



Town of Stowe- Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes – May 6, 2026

A meeting of the Stowe Historic Preservation Commission (SHPC) was held on Wednesday May 6, 2026, at approximately 5:15 pm. Participation was in person at the Akeley Memorial Building, online or telephone via Zoom.

Members Present: McKee Macdonald (Chair), George Bambara, Barbara Baraw, Tyson Bry, Chris Carey, Jennifer Guazzoni, Cindy McKechnie, and Shapleigh Smith

Staff Present: Kyle Hansen – Deputy Zoning Administrator

The meeting was called to order by McKee Macdonald (chair) at 5:16 pm.

Adjustments to the Agenda:

McKee Macdonald requested that the printed agenda be adjusted so that the only applicant presenting in person may present first, and so that both projects presented by Chris Carey will be presented in order near the end of the meeting rather than at the beginning. He requested to reorganize to hear the applications as follows: Project 7806, Project 7823, Project 7816, Project 7810, and add to the agenda Project 7828.

M. Macdonald stated that he is the applicant on behalf of the property owner, and that he will recuse himself during the review of Project #7823.

The HPC unanimously agreed to approve the adjustments to the agenda as presented.

Project #: 7806

Owner: Copley Hospital, Inc.

Tax Parcel: 07-158.010

Location: 125 Thomas Ln #310

Project: Generator and Compost Structure

Zoning: VIL PUD / SHOD

Jake Krohn presented the application. Zach Denekas and Chloe Mattson were present via zoom. Copley Hospital Inc. requires a new generator at this location, and the applicant proposes protecting the new generator with a manufactured shelter. This shelter will also block the view of the generator from residents on-site and will serve both purposes. The generator shelter will have a shed roof facing towards the Copley Woodlands building. A painted cedar fence serves as a visual screen of the existing and proposed generator unit from Depot Street, though this fence is also in disrepair. In addition to the simple generator shelter, the applicant proposes to construct an integrated compost shed inside the generator shelter, accessed via French doors on the side of the structure.

G. Bambara asked if the proposed generator will be located closer to the road than the existing unit. J. Krohn replied that the cement block upon which the current generator sits will be used for the new generator. The generator unit will not be relocated closer to the road; the only change will be the installation of the generator shelter and compost shed on the existing site. S. Smith asked

the applicant to confirm the use of the shed, to which the applicant confirmed that it will not be used for trash or recycling, and its sole purpose will be for storing compost bins. The applicant has considered including bear proofing measures. M. Macdonald asked if the fencing will be replaced, is it stacked or offset, as it appears to not be a solid fence line based on the images provided. J. Krohn replied that the fence also serves to screen electric utilities and transmission lines, and there are visible gaps between sections of the fence. If the fence were determined to be replaced, it would be replaced entirely in-kind.

S. Smith suggested that the applicant plant trees for screening where the fence has gaps, especially on the sides. J. Krohn replied that there previously were evergreen trees on site, however, the needles were corrosive and contributed to the damage to the generator, and the stump and roots were harmful to the fencing and contributed to additional damage. After the stumps of the removed trees are likewise removed from the location, the applicant will have the space to plant new, lower growing trees which provide screening, such as arborvitae. J. Guazzoni and C. McKechnie agreed that new trees will tie the project together and provide adequate screening of the generator from Depot Street.

B. Baraw motioned to approve the project nearly as presented, with the inclusion of arborvitae plantings as discussed, to fill in the gaps in the fencing on site and to provide additional screening of the generator shed from Depot Street. C. Carey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The project is classified as a minor, and it is exempt from DRB review under Section 2.7(F)

Project #: 7823
Owner: Stowe Maple St. LLC.
Tax Parcel: 7A-089.000
Location: 473 Maple St
Project: Fence Removal
Zoning: VR20 / SHOD

Jeremy Rubin presented on behalf of the owner. The old wooden solid wall/fence, located at 473 Maple Street, has been in disrepair for many years, and was considered for removal in August of 2025; however, those plans were never followed through with. Salt and water infiltration corroded the steel supports of the wall to the degree they rotted through and snapped. The applicant had no choice but to remove the wall to prevent potential human injury or property damage. The cement foundation wall which served as a base for the fence remains and is proposed to remain after it is cleared of any remaining debris. The applicant is considering planting small shrubs to serve as a screen of the dwelling in lieu of replacing the wall in-kind.

C. Carey asked if the fence was required to protect the dwellings and residents from snow and salt flung by plow trucks on Maple Street. J. Rubin replied that the area between the fence and the road is plowed by contractors and is privately maintained. Maple Street does not immediately abut the wall and that it was not essential for protection from snowplows.

