

Shaftsbury Development Review Board

October 20, 2021

Call to order

The meeting came to order at 6 p.m. Present were board members Tom Huncharek (chair), Lon McClintock, Tedd Habberfield, and Mike Day. Also present were Shelly Stiles (zoning administrator or ZA), architect Geoff Metcalfe, and landowners Langdon and Kathy Wheeler.

Conflict of interest

No board member expressed a conflict of interest with any item on the agenda.

Sign in sheets

Sheets were passed around and signed.

Outstanding minutes

Mr. Huncharek moved to approve all outstanding minutes. Mr. McClintock seconded the motion. Re the minutes for July 21, the vote was 3-0-1, with Mr. McClintock abstaining; re September 15 and October 6, the vote was each time 3-0-1, with Mr. Habberfield each time abstaining.

Sketch plan review

Sketch plan review, new site development, parcel 03 02 29, 2425 Maple Hill Road, owner Langdon Wheeler, presented by Geoff Metcalfe of Keefe and Wesner Architects.

Mr. submitted a revised sketch plan, containing two pages – one zoomed in and one zoomed out to capture the entire property and lands of abutters. He reiterated that the family wishes to move the home 20' further west of Maple Hill Road, thus making it less non-compliant.

Board members asked for additional items:

- A dotted line illustrating the edge of the Town's right of way on Maple Hill Road
- Allen Minzer now owns the former Minzer life estate north of the property

Ms. Wheeler described how the owners had finally decided that something like the existing clustering near the road, but further from it, would best conserve the extraordinary qualities of the compound. Mr. Huncharek moved to accept the sketch plan with changes as captured above. Mr. McClintock seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-0.

Other business

- 1) The board reviewed a recent decision in favor of Gregory Burke's appeal of the DRB decision denying him a permit for a boundary line adjustment on Glastenview Drive. It was agreed that, as per the findings of the Environmental Division of the Supreme Court, the zoning administrator would request a draft final plat from the appellant. Once she determines it meets all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, she will request a mylar and craft a permit document. She will secure all required signatures and file and record as required, with a copy of the Court's decision appended.
- 2) The board and ZA discussed how it came to be that a sketch plan review took place on what became a variance request. Mr. Huncharek thought it should have been a site plan review of a formal variance application. Ms. Stiles said that earlier in the process, the architect wasn't clear what the family intended to do and so asked to confer with the DRB. Mr. McClintock pointed out that it is not the DRB's job to design the project for the applicant. The ZA's allegiance should be to the Town (not its individual citizens) and her concern should be absolute fairness to all. She is not in any way primarily a problem solver.

- 3) Ms. Stiles will ask the Planning Commission to allow her to alter the permit application so she can simply refer applications to the DRB without first approving or denying.
- 4) Mr. Huncharek moved to adjourn at 7 p.m. Mr. Habberfield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Notes by ZA Stiles