

**VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
January 24, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jane Soule, Wendy Spector, Elizabeth Daniels
MEMBERS ABSENT: Keri Cole, Randy Mayhew
OTHERS PRESENT: Brad Prescott, Bob Crowe, Chris Ambrose, Brigitte Ambrose, Rachel Shields Ebersole, Antoinette Hunt, Jack Wiley, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Old Business: None

B. New Business:

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 2nd and 3rd level. The property is located at 20 Central Street and zoned Central Commercial / Design Review District.

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

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

The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve the application conditioned on the coloring of the side columns.

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 which will 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, for a total of six sets of 2:2 units. The windows can open to either side.

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

The front facade would have four large folding (accordion) window units. Each unit would have four lights 2:2, matching the side windows. In the open position, the windows would all fold within the building to the west side 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 entrance floor would be lowered to the sidewalk level to allow easy wheelchair access. There would be two carriage lights, matching the east side units, placed on either side of the door.

The existing door leads up to the two upstairs apartments. The existing step up from the sidewalk would remain. Both restaurant and apartment doors would be recessed back from the sidewalk.

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

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

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.

During the Design Review meeting, the applicant was questioned about the open window concept due to street noise and weather issues. The application assured the Board that they wish to keep the open concept. On a perfect weather day, the windows would be open from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

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

The Design Review Board recommended that the columns should be painted a lighter color such as white or off-white color to both accent the columns and match the neighboring facades.

The intent is to give the restaurant its own identity. The apartment entrance area west of the restaurant entrance would be painted a whitish color to blend in with the rest of the block and to set it apart from the restaurant.

The second story 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 are to be located at rear 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. The owners hope to retain one parking space here as well.

The Town Planner asked about frequency of pickup. Area smaller restaurants are known to have multiple pickups per week, especially in the hotter summer months.

The applicant stated the intent is to do one pick-up per week. However, this would increase based on need. The bins would be smaller units, manageable by hand.

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

The 2nd floor apartment would be reserved for the restaurant's manager or chef. The 3rd floor apartment would be rented on a full time basis.

The Town Planner noted that the application states the hours of operation have a 2:00 a.m. closing time on the weekend nights and inquired if there is any intent to have loud music and dancing or other late night activity? It was noted that this area is close to neighborhoods who have complained about excessive noise in the past.

The applicant stated there is no intent to have loud music or to create a dance environment.

Ms. Spector asked what kind of food can be expected from a "gastro pub" and about the function of the rear dining room.

The applicant noted high quality food but not 5-star quality. The rear dining room is limited to eight seats. Due to architectural constraints, a small room was created.

The VDRB reviewed Conditional Use and Design Review criteria with the applicant.

Testimony was closed.

B. V-3357-17 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 VDRB reviewed numerous photographs, renderings of the proposed renovation and site plans.

The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve with a condition that a landscape plan be presented for approval after the building is finished.

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 six 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 four 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 the stone 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 wall that matches the chimney stone. The wall would be in line with the edge of the deck located above. Fill would be placed behind the wall to equal the original topographic profile of the land to meet flood requirements.

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 Design Review Board discussed the modern look of the cable rails along the rear deck and staircase. They agreed with the applicant that the gables become invisible when viewed from a distance. The rear of the building is not visible from the street.

Although the use of a large stone for the chimney is different from the commonly used brick chimneys in the area, it is located on the rear elevation and therefore less visible to the public.

The applicant will not add privacy glass or tint the bathroom or closet windows located on the west wing. Any privacy issues would be dealt with from the inside via blinds or other elements.

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

The property, located on the Ottawaquechee River has a 100' riparian buffer. A variance was granted in 2016 to allow the buffer to be 55' on the west property line and to maintain the 10' mark on the east property line. The building is designed to stay outside of the agreed upon riparian buffer line.

The entire property is located within the 100' year Floodplain.

