



Notice of DRB Decision
Town of Stowe Planning and Zoning Department
PO Box 730
Stowe VT 05672

You recently received approval for the project listed below from the Development Review Board. Attached is a copy of the DRB decision for your records. Please note that there are conditions of approval required to be met before your Zoning Permit can be issued. Once you fulfill these conditions your zoning permit will be sent to you

Please contact the Planning and Zoning Department at 253-6141 if you have any questions.

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Project Number 7770
Application Date 1/29/2026
Physical Location 287 WINTERBIRD RD
Map ID 07-115.A00 **Tax ID** 26077-801
Project Description EXTERIOR RENOVATIONS WITH PROPOSED SHED DORMER, NEW WINDOW CONFIGURATION, AND EXTERIOR FINISHES.
Owner DANIEL F LINSALATA DONNA S LINSALATA
Applicant VOLANSKY STUDIO ARCHITECTURE & INTERIORS ANDREW VOLANSKY
Applicant Address 135 LUCE HILL RD
STOWE VT 05672

APPROVALS ON RECORD

Action Taken	Date	End of Appeal Period	Expiration Date	
INCOMPLETE APP	2/4/2026			SEE CHECKLIST
OTHER	2/11/2026			COMPLETE APP
DRB DECISION	4/27/2026	5/27/2026	5/27/2028	WITH CONDITIONS

Sarah McShane

Zoning Office

**TOWN OF STOWE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law



PROJECT# 7770

SUBJECT PROPERTY 287 Winterbird Road, Stowe, VT 05672 (#07-115.A00)

PROPERTY OWNER

Donna and Dan Linsalata
287 Winterbird Road
Stowe, VT 05672

APPLICANT

Andrew Volansky, Volansky Studio
135 Luce Hill Road
Stowe, VT 05672

APPLICATION

The Applicant, Andrew Volansky of Volansky Studio, on behalf of property owners Donna and Dan Linsalata (herein referred to as “the Applicant”), requests Ridgeline and Hillside Overlay District (RHOD) approval to renovate an existing single-family dwelling (SFD) and construct an addition, alongside related site improvements. The subject parcel is located within the Rural Residential 3 (RR3) zoning district and the RHOD. The application has been reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB) under applicable standards of the Town of Stowe Zoning Regulations (the “Regulations”) (effective January 31, 2024) for the purpose of RHOD review. The DRB’s procedural history and relevant findings are attached.

REVIEW PROCESS

(Application materials, hearing notices, meeting minutes on file at the Stowe Town Office.)

A Town of Stowe development application was filed on January 29, 2026. The application was initially deemed incomplete on February 4, 2026, awaiting a scaled site plan showing proposed clearing limits. Upon the submittal of the requested information on February 11, 2026, the application was accepted as administratively complete by Town of Stowe Zoning Administrator Sarah McShane and referred to the DRB for a public hearing. A public hearing of the DRB was scheduled for March 17, 2026 and was duly warned by the Zoning Administrator in accordance with Section 2.14 of the Regulations and 24 V.S.A. §4464. The hearing notice was published in the Stowe Reporter on February 26, 2026. The Applicant submitted the Certificate of Service on February 18, 2026.

The public hearing to consider this application convened on March 17, 2026 at the Akeley Memorial Building at 67 Main Street, with remote participation available via Zoom. A quorum of the DRB was present. No *ex parte* communications or conflicts of interest were reported. Members who participated in the review included: Drew Clymer (Chair), Tom Hand, Mary Black, Patricia Gabel, Peter Roberts, Alternate Scott Rank, and Alternate Chip Dillon. The DRB adjourned the hearing that evening, following the submission of testimony and evidence, marking the start of the 45-day period for the issuance of written findings and a decision.

INTERESTED PERSONS/PARTICIPANTS

In accordance with 24 VSA §4471, an interested person who has participated in a DRB proceeding may appeal a DRB decision rendered in that proceeding to the Vermont Superior Court Environmental Division. The following persons attended and participated in the hearing process, and may be afforded status as interested persons with rights to appeal:

1. Jonathan Severinghaus, Volansky Studio, 135 Luce Hill Road, Stowe, VT 05672
2. Tyler Mumley, Mumley Engineering, 46 Hutchins Street, Morrisville, VT 05661

THE RECORD

The following materials were submitted in support of the application and entered into the hearing record:

