

WOODSTOCK VILLAGE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Wednesday, September 16, 2020 – 4:00PM

MEETING MINUTES

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Rossi

OTHERS PRESENT: Neal Leitner, Jeffrey Simpson & Christina Salusti, Bill Corson, Brent Rakowski, Ralph Nimtz, Casey Gecha, David Green, Maryse Brand, Maureen O’Leary, Don Wheeler, Betsy Wheeler

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

II. PUBLIC HEARING – CONTINUED

A. V-3575-20; Mark Hall & Maryse Brand, owner/applicant; 27 The Green; Parcel # 23.52.19; Zone: RLD/DR; To Construct Covered Porch.

Applicant Maryse Brand described the project to the board. She mentioned that the porch was constructed already. She described the additional materials and plans she submitted since the previous meeting. Maryse Brand said the porch would be built of pine, painted white. The roof would match the roof on the front porch, which is a membrane.

Phil Neuberg thanked her for the additional materials. The elevations and revised site plan clearly showed the side porch design and materials.

Larry Zeitlin commented that the porch looks nice and fits in.

Nancy Sevchenko mentioned that the porch is visible from the sidewalk, but it does not block the view of Mount Tom.

The board motioned to approve the application as submitted.

Motion approved 4-0.

- B. V-3576-20;** Town of Woodstock, owner/applicant; 454 Woodstock Road; Parcel #21.53.25.; Zone: Community/DR; To Expand Existing Emergency Services Building.

Architect Ralph Nimtze re-introduced the architectural plans of the Emergency Services Building to the board. He described the proposed addition and the materials that would be used. The addition is on the back of the existing building. The parking lot will be pushed further back into the slope in the rear of the property. A 6-foot-tall retaining wall would be installed along the back of the parking lot. The same number of parking spaces will be provided in the new configuration. The walls will be made of a metal type siding that resembles wood siding, but is more weather resistant. It comes with a 10-year warranty.

Phil Neuberger asked if the metal siding could be purchased with a 20-year warranty. Ralph Nimtze said he could investigate that option.

Ralph showed samples of some of the materials to the board. He explained that the front façade would still have brick, but it would be integrated with some stucco elements, which were shown on the plans. The tower would remain intact.

Nancy Sevchenko asked about the placement of the windows on the upper floor, and why the window on the upper right seemed offset compared to the other windows.

The architect showed the floor plan and explained the sleeping quarters are in that area, so the size of the room is larger than the others.

Beverly Humpstone was concerned about the drab look of the front façade and if any effort was made to spruce it up.

The architect responded that the glass vestibule was introduced as an architectural element that would house an antique fire engine. He explained that an effort was made to

not call attention to the building, since it is not a centerpiece for the town. It would want to remain slightly subdued.

Casey Gecha, Ralph Nimtz's assistant, shared all the architectural plans and details with the board in a presentation. Brent Rakowski with Otter Creek Engineering described some of the engineering details with the board during the presentation.

A discussion of the architectural plans ensued among the board members. The board decided that they would like to see samples of the materials proposed in person whenever they become available in the future prior to construction. They noted that the exterior renovations will be in keeping with the character of the existing building and fit in with the streetscape since almost all of it will be behind the existing building, so not visible from the street.

A motion was made to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the board can review samples of the proposed materials at a later date when they become available.

Motion passed 4-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS - NEW

- A. V-3583-20;** TD Bank, NA, owner; One Stop Signs/Tiffany Suddarth, agent; 21 Elm Street; Parcel #20.52.30.; Zone: CC/DR; To Reface Existing Signs & Awning.

Tiffany Suddarth, the sign company representative for TD Bank introduced the project to the board. All existing signs associated with TD Bank will be replaced with updated TD signage reflecting the new logo. The new logo eliminates the word bank and leaves just TD in its place. The logo includes more light green than dark green in comparison to the original.

The board asked about the proposed awning, which would be light green, rather than dark green. They requested the pantone colors of the dark green and light green so they could review it.

Tiffany did not have them at the meeting, she said she would provide them to the board after the meeting.

The board thanked Tiffany Suddarth and closed testimony.

The board deliberated on Monday, September 21st via group email. The pantone colors are TD Light Green 361C and TD Dark Green 5535C. The board recommended using TD Dark Green 5535C.

A motion was made to approve the application with the recommendation that the awning is dark green rather than light green.

Motion passed 4-0.

B. V-3584-20; MaryAnne Flynn, owner/applicant; 27 Pleasant Street; Parcel #21.52.12.; Zone: RHD/DR; To Replace Exterior Door

Applicant MaryAnne Flynn introduced her project to the board. She would like to replace an exterior door with a new wooden door of the same size and location, but a different design.

The board reviewed the cut sheet of the proposed door and had no issues with the design. As it is a replacement of an existing door, the application is deemed minor.

A motion was made to approve the application as submitted.

Motion passed 4-0.

C. V-3586-20; Maureen O’Leary & Rafael Fissore, owner/applicant; 9 River Street; Parcel #20.51.14.; Zone: RMD/DR; To Install Fence.

