

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
February 4, 2015**

Members Present: Jeff Bendis, Don Olson, Jack Rossi, Nancy Sevchenko, Beverly Ritchie
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Bill Stetson, Dail Frates, Mark Libby, Ben Wilkerson, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER:

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. V-3110-15 Mark Libby

The application is for Design Review Approval to do exterior changes to garage and convert to commercial use and to put two windows on house. The property is located at 52 Pleasant Street and is zoned Light Commercial / Design Review.

Mr. Libby presented the application. Mr. Wilkerson aided the presentation.

The Board reviewed photographs of the building, renderings of the proposed changes, and cut sheets of the proposed windows, door units, awnings and light fixtures.

The intent is to convert a 1930's era two car garage into a physical therapy room similar to a gym. The applicant operates a physical therapy office in the main building.

The majority of the exterior work has already been completed without permit. Both a Design Review and a Conditional Use permit are required for the garage conversion.

Mr. Libby apologized to the Board, he felt a commercial use did not require additional permits.

The garage faces due south and the owner felt full glass doors would be beneficial for solar gain purposes. Two sets of swing out garage doors were removed and replaced with two sets of glass sliders. The sliders closest to center are stationary with the other two being operable.

Mr. Olson asked if sliders are allowed in a commercial building versus a regular door.

Mr. Wilkerson stated the State building code allows sliders when less than 10 persons would use the space.

Mr. Libby also noted the slider allows wheel chair access.

The sliders fit the exact opening of the removed garage doors.

Ms. Sevchenko asked about heat loss with a slider door versus a regular door when opened and closed.

Mr. Libby felt the sliders would not lose more heat than a regular door.

The front slider doors are custom made vinyl units with true mullions to create 20 panes per slider. There are a total of 80 panes in the two door sections.

The sliding glass doors placed on the side, one set, and two sets on the rear are one light units with no grid system.

Mr. Libby purchased the true mullion front sliders in an attempt to match the 12 over 12 windows on the main house.

Mr. Rossi disagreed, the 20 panes on each slider do not have an architectural relationship with the 12 over 12 units.

The removed garage windows on the rear and the sides were single pane units in a one over one configuration.

A palladium window with horizontal lower panes was placed above the garage doors on the front. A matching unit is placed in a similar location on the rear elevation.

Both Mr. Rossi and Ms. Humpstone stated the palladium windows as placed do not fit the village character.

Mr. Olson objected to the horizontal panes of the palladium window. They have no relationship to either the garage or the main house. They really throw the look off. The grid system of 20 panes each also does not have a relationship to any other window. The total of 80 window panes is far too busy and catches one's eye in a negative fashion as one drives/walks by.

Mr. Olson suggested replacing the palladium windows with a simpler small square barn window and to remove the grid look of the sliders. Removing the grid pattern would be an improvement over the current look. There is a garage at the intersection of South Street/Cross Street where the garage doors have been replaced with a set of single glass sliders.

Mr. Libby felt the 1930s garage looks better with its new look than it did before.

The Board disagreed.

A rendering of a recently created workshop studio within a barn on Pleasant Street was shown to the applicant. The Pleasant Street barn retains the barn doors on a sliding rail with the full glass

windows placed within. When not in use, the barn doors are slid shut thus retaining the look of the barn. Had Mr. Libby met with the Board before installation, this is an idea that could have been discussed.

The Town Planner mentioned that barn doors in their closed position would retain heat much better than glass sliders do just due to the difference in R-Values. With a total of five sets of glass sliders installed, the potential heat loss should be a consideration. Summer heat gain will be problematic with the full glass doors facing south. This is evident as the owner also proposes an awning system over each front slider to keep the sun at bay.

The Board stated they would not have approved the look as built. If the proposal had been submitted before the work was started numerous changes would have been required. The review process would have saved the owner money as well should he have to return certain items.

Both Mr. Rossi and Ms. Humpstone agreed the second story palladium windows do not work on this building. They should be replaced with a square or rectangular window that would be more in keeping with those found on other village garages.

Ms. Humpstone noted the proposed light fixtures are far too ornate for this type of building. A smaller simpler fixture is recommended. The Board agreed.

Light fixtures and electrical outlets are required for all doors and are noted on the renderings.

On the rear elevation an existing 1 over 1 window would be replaced with a 12 over 12 double hung energy efficient unit. The window to the west was removed. A double set of single glass sliders would be placed here to maximize views of the river and beyond. The palladium window placed above was discussed earlier. A propane furnace vent is proposed east of the light fixture which is just east of the sliders.

On the east elevation the rear window will be removed and clapboarded yet retaining window trim. The window to the front will be replaced with a 12 over 12 double hung energy efficient unit.

On the west elevation, the brick chimney is to be removed. The window to the front would be replaced with a 12 over 12 double hung energy efficient unit. The window to the rear would be removed and replaced with two full glass sliders.

All windows and doors to be placed would be vinyl.

