

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES  
January 17, 2018**

Members Present: Don Olson, Jack Rossi  
Members Absent: Jeff Bendis, Nancy Sevchenko, Beverly Humpstone  
Others Present: Bob Crowe, Brad Prescott, Chris Ambrose, Michael Brands

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. V-3356-17 Woodstock Investments, LLC**

The application is for Conditional Use and Design Review Approval to renovate facade, change use from retail to restaurant and reconfigure three apartments into two apartments on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> level. The property is located at 20 Central Street and zoned Central Commercial / Design Review District.

Mr. Prescott, architect, and Mr. Crowe of Woodstock Investments, LLC presented the application.

The Board reviewed numerous photographs and renderings of the proposed renovation.

The applicant had previously made an informal presentation to the Board on November 15, 2017.

The applicant was absent for the January 3, 2017 meeting. However, the Board did a brief review that resulted in 9 questions concerning the application (addressed below).

An 83 seat “gastro-pub” is planned for the first floor of the building. The kitchen would be placed in the basement. Second and third stories would be used for two apartments, one on each floor.

The restaurant would replace the Vermont Flannel retail shop space and would extend to the rear of the building. The current open walkway along the side would be enclosed, this would add +/- 500 square feet to the proposed 1176 square foot restaurant.

Along the side enclosure, the owner wishes to maintain the numerous columns which support the walkway. Large slider windows would be placed in between the columns.

Each column currently has a carriage style light fixture. This would be continued with enhanced light fixtures.

There would be six sets of double unit slider windows placed between the columns on the side of the building.

The front facade would have four large folding window units. Each unit would have four lights. In the open position, the windows would all fold within the building to the west next to the entrance door. The intent is to create an open airy “patio” effect. The building abuts the sidewalk, leaving no room for outdoor seating. The lower 36" would be a solid wood paneled wall.

The front door would be located to the west end of the restaurant. The existing door leads up to the two upstairs apartments. There would be two carriage lights, matching the east side units, placed on either side of the two doors.

On the second floor east side, the three large single pane windows would be replaced with two double hung 1:1 windows each.

A large kitchen exhaust vent would be placed on the flat roof at the rear of the building. It would not be visible to the public.

The applicant reviewed the January 3<sup>rd</sup> questions with the Board.

Addressing the look of the front facade with the folding windows open, Mr. Prescott presented a close-up rendering of the front facade with the windows both open and closed.

A lengthy discussion resulted to assure the applicant was willing to spend additional money on operational windows given the fact the windows would rarely be open. Vermont weather is not always conducive to open windows, both heat and cold are issues. The noise from the street, the neighboring post office driveway and pedestrians on the sidewalk are also considerations. Another area of concern is client preference.

On a perfect weather day the windows would be open from 10:00 am to 10:00 pm.

Mr. Prescott showed colored renderings of the proposed renovation, the first floor background is black with beige columns.

The Board asked that the columns along the side stand out somewhat to carry over the existing look. The Board also desired continuity with the other business facades along Central Street. The Board agreed a white or off-white colored column would work best to both accent the columns and to best match the neighboring facades.

The second bay window would remain as is.

A Morgan Block sign would remain, but possibly not the same sign or placement.

The proposed projected sign would not be illuminated. Exact dimensions and placement can be reviewed at a later date as an administrative permit.

Dumpsters, recycling bins and a compost barrel would fit on the backside of the building. They would be accessed from Elm Street via the back alley. The lot doglegs at the rear and comes behind the neighboring building to the west. The containers would be placed just west of the exterior stairs. A parking space would be removed to accommodate this.

The proposed side windows are double units that would slide open in either direction.

The side carriage lights would contain low voltage bulbs. They would not use an LED type bulb, as a warmer softer glow is desired. The lights are not meant to illuminate the surrounding area.

Mr. Rossi asked that special care should be taken during construction so as to not damage the one street tree located directly in front of the building.

After review, the Board recommended approval with the columns painted a lighter color such as white or off-white.

**B. V-3356-17 Douglas and Suzanne Laufer**

The application is for Conditional Use and Design Review Approval to construct a 3351 sq. ft. single family dwelling with 1657 in porches and garage in the Flood Hazard overlay zone. The property is located at 6 River Street and zoned Residential Low Density / Design Review District/Flood Hazard.