The applicant agreed that the cost of renovation exceeds the 50% value of the current home and is therefore considered a “substantially improved” building. Therefore, the new home will be built in compliance with the Section 404 Flood Hazard regulations.

The building design and placement have been reviewed and approved by the State Floodplain Manager, John Brooker-Campbell via a January 10, 2018 letter.

An Elevation Certificate for the property was submitted. The BFE (base flood level) is 684.5'.

The basement will be unfinished and used for storage only. All electrical or mechanical appliances etc. will be placed at least 3' above the base flood elevation. A series of flood vents has been placed flush to the basement floor on the rear mid section of the building. These will allow flood waters to enter to create an equilibrium to lessen structural damage.

All basement materials in the flood prone areas will be built of flood damage and resistant materials.

The VDRB reviewed Conditional Use, Design Review, Flood Hazard and Riparian criteria with the applicant.

Testimony was voted close.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Zoning Officer's Report

The report was issued.

B. Optimist Center

Ms. Ebersole representing the Optimist Center asked for clarification on door signs. She showed the VDRB a photo of the signs and additional door signs from throughout the village.

The center had been sent a letter from the Administrative Officer, noting the signs are too large and that they would be counted as a sign requiring a permit. The standard “open/closed” or “hours of operation” sign do not require a permit if it measures less than one square foot. The intent of the small sign is so one is able to read it up close to the door but not from a distance such as sidewalk or street in this case.

The VDRB viewed the photo of the door sign noting that the signs are large, making them readable from the street. Most of the other examples that Ms. Ebersole presented of door signs are decals and not readable from a distance. The VDRB suggested that all the signage

be placed within one window pane, which would most likely meet the one square foot maximum.

The Town Planner suggested that if the one square foot allowance does not work, than Ms. Ebersole may make a request to the Planning Commission to change the signage regulation.

C. Abracadabra Coffee

Antoinette Hunt, owner, and her father John Wiley asked if coffee tastings or an open house could be held at the Pleasant Street business. An issue is the lack of parking. The current four car parking arrangement is barely workable due to the lack of space to turn into or out of the parking spaces. Additional vehicles would not be able to turn around on the site. The owners would like to use the abutting East End parking lot owned by the Village. As a dedicated parking space for the business this would not be acceptable. The owners asked to have an open house once a month, but would prefer to hold them every weekend if there was interest.

The VDRB agreed in November that a trial use of the Village parking lot could occur as long as their driveway was blocked to keep clients out. This would be a temporary allowance to see how things worked out. The owners would also like to serve pastries or other baked goods to go with the coffee in addition to sales of coffee product. The permit under which they are operating does not allow sales or dining on-site. The permit was issued for food preparation only. An amended permit would be required to sell product on-site or to consume food on-site.

IV. DELIBERATIONS

A. V-3356-17 Woodstock Investments, LLC

After discussion, the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed numerous photographs and renderings of the proposed renovation.
2. The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve the application conditioned on the coloring of the side columns.
3. 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.
4. 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 which will add +/- 500 square feet to the proposed 1176 square foot restaurant.
5. 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, for a total of six sets of 2:2 units. The windows can open to either side. Low wattage carriage lights would be placed on each column for architectural enhancement.
6. The front facade would have four large folding (accordion) window units. Each unit would have four lights 2:2, matching the side windows. In the open position, the windows would all fold within the building to the west side next to the entrance door. The lower 36" would be a solid wood-paneled wall.
7. The front door would be located to the west end of the restaurant. The entrance floor would be lowered to the sidewalk level to allow easy wheelchair access. There would

