

Town of Starksboro  
Development Review Board  
Minutes (DRAFT)  
March 12, 2026

---

Members Present: Ben Campbell, Evelyn Boardman, Rob Liotard, Tom Perry, Arnell Paquette,  
Luke McCarthy, Rich Warren

Members Not Present:

Applicants Present: Kevin Harper, Julie Herr

Visitors: None

Others Present: Stephen Rooney, Zoning Administrator

---

Meeting called to order by Chair Ben Campbell at 6:37 pm

**Changes to the Agenda:**

None

**1/22/2026 Minutes Review:**

**Motion:**

L.McCarthy moved to accept the minutes of 1/22/2026

R.Liotard seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor

**2/26/2026 Minutes Review:**

**Motion:**

R.Liotard moved to accept the minutes of 2/26/2026

A.Paquette seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Public Comment:** None

**Hearing #26-DRB-01SD Harper-Herr 2-Lot Minor Subdivision Final Plan Review.**

Introductions and Sign-in Sheet distributed.

Final Plan Review Hearing opened at 6:42pm

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.

**Testimony:**

Kevin Harper and Julie Herr reviewed the application narrative and plans, and noted the following additional information.

- 1) The boundary line adjustment between VanSteamburg-Bedard and Dickason-Namy has been executed and recorded since the hearing was warned.
- 2) The forestry land use program on the proposed Lot 2 has recently been updated and will be transferred to VanSteamburg-Bedard with the land sale, and then updated for the sugaring operation.
- 3) State wastewater exemption forms and amended wastewater permits were issued for both the VanSteamburg-Bedard/Dickason-Namy boundary line adjustment, and for this subdivision application.
- 4) A road access easement is indicated on the proposed subdivision plat through Lot 1 to the private road to the south in the event that the land sale is not consummated, so that Lot 2 if approved will have the required road access required by Section 310.C.
  - a) K.Harper asked if the easement could be removed after the final lot merger. S.Rooney noted the DRB may want to consider adding a condition to a potential decision that the easement can be removed and the plat amended without a hearing if the sale is consummated, as the lot will have road access through the VanSteamburg-Bedard property at that point.
  - b) R.Warren asked if an easement deed would be recorded. J.Herr noted it would not unless the land sale was not consummated, if not the deed would need to be filed. S.Rooney noted that if the sale is not consummated and the applicant wished to sell the land to someone else and wanted to move the easement location, it may need to go back to the DRB to amend the plat. R.Warren asked if in any event it was true that the applicant was committed to providing the easement right-of-way if necessary. K.Harper and J.Herr agreed.
- 5) K.Harper noted the history behind the lot shape with regards to Section 351.E(1), and noted the new boundary line follows an existing stone wall.
  - a) S.Rooney noted this section was discussed in the pre-application meeting with regards to the final lot merger shape, and may not apply to the current subdivision application on it's own merits.
  - b) S.Rooney noted that the last sentence in the narrative under the 351.E waiver discussion applies to 351.E(3), which was provided in error as the paragraph does not apply to this project. K.Harper agreed.
- 6) K.Harper discussed the rationale for the request to waive the 351.F building envelope requirement, as the land is intended to be undeveloped for the foreseeable future, and the effort to determine a buildable envelope area is unwarranted.
  - a) T.Perry noted that this section had also been waived on previous applications where no development is proposed.

S.Rooney briefly reviewed the remaining undiscussed exhibits J-N.

S.Rooney pointed out in Exhibit K, page 3 (Lot 2 draft warranty deed from Harper-Herr to VanSteamburg-Bedard) that the previous subdivision requirement for the 20acre set-aside is referenced and carried forward. K.Harper reviewed the set-aside on the plans. J.Herr noted that the set-aside makes sense and encloses an area that should not be built on.

S.Rooney noted that exhibit M purchase and sale agreement includes a draft deed that will be replaced by Exhibit K once the sale is finalized.

T.Perry inquired about the Lot 1 wastewater permit. K.Harper explained the history of the original permit and replacement treatment area, and the State's amendment of that permit to address the new subdivision lot line.

B.Campbell questioned the calculation of the building rights table shown on the draft plat, and S.Rooney confirmed the table only deals with this subdivision and does not address the merged lot. S.Rooney confirmed that the 20acre set-aside is included in the rights table as there is no clear direction to not to include it in the bylaws. S.Rooney noted, however, that a building right does not automatically mean a building can technically be developed on a lot if it violates other sections of the bylaws.

S.Rooney noted the final VanSteamburg-Bedard lot merger cannot take place until the land is sold, which cannot take place until the subdivision is approved and recorded.

**Motion:**

E.Boardman moved that the application be accepted as meeting the criteria for a minor subdivision. B. Campbell seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor.

R.Warren asked what the process would be if the building envelope is waived and not indicated. S.Rooney noted that there isn't a set process; it was handled by adding a DRB condition to the last application that was granted this waiver that the DRB review the proposed development and not just receive a review for a zoning permit from the ZA.

B.Campbell read the exhibit list. S.Rooney noted there were no additions to be made.

**Motion:**

L.McCarthy moved to close the hearing. A.Paquette seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor.

The applicants were dismissed.

**Motion:**

L.McCarthy moved to go into Deliberative Session at 7:33pm. B.Campbell seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Motion:**

B.Campbell made a motion to adjourn at 8:00pm. E.Boardman seconded. **Vote:** All in favor.