

Town of Underhill
Development Review Board Minutes
Chairperson Scott Tobin

November 16, 2009

Board Members Present:

Scott Tobin, Chair
Penny Miller
Stan Hamlet
Will Towle
Charlie Van Winkle
Matt Chapek

Also Present:

Kari Papelbon, Zoning Administrator

6:30 PM: Site visit at 409 VT Route 15 for Conditional Use/Home Occupation application of Emily Garrett and Chris Charuk.

6:54 PM: Chairperson Scott Tobin called the Garrett/Charuk Conditional Use hearing to order.

Applicants Present:

Emily Garrett and Chris Charuk
409 VT Rte. 15
Underhill, VT

Identifier: Contents:

ZA-1	Emily Garrett's Application for Conditional Use Hearing (dated 11-4-09)
ZA-2	A copy of the Home Occupation Permit Application
ZA-3	A copy of the Proposed Findings of Fact
ZA-4	A copy of the tax map for VT409
ZA-5	A copy of the Signs section of the zoning regulations
ZA-6	A copy of the hearing notice published in the <i>Burlington Free Press</i> (dated 10-29-09)
ZA-7	Staff report prepared by ZA Papelbon
S-1	A copy of the Sketch/Area Table Addendum sheet from the Lister file

- Chairperson Tobin began the meeting by explaining the procedure for the conditional use hearing and swore in all interested parties. He then entered the above items into record.
- Emily Garrett and Chris Charuk provided an overview of their plans to offer yoga classes in their home. Up to 15 classes per week over time, max of 20

people per class. 9-7:30, classes are 1-1.5 hours each. Morning and evening class with none in-between. Guest instructors and day-long workshops on weekends.

- Board Member Charlie Van Winkle asked if morning and/or evening classes would be offered during day-long workshops or if the class would be incorporated into the workshop. Ms. Garrett stated that the class would be integrated with the workshop.
- Board Member Stan Hamlet asked if more than 20 people would be attending a weekend workshop. Ms. Garrett stated that she cannot fit more than 20 people in the studio space. Classes and workshops would be filled using pre-registration and a waiting list.
- Chairperson Tobin asked if the studio would operate 7 days/week. Ms. Garrett stated that she would like the option and flexibility to do so, but that she wouldn't teach more than 5 days per week.
- Board Member Penny Miller asked about the estimate of 12 cars if 20 students would register for a class. Ms. Garrett stated that more cars could probably fit in their driveway but that people might be able to park in the church parking lot or carpool.
- Board Member Will Towle stated that the DRB had driven in 9 vehicles to the site and it seemed like the parking area was full. Mr. Charuk stated that they had not yet done a parking plan yet but that they were going to explore options. Chairperson Tobin stated that while the DRB had little trouble parking during the site visit, a class departing at the same time another was arriving could cause some trouble. Ms. Garrett stated that she would schedule classes with enough time in between to avoid such issues.
- Chairperson Tobin asked if the 7:30 PM time would be the end time for classes or if that would be the start time for the last class of the day. Ms. Garrett stated that it would be the end time.
- Board Member Miller asked if the applicants had plans or wishes for adding more lighting to the parking area. Mr. Charuk stated that there would be additional lighting for the path to the front of the house.
- Chairperson Tobin asked if the applicants had been in contact with the Fire Marshall. Ms. Garrett stated that she spoke to one of the Fire Marshalls and further discussion is in process. A discussion of potential areas of concern for the Fire Marshall, including handrails, ensued. Mr. Charuk explained that if the Fire Marshall decision required changes to the existing staircase that they would probably not pursue the home yoga studio and rent the space as an apartment as was done previously. The discussion of potential issues for the Fire Marshall continued. Mr. Charuk explained that he and Ms. Garrett want to make sure that the space is safe.

