

**VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES  
May 13, 2015**

**PRESENT:** Jim Mills, Randy Mayhew, Jane Soule, Benjamin Pauly, Keri Cole  
**ABSENT:** None  
**ALSO PRESENT:** Dale Frates, Ron Jaynes, Kurt Spann, Ben Nickerson, Tom Hayes, Gary Thulander, Peter Goulazian, John Wetmore, Michael Brands

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Old Business** None

**B. New Business**

**1. V-3129-15 Oliver Block, LLC**

The application is for Design Review Approval exterior renovations including replacing a large window with three double-hung windows on East elevation of building. The property is located at 20 Central Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

The application was continued at the Design Review Board meeting as the applicant was not present.

**2. V-3130-15 Woodstock Resort Corp.**

The application is for Design Review Approval to change parking lot and path lighting at country club. The property is located at South Street and is zoned Residential Three Acre / Design Review.

Mr. Pauly stepped down from the VDRB.

Mr. Pauly, WRC staff, presented the application.

The VDRB reviewed a site plan, photographs of the existing lights and cutsheets of proposed lights.

The application was amended to retain three lights along the handicap entrance on the north side of the building. The fixtures would be changed to match the new proposed path lights.

In addition, six other path lights would be replaced and three new ones added.

The path lights are bollard style with a four-sided aged copper finish peaked roof.

The proposed post lights would be the same height as current posts - 6'. The fixtures would be brass with a copper finish. The squarish lantern type lamps would have a waterfall (wavy) glass, screening the three watt LED bulbs. Thirteen post lights are proposed for replacement.

A timer or photocell controller would be placed to assure the lights are not on all night.

The intensity of the light would be the same or slightly less than current lighting.

There were no other site plan changes.

The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented was read.

Testimony was voted closed.

Mr. Pauly returned to the VDRB.

### **3. V-3131-15 Zack's Place**

The application is for Design Review Approval for window and door changes, remove exterior staircase and attached shed on South elevation of building. The property is located at 73 Central Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

Ms. Frates, owner, presented the application. Ron Jaynes, Zack's Place board member, aided the presentation.

The VDRB reviewed a series of drawings and photographs.

The rear exterior set of stairs would be removed. The stairs are a hazard.

The bottom half of the Dutch door at the top of the stairs would be removed and clapboarded over. The upper half with a window area would be retained. This is a change in the original application.

The State Fire Marshall requires a new set of interior stairs within the building. A new exterior door would be placed on the south elevation replacing an existing window. The door would match an existing door on the same elevation.

The application was amended, the shed enclosure next to the stairs would not be removed.

An AC unit under the stairs would be painted black to blend in with the trim. This is similar to a Design Review requirement for the front and side AC/heat pump units.

The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented was read.

Testimony was voted close.

**4. V-3132-15 Kurt Spann & Elizabeth Neily**

The application is for Design Review Approval to replace and expand existing pool pumphouse by 140 sq. ft. and add pergola. The property is located at 33 River Street and is zoned Residential Low Density / Design Review.

Mr. Spann presented the application.

Due to the Design Review Board's recommendation, the owner submitted a new drawing showing a peaked roof on the pool house.

The VDRB reviewed photographs of the existing pool house and renderings of the proposed pergola.

An existing pool pump house would be converted to an 8' x 16' x 10' tall pool house. To the north of the pool house, an 8' section of open roofed pergola, a 16' section of roofed pergola and another 8' section of open roofed pergola would be constructed.

The pool house would be sided with 1" x 6" and 1" x 8" shiplap (vertical) rough cut pine. The front facade would have a double door (no windows) with a 12 glass fixed window on each side of the doors. A vertically mounted double-hung window would be placed in each end (north and south) of the building, with no windows in the rear.

The pergola structure would be made of rough lumber mounted on 6" x 6" posts. The center area (12' x 16') would have a peaked roof, also proposed to be galvanized corrugated steel. All sides of the pergola structure would be open.

