



**Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – June 3, 2025**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, June 3, 2025, starting at approximately 5:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Stowe Town Office with remote participation using the “Zoom” application.

Members Present: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Peter Roberts, Andrew Volansky, Alternate Lynn Altadonna, and Alternate Scot Baraw.

Staff Present: Sarah McShane, Planning and Zoning Director, 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 5:00 p.m.

Project #: 7462 (Cont. from 1/21, 3/18, & 3/25, 4/29)

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

(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Patricia Gabel, and Andrew Volansky. Absent: Tom Hand and Patricia Gabel- will review later.)

D. Clymer reopened the continued hearing for Project 7462. Representing the Applicant were the following individuals: Tyler Mumley, Thomas Keene, Mark Gallerstein, Seth Kimball, Ed French, and Britney Aube, (Patrick Booth and Skyler Ficke present via Zoom).

Interested persons present included: Tyler Renz, and Alvin Fagen

D. Clymer swore in all parties, both in person and via Zoom at approximately 5:02 p.m.

T. Mumley presented a revised water and sewer plan addressing concerns about drilled wells. The team proposed a phased approach where in phases 1 and 2, units 1-12 would connect directly to municipal water and sewer, and in phases 3 and 4, a booster pump system would be required to ensure adequate pressure for the uphill units 13-24.

T. Mumley explained that the Department of Public Works Director Harry Shepard expressed concerns about coordination with other users on the existing water and sewer line, specifically Neil Van Dyke. He further explained that there has been ongoing communication and cooperation with N. Van Dyke, who is supportive of the plan.

D. Clymer asked E. French whether written approval had been received from N. Van Dyke. E.

French stated that there were positive email exchanges but no formal letters yet.

D. Clymer asked who would own the infrastructure. T. Mumley confirmed that the town would own up to the booster pump system, while the remainder of the water and sewer infrastructure would be privately owned under consecutive system agreements.

T. Renz asked for further information regarding stormwater management in relation to the list of questions he had submitted, and whether any changes had been made since H. Shepard's most recent email.

D. Clymer asked T. Mumley to review the stormwater management plan. T. Mumley discussed the stormwater management plan and explained that H. Shepard was concerned about overflow. Although the overflow occurs over a rock swale without a defined outlet below, the flows are considered negligible.

D. Clymer questioned the driveway access and culvert mentioned in H. Shepards memo. T. Mumley explained that no changes are proposed due to its location within a 50-foot wetland buffer, thereby avoiding permit triggers and disturbances.

T. Mumley continued by addressing unit 21's proximity to wetlands. H. Shepard suggested that the southwest corner of unit 21 was close to the wetland. T. Mumley noted that the design had already been adjusted to minimize impact and disagreed with the assertion that further changes were necessary.

T. Mumley explained that H. Shepard suggested extending the drainage behind units 16-21. T. Mumley stated that the proposed design, with a maximum 3:1 slope, is acceptable and manageable, and considered this a matter of internal design, not one with offsite impacts.

T. Mumley also addressed H. Shepard's concerns regarding the retaining wall and driveway, stating that these were internal matters with no external consequences and within their design discretion.

T. Mumley noted that future work would involve coordinating an encroachment agreement and stormwater connection with H. Shepard.

T. Mumley explained that it is still undetermined whether the project will be classified as low or moderate risk by the State. If classified a moderate risk, a detailed plan and onsite manager with weekly reporting will be required. If low risk, standard erosion measures per the State regulations be sufficient.

D. Clymer questioned the driveway access rights and maintenance agreements. The applicant team confirmed they have access and maintenance agreements can be provided.

T. Renz reiterated his ongoing concerns, including the impacts on wildlife habitats, proximity to the historic district and visual aesthetics, potential use of impact hammers if blasting is not feasible, uncertainties surrounding utility and infrastructure planning, lack of rock hardness testing or test borings, and unresolved stormwater and construction impact concerns on surrounding

93 businesses.

94
95 A motion to close the hearing was made by M. Black and seconded by A. Volansky. The motion
96 passed unanimously.

97
98 **Project #: 7528**

99 **Owner: Percy Farm Trust (Cont. from 4/1)**

100 **Tax Parcel #: 09-014.000**

101 **Location: 26 Tinker Ln**

102 **Project: Final Review of 3-lot PRD on Elizabeths Ln /Double Setback Waiver**

103 **Zoning: RR2**

104
105 *(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Peter Roberts, Andrew*
106 *Volansky, and Alternate Lynn Altadonna. Absent: Tom Hand-will review later.)*

107
108 D. Clymer reopened the continued hearing for Project 7528. Representing the Applicant were the
109 following individuals: Tyler Mumley and Paul Percy

110
111 D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 5:27 p.m.

112
113 T. Mumley presented a revised plan for a traditional two-lot subdivision. Lot 3A is approximately
114 4.06 acres and could accommodate two primary dwellings due to the lot size. Lot 3B remains 2
115 acres, unchanged from the original project. Lot3A will share a driveway from Elizabeth Lane, while
116 Lot 3B will have its own driveway.