- Chairperson Tobin explained that the Fire Marshall and the State Wastewater Management Division may make a determination on the number of people allowed in the building that is outside of the DRB's decision on the capacity at any given hour. Ms. Garrett stated that Ernie Christianson mentioned, informally over the phone, that the septic system could handle up to 70 people per week.
- Board Member Charlie Van Winkle asked if there would be a sign for the home occupation. Ms. Garrett stated that she had a rough design and passed it around for the Board to review. Board Member Matt Chapek asked if the sign would be lighted, to which Ms. Garret replied that she had not yet decided. Mr. Charuk stated that he'd like to ask the neighbors what they'd want. ZA Papelbon stated that there are regulations for lighting the sign.
- Chairperson Tobin asked the Board to review the proposed Findings of Fact. Board Member Van Winkle asked to go back to the sign and stated that the signpost from the previous owner's business is still there. He then asked whether or not the Board needed to rule on the setbacks for the sign. ZA Papelbon wondered whether the existing signpost was in the right-of-way. She stated it was a preexisting structure. A brief discussion of the regulations and setbacks ensued. It was agreed that the signpost in the existing spot is a preexisting structure that could be used for the new sign.
- There were no issues with the Findings of Fact.
- ZA Papelbon stated that whenever Ernie Christianson provides a letter as to the septic capacity that a copy should be submitted to her. She also reiterated that whatever the Fire Marshall and the State Wastewater Management Division require for the home occupation is not in the DRB's jurisdiction and are separate requirements. She asked if the applicants would sell promotional items. Ms. Garrett responded that she would be selling items such as yoga mats, CDs, yoga bolsters, and related items to clients. Board Member Miller asked if the items for sale would be advertised on the outside premises, to which Ms. Garrett replied that she would not.
- ZA Papelbon asked how many guest instructors Ms. Garrett would have per class. After a brief clarification, Ms. Garrett stated that each class would have perhaps one or two guest instructors that would teach instead of her. Such classes would be included in, not in addition to, the 15 classes offer per week.
- Mr. Charuk reiterated that classes would not be scheduled back-to-back in order to avoid traffic issues.
- Ms. Garrett stated that she would like to change her request for hours of operation to accommodate potential requests for early-morning classes. The new proposed hours of operation would be Monday through Friday 6:00 AM – 7:30 PM and Saturday and Sunday 8:00 AM – 7:30 PM.

- Board Member Will Towle stated that a question about the adequacy of available parking was still before the Board. Board Member Stan Hamlet stated that he would like to see no more than 12 cars on the site and suggested that the applicants request permission to use the United Church of Underhill's parking lot for overflow parking. Board Member Penny Miller stated that she would like to see no cars parked on the side of the street. ZA Papelbon stated that she did not think parking on the street was allowed. Board Member Matt Chapek asked about safety for people crossing the street. Mr. Charuk stated that he and the neighbors might send a written request for a crosswalk. A short discussion on crossing VT Rte. 15 and alternate parking ensued.

7:28 PM: Chairperson Tobin asked if the Board felt they had enough information to make a decision on whether the application fulfills the requirements for conditional use. The Board stated that they had enough information to proceed. Chairperson Tobin stated that the evidentiary portion of the hearing was closed and explained the procedure for decision-making.

7:29 PM: Board Member Stan Hamlet made a motion, seconded by Board Member Matt Chapek, to enter deliberative session. The motion was passed by all Board Members present.

7:45 PM: Chairperson Scott Tobin made a motion, seconded by Board Member Will Towle, to move into open session. The motion was passed by all Board Members present. Board Member Stan Hamlet made a motion, seconded by Board Member Charlie Van Winkle, to approve the conditional use application as presented at the hearing with the following conditions:

1. The hours of operation shall be Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM – 7:30 PM and 8:00 AM – 7:30 PM Saturday and Sunday.
2. Up to 15 classes per week are approved, including weekend workshops.
3. No more than 12 vehicles per class shall be allowed in the outside parking area/driveway.
4. The sign design is approved and any sign erected shall comply with zoning regulations. The existing signpost on the premises may be used.
5. No exterior display of items for sale is approved. Items for sale inside the yoga studio are approved.
6. Guest instructors are approved.

The motion was passed by all Board Members present.

7:47 PM: Chairperson Tobin called the Tatro final subdivision hearing to order.

