VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
October 14, 2015

PRESENT: Jim Mills, Benjamin Pauly, Keri Cole, Randy Mayhew, Jane Soule
ABSENT: None
ALSO PRESENT: Les Berge, James Bold, Donna Bold, Gary Thulander, Paul Ramsey, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Old Business

1. V-3180-15 Town of Woodstock

The application is for Design Review Approval to construct a 296 square foot addition to comfort station and add office. The property is located at Mechanic Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

Continued as the applicant was not present.

B. New Business

1. V-3185-15 Jonathan & 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.

The Design Review Board recommended approval as a minor application and the permit was issued administratively.

2. V-3186-15 James & Donna Bold

The application is for Design Review Approval 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 VDRB reviewed photographs of the home and garage and previously approved elevation plans.

The VDRB reviewed each of the three requests listed in the application separately, starting with the first and third items.

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. There is a cupola in place over the barn, there is no need for a second cupola on the garage roof.

The Design Review Board recommended approval of the request.

After discussion, the VDRB noted there was no issue with not placing the cupola.

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.

The Town Planner suggested allowing an option via a condition that would allow placement or removal of the screens. During the spring months, the owners may want the screens in place to ward off the annual return of insects.

The Design Review Board recommended approval of the request.

After discussion, the VDRB agreed with the option to place or remove screens on the west porch without additional permit requirements.

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

The VDRB read the Design Review Board's split decision on the request. One member recommended shutters be retained on the south and east elevations but not the west elevation, one member recommended removal of all shutters, and three members recommended shutters be retained as they had been shown in the 2006 renderings, with the exception of the first floor shutter located closest to the electric meter box.

Chair Mills noted the request, V-3094-14, to remove the shutters had been denied on June 11, 2014.

Mr. Berge stated the application contains two other items as well, removal of cupola and removal of porch screens and, therefore, it is a different application from that denied last

year. He also felt the Sligar/Sattelberger court case which reversed a VDRB decision on shutters would have an impact on the outcome.

The VDRB stated the request to remove shutters had already been denied and is, therefore, considered a successive application.

The successive application doctrine prohibits a municipal panel from entertaining a second application for the same project concerning the same property after a previous application was denied, unless there has been a substantial change of conditions.

Mr. Mayhew helped explain the successive application doctrine and asked additional questions. Does the applicant offer anything that would negate the reasoning of the June 11, 2014 denial? Does the applicant have a legal basis that would override the successive application doctrine and thus allow the application to be heard.

The applicant stated there was no change that would negate the original denial and they had not consulted with an attorney on the matter.

The VDRB agreed the current request to remove shutters is the same as the June 11, 2014 request which was denied and therefore cannot be heard again due to the State's successive application doctrine.

Testimony was voted closed.

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.

Chair Mills stepped down from the VDRB, Vice Chair Soule presided.

The Town Planner presented the application.

The VDRB 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. The material would be a greenish color 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.

The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented, noting the roof in question is not visible to the passing public.

Testimony was voted closed.

Mr. Mills returned to the VDRB.

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 VDRB reviewed numerous site plans and photographs of the entrance.

A 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. It would be suspended from four chains anchored at the top of each corner column.

Four decorative support columns are to be added to the porte cochere, one at each corner to give the entrance more mass. The proposed columns would match existing units. The porte cochere would not be relocated or expanded in size.

Half moon lights would be placed in the stair walls. They would provide downlighting illumination of the stairs. The light source would be hidden from view.

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

Brass side railings are to 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. The bikes are very popular with the guests.

The steps would be made of granite and reduced to a six inch 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.

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

Testimony was voted closed.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Administrative Officer's Report

The report was issued and discussed.