Ms. Sevchenko agreed with the Board on their comments above. She suggested the applicant seek workable alternatives for next week's meeting with the VDRB. She felt there was a good chance the VDRB would not approve the sliders as proposed.

The Board then reviewed changes to the main building.

The owner installed palladium windows in each gable end. The appearance is that the units are

forced into the space as there is no room between the installed windows and the fascia boards.

The Board noted the upper curve of the palladiums has no relationship to the rest of the building.

The Board suggested a simpler window unit that is more appropriate to the house style.

Mr. Rossi and Mr. Olson suggested removing the upper curved section and replacing it with clapboard siding to match the rest of the wall. The Board agreed.

The Town Planner noted this is one of the older homes in Woodstock, having been built in 1830.

An additional item not presented in the application is a propane heater vent with a haphazardly built roof cover. A propane furnace was installed recently in the basement. The vent exits directly above the foundation sill on the southwest corner of the building. Due to this location it is highly visible from the sidewalk and Route 4.

Ms. Humpstone suggested placing a fence to hide the vent.

In addition, there are two large propane tanks placed on the west wall of the building that also are very visible from the street. The Board noted they should be relocated or screened.

Mr. Libby felt he could plant some evergreens in front of the tanks.

The Board suggested the furnace installer should look at the vent installation to see if it can be relocated to a less visible spot. Mr. Wilkerson noted it can not go up the existing chimney.

The Town Planner suggested burying the tank to resolve the issue.

The Board agreed the proposal would not have been approved as designed and built. Concerning the front doors on the garage, the Board noted alternative solutions are available. In an effort to offer suggestions, the Board recommended the following: 1. remove all palladium windows (garage and house) and replace with more appropriate square/rectangular windows, 2. remove grid windows on front sliders, 3. replace light fixtures with smaller simpler units that are more in keeping with the garage style, and 4. work with the furnace installer to find a more appropriate location for the furnace vent and the associated propane tanks.

B. V-3111-14 Zach's Place

The application is for Design Review Approval to install two wall mounted A/C units. The property is located at 73 Central Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

Ms. Frates presented the application.

The Board reviewed photographs of the two installed A/C heat units.

Ms. Frates noted Dead River donated the AC/heat units to Zack's Place, a non-profit organization. She did not realize a zoning permit was required.

The units are both wall mounted. There is one on the west wall and one on the north wall.

The north wall mounted unit is near the entrance where a recycling barrel and a trash barrel are stored. Both units had to be mounted higher up due to the proximity of entrance doors.

Mr. Olson suggested the units and all associated hardware be painted to match the wall color. The units are white and stand out in contrast to the red wall.

Ms. Frates was unsure as to whether the units could be painted.

Mr. Rossi felt a window A/C unit would be better aesthetically than the wall mounted units.

Ms. Frates noted the units are both for cooling and heating, and as such require a wall mount.

Ms. Humpstone suggested placing a trellis to screen the units.

The Board noted the window and door trim is black. Therefore, it may be better to paint the units black instead.

After additional discussion, the Board recommended the units and all associated hardware be painted black.

C. V-3112-15 Woodstock Resort Corp.

The application is for Design Review Approval to replace all windows. The property is located at 20 South Street and is zoned Inn /Design Review.

Mr. Stetson, WRC, presented the application.

The Board reviewed numerous photographs and cut sheets of the proposed windows.

The intent is to replace single pane windows with double pane energy efficient units.

All windows would be replaced.

There are three bedroom windows on the second floor that will require an egress casement window: the south, north and west end. Mr. Stetson marked each casement location on the photographs. The casement windows would have a mullion in the middle to resemble the one over one units of the rest of the building.

The exterior trim would not be changed, although it would be painted and refurbished where necessary.

The Board noted shutters had been in place on this building as the mounting hardware is still in place.

Mr. Olson suggested replacing the shutters. The majority of the homes in the neighborhood have shutters and this one stands out as it does not have shutters. Shutters would enhance the building's appearance.

The Town Planner noted that when the property's zoning district was changed to Inn district, a clause was inserted to retain the residential character of the buildings within the new district. The replacement of the shutters would help accomplish this objective.

After discussion, the Board recommended approval of the application with a strong suggestion that the shutters be replaced. The application continues to the VDRB meeting.

III. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Design Review Regulations.

Mr. Olson discussed his proposed Design Review Regulation changes. The changes are made specifically to address issues the Environmental Court Judge found to be lacking in a recent court decision on placement of shutters. The intent is to accomplish minor changes immediately. Within a year, the entire Village Zoning Regulations will be rewritten. When this happens additional changes can be added.

Mr. Bendis did an edit of minor items within the regulations. The Town Planner will pass these edits along to the Planning Commission for discussion.

After discussion, the Board noted approval of Mr. Olson's draft change. Mr. Olson will attend this evening's Planning Commission meeting to discuss the Design Review changes with them.

IV. NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting is scheduled for February 18, 2015.

V. ADJOURNMENT:

The Board adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP
Town/Village Planner