



Woodstock, Vermont *The Shire Town of Windsor County*

TOWN - VILLAGE MANAGER GOVERNMENT

Town Hall • P.O. Box 488 • Woodstock, Vermont 05091 • 802/457-3456

VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES
February 27, 2019

PRESENT: Jane Soule, Randy Mayhew, Wendy Spector, Keri Cole, Elizabeth Daniels
ABSENT: None
ALSO PRESENT: Dawn Dupuis, Michael Brands

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Old Business - None

B. New Business

1. V-3429-19 Danforth Pewter

The application is for a Variance to Section 519 - to add 2 additional window signs. The property is located at 9 Central Street and zoned Central Commercial/Design Review.

Ms. Dupuis, store manager, presented the application.

The VDRB reviewed the variance form and a number of photographs of the signs in question.

A request is made to place two additional signs (actually the signs are already in place). A variance request was submitted to seek allowance for the two additional signs.

The business currently has two signs, a projecting and a facade. Two signs per business is the maximum signage allowed per Section 517 Signs.

The additional signs are decals placed on the two front windows. Each sign states "Made in Vermont". The applicant stated the signs have tripled business over the prior year for the same sales period.

The VDRB reviewed the variance form with the applicant. To approve a variance, all answers need to be approved by the VDRB. Three of the 5 questions are answered with an N/A.

Question #3 for example, asks whether "such unnecessary hardship was created by the applicant" is a very difficult one to answer in a positive light. The answer "n/a - no changes to existing structure" does not explain the unnecessary hardship.

The VDRB agreed the variance form as completed does not meet the criteria for granting a variance per Section 715 Variances.

The VDRB suggested the existing signage could be amended to include the desired "made in Vermont" message. One is allowed to add words to an existing sign so long as the sign remains in the same location and that the size, dimensions and orientation are not changed.

The Town Planner noted many businesses have placed signage more than 12" from the interior surface of the glass. As the "12"" rule exempts signs on the interior placed at that distance.

The applicant thanked the VDRB for their suggestions.

Testimony was voted close.



III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Administrative Officer's Report

The report was issued and discussed.

B. Setback Discussion

The Town Planner discussed two questions on placing structures within a setback.

One concerned a heat pump and the second an exterior ground mounted air conditioner. The Town Planner suggested placing the items under the roof eave, as setback is measured from the "drip-edge" of a roof and not from the wall of a building. However in both instances the items are wider than the eave and would protrude into the setback area. In both cases the items could meet setback if placed in different yards than those desired by their owners. The VDRB agreed, the air conditioner and heat pump are structures and do need to meet setbacks. Allowing such items to be exempt from setbacks would set a bad precedent. The Town Planner will inform both owners that setbacks are required for their planned installations.

IV. DELIBERATIONS

A. V-3429-19 Danforth Pewter

After discussion the following findings of fact were established:

1. The VDRB reviewed the variance form and a number of photographs of the signs in question.
3. A request is made to place two additional signs (actually the signs are already in place). A variance request was submitted to seek allowance for the two additional signs.
4. The business currently has two signs, a projecting and a facade. Two signs per business is the maximum signage allowed per Section 517 Signs.
5. The additional signs are decals placed on the two front windows. Each sign states "Made in Vermont". The applicant stated the signs have tripled business over the prior year for the same sales period.
6. The VDRB reviewed the variance form with the applicant. To approve a variance, all answers need to be approved by the VDRB. Three of the 5 questions are answered with an N/A.
7. Question #3 for example, asks whether "such unnecessary hardship was created by the applicant" is a very difficult one to answer in a positive light. The answer "n/a - no changes to existing structure" does not explain the unnecessary hardship.
8. The VDRB agreed the variance form as completed does not meet the criteria for granting a variance per Section 715 Variances.

After additional discussion, Mr. Mayhew moved with a second by Ms. Cole to approve the application as presented.

The motion was denied on a 0-5 vote.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The January 23, 2019 minutes were approved as submitted.

VI. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for March 13, 2019.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Brands, AICP
Town/Village Planner