

WOODSTOCK
VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
May 12, 2021
ZOOM MEETING/CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Jane Soule, Randy Mayhew, Wendy Spector, Keri Cole, MaryAnne Flynn

Members Absent: Keri Cole

Others Present: Neal Leitner, Tom McCaughey, Ben Pauley, Sam DiNatale, Joe DiNatale, Toby Clyde

I. CALL TO ORDER 7:30 P.M.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS –

Old Business

V-3631-21; Frost Mills; owner applicant; 45 Elm Street; Parcel 20.52.04; Zone: RHD; Proposal: 14 x 24 swimming pool, pool cabana, pool fence, stair handrail and remove vehicular drive court to replace with garden. Install fencing along Elm Street property line.

Applicant's agent Jack Rossi introduced the application to the board.

He described the swimming pool, pool cabana, pool fencing, handrail on the stairs and the proposed fence along Elm Street.

The board had questions about each element of the application. Jack Rossi explained each element of the application in detail. The board discussed the proposed metal fence along Elm Street.

Jack Rossi informed them that the fence is designed to replicate a fence at the Rockefeller mansion and carry some of the materials over from the nearby railing on the bridge over the river.

The pool and cabana were discussed along with the fencing around the pool. After a discussion, the board agreed that all of the pool design elements were satisfactory and met setbacks.

Hearing no further testimony, a motion was made to approve the application as presented.

Motion passed 4-0.

New Business

V-3633-21; Bernard; owner applicant; 37 South Street; Parcel 23.55.20; Zone: RHD; **Proposal: Temporary Fence**

Item withdrawn at request of applicant.

V-3636-21; McCaughey; owner/applicant, 26 Pleasant St; Parcel 21.51.26; Zone: RHD; **Proposal: Trellis**

The applicant introduced the project to the board. Tom McCaughey, the applicant, stated that two sections of trellis style fences were installed for their hydrangeas and landscaping purposes. The trellis sections are under 4-feet tall and meet the zoning regulations for fences.

The board discussed the fence/trellis. It is located on the eastern property line.

The board found no issue with the two trellis sections. Hearing no additional testimony, a motion was made to closed testimony, it was seconded.

The board had no objections to the trellis fencing and made a motion to approve the application as presented. It was seconded.

Motion passed 4-0.

V-3640-21; Woodstock Inn; applicant; 14 The Green; Parcel: 23.56.26; Zone: Inn; **Proposal: 4 exterior lights behind the Tavern and bistro lighting.**

The applicant's agent introduced the project to the board. The Woodstock Inn would like to install four downcast exterior lights in an area of the garden/courtyard for an outdoor seating area to serve guests. The area will have brick pavers to match brick pavers located elsewhere on the Inn's property. The application also includes some string bistro lights over the outdoor seating area for aesthetic purposes during the warmer months.

The board reviewed the downcast lights and the plans submitted. Questions about visibility were raised. Neal Leitner said the lights could potentially be seen from Cross Street if one looked across the garden area of the Inn towards the corner.

The board was informed that the four lights would be dimmable and turned off at night after the restaurant and pub are closed.

Hearing no further testimony, the board thanked the representative for the Inn for the presentation.

The board discussed the application and had no objections.

A motion was made to close testimony, it was seconded.

A motion to approve the application as presented was made, it was seconded.

Motion passed 4-0.

V-3638-21; Copenhaver; applicant; 19 The Green; Parcel: 23.52.16

Zone: RLD; **Proposal: to replace existing wood fence with composite fencing**

The applicant presented the project to replace her wooden picket fence on the green with a white composite material fence. The applicant made a sample of the fence available to the board for review. The applicant stated that the existing fence gets stained by the trees with a black mold that cannot be washed off, she has to repaint the fence once a year to keep it looking fresh. She mentioned that the composite material could be cleaned without having to repaint every year.

The board thanked the applicant for her presentation. The board briefly discussed the material. Wendy Spector mentioned she has the same material for her fences and that they look great and weather nicely.

A motion was made to close testimony, it was seconded.

A motion was made to approve the application as presented. It was seconded.

Motion passed 4-0.

V-3641-21; DiNatale; applicant; Mon Vert Cafe; Parcel: 20.52.27

Zone: CC; **Proposal: Temporary Accessory Structure (Refrigeration Unit)**

Applicants Joe and Sam DiNatale introduced the project to the board. The proposal is to place a temporary refrigeration unit adjacent to the side ramp in the back portion of the alleyway where the owner of the restaurant currently parks her car. The white 8' x 10' refrigeration unit would be screened by a white wooden lattice to block the view from the street. It would be in place during the summer and fall months, to be removed by the end of October.

The board asked if the unit could be placed behind the restaurant.

Sam DiNatalie responded that it cannot go behind the building since it is very steep. The only flat area on their property for the unit is back where the dumpsters and the ramp are located, on the eastern side of the building.

A discussion ensued over the color of the unit and the writing on the side of the unit. The board asked if the writing could be screened from view. The applicant responded that they could do that with a lattice or wooden fence screening.

The board and the applicants discussed screening materials. The existing natural colored stockade style fence that screens the dumpsters was presented as an option. The other option

is to use a white lattice to screen the unit. The board discussed each option and ultimately left it up to the applicant to decide which screening fence to use.

Hearing no further testimony, a motion was made to close testimony, it was seconded.

A motion was made to approve the application as presented. I was seconded.

Motion passed 4-0.

II. OTHER BUSINESS

IV. ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:45PM