

**VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
September 27, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Soule, Keri Cole, Elizabeth Daniels
MEMBERS ABSENT: Wendy Spector, Randy Mayhew
OTHERS PRESENT: Ana DiNatale, Max Kelly, Frank Hewitt, Michael Riotto, Carl Cunningham, David Daralgy, Julia Cooza, Patrick Proctor, Daniel Notargiacomo, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Jane Soule called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Newest member Elizabeth Daniels was welcomed to the VDRB.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Old Business:

1. V-3327-17 John and Karen King

The application is for Site Plan and Conditional Use Approval to construct 4 additional residential units in 2 duplex buildings. The property is located at 25 Lincoln Street and is zoned Residential High Density.

The application was continued to the October 11, 2017 meeting.

B. New Business:

1. V-3340-17 DAL, LLC / Sam DiNatale

The application is for Design Review and Site Plan Approval to increase fence height from 4' to 6' to screen dumpsters. The property is located at 28 Central Street in Central Commercial / Design Review District.

Ms. DiNatale presented the application.

The VDRB reviewed numerous photographs and a site plan of the dumpster location.

The original approval via permit V-3296-17, was to place a 4' tall stockade fence to screen the dumpster.

When ordering the fence, the owners realized the 4' fence would not be tall enough for the intended purpose and ordered a six foot fence which is currently installed.

The fence is the same style and material as that previously approved.

The dumpster location was moved a few feet east of the approved location as well. The approved location was tucked into a space behind the east side ramp and close to the building. This also helped to screen the dumpster.

The waste and recycling contractor could not service the dumpster as approved. Moving the dumpster a few feet east placed the dumpster on a cement surface. The cement surface does not freeze in the winter and has a solid surface which aids the dumpster unloading process.

Unfortunately moving the dumpster east of the approved location also makes the dumpster site more visible. The applicant felt a taller fence would improve screening.

The Design Review Board felt the taller fence makes it more visible. Another issue is the wood material of the fence has not aged yet and has that bright new wood color quality. When properly aged the fence would be grayish in color and less visible.

The Design Review Board recommended that a gray tinted aging stain be applied to accelerate the graying of the fence and that the picket points be cut off to make the fence more compatible with the surrounding architecture.

Ms. DiNatale agreed to apply the aging product to the fence but disagreed with the removal of the picket points. The graying of the fence would make the points less visible. She preferred not to change the fence physically.

After discussion, the VDRB agreed the picket points did not have to be removed.

Testimony was voted close.

2. V-3342-17 Max Kelly

The application is for Conditional Use & Subdivision Approval to subdivide parcel 21.53.35.(0.47 acres) into three parcels of 0.13 acres, 0.15 acres and 0.19 acres. The property is located on Atwood Avenue and is zoned Residential High Density.

Mr. Kelly presented the application. Mr. Hewitt, contractor, assisted the presentation.

The VDRB reviewed a survey map of the proposed subdivision.

The applicant is requesting a 3 lot subdivision (5,630 square feet, 6650 square feet, and 8140 square feet) on the corner of Charles Street and Atwood Avenue.

The intent is to build three moderately priced cape styled homes, one per lot.

All lots would have driveway access off of Atwood Avenue, the highest point of each lot. The land is very steep. Parking for each home would be on the southeast edge of each lot.

A sewer right-of-way for the neighboring lot to the east passes through the lower northern portion of the land.

The frontages (west to east) are as follows: 88.7', 58.5' and 58.1'.

Keeping the proposed homes close to the street preserves the neighbor's view of the Billings Farm and Museum located lower in the valley.

Each home would be around 1600 sq. ft. with 3 bedrooms each. Each would also have a walk out basement due to the topography. Estimated (**Asking PRICE?**) cost for each home would range from \$280,000 to \$340,000.

Mr. Kelly distributed a list of responses to the Conditional Use criteria to be reviewed with the VDRB.