1. Town of Stowe Development Application, dated 1/29/26
2. Landscape/hardscape, A1.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 2/18/26
3. Cardinal Performance, Properties of IG units, no date
4. Marvin, Elevate Awning Window, no date
5. Marvin, Elevate Casement Window, no date
6. Marvin, Swinging French Door, no date
7. Marvin, Elevate Sliding Door, no date
8. Hinkley, lighting information, no date
9. Hinkley & FR, lighting information, no date
10. Hinkley, path light information, no date
11. Cover Sheet, A0.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 1/29/26
12. Site Plan, C-1, prepared by Mumley Engineering, Inc., dated 01/22/26
13. Viewshed Images, A1.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
14. Floor Plans, A2.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
15. Floor Plans, A2.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
16. Roof Plans, A2.3, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
17. Building Elevations, A3.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
18. Building Elevations, A3.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
19. Building Elevations, A3.3, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. The subject parcel is Lot A of the Winterbird Road Subdivision Phase II. Phase II involved the creation of four (4) lots, A, B, C, and D originally approved by the Town of Stowe Planning Commission under S-99-19 on August 10, 1999. Although receiving final subdivision approval, the plat was not recorded within the required ninety (90) day time period, which caused the approval to expire.
2. The Applicant re-applied for the same four (4) lot subdivision on July 12, 2001. The application was assigned the number S-99-19A. The final subdivision approval, S-99-19A, was granted by the Town of Stowe Planning Commission on September 25, 2001. The recorded plat was signed by the Chair of the Planning Commission on October 4, 2001, and was recorded on October 12, 2001, located in Book 13, Pages 25-26 of the Town of Stowe Land Records.
3. This approved subdivision included “typical” clearing limits for Lots A, B, C, and D, as well as building zones (building envelopes) which lay within the proposed clearing limits. The “typical” clearing limits encompassed the planned driveway accesses and the locations on-site water and wastewater treatment facilities for each lot.
4. The Planning Commission’s decision approving the creation of the lots recognized that since the lots are within the RHOD, precise limits of clearing would be determined at a later date once the architectural plans for the new dwellings were created. The approximate estimated or ‘typical’ limits of clearing were depicted on the recorded site plan, located in Book 13, Page 26 of the Town of Stowe Land Records.
5. In 2002, the property owner submitted an application for a zoning permit for the construction of a single-family dwelling. Application #Z-02-47 was assigned to the project. The Town of Stowe Zoning

Regulations, effective March 2002, included the provision that “projects classified as ‘minor’ may be issued a zoning permit.”

6. The Planning Director at that time wrote a recommendation letter, dated May 8, 2002, to the Planning Commission stating that he conducted a site visit on Lot A, and determined that the site was only visible from Winterbird Road, a privately owned and maintained road. This site visit and recommendation letter met the criteria at the time to allow the application to be considered a “minor”.
7. The Planning Commission classified the project as a “minor” during their regularly scheduled meeting held on Tuesday, May 14. The project was then issued a zoning permit on May 14, 2002 under Z-02-47. The application for the single-family dwelling was deemed a “minor” because it was not visible from public vantage points and thus was approved for a zoning permit without requiring full RHOD review. The approved site plan showed the same “typical” clearing limits as presented in S-99-19A.
8. In 2014, the property owner applied for a zoning permit to construct a detached garage. Project # 5016 was assigned to the application. The zoning permit was issued by the Zoning Administrator after determining that the project was exempt from RHOD review due to the proposed garage’s location behind an existing mature tree line. The approved site plan showed the proposed garage within the “typical” clearing limits and building zone as presented in S-99-19A. The zoning permit for Project #5016 was issued on August 11, 2014. A Certificate of Occupancy was issued for Project #5016 on April 3, 2015.
9. The property owner now seeks RHOD approval to renovate the existing single-family dwelling and construct an addition, alongside related site improvements. The proposed addition faces north towards Winterbird Road. There are no identified DRB or Planning Commission approved clearing limits for this lot.

FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

During its review of the application, the DRB made the following Findings of Fact:

The Applicant’s request for RHOD review was reviewed by the DRB for conformance with applicable requirements including the following:

Town of Stowe Zoning Regulations (effective January 31, 2024)

- Section 2- Administration and Enforcement
- Section 3- General Regulations
- Section 4- Specific Use Standards
- Section 5- Zoning Districts
- Section 6- Uses, Dimensional Requirements and Density
- Section 9- Ridgeline and Hillside Overlay District (RHOD)

DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

1. **Zoning District.** The subject parcel is located within the Rural Residential 3 (RR3) zoning district and the RHOD.
2. **Lot Area, Lot Width.** The subject parcel consists of ±4.1 acres. No changes to lot area or lot width are proposed.
3. **Setbacks.** The required minimum district setbacks for the RR3 District are front seventy (70’) feet, side sixty (60’) feet and rear sixty (60’) feet. The provided site plan identifies all applicable setbacks. The proposed residential addition meets the required setbacks.

