



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**Town of Stowe  
Development Review Board  
Meeting Minutes – February 21, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, February 21, 2023, 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, Tom Hand, Mary Black, Chris Walton, David Kelly, Leigh Wasserman, Peter Roberts

**Staff Present:** Sarah McShane- Planning & Zoning Director, Ryan Morrison- Deputy Zoning Administrator

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

**Approval of the Agenda**

Chair Clymer called the meeting to order at 5:02pm.

**Request for Reconsideration**

**Project #: 7073 (Public Hearing Only to be Held if Request for Reconsideration is First Granted by the DRB)**

**Applicant: Peter G. Anderson, Genevieve G. Anderson, and Michael J. Anderson**

**Owner: Nicholas F Stolowitz & Claudia G Thurston**

**Tax Parcel #: 07-367.000**

**Location: 300 North Hollow Rd**

**Project: Request to Reconsider DRB Approved Project 7033/ 2-Lot Subdivision**

**Zoning: RR5**

Chair Clymer swore in Peter Anderson and AJ LaRosa.

C. Walton made the motion to move to deliberative session. D. Kelly seconded the motion.

At 5:23pm the board exited deliberative session and Chair Clymer called the meeting back into order.

D. Kelly made the motion to deny the request for reconsideration and add the condition that errors identified within the original decision be corrected. The motion was seconded by C. Walton and approved (5-1) with T. Hand voting against. M. Black recused herself from this hearing.

**Development Review Public Hearings**

**Project #: 7057**

**Owner: Louise H Sparks & David Schwartz**

**Tax Parcel #: 06-039.000**

**Location: 2438 Mountain Rd**

**Project: Partial Review of Double Setback Waiver Criteria for a Planned Residential Development (PRD)**

**Zoning: UMR**

Chair Clymer swore in Tyler Mumley, Kyle Gambone, Kate Laster, and Carolene Downey.

46  
47 T. Mumley provided a summary of the project. A 50 ft setback will preserve existing trees and  
48 contours, continuing to block views of the future development. The property was previously  
49 developed, and that's where the proposed development would locate. If the proposed development  
50 were specifically located in a manner to meet the standard setbacks, much more clearing and  
51 grading would be required. The south and east sides will be preserved and development will be  
52 screened from Mountain Road.

53  
54 T. Hand asked why the applicant isn't seeking a standard subdivision. T. Mumley responded that  
55 due to the underlying zoning district limitations and the previous single-family use, new  
56 development is limited to the previous existing use (single-family). A Planned Residential  
57 Development is the only other option to development the property with more than one unit.

58  
59 Chair Clymer asked if the development would be forced closer to Mountain Road if the 100 ft  
60 setbacks were to be met. T. Mumley confirmed that that would be the case.

61  
62 T. Hand asked if the existing driveway will be used. T. Mumley confirmed.

63  
64 D. Kelly asked for more information on the appearance of the proposed structures. T. Mumley  
65 explained that they will be 2-story townhomes with 2-bay garages at the ground level, but  
66 architectural plans have not yet been prepared. This request is strictly for the setback waiver.

67  
68 Chair Clymer asked if parking would be visible from Mountain Road. T. Mumley responded that it  
69 will not be visible and they intend to install landscaping to aid in screening.

70  
71 Carolene Downey asked about the number of trees that will be removed along the northeast  
72 property line. T. Mumley responded that their intent is to preserve the trees on the north side of  
73 the property.

74  
75 Kate Laster noted that the top part is all rock and not a lot of trees. T. Mumley responded that K.  
76 Laster is referring to the east side, where the area is already thinned and some rocks are exposed.

77  
78 At 5:52pm Chair Clymer went through the standards.

79  
80 Chair Clymer noted that the applicant is seeking a straw poll which does not bind the application to  
81 its outcome.

82  
83 At 6:20pm D. Kelly made the motion to go into deliberative session. C. Walton seconded the motion.

84  
85 At 6:45pm the board exited deliberative session and Chair Clymer called the meeting back into  
86 order.

87  
88 Chair Clymer held a straw poll with the question: are members leaning toward approval of the  
89 waiver as proposed? T. Hand and L. Wasserman voted yes. C. Walton, D. Kelly, P. Roberts, and M.  
90 Black voted no.

91  
92 The applicant was given two options: withdraw the application or recess to a date and time certain.

