



**Town of Stowe
Development Review Board
Meeting Minutes – August 20, 2024**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board was held on Tuesday, August 20, 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: Drew Clymer, Mary Black, Peter Roberts, Tom Hand, Patricia Gabel, Andrew Volansky (arrived late), Lynn Altadonna (alternate).

Staff Present: Ryan Morrison - Deputy Zoning Administrator, Kayla Hedberg- Planning & Zoning Assistant

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

Meeting Chair Clymer called the meeting to order at approximately 5:01pm.

The Board approved the agenda for the meeting.

Development Review Public Hearings

Project #:7380 (cont. 6/18/24)

Owner: Shaw Hill Farm LLC

Tax Parcel #:06-176.020

Location: 934 Shaw Hill Rd

Project: New single-family dwelling in RHOD

Zoning: RR5/RHOD

The Applicant, Mr. Looney, was present via zoom. Mr. Looney requested a continuance prior to the meeting. Chair Clymer asked the applicant if he would be ready for the next meeting if a continuance was granted. Mr. Looney said he should be, he was just waiting for his updated designs.

M. Black motioned to continue the hearing to September 17th. T. Hand seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Project #: 7423

Owner: Lamb Loaf Trust- 2023c/o Bridget L Mullaney Trustee

Tax Parcel #: 15-042.880

Location: 920 Wade Pasture Rd

Project: Additions to single family dwelling in RHOD

Zoning: RR5

Chair Clymer swore in Architect Peter Heintzelman, representing the owner.

44 P. Heintzelman explained that the current dwelling was approved by the DRB three years ago. The
45 proposed addition to the home and the garage addition would not change the building height. There
46 would be no significant tree removal and no changes to the tree canopy. The existing architecture
47 and light fixtures will remain.

48
49 Chair Clymer asked if anyone had any questions.

50
51 T. Hand commented that the plans appeared straightforward. T. Hand clarified there would not be
52 any change to the visibility due to the addition, or the garage.

53
54 P. Gabel asked if the storm water discharge would be affected. P. Heintzelman said it should not.
55 However, there was no civil report, but all water should drain in its current drainage pattern.

56
57 T. Hand motioned to close the hearing. M. Black seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

58
59 The hearing was closed at 5:13pm. The DRB will render a written decision within 45 days.

60
61 **Project #: 7370 (cont. 7/16/24)**

62 **Owner: Juniper Creek LLC**

63 **Tax Parcel #: 10-226.000**

64 **Location: 1801 Pucker St**

65 **Project: New coffee roastery building with associated parking and onsite services**

66 **Zoning: RR2**

67
68 Chair Clymer swore in in participants Tyler Mumley, and Amy Saunders.

69
70 T. Mumley began by explaining that the current Snack Shack is proposed to be torn down, and
71 construction of the proposed coffee roastery in its place. T. Mumley explained that he believes that
72 the lot's history of non-conformity should be extended to this project even though the previous
73 non-conforming use had been discontinued for more than a year. T. Mumley explained that the new
74 building would be built within the current setbacks.

75
76 A. Saunders explained that the proposed building would be for the new roastery, and that the new
77 roaster will have a suppression system on it to reduce the odor when roasting.

78
79 T. Hand asked for clarification about the right of way and its correct placement on the drawings. T.
80 Mumley explained the VTrans drawings were incorrect and that his placements were correct.

81
82 Staff explained that the driveway setback would need to be waived.

83
84 T. Mumley explained that the coffee roastery is the best use of the land as it cannot be used as a
85 residential building, due to the septic allowance. He asked that the DRB appreciate that they are
86 trying to make the best use of land that has no other options.

87
88 T. Mumley acknowledged that they would need permission from neighbors for the parking lot.

