

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

Richmond Development Review Board  
REGULAR Meeting  
APPROVED MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 14, 2016 MEETING

---

6 Members Present: Ian Bender; Matthew Dyer; Gabriel Firman; Roger Pedersen; David  
7 Sunshine (Chair)  
8 Members Absent: Alison Anand (Alternate)  
9 Others Present: Niels Rinehart, Zoning Administrator; Ruth Miller for MMCTV  
10 Comcast 15; Jake Davis; Doug Goulette; and Tim Kenney

---

11  
12 David Sunshine called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.  
13

14 Timothy and Jennifer Kenney – Application #16-080 for a Sketch Plan Review by the DRB for a  
15 subdivision creation two additional lots at 1768 Wes White Hill Road (WW1768). The property is  
16 owned by Timothy and Jennifer Kenney and lies within the Agricultural/Residential District.  
17

18 David Sunshine opened the hearing and swore in Doug Goulette.  
19

20 Goulette introduced himself and explained that the Kenneys had hired him to design the proposed  
21 subdivision. The proposed subdivision would consist of three lots on Wes White Hill Road, producing  
22 two new lots on an existing 11.5 acre parcel. The landscape is largely an open meadow sloping to the  
23 north. The eastern half is wooded and slopes down to a stream that forms the eastern boundary of the  
24 parcel and the existing house lies on the western end of the parcel. The proposed two lots would include  
25 one with 3.8 acres and the other with 5.4 acres located on the eastern side. Single family homes are  
26 proposed for each lot. They located soils adequate for the construction of a wastewater system and  
27 following State requirements, have also established a location for a replacement wastewater system.  
28 They completed a topographic survey within the area where the improvements are proposed and  
29 otherwise relied on USGS contours where nothing proposed. A wetland is located within the northern  
30 portion of the existing parcel resulting in the creation of a 50-foot buffer. Goulette said that the proposed  
31 construction would remain well away from the wetlands. He explained that they are proposing separate  
32 wells and driveways for each home and that both locations meet the minimum requirements for  
33 setbacks. The slopes to the north range from 15 to 20 percent and so they have kept the houses to the  
34 south near the road where they will also have a good view of Mt. Mansfield.  
35

36 Sunshine asked if the applicant had obtained access and wastewater permits and Goulette said that they  
37 had not, but that they had perked the soil. He said that the eastern lot (Lot 3) would have an easement  
38 for the shared wastewater facility on Lot 2 (the center lot). Sunshine asked that the applicant provide  
39 the easement for the Board to review. Sunshine also asked if the applicant had reviewed the existing  
40 parcel for the location of State-identified deeryards and Goulette said that he had not.  
41

42 Roger Pedersen said he viewed the property and he expressed concern about the angle of the proposed  
43 driveways. Goulette said that they had spent a lot of time reviewing the driveways and that the posted  
44 speed limit is 30 miles per hour and so a total of 330-foot site distance is required. He said that the  
45 proposed driveways meet these requirements. He also explained that the driveway grades will range  
46 from 9 to 12 percent. Pedersen said that the useable range for driveways is rather narrow and so the  
47 driveways will have to be fairly close together. Sunshine asked if there could be a shared driveway for  
48 the two new lots but Goulette said that such an arrangement would not likely improve site distances or  
49 slope and people prefer to have separate driveways.  
50

1 Rinehart asked for a list of things that the DRB would like to see from the applicant in the next hearing.  
2 Sunshine said that the Board would need to see an easement for the use of the wastewater system on  
3 Lot 2 by the owners of Lot 3 and that the Board would also need to see a map of any deeryards found  
4 on the existing lot. He added that the DRB would make it a condition that the applicant provide  
5 wastewater permits and access permits for the Final Subdivision Review  
6

7 Jake Davis, an abutter spoke, explaining that he had no objections to the proposed development except  
8 that he wanted to know if the proposed houses would be single-family residences and he wanted to  
9 know of any plans for the future subdivision of Lot 3. He was concerned about potential impacts to the  
10 natural habitat at the north end of Lot 3 and possible impacts to the aesthetic of the neighborhood that  
11 any future subdivision might have. He reiterated that he had no objections to the current plans as  
12 proposed.  
13

14 Matt Dyer offered that given the existence of the wetlands and the slope in the location discussed by  
15 Davis that it was unlikely anything could be developed there. Ian Bender asked how many lots could  
16 be made out of an existing 5-acre lot but Niels Rinehart said that given the slope and the problems of  
17 access it's unlikely additional subdivisions could be made. Goulette argued that it would likely be  
18 difficult to find other perkable land.  
19

20 Sunshine asked about the condition of Wes White Hill Road these days. Davis and Tim Kenney said  
21 that it was hit or miss depending on different factors including the severity of the winter. Kenney said  
22 that new fabric was recently installed.  
23

24 Sunshine asked Kenney if they had checked their deed for any prohibition against subdivision and  
25 Kenney said that they had not found anything like that.  
26

27 Sunshine said that the applicant can come back for a Final Subdivision Review and Goulette said he  
28 will provide the plat map drafted in final form for that hearing. He also said that he would now apply  
29 for the wastewater and access permits.  
30

31 Matt Dyer and asked if site distance is involved in the access permit application and asked if the Board  
32 should ask for the Fire Chief's approval but the Board believed it was not an issue given the comparison  
33 of the proposed driveways to the existing driveways.  
34

35 *Bender made motion to approve Application #16-080. Roger seconded and all voted in favor (5-0).*  
36

37 *Approval of Minutes*

38 *-June 8th minutes*

39 Matt Dyer makes motion to approve minutes

40 Ian Bender seconded the motion

41 All in favor – approved  
42

43 *-July 13th minutes*

44 Matt Dyer makes motion to approve minutes

45 Roger seconded

46 All in favor  
47

48 Sunshine made the motion to close the meeting, Dyer seconded, all in favor  
49

50 **ADJOURN**

51 Respectfully submitted by Niels Rinehart, Zoning Administrator/Staff to the DRB