DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
October 7, 2015

Members Present:	Don Olson, Jeff Bendis, Jack Rossi Nancy Sevcenko, Beverly Humpstone
Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Les Berge, James Bold, Donna Bold, Gary Thulander, Paul Ramsey, Wendy Spector, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Bendis called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. V-3185-15 Wendy Spector

The application is for Design Review Approval to place two ground mounted A/C units on east elevation. The property is located at 16 The Green and is zoned Residential Medium Density / Design Review.

Ms. Spector presented the application.

The Board reviewed the proposed site plan and photographs.

The owners desire placement of additional air conditioning units on the east elevation.

Two ground mounted units were chosen. One measures 38" x 14" x 36" and the second measures 45" x 15" x 38". They would be placed together in the same site.

The area is very well landscaped. Current shrubs are 67" high and would screen the two units.

The area of placement is 25' east of the sidewalk, on the southeast corner of the main house.

After additional discussion, the Board recommended approval as a minor application via an administrative permit.

B. V-3186-15 James & Donna Bold

The application is for Design Review Approval to to remove roof cupola on garage from previously permitted plan, allow porch on west elevation to remain without screens and to allow

main section of house to remain without shutters. The property is located at 16 Pleasant Street and is zoned Residential High Density / Design Review.

Mr. and Mrs. Bold, and Mr. Berge, contractor, presented the application.

The Board reviewed photographs of the home and garage and previously approved elevations.

The Board reviewed each of the three requests listed in the application separately.

The first request is to remove the proposed cupola from the garage. The cupola had been approved in an earlier permit but has not been placed. The owners prefer not to place the cupola on the garage.

After discussion, the Board recommended approval of the request.

The second request, to remove the decorative blinds (shutters) from the main structure was reviewed.

The Board reviewed photographs of the building without shutters and renderings from 2002 that showed shutters on all windows of the front portion of the building except the first floor bay window on the east elevation.

The Design Review Board recommended approval of the shutter removal in June, 2014. The VDRB reversed the Design Review Board's recommendation and required that the shutters be retained on the building as shown on the 2002 elevation plans.

Earlier this year, the Design Review regulations were amended to place more importance on certain architectural elements. Shutters are one of the elements listed and the amended regulations state they should be retained where appropriate.

The owners feel the shutters look awkward as many of the windows are not conducive to their placement. The orientation of the building is different from the other homes on the block as the roof ridge runs north south with a gable end serving as the front facade. The barn was approved without shutters**.**

Ms. Sevcenko felt the building looked bare without the shutters.

The windows near the front chimney are too close to the chimney making it impossible for the inner shutter to lay flat. An electric meter on the first floor west side of the chimney is boxed and protrudes somewhat, making it impossible for a proper shutter placement.

The west facade has two sets of double windows, first and second floors, where shutters don't look right as a single shutter would not be able to cover both windows. On the east elevation, a bay window does not have shutters.

The Town Planner mentioned that not all shutters are flush to a wall. There are numerous homes in the Village where the shutters are placed as best they can due to their unique circumstances.

Mr. Olson feels shutters where the electric box and next to the second story chimney are important features. The front of the house is not as visible as the sides are when driving along Pleasant Street. The double windows on the west elevation are towards the rear and are not as visible as windows that are placed more forward.

It was noted that a tall shrub blocks the electric box on the front from street views. This shrub would also screen the area of the shutter, should one remove it or place it in a non-flush position.

A lengthy discussion took place.

All agreed the shutters would be required only for the front (older) portion of the home as drawn on the 2002 elevations.

Ms. Humsptone recommended placement of the shutters on the east and south elevations but not on the west elevation due to the double window situation.

Chair Bendis, Ms. Sevcenko and Mr. Olson all agreed shutters should be retained as they were drawn on the 2002 elevations. A clarification allowed a single shutter closest to the boxed electric meter not be removed, as a tall shrub screens this area.

Mr. Rossi recommended approval of the request as presented, that no shutters need to be placed on the building. There are many different window styles and shutter placement issues which make it difficult to have shutters proportionally mounted.

The third request is to remove the screens from the screened-in porch. The porch is located towards the rear of the west elevation behind the older portion of the home. It is not highly visible from the street. Removal of the screens would not significantly change the visual look of the building.

After discussion, the Board unanimously recommended approval of this request.

C. V-3187-15 Nancy Davis

The application is for Design Review Approval to replace galvanized roof on back porch with sarnafil membrane roof. The property is located at 9 Mountain Avenue and is zoned Residential Low Density / Design Review.

Mr. Mills, contractor, presented the application.

The Board reviewed the proposed material and a photograph of the roof.

A small porch roof is in need of repair. The roof is fairly flat. The current surface is soldered galvanized metal.

The applicant wishes to replace this with a membrane roof. A sample of the roof material was shown to the Board.

The greenish color is intended to simulate the patina color of weathered copper.

The roof is not visible from the street.

The flashing along the edge of the roof would be replaced as is.

After additional discussion, the Board recommended approval as presented noting the roof in question is not visible to the passing public.

D. V-3189-15 Woodstock Resort Corporation

The application is for Design Review Approval to do exterior renovations to the front entrance of Woodstock Inn . The property is located at 14 The Green and is zoned Inn / Design Review.

Mr. Thulander and Mr. Ramsey presented the application.

The Board reviewed numerous site plans and photographs of the entrance.

The request to rebuild the front entrance to the Woodstock Inn had been approved in 2010, but was never acted on.

The application is essentially the same but with a few changes such as the inclusion of a wheelchair accessible ramp.

The applicant's intent is to place a front set of steps that creates a more welcoming entrance to the Inn as viewed from the street.

A gas chandelier would be hung from the center of the porch cochere.

Four columns are to be added with two on each corner to give the entrance more mass.

Half moon lights would be placed in the stair walls, to illuminate the stairs.

The center island and area curbing would be removed from the drive-through area.

Brass side railings will be placed along the walls and one down the center of the stairs.

The platform just north of the drive-through would be enlarged to allow placement of single speed bikes. Bikes are very popular with the guests.

The steps would be made of granite and reduced to six inch wide riser from the originally approved seven inch riser.

Pavers would be placed as a pedestrian path through the driveway connecting the two sets of stairs leading to the entrance.

An ADA compliant ramp would be placed on west side of the entrance.

The landscaping plan was changed slightly with a new list of plants that are more appropriate for this climate. The cherry trees were removed from the list.

The first phase of work is planned to start November 2, 2015 through December. This would include work closest to the building. After February 22, 2016, the work would start up again and be finished mid-spring.

After discussion, the Board unanimously recommended approval as submitted.

III. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. 15 River Street

At the last meeting, Mr. Bousquet of the 15 River Street Condo Association brought in a set of full sized vinyl shutters. He prefers this to replace of the real wood shutters that had been removed a few years ago. The main reason is cost. Real wood shutters, painted and mounted cost upwards of $700 per window unit.

Mr. Olson showed the Board two photographs of shutters. The first was a properly placed wooden shutter - hinged on window hooks, slightly angled and tethered with a metal "dog". The second was a vinyl shutter with the typical mounting practice of being screwed flat to the wall of the building, just outside the window trim.

The Board reviewed the shutters. They noted the shutters are far too flimsy, do not have the look of a real shutter, would be difficult if impossible to mount in the correct manner and are likely to deteriorate with age. Therefore, the Board unanimously voted against the placement of the proposed vinyl shutters.

IV. NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting is scheduled for October 21, 2015.

V. ADJOURNMENT:

The Board adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP
Town/Village Planner