93  
94 T. Mumley asked why the change from what seemed to be board concurrence with the proposal. L.  
95 Wasserman responded that his main reason is visibility of the development from Mountain Road.

96  
97 P. Roberts reminded the applicant and board that parking for such a development is required in the  
98 rear.  
99

100 T. Hand made the motion to recess the application to the May 16, 2023, DRB meeting. The motion  
101 was seconded by M. Black and unanimously approved.  
102

103 At 6:57pm the board took a 5-minute break.  
104

105 Chair Clymer reopened the meeting at 7:04pm.  
106

107 **Project #: 7048**

108 **Owner: Little River Holdings LLC**

109 **Tax Parcel #: 11-152.000**

110 **Location: 3343 Mountain Rd**

111 **Project: Construct nine (9) one-bedroom lodging unit cabins, expanded parking, and**  
112 **associated site improvements**

113 **Zoning: MRC/FHOD**  
114

115 Chair Clymer swore in Tyler Mumley, Jed Harris, John Thurgood, and Olivia Terrazzano.  
116

117 T. Mumley provided an overview of the application. The application has been revised with a total of  
118 9 cabins instead of 10 as originally proposed. In addition to the cabins, the site will be further  
119 developed with a new 8-space parking area in front of the existing parking area. Overall, 66  
120 parking spaces will be provided to accommodate the 60 units and 5 employees. The development  
121 will not disturb more than 1/2 acre.  
122

123 J. Harris noted that the cabin units are pre-fabricated and will be brought onsite.  
124

125 At 7:14pm Chair Clymer went through the standards.  
126

127 T. Mumley noted that the cabin units will strictly be for lodging associated with Talta Lodge, not  
128 Airbnb, and they will be 12' 10" tall.  
129

130 Regarding the Fire Chief's comments, T. Hand asked if the 16' wide access path/road is required,  
131 can the development happen? Chair Clymer inquired about the distance between Units 5-9. The  
132 applicant responded that he is working with the Fire Chief about the access path/road. He also  
133 noted that the distance between Units 5-9 is 80 feet.  
134

135 T. Hand noted that the application seems quite preliminary. Chair Clymer also noted that the  
136 project as proposed does not meet one of the Fire Chief's requirements.  
137

138 P. Roberts asked if the units would be sprinklered, and if not, the applicant may want to consider  
139 that to address some of the Fire Chief's concerns. The applicant responded that the cabins are not  
140 proposed to be sprinklered.  
141

142 D. Kelly asked what material would be used for the walkway. The applicant responded that it  
143 would be either concrete or pavers.  
144

145 T. Hand asked if the cabins are shipping containers, and he has issue with the closeness of the  
146 cabins with each other. The applicant confirmed that the cabins are not shipping containers.  
147 Regarding the plans themselves, the applicant noted that the mini-split units will locate on the  
148 sidewalk side of the cabins and the cabins will have 2-inch overhangs, as opposed to the 10-inch  
149 overhangs depicted in the submitted plans. Deck walkways between the cabins will provide access,  
150 while the main walkway/drive may now actually be gravel or grass pavers.

151  
152 Chair Clymer asked about the potential of locating the expanded parking area near the dumpster  
153 area, where it would be closer to the proposed cabins. The applicant noted that he will take that  
154 into consideration.

155  
156 J. Thurgood commented that the new trees along Mountain Road will create shadowing on the road  
157 which will aid in ice accumulation.

158  
159 Regarding the new parking area, the applicant noted that it will be paved and striped, and existing  
160 pole lights in the adjacent parking area will provide sufficient light to the new parking area.  
161 Confirmation is needed to verify that the pole lights meet the lumens and night sky standards.

162  
163 C. Walton made the motion to recess the application to the April 4, 2023, DRB meeting. The motion  
164 was seconded by M. Black and unanimously approved.

165  
166 **Other Business:**

167  
168 None.

169  
170 **Review of Upcoming Schedule:**

171  
172 S. McShane discussed the upcoming DRB meeting agenda.

173  
174 **Approval of Minutes:**

175  
176 C. Walton made the motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 7, 2023. The motion was  
177 seconded by L. Wasserman and unanimously approved.

178  
179 At 8:12pm the meeting was adjourned.

180  
181 Respectfully Submitted,  
182 Ryan Morrison  
183 Deputy Zoning Administrator

184