Per the Design Review Board's recommendation an asphalt shingle roof would be used for both the pool house and the pergola roofs.

The wood would not be painted but would be allowed to weather.

The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve the application with a peaked roof for the pool house and asphalt shingles for both roofs.

The VDRB discussed the side setback of the proposed structure. The required side setback is 15' from property line. The open air pergola would be 7' 9" at its closest point. The enclosed pool house would be 26' from the property line. Section 502 Accessory Structures within the Setback allows an accessory structure to be placed up to half the required side setback with review by the VDRB. In this case 7' 6" would be half the required distance.

Testimony was voted close.

**5. V-3133-15 Mark Libby**

The application is for Design Review Approval window and door changes to garage. The property is located at 52 Pleasant Street and is zoned Light Commercial / Design Review.

Mr. Nickerson, architect, presented the application.

The VDRB reviewed a series of drawings and photographs.

A previous application for architectural changes to the garage was denied.

The applicant submitted a new rendering based on recommendations from the Design Review Board.

The new rendering shows a single set of slider doors centered on the front facade. On either side of the sliders are sliding solid barn doors attached to an overhead rail. The doors would be operable. A squarish six light barn window is placed directly over the doors in the gable end to increase the natural light within. A goose necked barn light would be placed centered over the front door.

The Design Review Board noted the recommended rendering presents a more balanced concept, one which does not overwhelm the building facade. The front facade is highly visible from Pleasant Street.

The same squarish six light barn window would be centered in the gable end on the rear elevation. The applicant would retain the two as-built set of sliders in the rear, but they would not be operable. A propane heater side vent would be placed just east of the set of sliders. A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window would be placed east of the sliders.

On the west elevation, a single set of slider doors is placed with an operable door. A canned light, with a hidden bulb and downward lighting, would be placed just south of the door. The chimney would be retained as is. A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window is placed on the south end of the elevation.

A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window would be placed on the south end of the east elevation. An existing window on the north end of the elevation would be removed and clapboarded over.

The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as discussed above was read. The front elevation would have a single slider centered on the facade and sliding barn doors to cover. The gable end window for both north and south facades as drawn without the palladium feature was recommended as well.

Testimony was voted close.

**6. V-3134-15 Woodstock Resort Corp. / Richmond House Condo Assoc.**

The application is for Design Review Approval to demolish the Nelson Cottage and return the site to lawn. The property is located at 39D Elm Street and is zoned Residential Low Density / Design Review.

Mr. Hayes, attorney representing the potential owner, presented the application. Mr. Thulander, representing the current owner of the condo unit, and Mr. Goulazian, representing the Condominium Association, were present.

The VDRB reviewed photographs of the existing structure and a site plan.

The intent of the applicant is to remove the cottage and replace the area with lawn. At a future date, the new owner would like to build on or near the site.

The cottage is in very poor shape both structurally and mechanically. It was estimated that it would cost \$200,000 to bring it back into a liveable condition.

The home is located directly behind the parish house on Elm Street. It is not visible from Elm Street or any other public location. The home is also well screened with mature trees.

The Design Review Board recommended a vegetated slope finish and retention of the surrounding mature trees.

The house is built into the hillside and would require fill to smooth off the hillside.

Mr. Hayes offered the following as a detailed plan for future use so as to comply with Section 405 H.2. of the Design Review Regulations: “the applicant shall in good faith submit a detailed plan for reuse of the vacated site”. The applicant would add 320 yards of clean fill to the site. The site would be smoothed off to match existing contours. The site would then be seeded and a fibrous membrane would be placed to prevent erosion. The site would be left as is for a number of years to allow the soils to compact. In the future the owner would like to build on or near the site, but at the moment there is no house design.

The house was rented up to a year ago but has had severe water damage due to frozen pipes and is unliveable in current condition.

Mr. Hayes noted the home is not on the historic register and is not of historic or design importance.