Mr. Ambrose, contractor, presented the application.

The Board reviewed numerous photographs, renderings of the proposed renovation and site plans.

The new owner wishes to remove the existing house and rebuild more to the center of the property. Due to restrictive riparian and flood hazard areas, the home is somewhat long and narrow to fit within the buildable area.

The new four bedroom home would be 95' long. The single story garage, on the east side, would be 25.5' long. The two story mid section would be 44' long. The west single story wing would be 25.5' long.

The siding would be clapboard. The roof would be a black metal standing seam.

The two garage doors would appear to be typical carriage swing open doors, but would

actually articulate upwards as a modern folding door. The upper portion of the panelized doors would have six transom style windows each.

A non-functioning cupola with a six pane window on all four sides and a weather vane would be placed centered on the garage roof.

The mid-section would have four 2:2 windows with shutters. The shutters would be placed in the correct historic manner. A wood paneled door would be centered on the facade, with full length windows on each side. Two carriage style lights would be placed on either side of the door.

A 9' wide covered porch would run the full length of the home's mid section, supported by 6 evenly spaced square wood columns.

There would be three dormers extending from the roof ridge on the second story. Each dormer would have a double set of 2:2 windows. There would be no shutters as there is no room for them.

The west wing is single story with three evenly spaced 2:2 windows. Each window would have shutters.

The west elevation is 23' wide with a centered boxed window. The window would be a double set of 2:2. There would be no shutters as there is no room.

The east elevation is 31' wide with two 4-light barn like windows for the garage.

On the east side of the rear elevation, a 10' wide 25.5' long screened-in porch would be placed. This would line up with the garage wing.

A 6.5' wide open deck would be placed the full length of the mid-section on the rear elevation. A double staircase, heading east and west, would be placed. Each staircase would have 13 steps. A series of wired cables would be placed in lieu of spindles along the edge of the deck and staircase. The cables are spaced 4" apart for safety reasons. A wood top rail would be placed as it is more stable and easier to grab. Wood support posts would be spaced accordingly.

The land slopes down considerably. A step-out basement area is accessed from under the deck. There would be a series of flood activated doors placed along the basement floor level. The entire property is located within the 100 year Floodplain.

Two banks of windows, each with three sets of 2:2 units, would be placed on either side of a centered double door on the first floor. The door would have 4 large glass panels. Two carriage lights would be placed on either side of the door. There would be no shutters.

The second story would have three sets of dormers matching those placed on the front elevation. There would be no shutters.

A stone chimney would be placed on the west edge of the roof. The chimney would not

be visible from the front of the home. The stone is somewhat large and would match that used in the exposed basement foundation.

The west wing would have two pairs of 2:2 windows placed side by side. There would be no shutters.

A portion of the west and east foundation would be exposed concrete. The lower section would have a stone dry laid foundation that matches the chimney stone.

The basement mid section would have clapboard siding. A double wide wood paneled door would be placed on the west side behind the stairs. Two 4-light windows, one centered and one to the east would be placed. These windows are behind the stairs.

The Board discussed the modern look of the cable rails along the rear deck and staircase.

The applicant noted the cable is chosen as it becomes invisible when viewed from a distance. It is only used on the rear of the home which is hidden from street views.

The use of large stone for the chimney was discussed as most chimneys in the area are built of brick and not stone.

The applicant noted the chimney is mainly visible from the rear. It is not visible from directly in front of the home. The stone matches the proposed foundation stone which is only visible from the rear.

In reviewing the floor plans the Town Planner noted the interior use is a closet on the front elevation and a bath tub on the west elevation. He asked if the owners had any privacy concerns.

The applicant noted the windows would not have any special treatment such as the use of privacy glass or the tinting of the windows. The windows would match those on the rest of the house. Privacy issues would be dealt with from inside. Wooden blinds or other blind type material can be placed.

Two trees would be removed. A large mature tree directly east of the current home and a smaller street tree in front of the home. There would be no vegetation removed from the riparian buffer area. The Board also noted concern with the exposed concrete on the rear basement walls.

The applicant stated that future landscaping would take place, but at the moment there is no plan in place.

After additional discussion, the Board recommended approval with a condition that a landscape plan be presented for approval after the building is finished.

**III. OTHER BUSINESS**

**VI. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for February 7, 2018

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP  
Town/Village Planner