

WOODSTOCK VILLAGE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Wednesday, July 15, 2020
4:00PM
CONFERENCE CALL/ZOOM MEETING
MEETING AGENDA
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nancy Sevchenko, Beverly Humpstone, Phil Neuberg, Larry Zeitlin

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Rossi

OTHERS PRESENT: Neal Leitner, Thomas and Paula Little, Wendy Marrinan, Matt Powers, Kit Mead, Dail Frates, Dani from Tesla, Bill Corson, Ben Nickerson, Roger and Debra Amato.

I. CALL TO ORDER 4:00 P.M.

II. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

- A. V-3553-20;** Tesla Energy Operations, agent; Larry Zeitlin, owner; 31 Elm Street; Parcel #20.52.25.; Zone: RLD/DR; To Install Solarized Roof.

Item was withdrawn due to the applicant deciding against the installation of the solar tiles due to the lack of grey tiles currently available and the inability to install copper seams on the roof with the solar tiles. The applicant's agent, Dani from Tesla, thanked the board for their consideration and looked forward to working with them in the future if another application for solar shingles comes to their board for review.

The board moved to the public hearing.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. V-3551-20;** Woodstock History Center, owner/applicant; 26 Elm Street; Parcel #20.52.32.; Zone: Comm/DR; To Add Driveway Between WHC & Dana Block Bldg. and 2 New Parking Spaces.

The Woodstock History Center was represented by applicant Matt Powers of the Woodstock History Center. Matt introduced the proposed gravel driveway with two parallel parking spaces along the driveway to the board. The driveway will connect the existing driveway for the Woodstock History Center to the parking lot behind the Dana Block. The primary purpose of the driveway is to help improve the flow of delivery truck traffic that currently uses that driveway. The driveway is shared with the Prince and Pauper restaurant. Delivery trucks must back up from Elm Street to deliver. This has caused property damage in the past. Additionally, a recent fire on the back of the Dana Block had to be accessed by the Fire

Department by driving over the grass and shrubs in the back of the block. This proposed driveway would give fire access to the back of the Dana Block. Matt Powers described the parking layout, which includes two 22' long by 9' wide parking stalls along the edge of the driveway. The driveway access point from the parking lot would displace one parking space, but that would be offset by the additional two parking spaces. Matt Powers indicated that the spaces are used and will be used by tenants in the rental units in the Dana Block.

Kim French, Woodstock History Center board member, described potential future aesthetic improvements planned for the area between the History Center and the Prince and Pauper restaurant. Allowing for the proposed driveway will free up some space that will allow for a more pedestrian friendly walkway and garden improvements.

After hearing the presentation, the board discussed the project among themselves. They agreed that the project will improve the access and flow of the site with minimal design impacts. They agreed that the driveway is best left unpaved.

A motion was made to approve the application as submitted.

Motion approved 5-0.

- B. V-3555-20;** Roger & Debra Amato, owner/applicant; 35 ½ River Street; Parcel #23.51.13.; Zone: RLD/DR; For Detached Apartment with 336 sq. ft. Addition.

Applicant Roger Amato introduced the application to the Design Review Board. It is a 336 square foot addition to an existing structure located in the rear half of the property. The addition is one story tall. It would extend approximately 14-feet north into the existing paved parking area at the terminus of the driveway. The existing roofline would be continued eastward 14 feet into the driveway parking area. Please note that Roger mentioned that we would be removing the tall chimney. The southwest facing upper window would be removed. The northwest elevation would be the front of the detached apartment with a front door and two six over nothing windows. The southeast elevation would have one window. The siding would match the wooden siding on the existing detached apartment and the color would continue to be green. He stated the structure is already being used as a detached apartment in an RLD zoned property. He described the minimum zoning regulations in terms of lot size, setbacks and height and showed that the proposed project meets those minimums. The maximum building height is 35 feet, the existing structure is 17 feet in height. The proposed addition will not exceed 17 feet in height.

Applicant Roger Amato described that there are 4 downcast sconces on the structure and will update them with more aesthetically pleasing downcast sconces. New additional exterior lighting will not be added.

Board member Phil Neuberg asked if the lights could be motion activated and solar controlled to reduce the amount of light pollution. Applicant Debra Amato responded that they would prefer that the lights in the parking area be will be motion activated, other than the front porch light, that would be switch operated. Board member Nancy Sevckenko expressed concern over the front porch light that faces the neighboring houses in the back of the property. The applicants explained that the light has been there for approximately 20 years, but the downcast sconces will mitigate any light pollution. Applicant Debra Amato explained that they would like to keep the existing front porch light manually operated for security reasons. If the occupant would like to illuminate the front porch without stepping outside to turn it on if a strange noise was heard for instance, the occupant should be able to do that. Board member Beverly Humpstone agreed and noted that downcast sconces would minimize light pollution significantly.

Regarding roofing materials, the new roof will be the same dark green-black roofing material that is currently on the structure will be matched. In response to a letter of concern submitted by a neighbor at 16 Mountain Avenue, the applicant clarified that the roof is not galvanized standing seam and that material is not planned on being used.

Board member Beverly Humpstone wanted to address the letter of concern from the neighbor and mentioned that the board should address each concern. The board then moved on to address each issue mentioned in the letter.

