



**Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – May 20, 2025**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, May 20, 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, David Kelly, Patricia Gabel, Andrew Volansky, Alternate Scot Baraw, Alternate Michael Diender, and Alternate Lynn Altadonna

Staff Present: Ryan Morrison- Deputy Zoning Administrator, and 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 #: 7552

Owner: John Springer-Miller & Tina Ross

Tax Parcel #: 11-255.000

Location: Lot 4A- End of Nature’s Way

Project: Phase V Continuation of Wildewood Community -10 Single Family Dwellings in AG-PRD

Zoning: RR5/RHOD

(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Patricia Gabel, Andrew Volansky, Alternate Scot Baraw and Alternate Michael Diender)

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7552. Representing the Applicant were the following individuals: John Grenier, Alain Youkel, Michelle Young, Larry Williams, and Attorney Jeremy Farkas.

Interested parties present included: Anne and Joe Gresci, Attorney Jon Anderson (representing the Covered Bridge HOA’s), Jeff and Jana Herman (present via zoom).

Anne and Joe Gresci	Attorney Jon Anderson	Jeff and Jana Herman
60 Mclane Rd #31	30 Main St, suite 500	35 Mclane Rd #25
Stowe, VT 05672	Stowe, VT 05672	Stowe, VT 05672

D. Clymer swore in all parties, both in person and via zoom at approximately 5:09pm

J. Grenier described the project as 10 single-family dwellings on Lot 4A. The project is a continuation of the Wildwood Community development (phase 5). He noted that the original project was approved for 90 units, of which only 58 were built.

J. Herman raised concerns about the project’s impact on the community and the total number of

houses approved in the original project.

J. Farkas clarified that when Phase 4 land was purchased, it was separated from Phase 3. An agreement among existing Phase 3 owners allowed up to 21 units on what became Phase 4 land, and 20 units were built. He further explained that the agreement did not pertain to tother land owned by the Springer-Millers.

J. Anderson expressed concern over the lack of a density analysis as required by zoning regulations. He stressed the need to comply with the ordinance and requested that the applicant provide proper documentation.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding the stream buffers. J. Grenier explained the permitted setbacks are 25 feet from the intermittent stream and 50 feet from the year-round stream. He agreed to reduce the clearing along the stream.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding the density calculation. J. Grenier stated that the density was a historic document. The project was previously approved for 90 units, and that was always the agreed number. He further explained that they would only be adding 10 units, making it 68 units, which is well withing the previously approved calculations. Drew clarified that the original density decision was made March 6th, 1989.

J. Herman questioned whether the Phase 3 meadow acquisition was included in the density calculation. J. Grenier clarified that the meadow was not part of the calculation.

J. Anderson asked for an updated density calculation citing RHOD regulations adopted after the original approval.

D. Clymer requested both historic and current density calculations.

D. Clymer inquired about municipal comments. J. Grenier stated they had a second technical review meeting with the municipal staff on May 5th, during which requests from DPW Director H. Shepard and the Interim Fire Chief S. Reeves were addressed. D. Clymer requested the updated comments.

M. Diender asked about wastewater permitting. J. Grenier explained that the permit would need to be updated and that two permits would regulate the project.

D. Clymer asked about fire truck access. J. Grenier provided a diagram demonstrating adequate maneuverability. M. Diender asked whether the Fire Chief should review it. D. Clymer confirmed that the plan should be submitted for review.

D. Kelly questioned whether the fire truck could enter from the left as well as he right. J. Grenier stated they would provide an alternate route analysis.

J. Herman brought up concerns regarding construction traffic and the condition of the current road.

93 D. Clymer asked about the anticipated traffic. J. Grenier explained that they were very conservative
94 with their numbers and estimated approximately 20 am and pm trips.

95
96 J. Anderson noted the poor condition of the road. D. Clymer pointed out the HOA is responsible for
97 road maintenance.

98
99 J. Anderson requested that the developer assist with improving the road during and after the
100 project.

101
102 J. Herman expressed concern about potential future road connections increasing traffic through
103 residential neighborhoods. He explained that he was worried about the long-term impact of
104 connecting the development to other areas, potentially creating a back route through residential
105 neighborhoods.

106
107 J. Grenier explained that the access road is a private easement owned and maintained by the
108 Springer-Miller family, and that the waterline goes through that area.

109
110 J. Anderson requested a condition be added to prevent future road connections.

111
112 J. Herman emphasized the investment by homeowners in maintaining the road and the need for
113 proper repairs.

114
115 J. Anderson requested a comprehensive, enforceable landscaping plan indicating schedule, size
116 and quantity.

117
118 D. Clymer asked how much of the current vegetation would be cleared J. Grenier said that only
119 minor clearing would be needed within the RHOD.

120
121 A. Youkel stated that previous phases included 25-35 more trees than initially proposed.

122
123 D. Clymer reiterated the need for a 50-foot buffer from the mapped blue line stream and 25 feet
124 from the intermittent streams.