- be two carriage lights, matching the east side units, placed on either side of the door.
8. An existing door leads up to the two upstairs apartments. The existing step up from the sidewalk would remain. Both restaurant and apartment doors would be recessed back from the sidewalk.
 9. On the second floor east side, the three large single pane windows would be replaced with a set of two double-hung 1:1 windows each.
 10. 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.
 11. On a perfect weather day, the windows would be open from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Windows would close by 10:00 p.m. On weekend nights the restaurant would be open to 2:00 a.m.
 12. The applicant agreed with the Design Review recommendation to paint the side columns a lighter off-white color that would accent the columns against the black background.
 13. The second story bay window would remain as is.
 14. A Morgan Block sign would remain, but possibly not the same sign or placement.
 15. Dumpsters, recycling bins and a compost barrel are to be located at rear 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. The owners hope to retain one parking space here as well.
 16. The intent is to reserve the 2nd floor apartment for the restaurant's manager or chef. The 3rd floor apartment would be rented on a full time basis.
 17. The VDRB reviewed Conditional Use and Design Review criteria with the applicant.

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

1. **The applicant shall adhere to the Design Review Board recommendation that the columns shall be painted a lighter color such as white or off-white.**

The motion was approved with a 3-0 vote.

B. V-3357-17 Douglas and Suzanne Laufer

After discussion, the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed numerous photographs, renderings of the proposed renovation and site plans.
2. The VDRB read the Design Review Board's recommendation to approve with a condition that a landscape plan be presented for approval after the building is finished.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. The siding would be clapboard. The roof would be a black metal standing seam.
6. 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.
7. 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.
 8. 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.
 9. A 9' wide covered porch would run the full length of the home's mid-section, supported by six evenly spaced square wood columns.
 10. 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.
 11. The west wing is single story with three evenly spaced 2:2 windows. Each window would have shutters.
 12. 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.
 13. The east elevation is 31' wide with two 4-light barn like windows for the garage.
 14. 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.
 15. 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.
 16. 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.
 17. 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 four large glass panels. Two carriage lights would be placed on either side of the door. There would be no shutters.
 18. The second story would have three sets of dormers matching those placed on the front elevation. There would be no shutters.
 19. 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.
 20. The west wing would have two pairs of 2:2 windows placed side by side. There would be no shutters.
 21. A portion of the west and east foundation would be exposed concrete. The lower section would have a stone dry laid wall that matches the chimney stone. The wall would be in line with the edge of the deck located above. Fill would be placed behind the wall to equal the original topographic profile of the land to meet flood requirements.
 22. 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.
23. The applicant will not add privacy glass or tint the bathroom or closet windows located on the west wing. Any privacy issues would be dealt with from the inside via blinds or other elements.
 24. 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 applicant stated that future landscaping would take place, but at the moment there is no actual plan in place.
 25. The property, located on the Ottauquechee River has a 100' riparian buffer. Due to a variance granted in 2016, the building will be built outside of the adjusted riparian buffer, 55' on the west property line and 100' on the east property line
 26. The entire property is located within the 100' year Floodplain.
 27. The applicant agreed that the cost of renovation exceeds the 50% value of the current home and is therefore considered a “substantially improved” building. Therefore, the new home will be built in compliance with the Section 404 Flood Hazard regulations.
 28. The building design and placement have been reviewed and approved by the State Floodplain Manager, John Brooker-Cambell via a January 10, 2018 letter.
 29. An Elevation Certificate for the property was submitted. The BFE (base flood level) is 684.5'.
 30. The basement will be unfinished and used for storage only. All electrical or mechanical appliances etc. will be placed at least 3' above the base flood elevation. A series of flood vents have been placed flush to the basement floor on the rear mid section of the building. These will allow flood waters to enter to create an equilibrium to lessen structural damage.
 31. All basement materials in the flood prone areas will be built of flood damage and resistant materials.
 32. The VDRB reviewed Conditional Use, Design Review, Flood Hazard and Riparian criteria with the applicant.

After further discussion, Ms. Spector moved with a second by Ms. Daniels to approve the application as presented. The motion was approved with a 3-0 vote.

V. NEXT MEETINGS

Next VDRB meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2018.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 8, 2017 were approved as submitted.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brands, AICP
Town Planner