Applicant Present:

Mike Tatro
535 Main St.
Dalton, MA 01226

Consultant Present:

Gunner McCain
McCain Consulting
93 S. Main St.
Waterbury, VT

Others Present:

Cindy Cross-Greenia
34 Mullen Road
Underhill, VT

William and Lynn MacDonough, applicants for next meeting

Guest

Identifier:	Contents:
ZA-1	Michael Tatro's Application for Subdivision: Final Hearing (dated 10-7-09);
ZA-2	A copy of the completed Subdivision Checklist: Final Hearing;
ZA-3	A copy of plans prepared by Gunner McCain of McCain Consulting for Michael Tatro (Sheets S-1 through S-3 and SW-1 through SW-2 revised 9-2-09);
ZA-4	A copy of the Final Plat prepared by Keith Van Iderstine of McCain Consulting for Michael Tatro (dated 6-29-06);
ZA-5	A copy of the Construction General Permit #5549-9020.3 (dated 9-18-09);
ZA-6	A copy of the Stormwater Permit #5549-9015 (dated 10-1-09);
ZA-7	A copy of the Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Permit WW-4-3334 (dated 9-4-09);
ZA-8	A copy of the letter from the Underhill-Jericho Fire Department (dated 4-24-09);
ZA-9	A copy of the Attorney's Report and Opinion on Title from Norman C. Smith, Esq. (effective to 10-5-09);
ZA-10	A copy of the Draft Declaration of Deer Run Planned Community (dated 10-8-09);
ZA-11	A copy of the email from Mike Weisel regarding comments made at the preliminary hearing (dated 3-23-09);
ZA-12	A copy of the minutes from the March 23, 2009 preliminary hearing;
ZA-13	A copy of the Preliminary Decision (dated 4-9-09);
ZA-14	A copy of the hearing notice published in the Burlington Free Press (dated 10-29-09)
S-1	Sheet SW-1 (revised 11-12-09)
S-2	Proposed Conditions for Subdivision
S-3	Waiver request for bonding requirement (dated 11-10-09)
S-4	Email from Nicole Fitch, McCain Consulting, addressing questions from ZA Kari Papelbon's email dated 10-12-09 (dated 11-11-09)

- Chairperson Tobin began the meeting by explaining the procedure for the final subdivision hearing. Chairperson Tobin then swore in all interested parties and entered the above items into record.
- Gunner McCain, McCain Consulting, stated that no significant changes had been made to the proposed 3-lot subdivision, and provided an overview of the minor revisions made since the preliminary hearing. Permits received for the project include onsite water and sewage, stormwater, and erosion (Construction General Permit).
- Chairperson Tobin asked what was changed on Sheet SW-1. Mr. McCain stated that it was an error in culvert size. One sheet showed a 30-inch culvert that should have been 18 inches. The 18-inch culvert is now shown. All revisions made in September were to address items from the preliminary hearing, including road names and lot codes.
- Board Member Stan Hamlet asked if the bent rail post on the bridge had been fixed. Mr. McCain stated that he did not believe so and Mr. Tatro confirmed that it had not. Mr. McCain stated that the understanding is that the post needs to be fixed and that some improvements will be required for the bridge, including runners and guardrails. ZA Papelbon added that there was an email from Mike Weisel, Town Engineer, included in the info packet with recommendations for the bridge. She also stated that recommendations for the bridge will be made to the Selectboard as it is their jurisdiction to approve or approve with conditions.
- Mr. McCain asked whether ZA Papelbon would submit the necessary requests for approval to the Selectboard (Proposed Condition #14), to which she replied she would. He then asked to clarify which Engineering Drawing Proposed Condition #2 referred to. ZA Papelbon stated that it would be changed to state Sheet S-1. There were no other concerns for the proposed conditions.
- Board Member Penny Miller asked whether the “Preliminary” language on Sheet S-3 could be changed. Mr. McCain stated that a revised copy would be provided for the zoning file.
- ZA Papelbon explained the revisions from the preliminary decision: private road name and parcel codes are shown on the plans; curve radii for the road are now shown and will need waivers from the Selectboard; a utility easement location is shown; details for the anti-seep collars, bioretention pond, and culvert headwall are in the plans; copies of the State wastewater permit, Construction General Permit, and Stormwater permit have been received; a letter from the UJFD has been received with comments the Board is used to seeing, recommendations for the bridge from Mike Weisel, and stated she did not know what the Board could do to please the UJFD in the future—all the Board can really do is follow the Road Policy; a copy of the Proposed

