

Town of Starksboro
Development Review Board
Minutes (DRAFT)
August 13, 2026

Members Present: Ben Campbell (Chair), Evelyn Boardman, Rob Liotard, Tom Perry, Arnell Paquette, Rich Warren.

Members Not Present: Luke McCarthy

Applicants Present: Alan Norris, Jason Barnard and Scott Baker (Applicant's agents).

Visitors: Kelly Norris, Kathleen Norris, Chris Child (via Zoom).

Others Present: Stephen Rooney, Zoning Administrator

Minutes Prepared by Stephen Rooney on August 14, 2026

Meeting called to order by Chair Ben Campbell at 6:35 pm

Changes to the Agenda:
None

Public Comment: None

Outstanding Minutes Review:

The minutes from the 6/25/2026 meeting were reviewed and accepted without comment.

Hearing #26-DRB-01PUD Norris 8-Lot Planned Unit Development Final Plan Review.

Introductions and Sign-in Sheet distributed.

Final Plan Review Hearing opened at 6:39pm

Chair Ben Campbell read the warning.

B.Campbell swore in the applicants.

B.Campbell asked if there were any conflicts of interest or Ex parte communications. None were reported.

B.Campbell reviewed the exhibit list. S.Rooney noted the following corrections were needed:

1. Exhibit Z: Document labelled "Decision" should be labelled "Preliminary Determination".
2. Exhibits I through L: Documents labelled "Nine-Lot" should be labelled "Eight-Lot".

J.Barnard noted the applicant had no exhibits to add to the list during the hearing.

Testimony:

J.Barnard reviewed the application materials.

J.Barnard confirmed that the wastewater permit was amended for the Lot 8 and 9 merger and has been recorded with the Town.

J.Barnard noted a small adjustment to the Lot 6 frontage boundary on the plats from the previous submittal that made a minor adjustment to the acreage for that lot.

J.Barnard noted that the State Wetlands Ecogolist provided a clear letter that no wetlands permit is required, and requested some boulders be placed along the wetlands delineation line.

J.Barnard noted that septic designs do anticipate the possible addition of ADU's to these lots.

J.Barnard noted that the lots have been physically staked now if anyone wishes to see the locations in the field.

R.Warren asked if the two leach fields in the common area would be marked in some fashion. J.Barnard noted that there would be flushing buckets at the end of each field, but otherwise they would not be marked. He noted the fields would be at grade and that normal foot and lawn care traffic would not be an issue, and that Lot 1 and 2 owners could choose to mark the fields.

R.Liotard asked if Lot 7 would be jointly owned. J.Barnard confirmed that Lot 7 will be co-owned by the owners of Lots 1-6 as noted in the Owners agreements in Exhibit FF.

S.Rooney noted Exhibit FF and GG homeowner agreements are drafts and are not yet final. A.Norris confirmed that the road name in Exhibit GG bylaws is for Stark Mountain Road, which is the proposed name of the new private road and has been registered with the State as part of the HOA. S.Rooney noted the name will still need to be approved by the Selectboard as part of the Town Road Naming Ordinance.

B.Campbell asked if an envelope waiver for Lot 8 is still requested. J.Barnard confirmed the applicant is requesting a waiver of the requirement to indicate a building envelope for Lot 8, as no development is proposed on Lot 8.

R.Liotard asked who has responsibility for the existing gravel road to the gravel pit. J.Barnard noted that it would be on Lot 2. A.Norris noted that Lot 2 might not be developed early, as it might block access to the pit for the other lot stockpiles. B.Campbell and R.Warren asked if the plan will still be to cap the gravel pit after Lots 1 and 2 would be developed. J.Barnard and S.Baker noted that some flexibility is needed as the order of the lot sales cannot be predicted, and that even though stockpile zones are noted on the SW plans, it may be advantageous to stockpile and stage out of the pit in different order than that described on the SW-4 Phasing Plan. J.Barnard noted that the fill from road work in Phase 1 and two lots would likely be all the pit would take before being capped, but it wouldn't necessarily be Lots 1 and 2, it might be two of the other lots depending on the order of sales.

S.Rooney asked if there were any locations where the pit drained out towards the wetlands. J.Barnard and A.Norris responded no, it is a full enclosed pit that drains down through the gravel, so no erosion issues are anticipated.

B.Campbell asked if the site line grading and the drive entrance for the Lot 8 drive access would be done in Phase 1. A.Norris said yes, to take advantage of the contractors being on site.

S.Baker noted that there is a 2 acre disturbance limit on the SW plans, which means only 2 acres can be disturbed at any time. S.Rooney asked what signified the end of the disturbance. S.Baker responded that stabilization measures needed to be in place prior to the disturbance of the next 2 acres.

