



Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – March 18, 2025

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, March 18, 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, Sarah McShane – Planning & Zoning Director

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

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

Deliberative Session: Reopen Project 7495

T. Hand made a motion to enter the deliberative session at approximately 5:06pm. M. Black seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The DRB entered deliberative session. Meeting participants exited the room, remote participants were put in the waiting room. The board exited deliberative session at approximately 5:48pm.

Upon returning from the deliberative session D. Clymer addressed Applicant’s T. Mumley and G. Mink. D. Clymer explained that the board was prepared to submit specific details outlining the additional testimony they would like to hear should the hearing be reopened. A special date of May 13, 2025, was proposed. T. Mumley inquired if he and G. Mink could discuss. After their discussion, T. Mumley and G. Mink requested the DRB not proceed with reopening the hearing.

Approval of Minutes:

M. Black motioned to approve the minutes of the prior meeting. P. Roberts seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7534

Owner: Robert Chase

Tax Parcel #: 06-033.000

Location: 332 Luce Hill Rd

Project: Final Review of 3 Unit PRD & Double Setback Waiver

Zoning: RR5

(DRB members participating: D. Clymer, M. Black, T. Hand, P. Roberts, D. Kelly, and P. Gabel. A. Volansky recused himself.)

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7534. T. Mumley, R. Barnett, A. Volansky and B. Chase were present for the applicant. Three audience members claimed interested person status. All parties were sworn in.

Interested Persons:

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Terry and Gail Spear | Joyce Blanker Stonybrook Court HOA |
| 115 Bouchard Rd | 201 Stonybrook Ln |
| Stowe, VT 05672 | Stowe, Vt 05672 |

D. Clymer discussed the need for a boundary survey to verify the parcel size and the need for a revised site plan before moving forward. After discussing this with T. Mumley, the board decided to move forward with the application addressing the deficiencies in the application and the need for a survey. T. Mumley explained that they are basing their application on the deed which says its 15 acres.

T. Mumley explained that there is a historic residential structure already on the property, and they propose the addition of two more residential sites, per density standards. T. Mumley explained they are also seeking a double setback waiver to allow for a buffer between the proposed building sites and the Meadowland Overlay District.

T. Hand questioned screening in the area as it applies to the planned residential development and front yard setbacks. T. Mumley explained that there were no immediate neighbors in the area. To the west, is conserved land, to the north is farm and prime agricultural, to the east is the river, and to the south is open space for Stonybrook.

T. Spear mentioned that keeping the proposed houses closer to the road would improve the view.

T. Mumley stated they would be adding some red maples for additional screening and pulling the buildings away from the meadow to keep the natural beauty of the area.

D. Clymer reminded T. Mumley that there is a historic structure on the property and plans would need to be reviewed by the HPC.

P. Roberts reiterated that the applicant needs to demonstrate that the property is at least 15 acres and that the project density is contingent upon this verification.

D. Clymer asked T. Mumley if the property was 15 acres. T. Mumley stated that the deed says plus or minus 15 acres.

D. Clymer moved on to water and sewer. T. Mumley explained the current building is serviced by municipal water. A. Volansky stated H. Shepard (DPW) was okay with connection to municipal water and onsite wastewater.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding the Stonybrook condo's connection to municipal water and sewer. T. Mumley was unsure. J. Blanker confirmed that the Stonybrook condos are connected to municipal water and sewer.

T. Hand inquired about the intended PRD. T. Mumley confirmed that there were no proposed buildings at this time.

T. Spear sought clarification regarding potential future buildings and whether they would require DRB approval. D. Clymer indicated that the board could impose conditions, or the applicant could

submit conceptual drawings for review.

P. Roberts asked whether their property would remain as a single lot. T. Mumley clarified that they were not proposing the creation of subdivided lots or adjustments to existing property lines.

A. Volansky explained that the request is to reduce the required double setback from 140 feet to 100 feet.

T. Hand inquired about the depth of the building zone. T. Mumley provided a measurement of approximately 67 feet. A. Volansky further explained that the setback waiver would provide greater flexibility in the design.