Homeowners Association; an Attorney's Report and Opinion on Title. The Private Roadway Agreement was submitted at the preliminary hearing and ZA Papelbon asked if it worked in tandem with the Homeowners Association document, to which Mr. McCain stated it did. She then asked Mr. McCain whether the correct base and fabric widths for the road are shown, to which he replied they were. She reiterated information that the post on the bridge hadn't yet been fixed but would be, and that recommendations for the addition of guardrails and runner planks would be made to the Selectboard. ZA Papelbon then stated that Ms. Cross-Greenia raised the concerns at the preliminary hearing for the culverts. Mr. McCain stated that the existing culvert would be removed and a 30-inch culvert will be installed properly. ZA Papelbon stated that she had a note that the Low-Risk Site Handbook would be used for installation and Mr. McCain added that such is a requirement under the Construction General Permit. ZA Papelbon then stated that a small culvert on the property line between Lots 1 and 2 was seen on the site visit. Mr. McCain stated that there was a small culvert in the watercourse on Lot 1 and stated that taking it out or leaving it in wasn't a problem.

- ZA Papelbon stated that she had a note about a limited cut zone and asked for clarification. Mr. McCain explained the restrictions per the State's requirements, the Town's requirements, and the Rural Development Credit criteria for the Stormwater program. A discussion of these requirements ensued and the limited cut zone requested from the preliminary hearing. It was agreed that a limited cut zone would be established on the plans along the shared property line with 34 Mullen Road and the ~129-foot area between Lots 1 and 2 along the brook. Clear-cutting would be prohibited and only limited cutting other than that necessary to construct the road would be allowed. Such area would be shown on the survey.
- Chairperson Tobin asked for public comment.
- Cindy Cross-Greenia, 34 Mullen Road, expressed her concerns for the UJFD letter requiring the bridge width to be increased from 11 feet to 20 feet. She stated that the bridge is not sufficiently wide enough for the fire trucks to get across and if there is a fire on one of the subdivision's lots, the fire trucks may not be able to reach it and may threaten her property. Chairperson Tobin stated that the letter is a request from the UJFD and that the Road Policy does not have specific requirements for bridges. He stated that the Board received an opinion from two engineers regarding the bridge design. Ms. Cross-Greenia stated that the Town Engineer is not a fire fighter and wanted to know how to appeal the decision. Chairperson Tobin and Board Member Van Winkle explained the appeal procedure. Ms. Cross-Greenia left at this point. A lengthy discussion of the UJFD letter, the bridge, and the Road Policy requirements ensued. It was determined that all submission requirements were accounted for and that the DRB could proceed with the subdivision hearing.
- Chairperson Tobin asked if there were further discussions or comments.

8:42 PM: Chairperson Tobin asked if the Board felt they had enough information to make a decision on whether the application fulfills the final hearing requirements for subdivision. The Board stated that they did. Board Member Stan Hamlet made a motion, seconded by Board Member Charlie Van Winkle, to move into deliberative session on the application. The motion was passed by all Board Members present with the exception of Board Member Will Towle who did not cast a vote as he did not participate in previous proceedings related to the application. Chairperson Tobin stated that the evidentiary portion of the hearing was closed.

8:44 PM: Chairperson Scott Tobin called the MacDonough sketch plan meeting to order.

Applicants Present:

William and Lynn MacDonough
P.O. Box 21 (42 Krug Rd.)
Underhill Center, VT

Identifier: Contents:

ZA-1	William and Lynn MacDonough's Application for Subdivision: Sketch Plan (dated 10-26-09)
ZA-2	A copy of the completed Subdivision Checklist: Sketch Plan
ZA-3	A copy of the plans prepared by Jeffrey Olesky of Civil Engineering Associates, Inc. for William and Lynn MacDonough (Drawings C1.0-C1.2 dated January 2009)
ZA-4	A copy of the tax map for KR042
ZA-5	Staff report prepared by ZA Papelbon

- Chairperson Tobin began the meeting by explaining the procedure for sketch plan review.
- William MacDonough, applicant, explained the sketch plan proposal. The parcel is roughly 7.5 acres at 42 Krug Road that they would like to subdivide into two lots with a new single-family residence on Lot 2. There are two variance requests: one for a setback for the existing house (~8 feet) and the second is for the road frontage (~12.5 feet for each new lot). Septic designs have been reviewed by the State and final approval is pending.
- Chairperson Tobin asked for clarification for the variance request for the existing house. The Board determined that since the house is a preexisting nonconforming structure that no variance would be required. The house was built in 1979 and ZA Papelbon stated that someone probably measured incorrectly when they built.
- A variance for the frontage requirement is approximately 25 feet in overall length.

