



Planning & Zoning Office  
Town of Richmond P.O. Box 285  
Richmond, VT 05477  
(802) 434-2430  
tmachia@richmondvt.gov  
www.richmondvt.gov

---

## Town of Richmond Development Review Board May 14, 2025 Minutes

**Members Present:** David Sunshine (Chair), Matthew Dyer (Vice Chair) Roger Pedersen, Padraic Monks, Matt Parisi

**Staff:** Tyler Machia, Keith Osborne

**Others Present:** Michael and Jess Sipe, Fran Thomas, Scott Baker, Tess Storrs, Denise Barnard, Jim Oliver, Chelsye Brooks, Duncan Wardwell

**Meeting Opened: 7:08 PM**

**Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items - None**

**Public Hearing**

**Item 1.**

**SP2025-02 Town of Richmond Parcel ID#BC0058**

**Project Location: 58 Browns Court**

**Project Description:** The Applicants are seeking site plan review to amend the site plan for the preexisting outdoor recreation facility located at Browns Court. The Applicants are looking to update the landscaping plan for the project. The Applicants are also looking to provide a phasing plan for the project.

**Comments:** Duncan provided an overview of the project, noting that the exercise here was to amend the landscaping plan to comply with the zoning permit.

Fran Thomas noted the amendment is to clean up confusion with the trees.

**Motion to approve as presented (Petersen, Dyer 2<sup>nd</sup>) - Unanimous.**

**Item 2.**

**SUB2025-04 David Sunshine & Carol B. Jordan Parcel ID#JR1582**

**Project Location: 1582 Jericho Rd**

**Project Description:** The Applicants are seeking final approval for a proposed two lot subdivision that will create two new lots, Parcel 3 and Parcel 5. Parcel 3 of this proposed subdivision is 168.7 acres and will be improved with a single-family residence. Parcel 5 is 2.57 acres and will be improved with a single-family residence.

**Comments:** David Sunshine recused himself at 7:18pm. Sunshine noted plans have not changed much since preliminary review. Petersen asked if there were any additional changes and it was noted the turnaround was relocated to accommodate the gravel wetland proposed and this change was

approved by the Selectboard as part of the Rural Road standards ordinance. The maintenance agreement as well as the shared infrastructure discussed; concerns raised with regard to the lack of information provided. Sunshine noted that there is a maintenance agreement in effect.

Brooks states after research that a Stormwater permit was not required as the 1 acre threshold was not met.

Pedersen wants covenants on record and referred to in the deeds for the new parcels.

**Motion to approve (Monks, Dyer 2<sup>nd</sup>) unanimous with the following conditions:**

- **Deed reference to recorded protective convenances for the previously approved road.**
- **Obtain all State permits**

**Item 3.**

**PRESUB2025-05 Jessica & Micheal Sipes Parcel ID#WF0060**

**Project Location: 60 Wolf Lane**

**Project Description:** The Applicants, Jessica & Michael Sipes, are applying for preliminary subdivision review. They are proposing a two-lot residential subdivision. One lot of the subdivision would consist of 1.74 acres and would include the existing house. The second lot would consist of 13.05 acres and would contain an existing studio barn that would be converted to contain a dwelling unit. The proposed second lot currently has a restriction on it noting that residential uses are prohibited. The applicants are seeking to remove this restriction.

**Comments:** Sunshine re-joins the board at 7:49pm.

Applicants provide an overview of the project and are looking to subdividing the house from the studio in order to make one 13.05 acre lot and one 1.74 acre lot. Neighbors in support and states that the Ag restriction is not a “critical permit conditions”. DRB noted that there is some confusion on the building envelope. DRB discussed the merits of the critical permit condition.

Motion to start deliberative session (Monks, Pedersen 2<sup>nd</sup>) Time: 8:42pm

Motion to end deliberative session (Monks, Pedersen 2<sup>nd</sup>) Time: 9:02pm

**Motion to deny (Monks, Pedersen 2<sup>nd</sup>) unanimous with the following comment:**

**Motion to deny based on prohibitions as set forth in the existing court order to require the building envelope for Lot 7 to be restricted to agricultural uses only.**