

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES  
November 2, 2016**

Members Present: Jeff Bendis, Don Olson, Nancy Sevchenko, Beverly Humpstone  
Members Absent: Jack Rossi  
Others Present: Paul Tripp, David Sigl, Michael Brands

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. V-3277-16 Joanna Garbisch**

The application is for Design Review Approval to construct 524 sq. ft. addition to house. The property is located at 11 Mountain Ave. and is zoned Residential Low Density / Design Review.

Mr. Sigl, architect, presented the application.

The Board reviewed numerous renderings of the proposed addition.

An 80 year old person recently purchased a home, but wishes to have a first floor bedroom.

The proposed addition would line up with the same non-conforming setback line as the existing garage which was built to half the setback (7' 8") in 1998. The 21' x 26' addition would be placed 5.5' behind the garage with a courtyard separating the two. The roof ridge would run in the same north/south direction as the garage and house.

The front elevation has a "cone of vision" drawn which shows that one would not be able to view, from a public area, the rear roof of the addition. The line of sight would be blocked by the garage roof. In the drawing the roof of the addition is taller than that of the garage.

The 524 square foot addition would have a cathedral ceiling and would contain the master bedroom.

The windows were discussed. The applicant noted there are many different window styles on the existing house.

The rear of the addition would have three 6 over 6 windows placed side by side. Two skylights would be placed in the roof.

Courtyard windows, two 6 over 6 units mounted side by side between garage and addition would not be visible by anyone. A smaller 4 pane window would be placed higher up near the house.

Three smaller 4 pane windows would be placed higher up on the north elevation to allow interior light yet reserve the interior walls for placement of paintings.

View of the north elevation is screened by an existing 6' tall stockade fence. A gate matching the existing fence style would be placed at the 5.5' opening between garage and addition.

The addition would have a standing seam metal roof, matching that of the house. It was noted the courtyard area would fill up with snow as both garage and addition roofs would unload at this point.

The kitchen would be relocated to a former bedroom. The existing double hung windows would be changed to a boxed window with a series of three casement style windows placed side by side. The windows face the courtyard and would not be visible to the passing public or the neighbors.

All trim and architectural details would match the existing house.

The owner has a preference for shingle siding, although the house and garage both have traditional clapboard siding. A sample of the green colored shingle was shown to the Board. The existing clapboards are a yellow color. For the most part the shingle siding would not be seen by the passing public as the addition is to the rear of the home.

A lengthy discussion took place about the Board's concern that the proposed shingles are not compatible with the existing clapboards.

Mr. Sigl as an architect, felt the shingle compatibility was not an issue. The wing is an annex and not integral to the main building.

The Town Planner noted accessory buildings such as a garage or barn are more likely to have shingles to set them apart from the main structure.

The Board agreed there was no objection to the size or scale of the addition, however the exterior appearance of the structure is an important component of the review process.

Section 403 G. Criteria for Approval 5. Materials: states "The similarity or compatibility of existing materials on the exterior walls or roof of buildings in the neighborhood shall be considered in the construction or alteration of a building. A building or alteration shall be considered to be compatible if the building materials used possess a kind or type which are appropriate to that building."

The Board asked the architect talk to the home owner to see if she would be willing to place clapboards instead of shingles.

After additional discussion, the Board recommended with a 4-0 vote to approve the addition with clapboards as siding and not the shingles as proposed.

**B. V-3278-16 T. D. Bank NA**

The application is for Design Review to place lights on existing signs. The property is located at 21 Elm Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

Mr. Tripp, sign contractor, presented the application.

The Board reviewed photographs of the existing signs and proposed lighting.

The applicant asked to withdraw the illumination of the projecting sign as placement of lights on this sign would be very complicated with the awning directly above.

The main facade sign is placed in a wood trim area which essentially separates the first and second floors of the brick building. The applicant prefers the fixtures to be mounted on either end of the sign, whereby the light would wash over the sign from each end.

A model light fixture was brought in by Mr. Tripp. The actual fixture would be smaller in size.

The Board suggested the LED fixtures that are used to illuminate the neighboring Vermont Flannel sign would be more appropriate. The fixtures measure 6" long by 2 3/8" diameter and are much smaller than that proposed.

The LED fixture would be 8 watts and with 500 lumens.

A bracket would be used to provide clearance for the fixture. After discussion, the applicant asked for a maximum of 20" from the trim board. However, he felt the actual distance would be much shorter once the fixtures are mounted.

The bracket and fixtures would be white to match the background color of the trim board.

After discussion, the Board unanimously agreed to issue the permit as a minor application via an administrative permit.

**C. V-3281-16 Woodstock Pooh LLC / Ellaway Property Services**

The application is for Design Review to replace an existing door on rear of building. The property is located at 37 Central Street and is zoned Central Commercial / Design Review.

The Town Planner presented the application.

The Board reviewed photographs of the facade and the proposed door.

The clapboards are being replaced on rear of the building. The contractor noted the existing door is warped and does not close correctly. The door should be replaced with a modern design which is narrower. This would require a narrower door frame as well. All finished trim details would match existing.

After discussion, the Board unanimously agreed to issue the permit as a minor application via an administrative permit.

**III. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Stone House Act 250 Extension Request**

The Town Planner noted an Act 250 hearing concerning the Stone House demolition is scheduled for November 4, 2016 at 9:00 am in the Town Hall conference room. A letter opposing the extension has been written by State Preservation Office. The Planning Commission will discuss the letter later this evening.

**IV. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for November 16, 2016.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP  
Town/Village Planner