



**Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – January 20, 2026**

1
2
3
4 A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, January 20,
5 2026, starting at approximately 5:00 pm. The meeting was held at the Stowe Town Office
6 with remote participation using the “Zoom” application.

7
8 **Members Present:** Drew Clymer, David Kelly, Mary Black, Tom Hand, Andrew Volansky, Peter
9 Roberts, Patricia Gabel, and Alternates Scott Rank and Chip Dillon.

10
11 **Staff Present:** Sarah McShane- Planning and Zoning Director, Kyle Hansen – Deputy Zoning
12 Administrator, and Kayla Hedberg- Planning & Zoning Assistant

13
14 **Others Present in Person:** [See sign-in attendance sheet]

15
16 Meeting Chair Clymer called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00pm.

17
18 **Project #: 7716**

19 **Owner: Willow Creek LLC**

20 **Tax Parcel #: 10-040.050**

21 **Location: 0 Needle Leaf Ln**

22 **Project: 2-Lot Subdivision**

23 **Zoning: RR5**

24
25 *(Participating members: D. Clymer, D. Kelly, M. Black, P. Roberts, A. Volansky, T. Hand, and P. Gabel)*

26
27 D. Clymer re-opened the continued hearing for Project 7716. Tyler Mumley, Nafisa Eachus and
28 Brian Eachus were present for the applicant and swore in by D. Clymer at approximately 5:03 p.m.

29
30 T. Mumley summarized the revisions and clarified that the Lot was created in 1977 by deed, not
31 through subdivision review. S. McShane explained that the lot is a legally pre-existing,
32 nonconforming lot due to the subdivision regulations at the time the lot was created. T. Mumley
33 explained that Lot 1 remains nonconforming due to the width. The right-of-way access intersects
34 two property lines, creating two front yard setbacks. These setbacks were revised to reflect 70-foot
35 setbacks.

36
37 T. Mumley provided a clearing analysis for both lots, showing existing and proposed cleared areas.
38 Lot 1 proposed clearing increase from approximately 42-43 percent to approximately 59 percent.
39 Lot 2 proposed clearing increases from approximately 49 percent to approximately 68-69 percent.
40 T. Mumley further explained that the clearing supports the proposed building zones and septic
41 locations while preserving the slopes and buffers.

42
43 D. Clymer asked about fire protection and stormwater management. T. Mumley explained that
44 conceptual driveway locations were shown for planning purposes and that notes on the plan
45 require compliance with fire department standards including driveway width, grade and
46 turnaround capability. T. Mumley stated that the total new impervious surface across both lots
47 would remain under 0.5 acres to avoid triggering a state stormwater permit. He noted that

48 construction-phase erosion controls measures were described, including silt fencing and
49 compliance with Vermont Erosion Control regulations.
50
51 D. Clymer questioned the blue-line stream. T. Mumley acknowledged the buffer and labeled it on
52 the plans.
53
54 D. Clymer questioned the septic and wastewater permits. T. Mumley clarified they did not have the
55 State permit, and the septic location is based on test pits and preliminary design.
56
57 D. Clymer and T. Hand expressed concern about the feasibility of the project given the conceptual
58 driveway and building locations.
59
60 M. Black motioned to enter deliberative session. P. Roberts seconded the motion. The motion
61 passed unanimously.
62
63 M. Black motioned to exit deliberative session. P. Gabel seconded the motion. The motion passed
64 unanimously.
65
66 Upon returning from deliberative session D. Clymer explained that the application does not yet
67 meet Standards 5.1.12 and 5.5 relating to fire protection access and stormwater. The board
68 requested additional evidence, including intended driveway locations and conceptual building
69 footprints sufficient to demonstrate fire access standards and impervious surfaces.
70
71 P. Roberts requested that the wetland and stream buffer setbacks be staked to prevent future over-
72 clearing.
73
74 D. Kelly motioned to continue the hearing to February 17, 2026, M. Black seconded the motion. The
75 motion passed unanimously.
76
77 **Project #: 7753**
78 **Owner: Adam Hergenrother**
79 **Tax Parcel #: 15-042.900**
80 **Location:1084 Wade Pasture Road**
81 **Project: Clearing Limit Amendment**
82 **Zoning: RR5/RHOD**
83
84 *(Participating members: D. Clymer, M. Black, P. Roberts, T. Hand, P. Gabel, and alternates S. Rank and*
85 *C. Dillon)*
86
87 *(Recused members: T. Hand and A. Volansky)*
88
89 D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7753. T. Hand and A. Hergenrother were present for the
90 applicant and sworn in by D. Clymer at approximately 5:56 p.m.
91
92 T. Hand clarified that they are seeking approval for additional clearing beyond the previously
93 approved limits. They are seeking to clear approximately 16,000 square feet, located downhill from
94 the pond in the southwest corner of the property.
95

96 The clearing area is on a steep slope and is intended primarily for recreational use, including
97 sledding. T. Hand noted that minor view improvements as a secondary benefit. The clearing would
98 extend approximately 40-50 feet beyond the existing clearing line to provide a safe runout area at
99 the base of the slope.

