



Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – March 4, 2025

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, March 4, 2025, starting at approximately 5:00 pm. The meeting was held at the Stowe Town Office with remote participation using the “Zoom” application.

Members Present: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, Andrew Volansky, David Kelly, Peter Roberts, Patricia Gabel, and Tom Hand

Staff Present: Ryan Morrison – Deputy Zoning Administrator, Kayla Hedberg-Planning and Zoning Assistant

Others Present in Person: [See sign-in attendance sheet]

Meeting Chair Clymer called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00pm.

Project #: 7532 (Cont. from 2/4/25)
Owner: Gristmill Properties LLC Manas LLC
Tax Parcel #: 10-079.000
Location: 0 West Hill Rd
Project: Update Site Plan with Storm Water Changes
Zoning: RR3

The applicant requested a continuance. T. Hand motioned to continue the hearing to a date and time certain of June 17th. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1. D. Clymer, M. Black, A. Volansky, T. Hand, D. Kelly, and P. Gabel voting in the affirmative and P. Roberts recused himself.

Project #: 7519
Owner: David & Bryan Lee
Tax Parcel #: 10-064.000
Location: 475 Tansy Hill Rd
Project: Proposed 3-lot Subdivision
Zoning: RR5/RHOD

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7519. T. Mumley, D. Lee and B. Lee were present for the applicant and swore in at 5:01pm.

T. Mumley presented the proposed subdivision citing that there are no plans for development or clearing limits at this time. Lots A and B would be accessed by the existing driveway and Lot C would be accessed by the existing Woods Rd. If Lot C were to be accessed in the future State permitting would be required due to the stream on the property. There is a wildlife habitat and deer wintering area located primarily on Lot C. At this time Lot C is being retained, Lot B is anticipated to be sold to the neighbor with no plans for development, and Lot A is an improved lot. T. Mumely explained that no wetlands studies were done because they had not proposed development in

those areas.

D. Clymer asked about wastewater permits, T. Mumley explained they are going to submit a wastewater application for Lot B and Lot C and have it deferred.

T. Hand asked for clarification regarding the driveway and if it meets regulatory requirements. T. Mumley clarified that it is an existing driveway that begins at the end of Tansy Hill Rd.

D. Clymer inquired about utilities. T. Mumley stated that they would use underground utilities.

T. Mumley requested that the board members consider conditioning Lot B as a buildable lot and not require additional DRB approval if the new property owner wants to build a house in the future.

T. Hand motioned to close the hearing. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7526

Owner: Thomas C Michelson

Tax Parcel #: 03-103.000

Location: 3285 Waterbury Rd

Project: Proposed 4-lot Subdivision

Zoning: RR2/RR5/RHOD

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7526. T. Mumley, A. Chmura, and J. Parsons were present for the applicant.

Interested Persons

Jodi Adams	April & William Knight (physical address 2999 Waterbury Rd)
2949 Waterbury Rd	PO Box 141
Stowe, VT 05672	Stowe, VT 05672

D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 5:30 pm.

T. Mumley presented on behalf of the applicant, A. Chmura. He is in the process of purchasing three of the four proposed lots from the current property owner, T. Michelson. T. Michelson will retain Lot 4. There is no proposed development at this time. The property is located in the RR-2 and RR-5 zoning districts.

A. Knight mentioned that there are multiple springs that provide water to the existing properties.

T. Mumley explained that all of the lots were over five acres referring to the density calculations.

T. Hand inquired about the setbacks, to which Staff member R. Morrison explained that the setback requirements may vary depending on the property's location within the two zoning districts. Specifically, the setback could be adjusted to take advantage of the zoning boundary within a 100-

foot proximity to that boundary.

T. Hand pointed out that the character of the area was mostly deciduous and evergreen trees. T. Mumley explained that there was a prior approval for a house and the existing clearings were created by the owner.

T. Mumley indicated they have permits to improve the existing driveway.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding the proposed development. Clarifying that in the narrative, the applicant claims no development but then delineates building zones and clearing limits on the site plan. A. Chmura admitted he has ideas for the properties, but did not feel comfortable making plans on a property he did not own yet.

M. Black noted that two building zones were proposed for Lot 1. In response, T. Mumley explained that the inclusion of two proposed building zones was intended to eliminate the need for the property owners to seek further approval from the DRB for construction. M. Black requested further clarification to ensure that approval would not imply the approval of two building sites. T. Mumley clarified that only one building site would be utilized and would apply to either one zone or the other, depending on which site the property owner chose to pursue.

T. Mumley pointed out he included a proposed building zone for Lot 2 providing the same reasoning as lot one. He explained that Lot 3 does have a proposed building zone, however he understands that due to the building zone being in the RHOD the future applicant would have to come before the DRB for review.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding the mapped stream. T. Mumley indicated that he had been on the property and not seen this stream on the property.

T. Hand expressed a preference for having the streams and springs documented for the natural and scenic features section of the regulations. D. Clymer noted that since the property owner is retaining Lot 4, he would like the springs and water sources to be included on the new site plan.