Demolition would be accomplished in a 6-8 week period per sales agreement. The contractors would disassemble the home to salvage all materials possible. The home will not be bulldozed.

A lot line adjustment of the land under the home would be done to remove the land and

the Elm Street access from the condo association. Access for future use would come from Frost Mills.

Mr. Wetmore noted the home was originally constructed in 1920.

The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve the application with the addition of a vegetated sloped finish and retention of the surrounding mature trees was read by the VDRB.

Testimony was voted close.

### III. OTHER BUSINESS

#### A. Administrative Officer's Report

The report was issued and discussed.

### IV. DELIBERATIONS

#### A. V-3129-15 Oliver Block LLC Continued

#### B. V-3130-15 Woodstock Resort Corp.

Mr. Pauly stepped down from the VDRB.

***After discussion the following findings of fact were established:***

1. The VDRB reviewed a site plan, photographs of the existing lights and cutsheets of proposed lights.
2. The application was amended to retain three lights along the handicap entrance on the north side of the building. The fixtures would be changed to match the new proposed path lights. In addition, six other path lights would be replaced and three new ones added.
3. The path lights are bollard style with a four-sided aged copper finish peaked roof.
4. The proposed post lights would be the same height as current posts - 6'. The fixtures would be brass with a copper finish. The squarish lantern type lamps would have a waterfall (wavy) glass, screening the three watt LED bulbs. Thirteen post lights are proposed for replacement.
5. A timer or photocell controller would be placed to assure the lights are not on all night.
6. The intensity of the light would be the same or slightly less than current lighting.
7. There were no other site plan changes.
8. The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented was read.

**After additional discussion, Ms. Cole moved with a second by Ms. Soule to approve the application as presented.**

**The motion passed with a 4-0 vote.**

Mr. Pauly returned to the VDRB.

**C. V-3131-15 Zack 's Place**

***After discussion the following findings of fact were established:***

1. The VDRB reviewed a series of drawings and photographs.
2. The rear exterior set of stairs would be removed. The stairs are a hazard.
3. The bottom half of the Dutch door at the top of the stairs would be removed and clapboarded over. The upper half with a window area would be retained. This is a change in the original application.
4. The State Fire Marshall requires a new set of interior stairs within the building. A new exterior door would be placed on the south elevation replacing an existing window. The door would match an existing door on the same elevation.
5. The application was amended, the shed enclosure next to the stairs would not be removed.
6. An AC unit under the stairs would be painted black to blend in with the trim. This is similar to a Design Review requirement for the front and side AC/heat pump units.
7. The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented was read.

**After additional discussion, Mr. Mayhew moved with a second by Ms. Soule to approve the application as presented. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.**

**D. V-3132-15 Kurt Spann & Elizabeth Neily**

***After discussion the following findings of fact were established:***

1. Due to the Design Review Board's recommendation, the owner submitted a new drawing showing a peaked roof on the pool house.
2. The VDRB reviewed photographs of the existing pool house and renderings of the proposed pergola.
3. An existing pool pump house would be converted to an 8' x 16' x 10' tall pool house. To the north of the pool house, an 8' section of open roofed pergola, a 16' section of roofed pergola and another 8' section of open roofed pergola would be constructed.
4. The pool house would be sided with 1" x 6" and 1" x 8" shiplap (vertical) rough cut pine. The front facade would have a double door (no windows) with a 12 glass fixed window on each side of the doors. A vertically mounted double-hung window would be placed in each end (north and south) of the building, with no windows in the rear.
5. The pergola structure would be made of rough lumber mounted on 6" x 6" posts. The center area (12' x 16') would have a peaked roof, also proposed to be galvanized corrugated steel. All sides of the pergola structure would be open.
6. Per the Design Review Board's recommendation an asphalt shingle roof would be used for both the pool house and the pergola roofs.
7. The wood would not be painted but would be allowed to weather.