- Mr. MacDonough stated that Alan Quackenbush of the State Wetlands Office would be conducting a site visit on November 18 to confirm the location of the Class II wetlands. All development is proposed well outside of the 100-foot town buffer.
- Board Member Charlie Van Winkle stated that the request is for a dimensional waiver for the frontage—approximately 24.5 feet. He explained the variance criteria and asked for information as to the “creation of hardship” criterion. Mr. MacDonough explained that there is more than the minimum acreage needed to subdivide, that the plans meet the density limits.
- Board Member Penny Miller asked if a PRD would be helpful. Board Member Van Winkle said that there are some options. Mr. MacDonough stated that the two lots they own have more than 750 feet and they could modify the frontage to satisfy the requirements for all lots, but that there are some disadvantages to doing so. A discussion of frontage and possible options for configuration ensued.
- Board Member Van Winkle stated that an option would be a PRD. ZA Papelbon stated that doing so would be basically the same plan with open space designated. Board Member Van Winkle explained the PRD option. Board Member Penny Miller asked whether the MacDonoughs would have to configure the lots to meet the requirement. A brief discussion of road frontage requirements and options ensued.
- Chairperson Tobin explained the issues with meeting the variance criteria versus the option of waivers in a Planned Residential Development (PRD). Board Member Van Winkle asked for a density plan to show that the lots can be configured to meet the requirements. Further explanations of the PRD process and requirements were given.
- Board Member Matt Chapek asked if Lot 2 was able to have its own wastewater. Mr. MacDonough stated it did not have any soils for any type of wastewater system. He stated that Ernie Christianson suggested the proposed location for the system.
- Board Member Will Towle asked what the site looked like presently. Mr. MacDonough said it was basically a pine tree plantation, but some trees were dying off.
- Board Member Stan Hamlet asked if the MacDonoughs were ok with having the proposed septic system in the proposed location considering the location of their well. Mr. MacDonough stated that they were since there was over 100 feet of separation. Their existing septic system is below their house.
- Board Member Towle asked how the septic system would be accessed—via easement? Mr. MacDonough confirmed that it would be via easement.

- Board Member Towle asked why the proposed road was configured so close to the abutting property line with KR032. Mr. MacDonough explained that it was configured due to topography. Board Member Towle asked how close to the property line it would be. It was explained that the current regulations require it to be 20 feet from the side lot line, but if a PRD is proposed a request for a waiver of that requirement may be submitted.
- Mr. MacDonough stated that he had spoken to the neighbor about buying a right-of-way easement to use his driveway for access with a maintenance agreement in place for upkeep, but the neighbor declined. The neighbor did not have a problem with the location of the proposed driveway. Further discussions with the neighbor may occur.
- ZA Papelbon explained the requirements for a site visit associated with the preliminary hearing requirements.
- Chairperson Tobin asked a procedural question about accepting the proposed sketch plan should the applicants choose to pursue a PRD. ZA Papelbon stated that other sketch plans have been accepted that changed at the preliminary stage. Chairperson Tobin stated that the appropriate acreage to meet the density requirements existed, and ZA Papelbon stated that the applicants could choose to pursue the current plan and request a variance.
- A brief discussion of procedure ensued.

9:07 PM: Chairperson Scott Tobin asked if the Board felt they had enough information to make a decision on whether the requirements for sketch plan had been met. The Board stated that they did. Board Member Charlie Van Winkle made a motion to reject the plan as presented, to accept the 2-lot subdivision concept, and that the Board encourages the applicants to submit a density plan with the preliminary plat submittal (motion failed). ZA Papelbon stated that there were several motions made. A discussion of procedure ensued.

Chairperson Tobin read the checklist for submission requirements. Board Member Will Towle read the requirements for sketch plan and gave an opinion on procedure. The procedure discussion continued.

9:18 PM: The Board was in agreement that the MacDonoughs could proceed with preliminary subdivision plan preparation, and provided recommendations for a Planned Residential Development and how to proceed with their preliminary application. End of sketch plan meeting.

The Board entered the deliberative session on the final Tatro subdivision application. Board Member Will Towle left at this point as he did not cast a vote in the hearing.