D. Clymer inquired whether the current owner intended to retain ownership, and T. Hand subsequently sought clarification regarding potential future sales. T. Mumley responded by confirming that the current owner plans to maintain ownership of the property. If the owner decides to sell in the future, the property would be sold as condominium. T. Mumley indicated there are currently no draft HOA documents available, though they are open to submitting a drafted HOA agreement for review.

T. Hand inquired whether the building zone extends to the meadowland. A. Volansky clarified that the building zone has been intentionally designed to be larger than the building footprint.

P. Roberts inquired about the cornfields used by the Percy family. T. Mumley explained that the use of the fields is contingent upon the agreement of the property owners.

D. Clymer requested that T. Mumley address the stormwater plans. T. Mumley explained that the project does not meet the thresholds required to trigger a stormwater review. They do not have formal designs, but they do intend to implement typical stormwater controls.

T. Hand made a motion to continue the hearing to July 15, 2025. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7496

Owner: NR Holdings LLC

Tax Parcel #: 07-299.000

Location: 754 River Rd

Project: Final Review of 4-lot Subdivision

Zoning: RR2

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7496. The applicants N. Riley and P. Riley were present and sworn in at 7:25pm.

N. Riley provided an overview of the project describing it as a 4-lot residential subdivision and lot line adjustment on a 13-acre parcel. The proposal includes two 2-acre lots on River Road and two larger lots on higher elevations. N. Riley discussed that the layout minimizes impact on wildlife corridors and habitat. N. Riley explained that their goal was to reduce fragmentation, limiting clearing to a minimum of 10 percent, preserving prominent trees, working within previously cleared areas and maintaining the wildlife corridor.

D. Clymer reviewed the dimensional requirements, lot configurations, building zones, fire protection access, and utilities. T. Hand raised concerns about the irregular shape of Lot 1 and fire department access to the upper lots. The applicant agreed to document compliance with fire department road standards as a condition.

P. Riley explained that the road was constructed in 2000 with an 18-inch culvert. N. Riley clarified that Willow Tree Lane, a private drive providing access through Lot 4, is already in place and has been updated. Additionally, an existing easement and road maintenance agreement are in place. N. Riley stated they would be open to conditions regarding the road.

D. Clymer inquired about the setbacks. N. Riley confirmed that the setbacks are at least 100 feet between buildings.

T. Hand inquired whether a site plan was available that included all relevant informational layers. N. Riley responded that he does not have a single combined document. However, he confirmed that the well and septic components will remain in their current locations.

D. Clymer asked what the estimated impervious surface is. N. Riley explained it was around 8,000 square feet, which is 1/5 an acre across the entire parcel including changes which include building zones, and any additional driveways or parking.

D. Clymer inquired about electrical services. N. Riley explained that the underground electrical lines have already been installed to serve all four lots.

T. Hand made a motion to close the hearing. A. Volansky seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7462 (Cont. from 1/21/25)

Owner: Lc1 Owner Stowe Vt LLC

Tax Parcel #: 7A-101.000

Location: 89 Golden Eagle Dr

Project: 24 Unit PRD & Related Site Improvements

Zoning:VC-30

D. Clymer reopened the hearing for Project 7462. Representing the Applicant were the following individuals: T. Mumley, T. Keene, P. Booth, M. Gallerstein, J. Parsons, S. Kimball, S. Ficke, and Britney Aube.

Interested persons present in the audience, and via Zoom were the following individuals: Tyler Renz, Todd Renz, Tyson Bry, Wendy Renz,

D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 8:15pm.

T. Hand questioned how the proposed project fits the character of the area. T. Mumley explained that they were trying to work within the landscape to provide a denser setting, while also leaving areas for open space, and maintaining the village commercial/residential feel.

191
192 D. Clymer inquired about municipal infrastructure. T. Mumley stated that he had been in contact
193 with the Public Work Director, H. Shepard. H. Shepard has indicated they still need to evaluate the
194 need for a booster pump to get the water service up to units 16-24. T. Mumley indicated that there
195 was an issue with how the booster pump would work with the fire hydrants and the Fire Chief isn't
196 willing to give up the fire hydrants. They currently have drilled wells proposed for units 16-24, which
197 would need to be approved by the state.