4. **Use.** The Applicant proposes to construct an addition to the existing single-family dwelling. Single-family dwellings are permitted uses in the RR3 District. The Applicant does not propose to change the use of the existing single-family dwelling or lot.
5. **Height.** The maximum building height in RR3 District is 28' feet. The elevation plans indicate that the existing dwelling has a height of 24' 2 1/2", as measured from the uphill site. The proposed southern addition will have a height of 11' 11 3/4", as measured from the uphill side. The proposed northern addition will have a height of 11' 0 1/4". The proposed addition conforms with district height requirements.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposed addition conforms to the dimensional requirements of the RR3 District.

SECTION 9 – RIDGELINE AND HILLSIDE OVERLAY DISTRICT (RHOD)

Standard (1) General Requirements:

6. The Applicant proposes to construct an addition to their existing single-family dwelling. The subject parcel is entirely located within the RHOD District.
7. The proposed project will have minimal, if any, impact on the physical environment, and the visual and scenic landscape character.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposal conforms to the general requirements established under Standard 1.

Standard (2) Designation of Vantage Points:

8. The Regulations define vantage points as maintained (class 3 or higher) public roads, state highways and municipal properties.
9. The viewshed analysis prepared by Volansky Studio, along with the provided site plan, shows that the proposed addition will be situated in an existing cleared area with access from the existing driveway to the dwelling.
10. As documented from site photographs, a young tree line will provide screening of the proposed addition. The provided site plan shows a "mature tree line" which will also provide screening of the proposed addition.
11. Photographs of two vantage points were identified from the subject property; one is a view of Mount Mansfield, and another is a view towards Weeks Hill. Neither are considered public vantage points, as defined under the Regulations.
12. The existing dwelling and related site improvements are not visible from any public vantage points.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposal will not have an impact on any viewsheds from public vantage points.

Section 9.5(3) A. Site Development and Environmental Protection

Standard (1.1)

13. The Applicant proposes to construct an addition and related site improvements, including planting three (3) trees, installing a hot tub, constructing patios and planting beds, and installing stormwater management improvements.
14. The area for the addition and related site improvements has already been cleared of mature trees, as shown on the aerial images.
15. A shallow swale leading from the addition to a proposed stormwater detention area near the north-west edge of the lawn will collect and filter stormwater. A silt fence will be installed downhill of the detention area.
16. The provided site plan also shows the silt fence detail, plans for the stormwater detention area, and a list of construction specifications.
17. The proposed impervious surface equals roughly 4,700 square feet, as shown on the drainage summary on the provided site plan.
18. The proposed stormwater detention area will allow the subject property to maintain its existing 2-year storm peak discharge of roughly 0.38 CPS. This satisfies the requirement established by Standard 1.1.
19. The proposed stormwater detention area will be located at the edge of the existing lawn as far upslope as possible. This will require some minor thinning of brush and young trees outside of the mature tree line as shown on the provided site plan.

Standard (2)

20. No future forest management or timber harvesting is proposed under this application. This standard is not applicable.

Standard (3)

21. The site for the proposed addition has already been cleared.
22. The proposed stormwater detention area may require some removal of low, young trees, and brush. However, no clearing or cutting of tall, mature trees is proposed in this application.
23. There are no forest management activities designed as pre-development site preparation, including road and driveway construction, clearing and/or grading for house-sites and septic systems or related work proposed under this application.

Standard (4)

24. There are no streams or watercourses identified on the subject parcel.
25. According to the ANR Natural Resources Atlas, the project area is located entirely within a deer-wintering area, and a medium level habitat block (Level 5 out of 10) crosses the property line and is located outside of the cleared area.
26. The subject property contains an existing single-family dwelling. The proposed addition will not create any additional impacts to the habitat block or deer wintering area.

27. The area for the proposed addition is already graded. Steep slopes (15%+) exist on the northern side of the subject parcel but will not be impacted by this project. The area around the subject dwelling, where the addition will be constructed, has grades of <2%, per information provided by Mumley Engineering during the hearing.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposal conforms to the applicable Site Protection and Environmental Protection Standards (1-4), of Section 9.5(3).