9:50 PM: Board Member Stan Hamlet made a motion, seconded by Board Member Charlie Van Winkle, to move into open session. The motion was passed by all Board Members present.

9:51 PM: Chairperson Scott Tobin made a motion, seconded by Board Member Penny Miller, to accept the final subdivision application as presented at the hearing with the following conditions:

1. Per the Underhill Subdivision Regulations, final approval of the subdivision is granted upon filing of the final subdivision plat in the Underhill Land Records. No transfer, sale, or development of property may occur prior to recording the final plat, decision, and all applicable permits and approvals in the Town of Underhill Land Records.
2. The final Engineering Drawing Sheet S-1 shall be recorded in the Land Records.
3. All State permits shall be recorded in the Land Records.
4. Prior to issuance of a building permit to any lot out of this subdivision, an engineer shall provide a letter to the Zoning Administrator certifying
 - a. that the shared infrastructure has been installed to the lot per the phasing schedule in the approved plans;
 - b. that the approved curb cut has been installed per the plan; and
 - c. that the driveway has been “roughed in” per the approved plan.

Driveway top treatment may be installed at the end of the construction period. All erosion prevention, sediment control, and stormwater measures shall be installed per the phasing schedule in the approved plans. Approved driveways shall be the only points of ingress and egress during the construction period so as to minimize:

- a. compaction of site soils; and
- b. the effect on the submitted stormwater plans.

The existing bridge shall also be upgraded to include runner planks and steel beam guardrails, and the bent post shall be fixed per Town Engineer Mike Weisel’s recommendations.

Upon completion of construction, the designer/engineer must certify by letter to the Zoning Administrator that the shared infrastructure and driveways have been constructed as designed. This certification shall be recorded in the Land Records.

5. All culvert installations shall follow the requirements in *The Low-Risk Site Handbook for Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control*.
6. The Private Roadway Agreement shall be recorded in the Land Records. Reference to the Private Roadway Agreement shall appear in any deed in this subdivision. This agreement may appear in the Homeowners Association agreement.

7. The Homeowners Association document shall be recorded in the Land Records. Reference to the Homeowners Association agreement shall appear in any deed in this subdivision. Failure to maintain a Homeowners Association and required agreements shall be considered a violation of the subdivision permit
8. All building envelopes and septic areas shall be staked out by the surveyor/engineer prior to any construction, and off-set stakes shall be held in place until completion of construction.
9. A copy of the engineer's letter to the State certifying that the septic system for any lot out of this subdivision has been installed per the approved plans shall be filed with the Town Clerk for recording and copied to the Zoning Administrator.
10. A copy of all inspection reports and certification reports sent to the State for the stormwater infrastructure shall be filed with the Town Clerk for recording and copied to the Zoning Administrator.
11. Prior to recording the final Mylars, the applicant shall submit a copy of the final plats and engineering drawing in digital format to the Zoning Administrator.
12. All lots shall have their 911 codes posted prior to issuance of any building permit (Lot 1: TA003, Lot 2: TA004, Lot 3: TA005).
13. All subdivision fees shall be paid in full to the Zoning Administrator prior to filing the final plat with the Town Clerk.
14. Applicant shall obtain approval of the curb cut, driveways, underground utilities, and waiver of the bonding requirement request from the Selectboard prior to filing the final plat.
15. A limited cut zone to maintain a vegetative screen within the Town's 100-foot brook buffer, shown as the area around the 129-foot property line between Lots 1 and 2, shall appear on the final Mylar. No clear-cutting shall be allowed in this area.

The following recommendations will be made to the Selectboard:

1. That the existing bridge be upgraded to include runner planks and steel beam guardrails, and the bent post fixed per Town Engineer Mike Weisel's recommendations.
2. That the Selectboard approves the waivers of the bonding requirement with the above recommendations in (4) above, and the minimum curve radii.
3. That the Selectboard approves the driveways/road designs.
4. That the Selectboard approves the underground utility location.

The motion was passed by all Board Members present.

The Board discussed their upcoming schedules and miscellaneous items.

10:00 PM: Meeting adjourned.

These minutes of the 11-16-09 meeting of the DRB were accepted

This _____ day of _____, 2009.

Chairperson Scott Tobin

These minutes are subject to correction by the Underhill Developmental Review Board. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the DRB.