125
126 A. Youkel said landscaping would screen AC condensers and between homes He explained that the
127 landscaping between houses was adequate for each property. He described landscaping along the
128 driveway and walkway with a maple tree out front and spruce trees on the side. D. Clymer
129 explained that the plans provided were not enforceable and needed more detail.

130
131 J. Anderson requested a chart specifying the minimum size, quantity and species as a condition.

132
133 J. Anderson brought up a homeowner's concern regarding the adequacy of landscaping for
134 screening.

135
136 J. Grenier clarified that there would be no clearing along the property line or within the stream
137 buffer.

138

139 A.Youkel explained that in this phase their goal was to maintain or improve the layout of the area,
140 they spaced the houses further than the original and they are heavily planted.
141

142 D. Clymer asked about erosion control and stormwater J. Grenier stated they would obtain an
143 erosion control permit. He explained that the stormwater system was designed for the 100-year
144 storm, exceeding the required two-year storm.
145

146 A.Volansky asked about the lighting plan. A. Youkel explained that light placement and that the
147 lights were dark sky compliant.
148

149 J. Anderson requested a lighting plan showing illumination levels and distribution.
150

151 D. Clymer requested a lighting plan with lumens per square feet.
152

153 D. Kelly questioned the missing 20-foot strips on lots 27-29. J. Grenier explained they were omitted
154 for a more compact feel and extra parking, and they already included a lot of screening. A. Youkel
155 agreed that the plans could be updated.
156

157 M. Diender asked about street lighting. A. Youkel confirmed there would be none, only home and
158 driveway lighting would be utilized.
159

160 D. Clymer asked to review the RHOD vantage points. M. Young identified views from Mountain
161 Road, Topnotch field and Edson Hill Road. M. Young pointed out that there is not much view from
162 the site. D. Clymer asked what was blocking the views from Edson Hills Road, J. Grenier explained
163 that it was vegetation from the reserved lot in the Wildewood PUD and the Mountain Road views
164 were blocked by topography.
165

166 M. Black asked if there is an existing break in the tree line or if it would be cleared. J. Grenier
167 indicated that stormwater discharge will be directed there.
168

169 D. Clymer raised concerns about the habitat block, pointing out that it is a level eight out of ten
170 deer wintering area.
171

172 J. Grenier explained that a large portion of the original PUD set aside land to maintain the habitat
173 area and that mitigation measures have already been implemented.
174

175 A.Youkel explained that specimen trees would be preserved and cleared areas replanted. J Grenier
176 stated the PUD clustering would limit clearing.
177

178 D. Clymer asked about the visibility above the tree lines. A. Youkel said landscaping and natural-
179 toned building colors would minimize visual impact.
180

181 D. Clymer asked if the property had ever been used designated Ag. PRD. J. Grenier stated this land
182 was always slated for development.
183

184 D. Clymer asked about private enforcement. A. Youkel confirmed a separate HOA would be

185 established.

186

187 M. Diender asked that the HOA draft include provisions for tree replacement. D. Clymer requested
188 the draft specify HOA transfer timelines, permitted open space uses and include a separate road
189 maintenance agreement between developments.

190

191 L. Altadonna requested a view analysis from 108 and Lower Sanborn, noting existing analysis was
192 from the east only. He also asked about using anti reflective windows in the RHOD.

193

194 J. Gresci asked where ravine setbacks were measured from. It was determined they start at the
195 base of the waterbed, measured vertically to the top of the plateau.

196

197 J. Herman asked if the Springer-Miller easement could be dissolved. D. Clymer clarified this is a
198 civil issue outside the DRB purview.

199

200 J. Anderson asked for a condition prohibiting future road connections.

201

202 A motion to continue the hearing to September 2, 20:5 was made by D. Kelly and seconded by M.
203 Diender. The motion passed unanimously.

204

205 **Project #: 7542**

206 **Owner: Peter Livaditis /Maple Corner Investments LLC**

207 **Tax Parcel #: 7A-029.000**

208 **Location: 48 South Main St**

209 **Project: Demolish Existing Building and Construct a Mixed-Use Building with Covered At-
210 Grade Parking**

211 **Zoning:VC10/SHOD**

212

213 (Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Patricia Gabel, Alternate Lynn
214 Altadonna, Alternate Scot Baraw and Alternate Michael Diender)

215

216 D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7542. Representing the Applicant were the following
217 individuals: Andrew Volansky, Kelly Osgood, Peter Livaditis, John Grenier, Corey Mack, Jeff Spear,
218 Ian Ambler

219

220 D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 7:20pm.

221 Corey Mack was sworn in at approximately 7:49pm.

222

223 A.Volansky explained that the applicant intends to demolish the existing building and construct a
224 mixed-use building with covered parking. The new building will include retail space and two
225 dwelling units. He further stated their intention to preserve the old tree on the corner of property.

