



**Town of Stowe  
Development Review Board  
Meeting Minutes – August 6, 2024**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, August 6, 2024, starting at approximately 5:00 pm. The meeting was held at the Stowe Town Office with remote participation using the “Zoom” application.

**Members Present:** Mary Black (via zoom), Patricia Gabel, Thomas Hand, Andrew Volansky, and alternates, Lynn Altadonna, William Ardolino, and Michael Diender

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

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

Staff S. McShane began the meeting by explaining to the board that Chair Drew Clymer could not attend due to illness. S. McShane explained that per the DRB’s Rules of Procedure the participating members need to elect an Acting Vice Chair to preside over the meeting. L. Altadonna made a motion to elect Tom Hand as the Acting Vice Chair to serve as Chair for hearings #7396, 7417, and 7325, M. Diender seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Staff explained that a second Acting Vice Chair would also need to be elected for Project 7355, as Tom Hand is recused from hearing this project. The DRB will elect an Acting Vice Chair prior to the #7355 hearing.

The Board approved the agenda for the meeting.

**Development Review Public Hearings**

**Project #: 7396**

**Owner: Melanie Young Bouchard Revocable Living Trust**

**Tax Parcel #: 06-299.010**

**Location: 778 River Rd**

**Project: Final Review- 2-lot Subdivision**

**Zoning: RR2**

Participating DRB Members: Tom Hand, Patricia Gabel, Mary Black, and Lynn Altadonna. Absent members Drew Clymer and Peter Roberts, who participated in the prior hearing, will review the recording and added materials in order to participate in the decision-making process.

Melanie Bouchard and Tyler Mumley were present. Acting Vice Chair Tom Hand reminded them they were still sworn in from the last hearing and provided an overview of the project. T. Hand reviewed the standards and asked for testimony. Mr. Mumley responded to T. Hand’s questions. T. Hand inquired about the additional information requested by the Board at the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Mumley referred to the revised Plat, (July 2024), which now shows the limits of clearings, contours and pull-offs/turn-around areas required by the previous subdivision. Mr. Mumley also referred to

46 the new view line analysis document (July 19, 2024).  
47 T. Hand asked the Board for comments. L. Altadonna stated he believed the former requests had  
48 been met. T. Hand reviewed the plat for conformity and asked for any additional comments.  
49 P. Gabel motioned to close the hearing, L. Altadonna seconded. The motion passed unanimously.  
50

51 The hearing closed at 5:18 pm. The DRB will render a written decision within 45 days.

52

53 **Project #: 7417**

54 **Owner: Mark Ray & Marc Chretien**

55 **Tax Parcel #: 07-004.000**

56 **Location: 17 Towne Farm Ln**

57 **Project: Host an Onsite Food Truck**

58 **Zoning: HT/FHD**

59

60 Participating DRB Members: Tom Hand, Patricia Gabel, Andrew Volansky, Mary Black, Michael  
61 Diender, Lynn Altadonna and William Ardolino.

62

63 Brittany Clark was present in-person and Marc Ray present via zoom. The Applicants/Owners,  
64 Mark Ray & Mark Chretien of Stowe Cider, request approval to host one (1) food truck from July 1,  
65 2024, to October 31, 2024. The location(s) for the food truck are shown on the site plan provided  
66 with the application. According to the application, the proposed days and hours of operation for the  
67 food truck are Sunday through Saturday 9:00 am-10:00 pm. T. Hand reviewed the standards and  
68 asked for testimony. Mr. Ray responded to T. Hand's questions. Mr. Ray stated the food truck would  
69 be used within normal operating hours, that the food truck would not be seen from the road and  
70 would not impact traffic in the area. Mr. Chretien stated the requested usage dates could vary.

71 T. Hand asked for clarification about the location of the food truck to which Mr. Ray responded that  
72 the food truck will only be set up in one area. The secondary area is set up as a contingency plan. M.  
73 Diender asked if the food truck had been approved by the board previously, and if there were any  
74 changes from previous years. Mr. Ray responded it had been approved the last three years and they  
75 are not making any changes.

76 T. Hand asked for additional comments. P. Gabel motioned to close the hearing and for the Zoning  
77 Administrator to draft a decision in favor of the project. A. Volansky seconded. The motion passed  
78 unanimously.

79 The hearing closed at 5:28 pm. The DRB will render a written decision within 45 days.

80

81 **Project #: 7355 (cont. from 5/21/24)**

82 **Owner: Jameson Partners LLC926 & 928 Pitt St LLC's & Donahue N & K**

83 **Tax Parcel #: 07-034.000**

84 **Location: 782 Mountain Rd**

85 **Project: Construct a 48-unit, Predominantly Retirement Rental Housing, Building and**  
86 **Associated Site Improvements.**

87 **Zoning: HT/FHD**

88

89 Tom Hand recused himself from this project. Board members discussed electing an Acting Vice  
90 Chair to conduct the hearing. P. Gabel made a motion to assign A. Volansky as Acting Vice Chair. A.  
91 Volansky was not comfortable accepting responsibility without having ample time to prepare. P.  
92 Gabel stated that she would be willing to step in as Acting Vice Chair. M. Diender made a motion to  
93 elect P. Gabel as Acting Vice Chair. W. Ardolino seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

94 Participating DRB Members: Patricia Gabel, Mary Black, Andrew Volansky, Michael Diender,  
95 William Ardolino, Lynn Altadonna.

