

**FAYSTON DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**  
**MINUTES**  
**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2019**  
**Unapproved**

Attending DRB Members: Shane Mullen (Chair), Mike Quenneville, Pete Ludlow, and Ky Koitzsch; ZA: John Weir; Public: Matt Parisi, Anthony Parisi

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m.

Chair Mullen opened the preliminary sketch plan review for a 3-lot subdivision off of Village Road, Fayston (parcel ID# 11-071). Applicants Matt Parisi and Blair Knowles request approval under Section 7 of the Fayston Land Use Regulations for a minor subdivision of one 10.1 acre parcel into three lots of 2.5 acres, 2.75 acres and 4 acres.

Matt Parisi presented his application. Matt inherited this 10.1-acre lot from his father. Matt is hoping to get preliminary approval for this subdivision before incurring great engineering costs. Matt proposes to subdivide the parcel into 3 parcels, with each new parcel being 2.5, 2.75, and 4 acres. Each lot will have one single family home or one duplex style home on it. This would mean a total of 3-6 units. Each new parcel would have its own well and septic system. Two of the lots would have a shared driveway accessed from Village Road. One lot would have its own private driveway accessed from High Road. Each new house would not exceed 3200 square feet in finished space and would likely not exceed 1600 square feet if built as a single-family home.

Matt has supplied the board with a sketch plan utilizing lidar information with unlabeled contour lines that he indicated were two-foot intervals. All locations of the proposed structures were approximate only. Per members' discussion, the site plan and information presented did not fully illustrate the site conditions in a way for the Board to determine if the proposed subdivision would be approvable. Based on the measurements taken from the site plan, it appears that the proposed layout of roads, houses and leachfields are located on slopes in excess of 25%. This is contrary to Section 3.4 E (1) (b) of the Land Use Regulations, which restricts development on slopes in excess of 25% in grade with minor exceptions not relevant to this application. The Board agreed that the plan as shown does not meet the standard of this section. Furthermore, development on slopes between 15% and 25% are subject to conditional use approval and require additional care to ensure that the proposed project does not result in an erosive condition. No erosion control plan was submitted.

Members agreed that, before the Board can review this proposed subdivision as part of a preliminary plat application and determine if it complies with the Land Use Regulations, engineering design will need to be performed to illustrate existing and proposed grades, driveway design, location of all utilities (i.e. water, sewer, electric/telecommunications, stormwater drainage), house locations, etc. Per the Board's written suggestions to the applicant, if he would like to continue sketch plan review for this project to determine if the concept is feasible and can move to the preliminary plat phase, the following would need to be provided for further consideration:

1. Site plan with shaded areas indicating slopes of 0 - 15%, 15 - 25%, and greater than 25%.
2. Relocated roads and houses on slopes under 15% as much as possible.
3. Existing and proposed road/driveway profiles illustrating the existing and proposed grades of the access to each of the houses.
4. A wetland delineation to illustrate how the project avoids impacts to these natural resources.
5. Preliminary information on the septic systems. Test pit information, coupled with the slope analysis, would provide an understanding of the conceptual feasibility of a wastewater disposal system.
6. Discuss how site conditions differ from those described in the record (i.e. letter from McCain Consulting dated 11/08/2006) that indicate the developability of the parcel with respect to the Land Use Regulations.
7. Bring a civil engineer to the next hearing to explain the design process and how the project was configured to meet the intent of the Land Use Regulations.

Members then reviewed the minutes from the last two meetings. Pete moved to approve the minutes of October 8, 2019, and Mike seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed. Pete moved to approve the minutes of November 12, 2019, and Shane seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.