226

227 M. Diender noted that the landscape feature was not shown on the site plan, but it was shown in
228 the rendering.

229

230 D. Clymer asked about a pending boundary line adjustment. A. Volansky explained that the
231 applicant purchased the other property and they are working with J. Grenier to finalize the boundary

line adjustment. The boundary line adjustment would put the existing porch into compliance, so they would not have to ask for additional waivers.

A. Volansky stated that the applicant is requesting a front yard setback waiver of nine feet for a covered entry porch and a side setback waiver of two feet for structured parking. No waiver is requested for the east side, and the waivers do not increase the preexisting nonconformity.

D. Clymer inquired about the building's height. A. Volansky explained that the maximum height per regulation is 28 feet. However, waivers may be granted if certain conditions are met, such as providing covered parking, year-round housing, and stepping back upper floors. A. Volansky noted that the parapet adds height to conceal mechanical equipment.

M. Diender asked if the cupola height needed to be included. A. Volansky said it does not.

D. Clymer asked about allocations from the town. J. Grenier stated they had a second technical review meeting with the municipal staff on May 5th, during which requests from DPW Director H. Shepard were addressed. D. Clymer requested the updated comments.

D. Clymer asked about traffic. C. Mack explained that the estimated increase is 10 trips during PM peak hours. He noted that this number could be less since standard formulas assume urban conditions, whereas in smaller towns, traffic tends to be more static as people park and walk

D. Clymer brought up construction staging plans. A. Volansky explained that the staging would occur behind the building, with construction traffic entering and exiting Route 108. The current parking plan includes 36 spaces, exceeding the required 32

R. Morrison asked how the staging area would affect the number of available parking spaces. P. Livaditis said he could provide net parking calculations.

L. Altadonna asked whether the project lies outside the sewer line right-of-way and avoids the underground stream. A. Volansky confirmed that it does.

D. Clymer asked for clarification on traffic flow into and out of the lot and the covered parking. It was explained that vehicles could enter or exit via Route 108 but only exit onto Route 100. D. Kelly asked whether the covered parking would be for visitors or tenants. P. Livaditis said they are considering making it tenant only parking.

L. Altadonna inquired about parking and crosswalks. C. Mack indicated that traffic control signs are needed to enhance visibility, especially near crosswalks. He also mentioned that a recent police report following an accident cited inadequate lighting as a contributing factor.

Parking calculations were revisited. J. Grenier explained that 48. South Main Street would require nine spaces to accommodate two apartments and retail establishments. P. Livaditis noted that during construction, operations between 48. South Main Street and 55 South Main Street would be limited, which would free up parking for the construction staging area.

P. Livaditis added that once the lot line adjustment has been approved, that would add additional

279 parking.

280
281 I.Ambler reiterated that it was their intent to keep the old tree on the corner and add garden beds
282 around the building. He confirmed that if the old tree cannot be saved, a honey locust will be
283 planted in its place. J. Spear explained that they had conducted a root crown excavation and
284 assessment, and the condition of the tree appears promising.

285
286 D. Clymer asked about stormwater management. J. Grenier stated that the design includes a flat
287 roof with internal drainage directed to the underground stream. The existing four-inch drainpipe
288 would be replaced with a 12-inch pipe.

289
290 K. Osgood described the lighting plan, which includes under porch fixtures, garage lighting, balcony
291 lighting and outdoor sconces. He confirmed the fixtures are dark sky compliant and its calculated
292 to produce 2.3 lumens per square foot. L. Altadonna asked about walkway lighting. It was
293 explained that lighting will be on the east side with step lights starting at ground level and
294 continuing up about 30 inches.

295
296 M. Diender inquired about lighting on the north side. I. Ambler confirmed those had been removed.

297
298 A. Volansky stated that their goal is for the new building to feel like an extension of the village.

299
300 D. Clymer asked about the HPC recommendation for demolition. A.Volansky explained that John
301 Higgins had evaluated the building and determined it was in poor condition. Bringing it up to code
302 would be costly. Although the building is in the Historic district, it is classified as non-
303 contributing.

304
305 D. Clymer inquired about the design inspiration and height comparisons. A. Volansky stated that he
306 drew from local character and provided streetscape illustrations showing the height comparisons.

307
308 L. Altadonna asked about the steps taken to reduce the mass. A. Volansky described the design
309 choices, including steps-back, horizontal bands to ground the building, material changes, and
310 having it darker on the bottom and lighter on the top.

311
312 M. Diender noted that the size of the building would attract more visitors from the south.

313
314 A motion to continue the hearing to July 15, 2025, was made by D. Kelly and seconded by M. Black.
315 The motion passed unanimously.

316
317
318 **Approval of Minutes:**

319
320 A motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 6, 2025, was made by M. Black and seconded by
321 M. Diender. The motion passed unanimously.

322
323 **Other Business:**

325 On a motion by D. Kelly, seconded by M. Black, the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50pm.
326 The motion passed unanimously.
327
328 Respectfully Submitted,
329 Kayla Hedberg
330 Planning and Zoning Assistant