96 P. Gabel opened the hearing at 5:37 pm.

97 Present Aaron Stewart representing Stewart Construction, John Grenier representing Grenier  
98 Engineering, and Nick Donahue (property owner -present via Zoom). P. Gabel swore in the  
99 participating members.

100

101 P. Gabel reviewed the standards and asked for testimony. Mr. Stewart responded to P. Gabel's  
102 questions. Mr. Stewart described the project as the construction of a new building that will offer 48  
103 units of predominantly retirement housing. Mr. Stewart cited an article in the Stowe Newspaper  
104 that indicated a lack of senior housing in the area. He feels that this development is a service to the  
105 town. The proposed building will have underground parking, indoor and outdoor gathering areas,  
106 and access to the rec path. The units will consist of one [1] and two [2] bedroom apartments.

107

108 Mr. Stewart stated that the DRB partially reviewed this application in the spring for a building  
109 height waiver which was favorably received. The project was also heard by the HPC, who voted  
110 unanimously to recommend the approval of the request and height waiver.

111

112 P. Gabel asked for clarification about what principally occupied meant and how they would  
113 guarantee the property would be principally occupied by senior citizens. Mr. Stewart stated that  
114 principally occupied is proposed to consist of a minimum of 51% be occupied by at least one  
115 individual 55+ years of age and that management could maintain tenant records for review at the  
116 request of the Town of Stowe Zoning Department. The leasing agent/management will market and  
117 offer vacant units to applicants over the age of 55 for a period of one [1] month.

118

119 M. Diender asked about the business plan and how 48 straight condos would alter the permit. Mr.  
120 Stewart indicated that 48 straight condos would affect the density and would not qualify, whereas  
121 retirement age rentals would not affect the density as seen in table 6.3 of the Zoning Regulations.

122

123 W. Ardolino asked for clarification about the one [1] month advertising as it pertains to renting  
124 units to those not of retirement age. Mr. Stewart clarified that one month would take place during  
125 the turnover period. If a senior vacated the unit, management would actively try and fill the vacancy  
126 with another senior for one month, before offering the apartment to the public.

127

128 W. Ardolino inquired as to why only 51% and not 75%. Mr. Stewart responded that they were  
129 following the guidelines.

130

131 L. Altadonna questioned the consequences of not maintaining the 51% ratio.

132

133 N. Donahue responded that he did not really consider it because he did not think it would be an  
134 issue, he felt the project would be well received.

135  
136 P. Gabel touched on the Highway Tourist district and zoning as it pertains to density reference  
137 Table 6.3.  
138  
139 Mr. Stewart mentioned that during the technical review meeting they discussed with Harry (DPW  
140 Director) a possible water supply issue. If the water supply cannot be met, the project cannot  
141 continue.  
142  
143 P. Gabel inquired about the building height waiver and the standard building height requirement of  
144 28ft. It was noted that the applicant proposes a building height of 34 feet.  
145  
146 Mr. Stewart referenced section 10.9 Dimensional Waivers in the Town of Stowe Zoning regulations;  
147 the DRB can grant a waiver from maximum building height up to 35ft.  
148  
149 A. Volansky asked for clarification if all three criteria must be met for the waiver or one of the three.  
150 S. McShane and R. Morrison provided clarification that at least one, but not all, need to be met.  
151  
152 P. Gabel summarized Section 3.7(4)(A) of the Town of Stowe Zoning Regulations.  
153  
154 Mr. Stewart mentioned that the Fire Department provided a list of recommendations to comply  
155 with fire department needs, these included road access, sprinkler room and Knox box placement,  
156 sprinklers, and no electric vehicle chargers in parking garage. These conditions have been  
157 incorporated into the plan.  
158  
159 L. Altadonna and S. McShane suggested getting additional information or written comments from  
160 Harry (DPW Director) about the water issue.  
161  
162 P. Gabel inquired about traffic. J. Grenier pointed out that the applicant proposes to utilize the  
163 existing access entrance onto Mountain Road.  
164  
165 L. Altadonna asked if they could install a bus stop in that area.  
166  
167 M. Diender reminded him that to install in a bus stop/pull-off area the state would have to get  
168 involved.  
169  
170 Mr. Stewart stated that they have taken into consideration the use of solar in the future when it  
171 might be more economically available and have worked it into the design but will not be using it at  
172 this time.  
173  
174 Following review of the conditional use criteria, P. Gabel recommended the DRB continue the  
175 hearing.  
176  
177 Mr. Stewart was okay with a continuance and suggested the date of September 3, 2024.  
178  
179 M. Diender, P. Gabel, L. Altadonna, and W. Ardolino offered suggestions to Mr. Stewart, including  
180 additional information to satisfy the question of being principally occupied.  
181  
182 M. Diender made motion to continue hearing to the time and date certain of September 3, 2024, L.