198
199 D. Clymer continued to the scenic and natural beauty relating to the proposed development
200 project. T. Mumley and J. Parsons explained that the site does not contain significant bear habitat
201 or a crucial deer wintering yard. He noted that while bears and deer may use the area, it lacks
202 specific features that would make it critical habitat for either species. The State's Fish and Wildlife
203 Department has also determined that the project does not warrant mitigation for deer yarding
204 impacts. J. Parsons elaborated on the site's forest composition, explaining why it is not ideal for
205 deer during severe winters, and mentions that recreational use of the area further reduces its value
206 as wildlife habitat.

207
208 Tyler Renz requested confirmation that the board received the photos he submitted showing
209 dozens of deer tracks and inquired whether J. Parsons was a certified wildlife biologist. D. Clymer
210 confirmed receipt of the pictures, and J. Parsons clarified that he is not a certified wildlife biologist.
211 However, he noted that certification is not required by the State of Vermont. He further explained
212 that wildlife certification is a process managed by the Wildlife Society. Additionally, J. Parsons
213 mentioned that he has been accepted as a qualified expert in Act 250 and Environmental Board
214 local hearings to testify on wildlife matters.

215
216 Todd Renz commented that he has lived in the area for over 20 years and has observed numerous
217 deer bedding down and disagrees with the wildlife evaluation.

218
219 Tyler Renz reiterated that he did not agree with J. Parsons evaluation of the wildlife habitat,
220 considering the hundreds of photographs he has taken in the area of deer tracks around the survey
221 stakes.

222
223 D. Clymer mentioned that the Cady Hill Forest is used for outdoor recreation, primarily mountain
224 biking and that the access that comes up from the backyard of the property is going to be
225 maintained as deeded.

226
227 T. Hand asked if they intended to relocate the trail. T. Mumley clarified that there is a 30-foot
228 easement, but the mountain bike trails have meandered and those trails outside the easement
229 could be impacted. T. Mumley explained that the property owner must maintain access through the
230 30-foot easement.

231
232 K. Brenner, Executive Director of Stowe Trails, stated that she felt confident working with the
233 landowner that they can use the right of way along the existing corridor that will access the houses.

234
235 E. Chismark asked if the trails would be open through construction and if they would have to be
236 rerouted, expressing concern over the money spent making these adaptive trails. Todd Renz asked
237 where the temporary reroute would be.

238
239 M. Gallerstein explained that they are committed to maintaining trail access, including for adaptive
240 use, either through the existing 30-foot right-of-way or by creating a temporary reroute during
241 construction. They also agreed to work with the local mountain biking community to ensure
242 continued access.
243
244 K. Brenner explained that to be adaptive compatible the trails must be at least 36 inches wide.
245
246 D. Clymer revisited the matter with the bears inquiring whether the applicant would be open to
247 including a clause in the HOA guidelines that would prohibit street side garbage pickup. The
248 applicant confirmed they could accommodate this request.
249
250 D. Clymer moved onto the view analysis. T. Mumley indicated that they had provided a new view
251 analysis and distributed it to the board.
252
253 P. Boothe provided a recap of the architectural design describing a building in the woods,
254 emphasizing its concept of blending into the surroundings. The design aims to minimize
255 disturbance to the earth and preserve tree canopy.
256
257 P. Gabel expressed concern relating to the amount of glass panels on the proposed buildings and
258 how that aesthetic could be detracting from the historic buildings in the area adjacent.
259
260 P. Boothe explained that the designs are site specific and designed in a way to blend into their
261 environment. The roof is fading away from the downhill side and the materials used are natural
262 woods with stains and the tree canopy is close to the building to help mitigate the reflectivity.
263
264 T. Renz indicated that there was a discrepancy in the placement of the deciduous trees located on
265 site and the coniferous trees shown in the renderings.
266
267 T. Bry expressed concern regarding extra tree clearing.
268
269 D. Clymer explained that the applicant is expected to detail their proposed clearings and if they do
270 not follow the approved plans, and that their certificate of occupancy is contingent on them
271 following the plans approved by the DRB.
272
273 Todd Renz asked about the placement of trees in the renderings and asked what would happen if
274 homeowners decided they wanted to remove trees in the future.
275
276 W. Renz expressed the same concern regarding possible removal of trees once homeowners take
277 possession of the house.
278
279 D. Clymer emphasized that, if the project moves forward, the property owner would be required to
280 adhere to specific conditions, with the clearing limits being enforceable.
281
282 P. Boothe explained that they conducted a detailed tree survey for the immediate foreground on
283 the downhill slope, adjusting the 3D model based on caliper information and tree types.