J. Guazzoni stated that she believes it will be difficult to plant shrubs on that site given the constraints and amount of cement present. C. McKechnie noted that there are some shrubbery options which are resistant to road salt and will provide screening of the residence and the remaining cement base.

G. Bambara asked if the windows used in the in-kind renovation project underway at the site were simulated dividing light. J. Rubin was unsure. This prior renovation project was determined to not require HPC review, as it only involved in-kind replacements.

C. Carey motioned to approve the project nearly as presented, with the inclusion of salt resistant shrubbery to serve as additional screening of the dwelling in lieu of the collapsed and removed wall/fence. C. McKechnie seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. This project is classified as a minor.

Project #: 7816
Owner: Stowe Electric Department
Tax Parcel: 03-033.000
Location: 435 Moscow Rd
Project: Renovation of Millwright's Building
Zoning: MC/FHD

This project was previously informally reviewed by the HPC most recently during the 3/04/2026 meeting. Chris Carey recused himself from reviewing this project and presented on behalf of the applicant. Jackie Pratt joined the meeting via Zoom.

C. Carey explained that the new powerhouse building is exempt from permitting because it is a power generation facility, so the HPC only needs to focus on the Millwright's building. The powerhouse will be detached from the historic mill building and will house the hydroelectric turbine.

The applicant is proposing to construct an addition to the Millwright's building to allow for an elevator, internal stairs, and an access ramp on the front. These additions along with the overall renovation project will allow the applicant to change the use of the building, to create additional ADA accessible, code compliant office space. The renovation includes new windows, doors, siding, roofing, lighting, and an internal redesign of the floor space including bathrooms and office space. Electrical, servers, and other equipment will be installed upstairs.

HPC members voiced their support of the project. M. Macdonald asked what exterior color the applicant was considering painting the buildings. J. Pratt explained that the dam will be tinted concrete, the powerhouse and millwright's building will likely be painted grey with white trim, the mill building will likely remain red, or may eventually be painted yellow as it was historically.

G. Bambara motioned to approve the project as presented. B. Baraw seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The project is classified as a major and will require floodplain and DRB review.

Project #: 7810
Owner: 109 Main LLC
Tax Parcel: 7A-046.000
Location: 109 Main St.
Project: Covered Porch Replacement
Zoning: VR10 / SHOD

C. Carey recused himself from reviewing this project and presented on behalf of the applicant. Adam Glick was present via zoom. C. Carey explained that this project entails the replacement and renovation of the deck at 109 Main Street, as the current deck is old and in a state of disrepair. The applicant will keep the existing roof, brackets, and square footage, so the covered porch will not be expanded in height or any other dimension. During this process, the deck must be brought up to code. This will require the railings to be increased in height compared to what is currently in place. The steps and decking will also be replaced with new wooden decking material. The deck balusters, railings, and lattice will be painted white as it currently appears.

B. Baraw asked if the applicant will keep the same baluster design. C. Carey replied that the balusters and ornamental trim pieces will be restored. However, if they are rotten and unable to be restored, new wooden balusters and ornamental trim pieces will be carved to identically match the existing design. There will be new lattice pieces installed underneath the decking, painted white, to replace the deteriorating lattice currently in place.

S. Smith stated that he believes the design will not appear substantially different when viewed from the street, based on the plans and the applicant's testimony.

C. McKechnie motioned to approve the project as presented. S. Smith seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The project is classified as a major and will require DRB review due to a condition in a previous DRB decision for project 5340, which requires all changes to the south façade of 109 main street to be reviewed by the DRB.

Project #: 7791

Owner: Aaron Fastman

Tax Parcel: 7A-018.000

Location: 134 S. Main Street Unit A2

Project: Replacement Window, addition of handrails

Zoning: VC10/SHOD

M. Macdonald, on behalf of the property owner, recused himself from ruling on this project. Since Vice Chair S. Scofield was not present, S. Smith served as acting chair during this presentation.

M. Macdonald described the reason for proposing an amendment to permit Z-7791, which was reviewed by the HPC on 3/18/2026. The Fire Marshal determined that the approved side egress window was too small, so a larger window was required to bring the unit up to code. The applicant was unable to find a simulated divided light egress window in the size required by the fire marshal, and the window design now matches the other 6 over 6 windows in the unit. The fire marshal also required the applicant to install an additional handrail along the steps leading from the front deck, which matches the design of the one previously approved by the HPC.

