

**TOWN OF ELMORE, VERMONT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, October 6, 2026, 6:00 p.m.

Elmore Town Offices, 1175 VT-12, Elmore, VT 05657, and Zoom

Source materials reviewed: October 6, 2026 DRB agenda; meeting attendance record; Zoom transcript; Mandigo site plan (C-1, dated September 3, 2026); and August 4, 2026 DRB meeting minutes.

Recording: https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/oFsK0QH-pAljT0QPjFfDdNDe210rDZlgpgYL_L1rHFsOUfZR9eGqulkgUzhmv3oe.mFqgXRRPZRA8pY4n?startTime=1791324329000

Passcode: E@q2ATY.

1. Call to Order and Attendance

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. The Chair noted that one warned hearing was scheduled. No additions or deletions were made to the agenda.

Role	Name / Status
DRB members present	Michael Furst, Chair; Jason Cohen; Tom Waldman; Caroline DeVore
DRB member absent	Paul Rousselle
Zoning Administrator	Charles Burnham
Applicant / principal party	Samuel Mandigo
Observer	Dawn Anney-Kress
Interested persons	No interested persons registered
Conflicts of interest	None disclosed; ZA Burnham stated that he had no conflict.

2. Agenda Management, Prior Minutes, Oaths, Conflicts, and Public Comment

- The August 4, 2026 DRB meeting minutes were approved as written. Agenda noted July to be approved, but they had been approved at the August 2026 meeting.
- The Chair asked whether anyone wished to register as an interested person; none did.
- The Chair administered an oath to those who would provide testimony. The applicants participated in the hearing; no general public comment was offered.
- No conflicts of interest were disclosed by DRB members, and ZA Burnham stated that he had no conflict.

Motion / Action	Made by	Seconded by	Vote / Result
Approve the August 4, 2026 DRB meeting minutes as written.	Jason Cohen	Tom Waldman	Approved; all in favor, none opposed.

3. Warned Hearing: Samuel and Lindsey Mandigo - Conditional Use Review

Application	Details
Application	Conditional Use Review for a second driveway to serve an approved accessory dwelling unit (ADU).
Owner / Applicants	Samuel and Lindsey Mandigo
Location	834 King Road; Tax Map ID 08/01/13.11; 4.13 acres
Zoning District	Rural East
Request	Approval of a second driveway entrance from King Road to serve the ADU, instead of extending access from the existing driveway.
Review Criteria	Section 3.1B, Access, Driveway, Roads, and Frontage Requirements; Section 5.3, Conditional Use Review Procedure.

Presentation and Evidence

- ZA Burnham explained that the Mandigos had obtained approval for an ADU and were seeking separate driveway access for it. The warned hearing concerned only the second driveway, not the ADU approval.
- ZA Burnham reviewed Section 3.1B, which generally limits a lot to one access road or driveway unless an additional access is permitted through conditional use or subdivision review. He stated that access construction must comply with municipal and state requirements and that the Road Commissioner had visited the site and was prepared to issue an access permit.
- Samuel Mandigo explained that the proposed ADU is located before the existing driveway along King Road. Connecting it from the existing driveway would require an approximately 100-foot driveway across the property; the proposed direct connection would be approximately 15 feet. The lot contains 4.13 acres.
- The applicant identified the proposal on the submitted site plan, C-1, dated September 3, 2026. The plan shows the property, King Road, the existing residence and driveway, the ADU, and the proposed driveway connection.
- The applicant said the ADU is one bedroom and may be used as a short-term or long-term rental to provide additional income; the use had not been decided. A temporary driveway was in place for construction access and materials.

Board Discussion / Criteria Issues

Topic	Discussion Summary
Community services and facilities	The Board noted that the ADU had already been approved and that the matter before it was the driveway. Members observed that a separate, shorter access could facilitate emergency-vehicle access and support a separate E911 address.
Character of the area	Members discussed the location on King Road, near a bend and the Yankee Way area. The Road Commissioner had inspected the site and was prepared to issue an access permit. Members did not identify an adverse effect on the area's character.
Nuisance, hazard, and safety	ZA Burnham suggested that the driveway would not create a nuisance or hazard. Members discussed whether driveway location and visibility could create a concern, such as placement on a blind curve; the Road Commissioner's site review was noted.
Traffic and road maintenance	ZA Burnham stated that the additional driveway was not expected to significantly affect traffic or the road intersection. The applicant's short-term versus long-term rental plans were discussed, but members focused on the one-bedroom ADU and the driveway request. Members noted that the separate driveway could keep vehicles off the road and make winter plowing easier.
Bylaws and access permits	The Board discussed the Road Commissioner's readiness to issue an access permit and the relationship between driveway approval and the ADU. Members discussed that the ADU could not presently be configured for subdivision because of setbacks between existing buildings; separate access would make it independently accessible. No additional condition of the ADU approval was identified in the discussion.
Renewable energy resources	Members considered the criterion and concluded that it was not materially implicated by the driveway request. Discussion was limited to the proposed driveway rather than the ADU structure.
Drainage and existing work	Members asked whether driveway work had begun. The applicant clarified that the access in place was temporary for construction. The Board discussed drainage and culvert requirements; a participant noted that a culvert was already present, and the Road Commissioner's requirements would apply.

Status / Motions

Motion / Action	Made by	Seconded by	Vote / Result
Close the Mandigo warned hearing.	Tom Waldman	Jason Cohen	Approved; no opposition heard. Hearing closed at 6:20 p.m.

4. Executive Session and Board Member Comments

After the hearing closed at 6:20 p.m., the DRB entered executive session. The Chair had advised the applicants that the Board would render a decision and provide notice within 45 days. The public record provided for preparation of these minutes does not include the Board's deliberation or a final decision.

Following executive session, the Board returned to the remaining agenda item for Board member comments and requests to the ZA. No specific comments or requests were raised. The ZA reported that no applications were then pending or anticipated for the next month, though one could still be submitted. Members confirmed that application materials for a November meeting were due October 8 so the ZA could meet the newspaper-warning schedule.

The Chair closed the public session at approximately 6:22 p.m. Motion to adjourn: DeVore; second Furst, all in favor.

5. Follow-Up Items and Next Meeting

Item	Responsible Party	Due / Notes
Provide the Mandigo applicants with the Board's decision.	DRB / ZA	The Chair stated that notice would be provided within 45 days; no final decision is included in the public record reviewed.
Submit materials for a November DRB meeting.	Applicants / ZA	Agenda requests and applications due Thursday, October 8, 2026, to allow for notice and newspaper warning.
Next regular meeting.	DRB / ZA	Wednesday, November 4, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., as listed on the agenda; the ZA reported no applications were then pending.

Minutes Captured and Submitted by: Caroline DeVore, DRB Member / Clerk - Draft dated October 11, 2026

Town Of Elmore Meeting Attendance Record

ENTER MEETING DATE:	DRB
ENTER MEETING NAME:	OCT 6, 2026

[illegible]