Applicant Maureen O’Leary introduced her fence project to the board. She used the same design and size of the 6’ tall fence that was used for the backyard between Al Sorrentino’s property and the Wheeler’s property. Her fence separates her backyard from the Wheeler’s property. It has 17 panels made of cedar with a lattice top. The fence was installed without a permit. She had a survey completed prior to installing the fence.

Don and Betsy Wheeler stated that they would have appreciated the ability to comment on the fence before it was installed. They wrote a letter to the board expressing their dissatisfaction with the visual effect it has on their backyard. They explained that it creates an alleyway look to their backyard. The final panel has a post that is placed in a drainage area that gets wet seasonally from water coming down off Mount Tom.

Phil Neuberg asked if the fence runs between the Wheeler’s detached garage along the property line to the back end of the lawn areas. She confirmed that was a location.

Nancy Sevchenko asked to see photos of the installed fence to see what the Wheeler's are opposed to.

Betsy Wheeler said that the fence runs the entire length of the backyard and requested that the last panel be removed so they could retain a little sense of openness.

Beverly Humpstone mentioned that the fence will weather, and turn grey after time, potentially blending in better.

The concern over the last post being placed in the drainage ditch was discussed. It is not a classified wetland, but it is a spring runoff, high water event area that runs during those times.

Nancy Sevchenko asked the Wheeler's to describe the view of their backyard before the fence was installed.

Betsy Wheeler explained that the backyard area was more open and allowed for a more expansive view before the fence was installed. She mentioned that she is not opposed to the entirety of the fence, just the last panel. The Wheeler's said they would have liked the opportunity to express that during the permitting process.

The applicant asked why the board would make her remove part of her fence. She wanted to know the rationale.

Phil Neuberg responded that if the fence permit was requested before installation, it would have given the abutting property owners the ability to partake in the due process, which would have allowed the Wheelers to comment on the length of the fence, potentially altering the end product so that both property owners could come to a solution.

The applicant said that she was not aware of the requirement for a permit and told the Wheeler's that she would have appreciated it if they informed her of the need for a permit.

Betsy Wheeler responded that it is not their responsibility to inform her of the requirement to obtain a permit prior to the installation of the fence.

Beverly Humpstone stated that the board is tired of people doing projects and making decisions without obtaining permits beforehand.

Beverly Humpstone suggested the board conduct a site visit to see the fence together and reconvene at that time.

The town planner said the board can place the item into recess until the site visit per Vermont Open Meeting Law, at which point they can reconvene.

The board agreed to place the item into recess until Friday at 1:00pm to conduct a group site visit.

The board closed testimony on the item.

D. V-3587-20; Jeffrey Simpson & Christina Salusti, owner/applicant; 75 Central Street; Parcel #21.52.07.; Zone: CC/DR; To Construct Addition, Place Shed, Replace Windows & Doors.

Applicants Jeffrey Simpson and Christina Salusti introduced the project to the board. They propose to place a small storage shed on the western side of the house to store equipment that currently sits on the side of the house without enclosure and to construct a small addition on the back side of the house. They also propose to replace the windows and doors on the back of the house. They stated they want to improve the aesthetics of the back end of the house.

The board asked questions about the shed.

The board thought the propane tank should also be shielded with the wooden lattice that forms the sides of the equipment enclosure shed.

The applicants agreed.

The windows and doors were reviewed. The board thought they were improvements and the design fit with the house.

The shed and addition meet setbacks.

The board thanked the applicants for their presentation.

A motion was made to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the wooden lattice that shields the equipment in the side storage shed on the western side of the house be extended to include the propane tank, which is located adjacent to the proposed storage shed.

Motion passed 4-0.

IV. SITE VISIT AND DELIBERATIONS

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Neil Leitner, Maureen O’Leary, Don Wheeler, Lynn Beach

V-3586-20; Maureen O’Leary & Rafael Fissore, owner/applicant; 9 River Street; Parcel #20.51.14.; Zone: RMD/DR; To Install Fence.

The board reconvened item V-3586-20 at 9 River Street to conduct a site visit and discuss the fence with the applicant and neighbors at 1:00 PM on Friday, September 18th, 2020.

The applicant explained that the fence will enhance her lawn that she installed, and it provides privacy from the neighbors.

The board examined the drainage area at the far end of the fence. A small footbridge is installed over the drainage area. The final fencepost, which is in the base of the drainage ditch area, was examined.

The applicant explained that the fencepost does not block drainage and would not detrimentally impact the movement of water.

The board stated that the last section of the fence may not have been permitted if it came before the board prior to installation due to the drainage and wet soil issue.

The board asked if the applicant would be willing to take the final panel of the fence and move it 90 degrees into her property.

The applicant refused.

The fence was compared to the previously approved fence on the other side of the backyard. The two fences have the same dimensions. The lattice on the applicant's fence contains 3 slats, versus 4 slats on the previously approved fence between the Wheeler's and the Sorrentino's property.

Deliberations:

The board agreed unanimously that the last panel at the rear of the property should be removed.

The board recommends approval of the fence with the condition that the final panel at the rear end of the fence is removed.

Motion passed 5-0.

V. ADJOURNMENT Meeting adjourned at 6:25PM