Visibility and proportion were discussed. The board asked the applicants if it would be visible when the leaves fall. The applicant's asserted that it would be no more visible from the public right of way (Mtn Ave and River St) than it is today. They stated that proportionally, the proposed addition would not be out of scale as it would continue the same roofline, roof shape, roof material and height of the existing structure.

Noise was discussed. The board asked the applicants if the proposal would increase noise levels. They responded that the detached apartment would not create noise, other than during the initial construction of the addition. They noted that noises greater than 70 decibels as measured from the property line, as per village regulations, would not emanate from the proposed detached apartment.

Neighbor and meeting attendee Wendy Marrinan asked to comment. The board allowed for public comment. She expressed her wish to give the board context. She explained that since the position of the front door of the detached apartment faces the properties in the back, including 18 and 16 Mountain Avenue. She stressed that the impact of having the front door of a living unit facing one's backyard has more of an impact. Due to this, she stated that the proposed project is less in their (the applicant's) neighborhood and more so in the neighborhood of the property owners behind 35 River Street. She asked the board to be sensitive to that notion.

Board member Nancy Sevchenko asked if there is any reason why the front porch must face the back properties. Applicant Amato responded that they would like to keep the existing layout of the apartment unit by utilizing the existing front door. The idea was to add a bedroom addition to the unit for their tenant. The applicant also mentioned that they initially planned to add the bedroom addition to the north side of the structure, which would have pushed it closer toward the residences on Mountain Avenue, behind the subject property. The applicant mentioned that they currently have over 37 feet of rear setback from the existing structure, but still decided against encroaching any further towards the rear neighbors and instead to push into their parking area at the end of the driveway. The side yard setbacks would be respected even with the 14-foot extension into the side yard.

The applicant stated that the apartment was permitted as a conversion from an office to a private studio in 2000. Since it did not receive a conditional use permit in 2000, to bring it into conformance, a conditional use permit is needed for detached apartments. But the applicant asked the discussion to adhere to the specifics of the design and whether or not their proposal meets Section 405 of the Village Zoning Regulations: Design Review. The board and members of the public agreed.

The applicant stated that the main living space of the detached apartment is facing the southwest, away from Mountain Avenue neighbors. The front door of the apartment is not where the living space of the structure is focused. She mentioned that the previous tenant utilized the southwest portion of the unit and the parking area with it much more intensely than the front door. The front door was used as an access point only. The front porch is designed as a snow-shed type roof just to provide some relief from snow piling up in front of the front door, it is not a porch on which one could sit and relax on.

After a board discussion about the design, the board agreed that it meets the criteria for design review approval and that they have reviewed the application in detail.

Board member Beverly Humpstone motioned to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Board member Phil Neuberg.

Motion passed 5-0.

V-3556-20; Thomas & Paula Little, owner/applicant; 5 Mountain Avenue, Unit 4; Parcel #23.52.08.004; Zone: RLD/DR; To Replace Front Entry Door & Add Doors to Existing Shed.

Applicant Paula Little introduced the application to the board. She proposes to replace the exterior storm door on her unit. The existing storm door is unsightly and does not close completely. The new storm door would be a simpler design than the outgoing storm door. It would have glass and screen which allows for the existing door to be more visible through the storm door. The applicant does not

wish to replace the existing door that is original to the house. The frame of the proposed storm door is relatively small.

The board asked about the proposed carriage doors on the accessory carriage structure. The doors would be painted white to match the existing color of the structure. The planks used on the carriage doors will be wooden. The structure does not have doors on it now, which is why the applicant would like to install new doors. A local contractor has been employed to make the carriage doors; they are not prefabricated. Board member Phil Neuberg advised the applicant to paint it with white gloss. Paula Little confirmed that she plans to use white gloss paint on the doors.

The board had no objections to the proposed storm door or carriage doors. A motion was made to approve as submitted.

Motion passed 5-0.

V-3557-20; Frost Mills Nominee Trust, owner; Ellaway Property Services, agent; 4 Benson Place; Parcel #20.52.04.; Zone: RHD/DR; To Install Tesla Car Charger.

Applicant's representative Kit Mead from Ellaway presented the proposal to the board. The proposed Tesla car charger, which would be approximately 12" X 18" hung on the exterior wall outside of public view on the side of the house that is considered the back side. She said it is a silver. The board asked if other colors are available. Board member Nancy Sevckenko asked if the unit could be painted the same color as the house. Kit Mead responded that the house is stained, or wood color, so that would be difficult. Nancy Sevckenko asked if it could be painted black. Kit responded that it could, and the electrician confirmed it could be painted.

Neighbor Bill Corson asked Kit Mead if the charger will make noise. Board member Larry Zeitlin responded that the unit is silent. Bill Corson asked if the charger would be available for the public to use. Kit Mead responded that it is a charger for the private resident only.

Board member Phil Neuberg did not have concerns regarding this particular charger, as it is out of sight, but mentioned that the board may want to look at developing guidelines for private car chargers in the near future, since they are becoming more popular.

Wendy Marrinan asked what the advantage a Tesla wall charger versus just plugging into the electric outlet on a house. The response was that the Tesla charger can fully charge a car in a few hours versus 12-24 hours using a normal electrical outlet.

Board member Beverly Humpstone thought the charger could be painted to help it blend in with the house. Kit Mead said she can paint it a brown color.

A motion to approve the application with the condition that it is painted to match the house color.

Motion passed 5-0.

B. OTHER

C. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:53pm.