T. Hand asked if any wetland mapping had been done. T. Mumley indicated that it had not. He stated he did not see anything that indicated there were wetland areas.

P. Roberts inquired about the location or existence of any culverts. T. Mumley was unsure if there were any culverts. W. Knight, J. Adams, and T. Michelson (T. Michelson was sworn in at approx. 6:08) explained that there are culverts that run under Route 100 that directs the stream which feeds the ponds and that there are culverts under the driveways.

J. Parsons, wildlife biologist, conducted a site visit on February 12th to assess the habitat on the proposed subdivision property. He notes that the site is mapped as part of a habitat block ranked five out of ten in importance, with the property located on the western edge of this block. The entire parcel is within a deer wintering area and part of the Shutesville Wildlife Corridor connecting the Green Mountains and Worcester Range. No significant natural communities were identified on the site according to state mapping.

139
140 D. Clymer asked about the depth of snow when he did his assessment. J. Parsons stated there was
141 16-22 inches of snow. He commented that he was surprised that there was no indication of recent
142 use or deer activity. He did note old signs of deer barking. D. Clymer asked about the average depth
143 of snow in deer wintering areas. J. Parsons replied approximately fourteen feet. It was his opinion
144 that due to the property's location near Route 100 and the surrounding housing, the area has
145 potential but is not utilized frequently by deer.
146
147 T. Hand inquired about the snow fall leading up to the day of the assessment and whether the deer
148 tracks could have been covered. T. Mumley clarified, and J. Parsons explained that tracks can be
149 seen after multiple snowfalls, if you know what to look for.
150
151 J. Parsons indicated that the ANR Atlas does not indicate that this area is a connector. He stated
152 that substantial development would not serve the corridor well. He would have to see overlays of
153 the Shutesville Corridor and make an assessment.
154
155 W. Knight stated that it is called bear run because bears transverse the area and brought up
156 concerns about potential endangered amphibians in the area.
157
158 T. Hand asked if the VT Fish and Game keep track of where deer have been hit by motor vehicles. J.
159 Parsons explained that they used to, however, the state is not keeping an accurate count anymore.
160
161 D. Clymer inquired about potential endangered species. J. Parson confirmed that there were no
162 vernal pools or rare amphibian habitats on the property, but he recommended having wetlands
163 study on the property if they saw necessary. He also stated that the property was not a travel
164 corridor, and it was not mapped as a connecting habitat.
165
166 T. Hand asked if there was a map from the ANR that shows the Shutesville Hill Corridor, to which J.
167 Parsons responded that the previous iterations of mapping habitat blocks in the State do show a
168 connecting corridor, but not with much accuracy. T. Hand requested a map for the record showing
169 the habitat block and corridor in relation to the project.
170
171 T. Mumley pointed out proposed clearing limits on Lot 2. Pointing out that a portion of the lot was in
172 the RHOD. T. Hand recommended limiting the clearing limits to what is already cleared and not
173 extending into the RHOD. He also recommended removing the clearing limits from Lot 3 to allow
174 RHOD review for potential projects.
175
176 D. Kelly pointed out that Lot 1 had potential for substantial clearing if two clearing limits were
177 approved. P. Roberts recommended adding conditions that would remove variability, one site, one
178 clearing limit. T. Mumley pointed out that both potential clearing sites would not be seen from the
179 road and Lot 3 view is protected by the existing tree line.
180
181 D. Clymer asked about the plans for Lot 4. T. Mumley reiterated that the property owner would be
182 retaining the land and there was no proposed development. T. Hand recommended they consider
183 conditioning Lot 4 for review.
184

185 D. Kelly proposed adding powerlines/utilities to the site plan. It was determined that Lots 2 and 3
186 already had the means to hook up to electric, however, Lot 1 did not. Current electricity is provided
187 by two power poles and then runs underground through Lot 3 over to Lot 2. T. Michelson confirmed,
188 but said the electric company took the transformer since it was not being used.

189
190 DRB members asked the applicant to provide additional information, including calculations for
191 minimum lot size area, the addition of utilities, culverts, streams and springs to the site plan, revise
192 proposed clearing limits, provide more details pertaining to Lot 4 and provide a map showing the
193 Shutesville Hill Corridor in relation to the project.

194
195 T. Hand motioned to continue the hearing to April 15, 2025. M. Black seconded the motion. The
196 motion passed unanimously.

197
198 **Other Business:**

199 None.

200
201 **Approval of Minutes:**

202
203 A. Volansky motioned to approve the meeting minutes with minor amendment from February 18,
204 2025. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-1 with D. Clymer, M. Black, A.
205 Volansky, P. Roberts, D. Kelly, and P. Gabel voting in the affirmative and T. Hand abstaining.

206
207 M. Black motioned to adjourn the meeting. D. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion passed
208 unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:42pm.

209
210
211 Respectfully Submitted,
212 Kayla Hedberg
213 Planning and Zoning Assistant