Section 9.5(3) B. Landscape and Scenic Character

Standard (5)

28. The view analysis provided, along with photographs of the site, indicates that the proposed addition will not be visible from public vantage points.

29. The property is located on a forested hillside, however there will be no exposure of the existing building or proposed addition.

Standard (6)

30. With the exception of existing residential development, the site and surrounding area are forested.

31. There are no agricultural fields or open meadows on the parcel. The proposal will not detract from the sense of order or harmony of the landscape patterns formed by forests and will not require the removal of any mature trees.

Standard (7)

32. Photographs provided in the application show a surrounding "mature tree line" canopy at an estimated height of fifty (50') to seventy-five (75') feet tall. The surrounding trees will remain along the mature tree line shown on the provided site plan.

33. The young tree line is an estimated twelve (12') to eighteen (18') feet tall, towards the north-west viewshed. The young tree line to the east within the building zone is approximately eight (8') to ten (10') feet tall.

34. The provided site plan shows three (3) new trees that the Applicant proposes to plant on the site. These trees are intended for residential landscaping purposes but do not shield the dwelling and are not located in a manner to shield the dwelling.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposal conforms to the Landscape and Scenic Character Standards (5-7), of Section 9.5(3).

Section 9.5(3) C. Road and Driveway Access

Standard (8)

35. The application does not propose constructing a new driveway or relocate the existing private driveway.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that Standard (8) of Section 9.5(3) is not applicable.

Section 9.5(3) D. Building Design

Standard (9)

36. Site photographs indicate that the proposed addition will not visually exceed the “mature” tree line. The younger tree line to the north-west of the existing dwelling is much lower than the height of the surrounding “mature” tree line.
37. The proposed northern addition, with a height of eleven (11’ 0 ¼”) feet and one quarter inch tall, will be significantly lower than the existing tree canopy, and is lower than the existing dwelling height of twenty-four (24’ 2 ½”) feet, two and one-half inches.
38. Given the site elevation, the retained tree lines as discussed under Standard (7), and the proposed height and design of the addition, there will be no visual impacts from public vantage points.

Standard (10)

39. The proposed addition on the downhill side, facing the viewshed, will be eleven (11’0 ¼”) feet and one quarter inch tall and will be finished with a low sloping roof.
40. Above this roof, the Applicant will construct a new shed dormer to the existing second floor of the dwelling, as shown in the provided elevation drawing plans, sheet A3.1.
41. The proposed addition on the uphill side, screened by the existing dwelling, will have a height of eleven feet eleven and three quarter inches (11’ 11 ¾”).
42. The massing of the additions is designed in harmony with the surrounding landscape.

Standard (11)

43. The Applicant provided manufacturer cut sheets showing proposed light fixtures. The cut-sheets indicate dark sky compliance.
44. The provided elevation drawings and site plan, Sheet A1.1, depict and label the location of the proposed outdoor light fixtures.
45. The following light fixtures are proposed: two (2) large hanging lanterns, located at the rebuilt southern entryway; nine (9) path lights; and seven (7) wall sconces.
46. The proposed Lumens per developed residential area is compliant with Section 4.8(8) of the Zoning Regulations.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that this proposal, as conditioned, conforms to the Building Design Standards (9-11), of Section 9.5(3).

Section 9.5(3) E. Development Density

Standard (12)

47. No change to lot area or size is being proposed under this application.

Conclusion: Based on the above findings, the DRB concludes that Standard (12) of Section 9.5(3) is not applicable.

