the meeting recordings and why the camera does not show the audience and only what is on the computer screen. He also stated that he would not be joining the board at the table. M. Boltz-Robinson answered that he did not know when that camera behavior started. He then stated that more administrative tasks needed to be completed before any testimony could be given to maintain its legitimacy.
    - iv) M. Boltz-Robinson asked the board if any members have any conflict of interest or financial ties to the hearing, anything that would have arisen since the recessed hearing on March 18th, 2026. All board members answered in the negative.
    - v) M. Boltz-Robinson asked the board if any member has had any additional or new ex parte communication outside the room regarding the case since the last hearing. All board members answered in the negative.
    - vi) M. Boltz-Robinson asked the board if any member had any personal bias that had cropped up that would prevent them from making an impartial decision based strictly on the Monkton Unified Planning Document

(UPD), testimony and evidence entered in. All board members answered in the negative.

- vii) M. Boltz-Robinson administered the oath and swore in all participants.
- viii) M. Boltz-Robinson stated that the board is factoring in by default the Monkton Town Plan for 2025-2033 (as approved by the voters of Monkton) as well as the Monkton UPD (approved in March 2023).
- ix) M. Boltz-Robinson reviewed the two Sections of the Monkton UPD under consideration for this hearing (Section 440 and Section 490). He stated that those are the only two items that are under consideration for the hearing.
- x) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Guillemette if he had anything else he wished to enter into evidence or had any additional testimony that he would like to submit related to the outdoor storage or unregistered trucks and trailers.
- xi) M. Guillemette stated that he had some letters to discuss but was hesitant to do so due to personal information contained within said letters. He then stated that M. Casey should go first because he seemed to have a lot of evidence.
- xii) M. Casey joined the board at the table.
- xiii) M. Casey brought forth more photos to be admitted into evidence. After initial review by the board M. Boltz-Robinson stated that the new evidence might be encroaching on being repetitious or redundant. M. Casey insisted that these new photos be added into evidence as they show "all of it".
- xiv) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey if it was his sworn testimony that these new pictures show items observed on M. Guillemette's property. M. Casey answered that yes, all of the pictures depict items on the Guillemette property and that these images are from October 2021. M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey if it was his belief that none of the items depicted in the new images were on the property before 2021. M. Casey stated that he had a deposition from Ward Butler stating that none of it was on the property when it was purchased by Mr. Butler in 2019.
- xv) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey how many new photos there were. M. Casey did not know. M. Boltz-Robinson suggested that M. Casey should count the number of photos from October 2021 and they would be admitted into evidence as one exhibit.
- xvi) M. Casey asked "is this what you folks would like to see on your property if you had bought it?" M. Boltz-Robinson replied that was not a question the board could or would answer at this time.
- xvii) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey the significance of the numbered post-it notes on the photos. M. Casey stated that was for his logging purposes.
- xviii) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey why one of the photos already had an evidence tag on it. M. Casey stated that was evidence in a previous civil trial.

- xix) M. Casey brought forth an original letter written to the previous Zoning Administrator, Kris Perlee. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that this letter was not relevant to the specific appeal in question. He further re-iterated that on January 15th, 2026 the Zoning Administrator issued a decision regarding the two specific UPD sections, 440 and 490, and that M. Casey was bringing up something that has already been adjudicated by the Vermont Supreme Court. He then stated that the letter was already in evidence as exhibit **C01**.
- xx) M. Casey stated that he did not have the Zoning Administrator's original decision letter during the first meeting where he states the ZA found the Guillemettes in violation and then reversed the decision with a phone call with no appeal to the environmental court or the DRB.
- xxi) M. Boltz-Robinson stated that the "original" decision letter (dated December 30th, 2025) was in the overall files for this proceeding, but is unsigned and there is no evidence showing that the decision letter was issued to any party. He continued that if it was not issued to any party and it was not a definitive decision signed by the Zoning Administrator then it is not technically applicable. He then stated "You can't appeal something that was never decided if this was not the official decision entered into the record. The decision entered into the record was from January 15th and you have now successfully appealed that decision (of the ZA to the DRB)."
- xxii) M. Casey brought up a document already admitted into evidence as exhibit **DRB16**.
- xxiii) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Casey if he had any other new testimony or evidence to offer.
- xxiv) M. Casey produced images from 2017. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that the images were already admitted into evidence.
- xxv) M. Casey brought up the DRB meeting minutes dated July 14th 2020, where M. Guillemette addressed the board. He asked the board why the Guillemettes were not turned away from expanding a Conditional Use permit? M. Boltz-Robinson explained that the composition of the board today is not the composition of the board from 2020 so the board could not answer why the previous board made that decision.
- xxvi) M. Casey brought forth the DRB meeting minutes for May 28th, 2019. M. Boltz-Robinson determined, with input from the board, that these meeting minutes would not be admitted into evidence as they do not have any bearing on the appeal in question.
- xxvii) M. Casey brought forth a Selectboard meeting Public Comment made by M. Guillemette on December 23rd, 2025, to be considered as evidence. The board played several minutes of the Selectboard meeting recording during the hearing, at M. Casey's request, but there were audio issues with very low volume in the playback.
- xxviii) M. Casey wished to admit into evidence and the board accepted:
  - (1) **C12**: 20 photos of vehicles, metal, bicycles, etc., taken 10/29/2021
  - (2) **C13**: DRB Meeting Minutes of July 14, 2020

