

Monkton Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes
Monkton Town Hall & via Zoom
September 28th, 2026
(Approved: TBD)

Attendance:

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

DRB Members Absent: Curtis Layn, Chris Acker

Others in Attendance: Susan Gulrajani (Zoning Administrator), Mickey Schwarz (Recording Secretary), Lisa Burns, Sam Burr, Adam Miller (Planning Commission Clerk), Marilyn Cargill (Planning Commission Co-Chair), Ivor Hughes, Wendy-Sue Harper (Planning Commission Co-Chair)

1) Call To Order and determine quorum; Review Agenda

- a) The meeting was called to order at 7:33 PM by S. Gordon with 5 members present.

2) Public Comment - Questions and Comments from the Public Not Related to Agenda

- a) No public comment.

3) New Business

- a) **Joint special meeting with the Monkton Planning Commission** - discussion of UPD updates
 - i) Members of the Planning Commission (PC) joined the Board.
 - ii) M. Cargill started with an overview of the proposed changes to the Monkton UPD. She stated that the PC has spent the better part of the past 8 months working on the UPD, the bulk of which are within Article 2 (establishment of zoning districts and zoning maps) and wanted to go over the largest changes to Article 2. The Regional Planning Commission has created a new map for the Zoning Administrator, DRB, PC and all citizens to look at a parcel and understand exactly what is in that parcel from a zoning perspective. Lastly, M. Cargill wanted to hear from the DRB to understand what parts of the UPD are giving the DRB, or people who come before the DRB, issues.
 - iii) Article 2 of the UPD Proposed Changes
 - (1) M. Cargill discussed the 4 zoning districts within the town. She explains that the PC has tried to summarize in a better way each zoning district, its permitted uses, conditional uses and dimensional standards. These 4 zoning districts are High Density Village District (HDVD), Medium Density Rural Agricultural District (RA 2 MD), Low Density Rural Agricultural District (RA 5 LD), Conservation District - Prohibited (CON-P, to be renamed Hogback Conservation District).

- (2) M. Cargill further stated that the PC was looking to take the overlying descriptions of the forest blocks and wildlife corridors and how to put any kind of zoning or regulation around those acreages around town.
 - (3) W. Harper added that both wetlands districts are combined into one zoning district.
 - (4) S. Pilcher mentioned that the river corridor district comes from the State. He further stated that some of the changes to the overlay districts are mitigation strategies to reduce impacts to those overlay districts.
 - (5) M. Cargill stated that there is a desire for the town to maintain the rural feel of the town. She stated that she wants people to build here, just in a way that doesn't destroy the fabric of the town.
 - (6) M. Cargill discussed proposed changes to the High Density Village District
 - (a) Consider ½ acre zoning instead of 1 acre zoning to encourage infilling the town village instead of sprawling outwards (to help protect the wildlife corridors and forest blocks).
 - (b) Recommending to expand current village zoning from Monkton Ridge south Morse Park and east-west to surround Monkton Pond.
- iv) J. Schulte asked the PC if they were planning on making any changes to the PUD as he had some concerns over a repeat of Monarch Meadows. The PC stated that they would look at the language of PUDs to help minimize those types of developments. M. Cargill stated that the PC is trying to make sure that the DRB has the authority and also the ability to work with landowners.
- v) S. Pilcher presented a new map that the Regional Planning Commission has created to be used to help landowners and the DRB to determine zoning and overlay districts on any parcel in town.
 - (1) J. Schulte worked with S. Pilcher to toggle the display layers to show different aspects of the map, showing the volume of forest blocks and wildlife corridors the town has.
- vi) M. Boltz-Robinson brought up that there currently is nothing in the PUD that specifies where and how the conserved land set-aside is documented. M. Cargill stated that it should be on the Mylar. M. Boltz-Robinson replied that puts the onus on the DRB to look for the historical records and Mylars for the property as opposed to being in the current deed. His suggestion would be to have that information documented in the deed. Putting that documentation in the deed would only be helpful as long as it was a new standard. L. Burns mentioned that there are a lot of rules but no enforcement to make sure that those rules are followed. M. Boltz-Robinson stated that the best way forward would be to specify requirements to be added to a deed during the application process.

- vii) J. Schulte wanted to get some guidance from the PC over setbacks. He stated that there was no guidance over what constituted a setback. There was a discussion over past approvals of waivers for setbacks. S. Gordon added that the language should be such that it is not too narrow to disallow anything to be done, but to have some leeway for the DRB to make decisions based upon.
- viii) S. Pilcher brought up that there is a lot of duplication of checklists for Site Plan and regular Plat. S. Gordon stated that roughly $\frac{3}{4}$ of each checklist are the same. He suggested combining the checklists to minimize that duplication and time wasted.
- ix) S. Pilcher mentioned that the town is still not doing enough to encourage cluster housing. There was discussion between the DRB and PC over example properties that did or did not cluster housing. S. Pilcher brought up carrots vs stakes and whether or not that would affect how the PUD would split up parcels.
- x) J. Schulte brought up that there is no feasible way to have all definitions within the UPD, stating that the DRB referred to State Statutes for any definition that was not present in the UPD. He suggested that there should be some language in place in the UPD that if there is a term that is not defined, look at the State Statutes for further definitions.
- xi) M. Boltz-Robinson mentioned there were some wording discrepancies in the proposed changes, specifically “development” versus “building development.” M. Cargill stated that the PC has been making updates and may have missed that, but would be making those changes.
- xii) S. Pilcher brought up that there was no mention of Section 290, Conditional Uses, in the proposed Article 2 changes. M. Cargill stated that is on the list of changes to be made, as the current proposed changes are not a complete list yet. S. Pilcher added that the DRB and PC could meet again once the UPD changes are further along to re-review.

4) Regular Business

- a) Zoning Administrator Update
 - i) Upcoming projects & schedule
 - ii) Other Updates
- b) Review Meeting Minutes
 - i) Minutes of 09/14/2026
 - (1) **S. Pilcher moved to accept the minutes of 09/14/2026 as presented. M. Brennan seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0.**
- c) Decision letters
 - i) No action taken.
- d) There was a discussion over a Mylar for The Nature Conservancy/Latreille project that was given to the Town Clerk over 180 days from the DRB Final

approval of the project in question. S. Gordon asked if the Board should look at this tonight or table it until the re-warned hearing. J. Schulte stated that the Board would need to give feedback to The Nature Conservancy saying the Board would be unable to sign the Mylar due to the 180-day rule. The Board determined that the final application for the project would need to be re-warned and a re-approval of the previous decision would need to be made.

5) Adjournment

- a) **S. Pilcher moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:17pm. M. Brennan seconded. The vote passed 5-0-0.**

Minutes taken by Mickey Schwarz