

**WOODSTOCK
VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
SEPTEMBER 23, 2020
ZOOM MEETING MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Mayhew, Wendy Spector, Jane Soule, Keri Cole, MaryAnne Conway

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

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

I. CALL TO ORDER 7:30PM

II. PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. 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 and Mark Hall 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.

The elevations and revised site plan clearly showed the side porch design and materials. The town planner mentioned the Design Review Board approved the application as submitted.

Chair Soule asked the applicants if the side porch is finished.

The applicants said it was finished and apologized.

The applicants explained that there is recessed ceiling lighting under the roof of the porch. They said it will help with protecting their main door from snow falling.

A motion was made by Randy Mayhew to close testimony on the item. It was seconded by Keri Cole.

Motion approved 5-0.

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

Brent Rakowski of Otter Creek Engineering introduced the proposed plans of the Emergency Services Building to the board. He described the proposed addition and also introduced Ralph Nimtz, the architect. 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. The existing tower would remain intact.

Wendy Spector asked if the parking and loading area in front of the EMS building would be eliminated as part of the new landscaping plan. Brent confirmed that the new bump out with landscaping will eliminate the parking and loading spaces directly in front of the EMS building.

MaryAnne Conway stated that the driveway is tight and asked if they conducted turn-analyses to ensure that the fire trucks and equipment would be able to safely maneuver around the building.

Brent Rakowski confirmed that they analyzed the trucks, along with the possibility of a longer ladder truck that may be added to the fleet. It would be able to maneuver safely as well.

Randy Mayhew asked if parking spaces are delineated on the proposed site plan.

Chair Soule responded that there are 23 parking spaces on the proposed plan. She asked if the glass enclosure would be built for the antique fire engine.

The architect Ralph Nimtz responded that the glass vestibule was introduced as an architectural element that would house an antique fire engine.

Wendy Spector commented that she likes the enhanced plantings proposed along the sidewalk in the front of the building.

Randy Mayhew asked about the location of dumpsters, and where they are located.

Brent Rakowski responded that dumpsters would be located on the southwest corner of the property.

Keri Cole asked about the freestanding lights and where they would be located.

Brent Rakowski said there are two lights in total, one on the west side of the parking lot and one on the south portion of the parking lot.

Randy Mayhew asked if the site plans meet the criteria for Site Plan Approval per Section 709 of the zoning regulations.

Brent Rakowski described the site plans and how they meet the criteria.

Randy Mayhew asked if the dumpster can be shielded from public view.

The architect Ralph Nimtz responded that they will place a hemlock hedge around the dumpster, but they will not be fully screened from view. They will be in the rear of the property and not easily seen.

Wendy Spector noted that the dumpster could potentially be moved towards the center rear of the parking lot to be fully shielded.

Chair Soule mentioned that it might make it hard for truck circulation if they did that.

Brent Rakowski confirmed that moving the dumpster would impede circulation.

Keri Cole asked if all the lighting is downcast.

The architect responded in the affirmative.

A motion was made by Keri Cole to close testimony on the item. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

3. **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, TD Light Green 361C, rather than dark green.

Tiffany Suddarth responded that the awning would be light green, rather than dark green.

The Design Review Board recommended using TD Dark Green 5535C, but the Development Review Board does not regulate colors since they are not regulated

in the Village Zoning Regulations, so the VDRB stated that the color of the awning is outside of their jurisdiction.

A motion was made by Randy Mayhew to close testimony on the item. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

4. **V-3584-20;** MaryAnne Flynn, owner/applicant; 27 Pleasant Street; Parcel #21.52.12.; Zone: RHD/DR; To Replace Exterior Door. *<Deemed a Minor Application by Design Review>*
5. **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 mentioned that she used the same design and size of the 6’ 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.

The town planner stated that the Design Review Board conducted a site visit and recommended approval of the fence with the condition that the last panel in the rear be removed.

The applicant presented a PowerPoint presentation to the board, explaining the fence design, location, and intent. She claimed she did not know about the need to obtain a permit for the fence.

She discussed the issue of drainage that was discussed between the neighbors, the Wheelers and the Design Review Board.

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. 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 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.

Chair Soule stated that the fence post will rot if it is placed in a drainage ditch.

A motion was made by Wendy Spector to close testimony on the item. It was seconded by Keri Cole.

Motion passed 5-0.

6. **V-3587-20;** Jeffrey Simpson & Cristina 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. They mentioned that the lattice enclosure around the shed would include the propane tank, so it can be shielded from view also.

They mentioned that there was an old ash tree that was removed because it was affecting the structural integrity of the house. Now that it is removed, they would like to build the proposed addition.

The shed and addition meet setbacks.

The board thanked the applicants for their presentation.

A motion was made by Keri Cole to close testimony on the item. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

IV. DELIBERATIONS

1. V-3575-20

The board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405.G.: Design Review Approval. The board reviewed the complete application package and the minutes from the Design Review Board meeting. The Design Review Board approved the application as submitted.

The Board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405: Design Review Approval. The side porch addition meets setbacks and the criteria set forth in Section 405.

A motion was made by Wendy Spector to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Randy Mayhew.

Motion passed 5-0.

2. V-3576-20

The board found that the application is in conformance with Sections 405.G, 709 & 710: Conditional Use, Design Review & Site Plan Approval. The Design Review Board approved the application as submitted.

The Board found that the application is in conformance with Sections 704, 709 & 710. The proposed EMS building will meet setbacks and all other applicable criteria set forth in Section 709.

A motion was made by Randy Mayhew to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

3. V-3583-20

The board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405.G.: Design Review Approval. The Design Review Board approved the application as submitted.

The Board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405: Design Review Approval.

A motion was made by Randy Mayhew to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

4. V-3586-20

The board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405.G.: Design Review Approval. The Design Review Board approved the application with a condition that the last panel be removed.

The Board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405: Design Review Approval. The fence meets the applicable criteria set forth in that section.

The board discussed regulations pertinent to the fence and placement, and whether the regulations grant the board the ability to require the applicant to remove the last panel.

Keri Cole encouraged the Wheelers to go to the Planning Commission and discuss the issue of rear yard fences in the village since more people are moving to the village that may be more concerned about privacy. She stated that as the ordinances and regulations stand, the fence meets the applicable village zoning regulations.

A motion was made by Keri Cole to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

5. V-3587-20

The board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405.G.: Design Review Approval. The Design Review Board approved the application as submitted.

The Board found that the application is in conformance with Section 405: Design Review Approval.

The addition and shed meet the criteria for site plan approval set forth in that section.

A motion was made by Keri Cole to approve the application as submitted. It was seconded by Wendy Spector.

Motion passed 5-0.

V. OPEN DISCUSSION

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the August 26, 2020

VII. NEXT MEETING

October 14, 2020

VIII. ADJOURNMENT