117
118 D. Clymer questioned the lot width. T. Mumley clarified that there was a typo on the plan and
119 confirmed that the actual frontage is 278 feet, which complies with zoning regulations.

120
121 D. Clymer inquired about driveway setbacks. T. Mumley explained that the site plan includes a note
122 verifying compliance with the 10-foot minimum requirement.

123
124 D. Clymer also questioned the previously requested waiver for a double setback. T. Mumley
125 indicated that the waiver is no longer applicable due to the change from a PRD to two-lot
126 subdivision.

127
128 L. Altadonna asked about the open space shown in the previous plans. T. Mumley explained the
129 open area in the middle is now part of lot 3B.

130
131 D. Clymer reviewed the permitted uses and density and questioned the separation between the
132 dwellings. T. Mumley noted that the estimated distance between the dwellings is approximately
133 164 feet, and clarified that the site plans show building envelopes, not proposed structures.

134
135 D. Clymer pointed out that the property is designated as prime agricultural. T. Mumley and P. Percy
136 explained that the land was previously used as a gravel pit and has been modified significantly. T.
137 Mumley added that although it is mapped as prime agricultural (with a value rating of 6), the
138 classification is outdated. P. Percy emphasized that the land is not suitable for agricultural use.

139
140 D. Clymer proceeded to discuss visual impact, rural character, landscaping, and traffic and

pedestrian access. T. Mumley noted that the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and minimizes visual impacts from roadways and adjacent properties. He also stated that a minimal traffic increase is expected (approximately 3 peak-hour trips), which Route 100 can accommodate.

D. Clymer inquired about fire protection. T. Mumley stated that fire protection is available via an existing fire pond partially located on the applicant's property. P. Percy confirmed the pond is equipped with a dry hydrant.

D. Clymer asked about private enforcement mechanisms. T. Mumley agreed that a shared driveway agreement would be required if two primary dwellings were developed.

D. Clymer raised concerns about a sewer easement encroachment. T. Mumley explained that the easement was inaccurately depicted due to the State wastewater permit using incorrect property lines.

D. Clymer asked for clarification regarding stormwater management. T. Mumley noted that the initial disturbance and impervious surfaces values were incorrect and have been revised. The disturbed area is .85 acres (over the .5-acre threshold), requiring an erosion control plan. The impervious surface is under one-half acre, so the regulations do not require stormwater management. T. Mumley further explained that the site is flat with minimal impact expected.

T. Mumley explained that utility access will be underground and provided by Morristown Water and Light.

A motion to close the hearing was made by M. Black and seconded by L. Altadonna. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7533 (Cont. 4/1)

Owner: Donaldson Family Trust

Tax Parcel #: 08-061.020

Location: North Hollow Rd

Project: RHOD Review for Single-Family Dwelling & Related Improvements

Zoning: RR5

(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, David Kelly, Peter Roberts, Andrew Volansky, and alternate Lynn Altadonna. Absent: Tom Hand- will review later.)

D. Clymer reopened the continued hearing for Project 7533. Representing the Applicant were the following individuals: Tyler Mumley, (Rebecca and Mark Donaldson via Zoom)

D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 5:55 p.m.

Interested persons: Chelsea Orr (present via Zoom) swore it at approximately 6:08 p.m.

T. Mumley presented updates to the site plan and architectural elements of the proposed project, relating to the concerns raised during the previous hearing. T. Mumley pointed out the removal of the proposed clearing limits on the south side of North Hollow Road. He further explained that they

maintained vegetation along the north side (house side) of the road to preserve screening and buffer. They shifted the building location to increase the buffer from the stream.

T. Mumley explained that the design remains a walkout structure, but improved cuts and fills integrate it better into the landscape. The roof elevation remains below the tree canopy, preserving the visual screening from all vantage points.

L. Altadonna asked about stormwater management. T. Mumley explained that standard erosion control measures like silt fencing, and erosion control matting on slopes steeper than 3:1 will be implemented. Post construction a swale is planned to divert runoff from undeveloped uphill areas away from the building. A detention pond is proposed at the lower part of the site to collect and manage runoff from developed areas. T. Mumley further explained that the pond is designed to detain the 2-year storm event and discharge towards an existing stream to the north. Roof runoff will flow into the drainage system and be captured by the pond.

D. Clymer asked whether an updated view analysis had been conducted. T. Mumley explained that the height of the building had not changed so they did not think it was necessary to complete another view analysis.

D. Clymer questioned how many acres would be cleared. T. Mumley stated less than one acre would be cleared.

C. Orr expressed concerns about the potential for stormwater runoff to damage their horse farm and equestrian business, the potential for increased flooding and erosion, and the lack of clarity in the engineering plans regarding runoff mitigation. She emphasized that the neighborhood had experienced significant water issues and feared negative impacts from new development.

D. Clymer inquired whether this application required further review under the Stowe Club Test criteria. S. McShane explained that the lot was previously approved as a deferred lot and no additional review under those criteria is necessary.