C. McKechnie suggested that the applicant install caps on both railing posts on the steps of the front deck, as they are both currently bare and appear to have been quickly and cheaply constructed. M. Macdonald replied that the unit has already been sold, but that he will refer their comments to the owner and will install caps on the two (2) railing posts as suggested.

T. Bry motioned to recommend the project nearly as presented, including the two (2) railing post

caps as discussed. G. Bambara seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. This project is classified as a minor.

Other Business:

Informal Review - 129 Mountain Road

Catherine Scalzi presented the changes made to the design of this project since the previous informal review. She described changes made to the building's scale, layout, and design of the proposed three (3) unit multi-family dwelling. The building is now a two (2) story L-shaped design, with a two (2) story front porch facing Mountain Road. The primary access to the three (3) units is at the rear of the building, though the two (3) first floor apartments have secondary access points via attached porches. The second floor is devoted entirely to one apartment. The applicant believes that the design aligns more closely with the site given the lot's constraints and size, and that it more closely matches the layout of nearby buildings. There are now multiple rooflines, balconies, porches, more windows, fewer blank walls and facades, and the stairs accessing the second floor are internal to the building.

M. Macdonald stated that the design presented is a major improvement over previous iterations, however, it still requires additional changes. He also asked the applicant to make sure that the building, including rooflines, complies with the setback line to the south, and the property line to the north. Kyle Hansen, staff, explained that the only applicable setback lines on this parcel are the southern and western setbacks.

S. Smith asked about external ventilation for A/C, heating, and utilities. C. Scalzi replied that there are two chimneys which will manage exhaust from heating and cooling utilities. B. Baraw asked for clarification regarding vents for laundry units. These will be incorporated into the design's next version, as they are not presently shown on the elevation plans.

T. Bry voiced his support for utilizing chimneys in the design. The windows still cause the building to appear to be modular in design, and they are all the same size. Historically, second story windows have been smaller than first story windows. C. McKechnie agreed that this building would appear more historic and similar to other two story buildings in the village if the second story windows were smaller than the first story.

HPC members discussed the second story deck, the railing height, access points, and materials proposed to be used, as well as the size of the windows. C. Scalzi stated that the windows are five (5') foot by eight (8') foot in size. C. Carey stated that the windows must be 18" off the floor or be tempered safety glass. The second story windows appear to be overly large and too close to the floor. C. Carey continued that the window patterns should be varied, and that the windows shown appear to be too uniform across the entire building. The windows also too closely resemble the design of the doors. M. Macdonald asked about the window trim being flat. C. Scalzi answered that the window trim could be changed to add some definition.

The rear of the building where the main entry doors are planned will create a valley between the wall of the building and the steep slope at the property line. As presented, the proposed graveled path is within the setback, and the access doors do not have overhangs to protect residents from snow falling off the roof. M. Macdonald suggested that the applicant request a setback waiver and

present a draft with a wraparound covered porch or roof overhang protecting the walkway and access doors if the rear of the building will be utilized in this manner. T. Bry added that standalone single door overhangs should be gabled and not shed roofs, so that snow will fall to the sides instead of in front of the doorway and onto walkways. This design will also make the building appear more historic. T. Bry continued, stating that the proposed lighting fixtures appear too nautical for Stowe and should be revised to appear more consistent with exterior light fixtures in the village. C. Scalzi stated that the LED light strips and lamppost have been removed from the plans, and that she will investigate new outdoor light fixtures.

M. Macdonald asked if there will be fireplaces in the units. C. Scalzi answered in the negative. T. Bry said that if the applicant wishes to add heat pumps, that they must be included on the presented plans. J. Guazzoni suggested that the applicant cover the second story deck and include overhangs over the individual doors to break up the facades and to protect residents from snowfall. M. Macdonald also suggested the applicant consider landscaping to protect the rear walkway and prevent undue erosion at the rear of the building. The steps will require railings.

The HPC understands that the lot has constraints and will require three (3) parking spaces as defined in the regulations, so it is difficult to move the proposed building around on the subject parcel. The HPC looks forward to seeing further revised plans at a later date once the changes have been made and are ready for review.

HPC Chair and Vice Chair Election

On a motion by G. Bambara, seconded by S. Smith, McKee Macdonald was nominated to continue as Chair, and Sam Scofield was nominated to continue as Vice-Chair. The HPC unanimously voted to approve the motion.

Review Meeting Minutes:

No changes or edits were made to the prior meeting minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 6:22 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Kyle Hansen, Deputy Zoning Administrator