89
90 T. Hand asked if there was enough room to turn around out back and reiterated that parking cannot

91 function without neighbor permission.
92
93 At 5:33 abutting neighbors participating via zoom asked to provide testimony.
94
95 Chair Clymer swore in Julie and Justin Brink.
96
97 J. Brink stated they were in support of the project, however, they wanted to clarify that the setbacks
98 on the drawings were correct. They believed that the measurements were off and too close to their
99 septic.
100
101 T. Mumley said that they had a survey completed of the property, but he was not aware of their
102 septic along the tree line. T. Mumley said that he would be willing to review their survey and
103 compare it to what they have.
104
105 D. Clymer explained that in the RR2 district light industry is not permitted.
106
107 T. Hand questioned why the board allowed the Roaster to be built in the former Stowe Cider
108 building. Chair Clymer explained the non-conforming use did not lapse.
109
110 A. Saunders said utilizing that space is better than letting it rot. A. Saunders also stated that the
111 former Stowe Cider building was non-operational for more than a year and the DRB allowed it.
112
113 Chair Clymer asked to circle back on 'use'.
114
115 T. Hand asked if there had been a change in the light industry definition since the Roastery was
116 approved by the DRB. Staff said they would have to look back to prior regulations.
117
118 P. Gabel motioned to enter deliberative session. M. Black seconded; the motion passed
119 unanimously.
120
121 The Board entered deliberative session at 6:01pm.
122
123 M. Black motioned to end the deliberative session. A. Volansky seconded; the motion passed
124 unanimously.
125
126 The Board exited deliberative session at 6:12pm.
127
128 T. Mumley reiterated that the new building would be within the current setbacks, removing the
129 non-conformity for the structure but keeping the non-conforming use.
130
131 T. Hand and T. Mumley questioned whether the patios should be considered for use.
132
133 T. Hand asked for clarification for use whether it would be public or private. A. Saunders said it
134 would be just the employees.
135
136 T. Hand brought up the possible wetland on the back of the property. T. Mumley said nothing was
137 noted in the immediate area. A. Saunders confirmed that at the rear of the property down the hill

138 there is a wetland area, but it would not be affected.
139
140 Chair Clymer indicated that a VTrans 1111 permit would need to be obtained.
141
142 Chair Clymer also questioned where the dumpsters would be located. A. Saunders said they would
143 be with the coffee shop.
144
145 Chair Clymer noticed on the drawings there was not a lot of venting. A. Saunders stated that the
146 roaster would need a vent, even with the suppression system. In total there should be three vents.
147
148 T. Hand stated that the venting would need to be on the rear side of the building.
149
150 Chair Clymer asked if DPW should look into the effects the new structure would have on storm
151 water.
152
153 T. Hand pointed out the lighting details were missing from the new drawings but remained on the
154 previously submitted set.
155
156 J. Brink joined the conversation again and asked what resolution to their measurement verification
157 would be.
158
159 Chair Clymer responded that it was up to the two parties to verify that information.
160
161 Chair Clymer asked if the board had enough information to make a decision.
162
163 Following submission of evidence and testimony, M. Black motioned to close the hearing. P. Roberts
164 seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously. The DRB will render a written decision
165 within 45 days.
166
167 **Other Business:**
168
169 None.
170
171 **Approval of Minutes:**
172
173 M. Black motioned to approve the meeting minutes from July 16, 2024. A. Volansky seconded the
174 motion; the motion passed 5-0-2 (Drew Clymer, Peter Roberts, Mary Black, Patricia Gabel and Lynn
175 Altadonna in favor.) (abstaining Tom Hand and Andrew Volansky)
176
177 A. Volansky motioned to approve the meeting minutes from August 6, 2024. M. Black seconded the
178 motion; the motion passed 5-0-2 (Mary Black, Patricia Gabel. Tom Hand, Andrew Volansky, Lynn
179 Altadonna in favor.) (abstaining Drew Clymer, and Peter Roberts)
180
181 M. Black motioned to adjourn the meeting. A. Volansky seconded the motion; the motion passed
182 unanimously.
183
184 The meeting adjourned at 6:52pm.
185

186 Respectfully Submitted,
187 Kayla Hedberg
188 Planning and Zoning Assistant