8. The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve the application with a peaked roof for the pool house and asphalt shingles for both roofs.
9. The VDRB discussed the side setback of the proposed structure. The required side setback is 15' from property line. The open air pergola would be 7' 9" at its closest point. The enclosed pool house would be 26' from the property line. Section 502 Accessory Structures within the Setback allows an accessory structure to be placed up to half the required side setback with review by the VDRB. In this case 7' 6" would be half the required distance.
10. The VDRB agreed the proposed structure meets the character of the area criteria of Section 502.

**After additional discussion, Ms. Cole moved with a second by Ms. Soule to approve the application as presented.**

**The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.**

**E. V-3133-15 Mark Libby**

***After discussion the following findings of fact were established:***

1. The VDRB reviewed a series of drawings and photographs.
2. A previous application for architectural changes to the garage was denied.
3. The applicant submitted a new rendering based on recommendations from the Design Review Board.
4. The new rendering shows a single set of slider doors centered on the front facade. On either side of the sliders are sliding solid barn doors attached to an overhead rail. The doors would be operable. A squarish six light barn window is placed directly over the doors in the gable end to increase the natural light within. A goose necked barn light would be placed centered over the front door.
5. The Design Review Board noted the recommended rendering presents a more balanced concept, one which does not overwhelm the building facade. The front facade is highly visible from Pleasant Street.
6. The same squarish six light barn window would be centered in the gable end on the rear elevation. The applicant would retain the two as-built set of sliders in the rear, but they would not be operable. A propane heater side vent would be placed just east of the set of sliders. A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window would be placed east of the sliders.
7. On the west elevation, a single set of slider doors is placed with an operable door. A canned light, with a hidden bulb and downward lighting, would be placed just south of the door. The chimney would be retained as is. A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window is placed on the south end of the elevation.
8. A 12 over 12 double-hung energy efficient window would be placed on the south end of the east elevation. An existing window on the north end of the elevation would be removed and clapboarded over.
9. The Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as discussed above was read. The front elevation would have a single slider centered on the facade and

sliding barn doors to cover. The gable end window for both north and south facades as drawn without the palladium feature was recommended as well.

**After additional discussion, Mr. Pauly moved with a second by Mr. Mayhew to approve the application as presented.**

**The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.**

**F. V-3134-15 Woodstock Resort Corp. / Richmond House Condo Assoc.**

***After discussion the following findings of fact were established:***

1. The VDRB reviewed photographs of the existing structure and a site plan.
2. The intent of the applicant is to remove the cottage and replace the area with lawn. At a future date, the new owner would like to build on or near the site.
3. The cottage is in very poor shape both structurally and mechanically. It was estimated that it would cost \$200,000 to bring it back into a liveable condition.
4. The home is located directly behind the parish house on Elm Street. It is not visible from Elm Street or any other public location. The home is also well screened with mature trees.
5. As the house is built into the hillside, the Design Review Board recommended a vegetated slope finish and retention of the surrounding mature trees.
6. The applicant offered the following as a detailed plan for future use so as to comply with Section 405 H.2. of the Design Review Regulations: “the applicant shall in good faith submit a detailed plan for reuse of the vacated site.” 320 yards of clean fill would be added to the site. The site would be smoothed off to match existing contours. The site would then be seeded and a fibrous membrane would be placed to prevent erosion. The site would be left as is for a number of years to allow the soils to compact. In the future, the owner would like to build on or near the site but at the moment there is no house design.
7. The applicant noted the home is not on the historic register and is not of historic or design importance.
8. Demolition would be accomplished in a 6-8 week period per sales agreement. The contractors would disassemble the home to salvage all materials possible. The home will not be bulldozed.
9. The Design Review Board’s recommendation to approve the application with the addition of a vegetated sloped finish and retention of the surrounding mature trees was read by the VDRB.

**After additional discussion, Mr. Mayhew moved with a second by Ms. Cole to approve the application as presented. The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.**

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The April 22, 2015 minutes were approved as amended.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Brands, AICP  
Town/Village Planner