284
285 T. Hand, and Ty. Renz expressed concerns about the accuracy of the canopy depictions,
286 particularly regarding mature trees with elevated canopies and the number deciduous and
287 coniferous trees.

288
289 P. Boothe acknowledge that while they made their best effort to represent the trees accurately,
290 there may be some limitations in showing every tree, especially smaller ones. P. Boothe discussed
291 the detailed view analysis of the proposed development presenting 3D renderings and
292 comparisons with actual photographs to demonstrate the visual impact of the buildings from
293 various vantage points. P. Booth points out that the buildings are screened by existing trees.

294
295 P. Gabel expressed concern about how visible the proposed homes are going to be.

296
297 A. Volansky noted that they may be trying to apply RHOD standards to a project that does not
298 require it.

299
300 P. Gabel pointed out that the project is adjacent to the historic area and the screening should be
301 addressed to respect the adjacent historic structures.

302
303 Tyler Renz wanted to make sure that the applicant was depicting the correct type of trees in the
304 view studies. D. Clymer noted his concern and clarified that the board had reviewed the view
305 analysis with this issue in mind. The board relied on the applicant's testimony, but they will not
306 indicate whether or not they have met the standard.

307 D. Clymer moved onto the undue water, noise or air pollution. T. Hand noted that construction
308 hours would need to be specified. T. Mumley provided standard construction hours, Monday
309 through Friday 7:00am to 5:00pm; Saturday 8:00am to 4:00pm; with no construction permitted
310 Sunday and Holidays. The construction process would be carried out in three phases, each lasting
311 two years.

312
313 D. Clymer inquired about the necessity of blasting and hammering. T. Mumley responded that
314 further studies would be required to identify which sites would necessitate blasting and
315 hammering. He also stated that, in accordance with the State of Vermont regulations and Act 250
316 permitting, a licensed blasting company would need to be hired to assess the sites and submit a
317 blasting plan.

318
319 Todd Renz expressed concern regarding the absence of geotechnical surveys and potential gaps in
320 the site design, highlighting issues related to the extent of trenching and blasting required. He
321 questioned the potential impact these activities could have on the surrounding area. Additionally,
322 he was concerned about the trees that would have to be removed during excavation. D. Clymer
323 reiterated that they would be held accountable if they deviated from the plan.

324
325 Tyler Renz, a licensed professional engineer in the State of Vermont, stated that he had submitted a
326 soil sample for the project site. He explained that the soil data indicates poor conditions for
327 construction of both roads and dwellings without basements. D. Clymer acknowledged the receipt
328 of his comments.

D. Kelly made a motion to enter deliberative session. A. Volansky seconded; the motion passed unanimously. The board entered deliberative session at approximately 9:56pm.

The board returned from deliberative session at approximately 10:02pm.

D. Clymer explained that a special meeting would be scheduled to continue discussion of this project. He proposed March 25th and April 8th as potential dates for the meeting. The applicant team chose March 25th.

T. Hand made a motion to continue the project to a special meeting date of March 25th, 2025, beginning at 5:00pm. D. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business:

None.

D. Kelly motioned to adjourn the meeting. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:08pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kayla Hedberg
Planning and Zoning Assistant