IV. DELIBERATIONS

A.	**V-3180-15**	**Town of Woodstock**	*Continued*
B.	**V-3185-15**	**Jonathan & Wendy Spector**	*Issued Administratively*
C.	**V-3186-15**	**James & Donna Bold**	

After discussion the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed photographs of the home and garage and previously approved elevation plans.
2. The VDRB reviewed each of the three requests listed in the application separately, starting with the first and third items.
3. 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.
4. The owners prefer not to place the cupola. There is a cupola in place over the barn, so there is no need for a second cupola on the garage roof.
5. The Design Review Board recommended approval of the request.
6. After discussion, the VDRB agreed there was no issue with not placing the cupola.
7. 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.
8. The Town Planner suggested allowing an option via a condition that would allow placement or removal of the screens. During the spring months, the owners may want the screens in place to ward off the annual return of insects.

9. The Design Review Board recommended approval of the request to remove the screens.
10. After discussion, the VDRB agreed with the option to place or remove screens on the west porch without additional permit requirements.
11. The second request, to remove the decorative blinds (shutters) from the main structure was discussed.
12. Chair Mills noted the request, V-3094-14, to remove the shutters had been denied on June 11, 2014.
13. The applicant stated the application contains two other items as well, removal of cupola and removal of porch screens, and, therefore, it is a different application from that denied last year.
14. The VDRB stated the request to remove shutters had already been denied and is therefore considered a successive application.
15. The successive application doctrine prohibits a municipal panel from entertaining a second application for the same project concerning the same property after a previous application was denied, unless there has been a substantial change of conditions. The doctrine is based on State Statutes Chapter 117 Title 24 Section 4472 (d), which states in part: "all interested persons affected shall be bound by that decision".
16. After discussion, the VDRB agreed that the current request to remove shutters is the same as that heard on June 11, 2014 which was denied. The same request cannot be heard again due to the State's successive application doctrine. Therefore the request to remove the shutters remains as it was on June 11, 2014, denied.

After additional discussion, Mr. Mayhew moved with a second by Mr. Pauly to approve the application with the following conditions:

1. **The cupola does not have to be placed on the garage.**
2. **The applicant has the option of placing or removing the screens from the west side porch without additional permit requirements.**

The motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

D. V-3187-15 Nancy Davis

Chair Mills stepped down from the VDRB. Vice Chair Soule presided.

After discussion the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed the proposed material and a photograph of the roof.
2. A small porch roof is in need of repair. The roof is fairly flat. The current surface is soldered galvanized metal.
3. The applicant wishes to replace this with a membrane roof. The material would be a greenish color intended to simulate the patina color of weathered copper.
4. The roof is not visible from the street.
5. The flashing along the edge of the roof would be replaced as is.
6. The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented, noting the roof in question is not visible to the passing public.

After additional discussion, Mr. Pauly moved with a second by Ms. Cole to approve the application as presented. The motion passed with a 4-0 vote.

Chair Mills returned to the VDRB.

E. V-3189-15 Woodstock Resort Corporation

After discussion the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed numerous site plans and photographs of the entrance.
2. A request to rebuild the front entrance to the Woodstock Inn had been approved in 2010, but was never acted on.
3. The application is essentially the same but with a few changes such as the inclusion of a wheelchair accessible ramp.
4. 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.
5. A gas chandelier would be hung from the center of the porch cochere. It would be suspended from four chains anchored at the top of each corner column.
6. Four decorative support columns are to be added to the porte cochere, one at each corner to give the entrance more mass. The proposed columns would match existing units. The porte cochere would not be relocated or expanded in size.
7. Half moon lights would be placed in the stair walls. They would provide downlighting illumination of the stairs. The light source would be hidden from view.
8. The center island curbing would be removed from the drive-through area.
9. Brass side railings are to be placed along the walls and one down the center of the stairs.
10. The platform just north of the drive-through would be enlarged to allow placement of single speed bikes. The bikes are very popular with the guests.
11. The steps would be made of granite and reduced to a six inch riser from the originally approved seven inch riser.
12. Pavers would be placed as a pedestrian path through the driveway connecting the two sets of stairs leading to the entrance.
13. An ADA compliant ramp would be placed on west side of the entrance.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve as presented.

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.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The September 23, 2015 minutes were approved as submitted.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Brands, AICP
Town/Village Planner