T.Perry asked if there was anything that noted that the phasing could be changed for flexibility without some indication on the approved plan. S.Rooney noted that on in the EPSC Phasing notes on SW-4 Phasing plan there is a note that allows for flexibility in the order of construction of Phase 2 and 3.

R.Liotard asked if A.Norris would be constructing each of the lots or would it be the responsibility of each lot owner. R.Liotard noted that his question was in regard to who would be monitoring the erosion if multiple contractors are on site. B.Campbell expressed the same concern. J.Barnard responded that erosion control monitoring could be done by Alan or the owner's contractor under the same erosion permit depending on how the contracts are written. S.Baker also noted that the total disturbance noted on the chart on SW-4 is under two acres for Phase 1, and almost under 2 acres for all of Phases 2 and 3, so it's unlikely the two-acre disturbance limit would be reached at any point during construction, regardless of the order of construction. B.Campbell asked if the state monitored this. J.Barnard noted that they will monitor if they get a complaint, and there is reporting requirements along with the permit.

A.Norris stated his intent was to complete Phase 1 and utilities before any lots would be developed.

T.Perry asked who would install the septic. J.Barnard responded it would be the lot owner's contractor.

R.Warren asked what the advantage was of capping the pit after two lots were developed vs. waiting until the whole development was complete. A.Norris responded that it was something that was asked about during the preliminary hearing that he agreed to. B.Campbell noted it also kept the issue from being left off at the end of the project and forgotten.

J.Barnard asked if the narrative needed to be re-read as it had been covered several times earlier. S.Rooney noted there is no statutory requirement. B.Campbell asked if the narrative was the same as previous. J.Barnard said yes, except for the merger of Lots 8 and 9. S.Rooney noted the important thing was to review changes from the earlier submissions.

J.Barnard reviewed the stormwater design and disconnect details on the SW plans, and noted that from the test pit investigations the draining of the soils is exceptional. He noted that road run-off

along Lots 1 and 2 is directed out to the gravel pit, which will not be filled “level” and can act as a retaining device. Road runoff south of the Lot 1 and 2 section is shown draining along a swale into a meadow area adjacent to the wetlands. B.Campbell asked if there would be a basin at the end of this swale. J.Barnard responded that it’s a natural basin with sheet flow into the wetlands. J.Barnard noted that this flow exists off the existing field road now, it would just be directed towards this meadow area. S.Baker noted this was discussed with the storm water engineer, and it was felt that it was not necessary due to the expected soils infiltration, but if an issue arose, an infiltration “trench” could be installed in this swale.

R.Warren noted a typo on Sheet S-2 where the septic field for Lot 3 is noted as “Lot 4”. J.Barnard concurred.

B.Campbell asked if lot owner’s obtained their own construction erosion permits would they be subject to the general permit conditions. J.Barnard responded yes.

J.Barnard reviewed the plats. S.Rooney noted on PL-1 that it still lists the Watershed Protection (WP) district as one of the zones in the project. This was noted to be corrected in earlier ZA correspondence with the applicant. S.Baker concurred and noted that it will be corrected.

B.Campbell reviewed the letters of testimony from Charlotte Sullivan and Chip and Jennifer Lovett (Exhibits CC and DD respectively). B.Campbell noted the questions and requests for actions directed to the DRB from these letters would be responded to by the Board after the deliberative session to assure the response was approved by the board and not be individual responses.

R.Warren asked if the HOA would allow folks to put up their clothes up on a line to dry. A. Norris answered yes.

Motion:

R.Liotard moved that the Board accept the application and testimony provided as meeting the requirements necessary to conduct the PUD hearing as set forth in the bylaws. E.Boardman seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion:

R.Warren moved to close the hearing. A.Paquette seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion:

A. Paquette moved to deliberate on the application in a closed Session. E.Boardman seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

The visitors were dismissed.

(continued on next page)

Motion:

E.Boardman moved to continue the open Deliberative Session for 26-DRB-03 McCormick.
R.Liotard seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

Open Deliberative Session for 26-DRB-03 McCormick

A quorum of attending members was confirmed. E.Boardman assumed the Chair.

Motion:

R.Liotard moved to accept the drafted decision with the noted correction of the SLDUR acronym on page 1. A.Paquette seconded.

Vote: All in favor

The Board then entered a closed deliberative session at 8:05pm.

Motion:

B.Campbell made a motion to adjourn at 9:00pm. A.Paquette seconded. **Vote:** All in favor.