100

101 D. Kelly asked about potential impacts on the neighboring properties. A. Hergenrother explained
102 that the nearest neighboring residence is approximately 100-150 feet away, with substantial tree
103 cover remaining.

104

105 D. Clymer discussed whether the application triggered the Stowe Club test. T. Hand noted that
106 original permit conditions anticipated the possibility of future amendments to clearing limits and
107 that the clearing area is not critical to the original project approval.

108

109 T. Hand pointed out a section of over-clearing and noted that this was done over 20 years ago, and
110 it has been revegetated.

111

112 S. Rank questioned the Act 250 permit and the conservation zone. T. Hand and A. Hergenrother
113 clarified that the Act 250 permit would likely be required following local approval. He further
114 explained that the Robinson Spring covenants allow for recreational use within the conservation
115 zone. The previous clearing boundaries were aligned with the conservation zone boundaries to
116 minimize disturbance.

117

118 M. Black motioned to close the hearing. S. Rank seconded the motion. The motion passed
119 unanimously.

120

121 **Project #: 7754**

122 **Owner: John Cohen and Vicki Cohen**

123 **Tax Parcel #: 10-188.000**

124 **Location: 271 Lower Leriche Rd**

125 **Project: Dimensional Waiver For 2nd Level Addition - Renovation**

126 **Zoning: RR5**

127

128 *(Participating members: D. Clymer, M. Black, P. Roberts, A. Volansky, T. Hand, P. Gabel, and D. Kelly)*

129

130 D. Clymer opened the hearing for Project 7754. John and Vicki Cohen were present for the
131 applicant.

132

133 Interested persons included Robert Rose, Mary Rose and Robert Rose Jr (present via zoom).

134

135 D. Clymer swore in all parties at approximately 6:13 p.m.

136

137 Robert and Mary Rose

Robert Rose Jr.

138 97 Lower Leriche Rd

301 Lower Leriche Rd

139 Stowe, VT 05672

Stowe, VT 05672

140

141 V. Cohen stated they are requesting a dimensional waiver to allow a second-story addition to their
142 single-family home. The existing house was not built in conformance with the permitted plans or
143 within the designated setbacks. She further explained that they were not aware of this

144 noncompliance at the time the home was purchased. The proposed second story is designed to
145 comply with the 75-foot setback, but the roof overhang would encroach into the setback.

146

147 T. Hand questioned whether the applicant knew that the overhang must also fall within the
148 setback. J. Cohen clarified they are requesting a setback waiver of approximately 5-7 feet to account
149 for the overhang. He further explained that the second-story addition was designed with a hip roof
150 to reduce perceived mass.

151

152 D. Clymer noted the irregular lot configuration. J. Cohen noted the lot that does not meet the
153 minimum 300-foot lot width requirement, is smaller than 5 acres in the RR5 zoning district and the
154 property is relatively flat, then slants towards the stream.

155

156 R. Rose Jr. stated they have had interactions with the property owner and feel comfortable that the
157 proposed addition is consistent with the neighborhood character. He also discussed the possibility
158 of additional landscaping for visual screening.

159

160 T. Hand asked if the addition would be compatible with the area. J. Cohen confirmed that the project
161 is compatible with the scale and design with nearby homes, there would be no impact on sight
162 distances and road safety and would not adversely affect the use of adjacent properties.

163

164 A. Volansky questioned whether the house would be a legally nonconforming structure. K. Hansen
165 clarified since the house was not built to the permitted specs it would not be considered a pre-
166 existing nonconforming structure.

167

168 P. Roberts motioned to close the hearing. M. Black seconded the motion. The motion passed
169 unanimously

170

171 **Other Business:**

172 None.

173

174 **Approval of Minutes:**

175

176 M. Black motioned to approve the meeting minutes from January 6, 2026. T. Hand seconded the
177 motion. The motion passed unanimously.

178

179 D. Kelly motioned to enter deliberative session. A. Volansky seconded the motion. The motion
180 passed unanimously.

181

182 Respectfully Submitted,

183 Kayla Hedberg

184 Planning and Zoning Assistant