D. Clymer asked about the proposed detention pond. T. Mumley explained that the stormwater detention pond is proposed on the downhill side to capture runoff and intended to manage the pre and post runoff differences during the 2-year storm event. T. Mumley further explained that the calculations were based on standard modeling tools. The intent is to ensure no increase in runoff volume or rate compared to predevelopment conditions.

D. Clymer asked about the driveway slope and water discharge. T. Mumley explained that the slope is 10 percent and water discharges away from the road.

P. Roberts requested that the applicants stake out the detention pond, building site and driveway for site visit.

A motion to conduct a site visit on June 17th, at 4:00 p.m. and to continue the hearing to June 17th was made by M. Black and seconded by A. Volansky. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7572

Owner: Robert and Lisa Leopold

Tax Parcel #: 7A-005.000

Location: 277 South Main St

Project: Setback Variance for Construction of a Single-Family Dwelling

Zoning: VR40/SHOD

(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, Peter Roberts, David Kelly, Andrew Volansky, Alternate Lynn Altadonna and Alternate Scot Baraw.)

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7572. Representing the Applicant was Alan Guazzoni.

D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 6:28 p.m.

A. Guazzoni explained that they are requesting a front yard setback variance for proposed construction of a single-family dwelling. The original project (permit 6664) was approved but lapsed after two years. The proposed new structure is now three feet outside the right-of-way but still within the required front yard setback, necessitating a variance.

R. Morrison explained that a permit for reconstruction was issued based on the nonconforming status of the prior building, allowing permit 6664 to be approved administratively. However, the previously approved project did not occur within the required two-year window, and the permit expired. Because more than two years have passed since the demolition, the applicants are no longer eligible for administrative approval and must now apply for a variance.

A. Guazzoni noted that the proposed structure is nearly identical to the previously approved design. The only notable change is the proposed structure has been moved back three feet from the original plan to avoid encroachment on the town highway right-of-way.

D. Clymer clarified that the required front yard setback is 30 feet, and the applicant is requesting a 27-foot reduction.

A. Volansky clarified that because the proposed variance exceeds 20 percent, it qualifies as a variance, not a waiver.

D. Kelly questioned the reason for the delay. A. Guazzoni explained that they were not ready to proceed with the original rebuild.

A motion to enter deliberative session was made by D. Kelly and seconded by M. Black. The motion passed unanimously.

The board returned from deliberative session and asked A. Guazzoni if he had anything else to add. He stated he did not.

A motion to close the hearing was made by M. Black and seconded by D. Kelly. The motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7593

Owner: TJVT LLC

Tax Parcel #: 07-107.000

Location: 512 Mountain Rd

Project: Increase Capacity of Childcare Center

Zoning: HT

(Participating DRB Members: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, Peter Roberts, David Kelly, Andrew Volansky, Alternate Lynn Altadonna and Alternate Scot Baraw.)

D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7593. Representing the Applicant were Sarah Tousignant and Nick Tousignant.

Interested persons present included David Wolfgang.

D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 6:52 p.m.

S. Tousignant presented a request to increase the capacity of the existing childcare center, Mountain Village School (MVS). The center currently operates on the first floor of the building, and the second floor will become available in July. MVS would like to expand operations to the second floor and increase the licensed capacity from 40 children to 70 children.

D. Clymer reminded S. Tousignant that additional water and sewer allocation must be approved by the Department of Public Works.

D. Clymer questioned the traffic impact. S. Tousignant explained that pickup and drop-off times are staggered. Morning drop-off is 7:30am to 8:30am and afternoon pickup is 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. She further explained that the departure of the Ride Spin Studio is expected to reduce overall traffic at the site.

L. Altadonna asked if there was access to Weeks Hill Road. S. Tousignant explained that the access through the neighboring property has been closed. All traffic now enters and exits via Mountain Road.

D. Clymer asked about parking requirements. S. Tousignant requested approval for up to eight staff members, though typically six to seven will be on site. Staff parking will occupy up to eight full-day spaces. Parent parking is short-term (5-10 minutes) and staggered during designated hours. S. Tousignant explained that the site has sufficient parking based on a combination of allocations from the existing and proposed floor space, including seven spaces allocated under previous agreements with Ride.

R. Morrison explained that the regulations do not prescribe a specific parking minimum for childcare centers, the current configuration meets expected needs.

A motion to close the hearing was made by D. Kelly and seconded by M. Black. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes:

A motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 20, 2025, was made by M. Black and seconded by M. Diender. The motion passed unanimously.

333 **Other Business:**

334

335 L. Altadonna recommended tabling the election of a Chair and Vice Chair until all regular members
336 were present for discussion. The board agreed and tabled the discussion until July 1st, 2025.

337

338 On a motion by D. Kelly, seconded by M. Black, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:05 p.m.
339 The motion passed unanimously.

340

341 Respectfully Submitted,

342 Kayla Hedberg

343 Planning and Zoning Assistant