183 Altadonna seconded.

184

185 The motion passed unanimously.

186 The hearing closed at 6:50 pm.

187 The DRB took a five-minute break.

188

189 **Project #: 7325 (Cont. from 6/4)**

190 **Owner: Stowe Country Club LLC c/o Stowe Mountain Lodge**

191 **Tax Parcel #: 06-081.000**

192 **Location: 744 Cape Cod Rd**

193 **Project: Preliminary Subdivision/PUD Review including Club House, Recreational Amenities,**  
194 **and Residential Uses.**

195 **Zoning: RR2/RR3**

196

197 Participating DRB Members Tom Hand, Patricia Gabel, Andrew Volansky, Mary Black. Tom Hand  
198 served as Acting Vice-Chair. Absent members Drew Clymer and Peter Roberts, who participated in  
199 the prior hearing, will review the recording and added materials in order to participate in the  
200 decision-making process.

201

202 Sam Gaines, Rob Apple, Dave Marshall, and Christopher Roy, present for the applicant/owner.

203 James Dumont, Debra Reiser, Johnathan Thomas, Tony Stout, Andrea Gellis, Charles Pineles-Mark,

204 were in attendance as interested persons.

205

206 T. Hand re-opened the hearing at approximately 7:05pm

207

208 Participants were sworn in at 7:07pm.

209

210 Mr. Dumont representing Ms. Reiser raised a possible jurisdictional error. He claimed that the new  
211 adjoiners did not receive written notice of the golf course project Mr. Dumont claimed if the  
212 proceedings continued it could lead to future appeal issues.

213

214 T. Hand addressed Mr. Gaines and asked if he had any knowledge of re-noticing new abutters once  
215 the project description changed.

216

217 Mr. Roy, representing the applicant, argued that it shouldn't matter if the abutters in question didn't  
218 receive notice because the property they abut will not be affected by the modified project.

219

220 T. Stout from Lake Side Environmental testifying on behalf of Ms. Reiser stated he referenced the  
221 CEA site plan to obtain an approximate number of properties that were not notified and identified  
222 six possible properties. He deduced this by looking at the old application and the new application  
223 and counting the number of properties that were labeled N/F.

224

225 J. Thomas addressed the board and stated that his company Timber Homes did not receive a copy of  
226 the notice. Upon further review of the applicants copy of the abutters list, it was shown that Timber  
227 Homes was mailed a letter.

228

229 P. Gabel motioned to go into deliberative session at 7:31. A. Volansky seconded the motion. The

230 motion passed unanimously.

231

232 A. Volansky motioned to exit the deliberative session and resume the hearing. M. Black seconded  
233 the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

234

235 T. Hand asked Mr. Dumont if they had clear evidence of a defect in notice because after further  
236 review Timber Holmes was found to be on the abutters list and notified of the hearing.

237

238 S. McShane explained to Mr. Dumont that a copy of the abutters list is located in the Planning &  
239 Zoning Office and can be reviewed at any time during normal business hours. She explained that it  
240 is not posted online.

241

242 S. Gaines stated that the acreage of the project was increased to include the Golf Course to support  
243 density.

244

245 D. Marshall spoke about the dimensional elements of the golf course project citing map C1.0, C1.1  
246 and additional landscaping renderings over time.

247

248 T. Hand requested additional information regarding the setback waivers. S. Gaines explained that  
249 conceptually they thought this was the best layout for the aesthetics they are trying to achieve in  
250 the area. S. McShane advised T. Hand that the DRB has the authority and discretion to approve the  
251 proposed setbacks requested.

252

253 C. Pineles representing the Stoweflake Town Houses asked for clarification if they were requesting  
254 a variance regarding the dimensional requirements. S. McShane referred to Section 13. 2 of the  
255 Town of Stowe Zoning regulations. T. Hand clarified that this would not be a variance but would be  
256 a dimensional modification.

257

258 A. Gellis representing Stowe Highlands asked for clarification about the double setback in relation  
259 to Sinclair Drive. D. Marshall explained the map key and pointed out the areas where there would  
260 not be any changes near Sinclair Drive.

261

262 T. Hand addressed the meeting participants and asked if there were any additional comments  
263 related to what was discussed. Mr. Strout indicated he had additional comments on multiple  
264 sections and will address them at the next meeting.

265

266 P. Gabel made a motion to continue the hearing to the time and date certain of September 3, 2024.  
267 The motion was seconded by A. Volansky and passed unanimously.

268

269 **Other Business:**

270

271 None.

272

273 **Approval of Minutes:**

274

275 The review of meeting minutes was tabled until the next meeting.

276

277 **Deliberative Session:**

278

279 P. Gabel made a motion to adjourn at 9:04 pm. The motion was seconded by A. Volansky. The  
280 motion passed unanimously.

281

282 Respectfully Submitted,

283 Kayla Hedberg

284 Planning and Zoning Assistant

285