(3) **C14**: Selectboard Recording of 2025-12-23 - remarks of Guillemette

- xxix) M. Boltz-Robinson invited M. Guillemette to join the board. M. Guillemette asked the question if the board was getting close to a decision or if the process would take 3-4 more months. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that M. Casey was done with presenting evidence and that he could not think of any other evidence that could be admitted given that it would need to be constrained to the appeal in question.
- xxx) Rebecca Kerr joined the board to speak as a character witness on behalf of M. Guillemette. She stated that M. Guillemette is her stepfather and that she lived on the property from 2000 to 2010 and then part-time for the next few years until she got married and moved away. M. Boltz-Robinson asked R. Kerr to speak about the nature of the property. R. Kerr stated that the use of property hasn't changed since she was 8 years old and that M. Guillemette has been pretty open about the stuff on his property and the uses he has for the materials. She further stated that the land has been used with 4-wheelers throughout and that there were vehicles and different things and that M. Guillemette has been repurposing them as long as she can remember.
- xxxii) M. Guillemette brought forth a letter from Giroux's Body Shop to be admitted into evidence. The board reviewed the letter and admitted it.
- xxxiii) M. Guillemette read a letter in support of him and the uses of his property. He did not want to admit the letter into evidence without redacting some personal information.
- xxxiv) M. Guillemette brought forth two Burnett Scrap Metals slips from 2011 to be considered as evidence. J. Schulte asked if the documents were intended to establish a timeline for the uses on the property. M. Guillemette answered in the affirmative. The board reviewed both documents.
- xxxv) M. Guillemette also brought forth Google Earth imagery from 2022 and 2023 showing storage and horse trailers and scrap on the property. The board reviewed the images.
- xxxvi) M. Guillemette brought forth an image of truck bodies given to him by Giroux's Body Shop to be used as wood drying racks. The board reviewed the image.
- xxxvii) M. Guillemette asked the board why there was discussion about unregistered vehicles during M. Casey's testimony. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that this hearing pertains to Section 440 and 490 of the Monkton UPD. M. Guillemette asked if the board could define what automobile junk is. The Board reviewed the UPD and could not find a definition for it within the document. The definition will be considered in deliberations.
- xxxviii) M. Guillemette stated that there has been material on the property for more than 15 years, some of which is to repair old trucks. He stated that he drives a 1956 truck for firewood delivery and that he has an additional truck to use for repairs. He further stated that all of the automotive parts on the property are for personal use and not sold to the public.

- xxxviii) M. Boltz-Robinson asked M. Guillemette some clarifying questions about the nature of the businesses on his property. M. Guillemette stated that most of the large trailers are used for the wood processing business and that one is used for his shop and contains a waste wood fired boiler. He stated that his shop has been there since 2009.
- xxxix) S. Pilcher asked M. Guillemette when he bought the land. M. Guillemette stated that he bought the property in 1998. S. Pilcher asked what the condition of the property was when the property was purchased. M. Guillemette stated that there were manure spreaders, large water tanks, a couple of dump spots, and an old school bus on the property.
- xl) S. Pilcher asked if there were any unregistered trucks used in the firewood operation. M. Guillemette stated that there are two unregistered trucks that he uses for the firewood operation, to move equipment, and that they do not leave the property.
- xli) S. Pilcher asked about the age of the wood processing business and Old Iron Repair business. M. Guillemette stated that they have been around for 20 years. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that there is an Act 250 permit for Old Iron Repair.
- xlii) M. Guillemette redacted personal information from a letter he wanted to admit into evidence. He also produced active registrations for five trailers and redacted the vin numbers on the registrations. He stated that the trailers were registered before the original complaint.
- xliii) M. Guillemette wished to admit into evidence the following, which were accepted by the board:
  - (1) **G01**: Letter from Giroux's Body Shop
  - (2) **G02**: Receipt from Burnett Scrap Metals for Guillemette 4-11-2025
  - (3) **G03**: Receipt from Burnett Scrap Metals for Guillemette 8-13-2011
  - (4) **G04**: Google Earth street view of Guillemette property from Oct 2022
  - (5) **G05**: Google Earth street view of Guillemette property from Oct 2023
  - (6) **G06**: Picture of firewood stacked on a truck body as a drying rack
  - (7) **G07**: Trailer registrations, portions redacted
  - (8) **G08**: Redacted letter in support of Guillemette
- xliv) **S. Pilcher moved to close the hearing. M. Brennan seconded. There was no further discussion. The vote passed 5-0-0.**

#### 4) Adjournment

- a) **M. Brennan moved to adjourn the public portion of the meeting at 8:55pm. S. Pilcher seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0.**
- b) **The board entered into a deliberative session at 8:56pm.**
- c) **The board recessed the deliberative session at 9:56pm until a date certain of June 1st, 2026 at 7:00pm.**

Minutes taken by Mickey Schwarz