One well would be drilled for the 3 homes. Upgrading the Woodstock Aqueduct's lines, which are old and too narrow (2" diameter), would be too expensive.

The VDRB noted concern with the corner lot. The driveway as proposed could lead to traffic conflicts on the blind and steep corner. Charles Street is one of the steepest streets in the Village.

The Town Planner suggested moving the property lines of each lot further east. This would move the access for the corner lot away from the corner.

Ms. Daniels asked if the land would be cleared.

Mr. Hewitt stated the intent is to keep as many trees as possible, especially the mature trees. Trees would obviously be removed from the building sites.

Town Manager Phil Swanson has viewed the site in relation to the Village's required curb cut permits. He is waiting for input from the VDRB before making a decision.

As Charles Street is very steep, stormwater control will be an issue. Winter travel is also very difficult during snow storms.

Ms. Daniels asked about the proposed driveway surface. It is unlikely an asphalt surface would be utilized. Hardpack or gravel are more aesthetically pleasing and handle stormwater better.

Vice-chair Soule suggested a site visit to get a better understanding of the traffic and stormwater issues.

Mr. Kelly was amenable to submitting another survey to show an alternative lot arrangement that would address the corner lot's access.

Mr. Proctor, Slayton Terrace resident, spoke in support of the project. The community needs affordable homes and Mr. Kelly does good work.

Ms. Cunningham asked to look at the proposed survey map.

The attending public approached the table and the applicant reviewed the map with them.

After discussion, the VDRB continued testimony to the October 11, 2017 meeting, to allow time for a site visit.

The Town Planner will arrange a site visit for next week.

C. V-3343-17 Charles & Carolyn Kimbell

The application is for Design Review Approval to replace roofs with standing seam roof material. The property is located at 19 River Street in Residential Low Density / Design Review District.

The Design Review Board recommended approval of the request as a minor application with permit to be issued administratively.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Zoning Officer's Report

The report was issued.

IV. DELIBERATIONS

A. V-3327-17 John & Karen King Continued

B. V-3340-17 D A L, LLC / Sam Dinatale

After discussion, the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed numerous photographs and a site plan of the dumpster location.
2. The original approval via permit V-3296-17, was to place a 4' tall stockade fence to screen the dumpster.
3. When ordering the fence, the owners realized the 4' fence would not be tall enough for the intended purpose and ordered a 6' fence which is currently installed.
4. The fence is the same style and material as that previously approved.
5. The dumpster location was moved a few feet east of the approved location as well. The approved location was tucked into a space behind the east side ramp and close to the building. This also helped to screen the dumpster.
6. The waste and recycling contractor could not service the dumpster as approved. Moving the dumpster a few feet east placed the dumpster on a cement surface. The cement surface does not freeze in the winter and has a solid surface which aids the dumpster unloading process.
7. Unfortunately, moving the dumpster east of the approved location also makes the

- dumpster site more visible. The applicant felt a taller fence would improve screening.
8. The Design Review Board felt the taller fence makes it more visible. Another issue is the wood material of the fence has not aged yet and has that bright new wood color quality. When properly aged the fence would be grayish in color and less visible.
 9. The Design Review Board recommended that a gray tinted aging stain be applied to accelerate the graying of the fence and that the picket points be cut off to make the fence more compatible with the surrounding architecture.
 10. Ms. DiNatale agreed to apply the aging product to the fence but disagreed with the removal of the picket points. The graying of the fence would make the points less visible. She preferred not to change the fence physically.
 11. After discussion, the VDRB agreed the picket points did not have to be removed.

After further discussion, Ms. Cole moved with a second by Ms. Daniels to approve the application with the following condition:

1. **A gray tinted stain with an aging product shall be applied to the fence before November 1, 2017.**

The motion was approved with a 3-0 vote.

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| C. | V-3342-17 | Max Kelly | Continued |
| D. | V-3343-17 | Charles & Carolyn Kimbell | Approved Administratively |

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the September 13, 2017 meeting were approved as submitted.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP
Town Planner