DECISION

The DRB hereby approves the Applicant's request for RHOD approval to construct an addition to the existing dwelling and related site improvements as outlined in the application dated January 29, 2026, and supplemental materials, subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. The project shall be completed, operated, and maintained in accordance with: (a) The conditions of this approval, and (b) the permit application, plans, and exhibits on file in the Town of Stowe Planning & Zoning Office and other material representations. Any change to the plans or the proposed use of the property shall be brought to the Zoning Administrator's attention, prior to its enactment, for a determination if an amendment is required. The Zoning Administrator is granted the authority to review and administratively approve non-material modifications to the approved plans upon finding that the proposed change or alteration would not have affected the decision made or any conditions if had been included in the plans as approved. The approved plans, amended herein, include:
 1. Town of Stowe Development Application, dated 1/29/26
 2. Landscape/hardscape, A1.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 2/18/26
 3. Cardinal Performance, Properties of IG units, no date
 4. Marvin, Elevate Awning Window, no date
 5. Marvin, Elevate Casement Window, no date
 6. Marvin, Swinging French Door, no date
 7. Marvin, Elevate Sliding Door, no date
 8. Hinkley, lighting information, no date
 9. Hinkley & FR, lighting information, no date
 10. Hinkley, path light information, no date
 11. Cover Sheet, A0.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 1/29/26
 12. Site Plan, C-1, prepared by Mumley Engineering, Inc., dated 01/22/26
 13. Viewshed Images, A1.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 14. Floor Plans, A2.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 15. Floor Plans, A2.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 16. Roof Plans, A2.3, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 17. Building Elevations, A3.1, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 18. Building Elevations, A3.2, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
 19. Building Elevations, A3.3, prepared by Volansky Studio, dated 01/29/26
2. All conditions of prior approvals, except as amended herein, remain in full force and effect.
3. Prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, the Applicant shall confirm in writing that the outdoor lighting proposed for this project does not exceed the maximum 1.25 lumens per developed square foot per Section 4.8 (8), by providing the calculation of the total number of lumens per developed area.
4. Clearing shall be restricted to the areas shown on the approved 'Site Plan' prepared by Mumley Engineering (Sheet C-1, dated 01/22/2026). Lands outside of the shown clearing limits shall be left undisturbed except as necessary to remove dead or diseased trees and to promote the health of the forest. Future forest management and timber harvesting shall, at a minimum, adhere to the guidelines included in the publication Acceptable Management Practices for Maintaining Water Quality on Logging Jobs.
5. The installation of outdoor light fixtures is limited to those described and depicted within the application.

6. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be shielded and aimed so that illumination is directed only to the designated area and does not cast direct illumination or cause glare beyond the boundary lines of a property.
7. Site construction shall adhere to the standards outlined in Section 3.12(2)(A-F) including:
 - a) The amount of soil exposed at any one time must be kept to a minimum.
 - b) Areas of exposed soil that are not being actively worked, including soil that has been stockpiled, must be stabilized.
 - c) Stormwater shall be controlled during construction to minimize soil erosion and transport of sediment to surface waters.
 - d) Soil disturbance shall not be allowed between the period of October 15 to April 15 unless adequate erosion control measures are provided as outlined in Section 3.12(2)(A-C) taking into consideration winter and spring conditions.
 - e) Existing drainage patterns must not be altered in a manner to cause an undue adverse impact on neighboring properties, town highways or surface waters.
8. A Certificate of Occupancy must be obtained from the Zoning Administrator following the construction but prior to occupancy and use to ensure that it has been constructed as approved by the DRB. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy the Applicant shall submit the following:
 - a) A licensed engineer shall provide written certification that the stormwater management, and other site improvements presented have been constructed and clearing completed per the approved plans.
9. These conditions of approval shall run with the land and are binding upon and enforceable against the Applicant and its heirs, successors and assigns. By acceptance of this approval, the Applicant, and his successors, agrees to allow authorized representatives of the Town of Stowe to access the property subject to this approval, at reasonable times, for purposes of ascertaining compliance with the conditions of approval.

Voting in favor: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, Tom Hand, Patricia Gabel, Peter Roberts, Scott Rank, Chip Dillon
 The motion passed, 7-0.

Dated at Stowe, Vermont this the 07 day of April 2026

By: 
 Drew Clymer, Chair

NOTICES:

1. In accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 4449(e), applicants are hereby notified that state permits also may be required prior to land subdivision or construction. The applicant should contact the DEC Permit Specialist for District #5 (802-505-5367) to determine whether state permits are required.
2. The applicant or another interested person may request reconsideration of this decision by the Development Review Board, including associated findings and conditions, within 30 days of the date of this decision by filing a request for reconsideration that specifies the basis for the request with the Secretary of the Development Review Board. Pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4470, the board may reject the request within 10 days of the date of filing if it determines that the issues raised have already been decided or involve substantially or materially the same facts by or on behalf of the appellant.
3. This decision may also be appealed to the Environmental Division of the Vermont Superior Court by the applicant or another interested person who participated in the proceeding before the Development Review Board. Such appeal must be taken within 30 days of the date of this decision, pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4471 and Rule 5(b) of the Vermont Rules for Environmental Division Court Proceedings.
4. In accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 4455, on petition by the municipality and after notice and opportunity for hearing, the Environmental Division may revoke a permit based on a determination that the permittee violated the terms of the permit or obtained the permit based on misrepresentation of material fact.