

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

OFFICES OF PLANNING COMMISSION
PO BOX 715
EAST DORSET, VT 05253-0715

TELEPHONE (802) 362-4571
FAX (802) 362-5156

DORSET DESIGN REVIEW BOARD **April 25, 2016**

Members present: Kit Wallace, (Chairman), Peter Palmer, Jim Clubb, Lindy Bowden and Arnie Gottlieb.
Also present: Glenn Callen, owner of 108 Church St with his attorney Merrill Bent; Gary Baierlein for Ed Howe, 45 Dorset Hollow Road; Beverly Buber and Leo Ledoux, owners of 3269 Route 30; Sharon Connell and Gianfranco Chiapperini, owners of 3259 Route 30. Tyler Yandow, Zoning Administrator

Minutes: R. Nawrath
Meeting started at 5:28 PM

Howe Residence: Replace existing fence with a stone wall in front of the house **45 Dorset Hollow Road**

Gary Baierlein for the applicant:

- The picket fence in front of the house will come down. It is real wood but became a maintenance issue. Will replace it with a low stone wall, 18" high.
- Will build the wall to look like the one at the Cornucopia just down the street.
- The material will be a type of granite; definitely real stone

Discussion:

Criterion 5.9: Fences and Walls: "No fences, hedges, or walls will be allowed in the Dorset Village Historic District on Church Street from Route 30 to Cheney Rd. Fences and walls will be allowed at the rear and side lots only with the DRB's approval. Fences or walls at the side lots shall not extend beyond the front of the dwelling."

- The stone wall is consistent with other landscaping on the side of 45 Dorset Hollow Road and Cornucopia provides a precedent for low stone walls in the proximate area.
- This property is not in the area on Church Street within which front fences and walls are prohibited; therefore it is allowed.

P Palmer moved we approve the application as presented for a stone wall
A Gottlieb 2nd. Approved

Buber House: add fence and deck, change doors and windows **3269 Route 30**

Beverly Buber, applicant spoke to the project

1. Add a landing/deck on the back steps made of normal decking material. 4.2.8
2. Replace single porch door with double door. 4.2.4
3. Replace picture window with true divided light window. 4.2.4
4. Replace old single pane one over one windows with 6 over 6, 4.2.4
5. Add a fence on the north side between Dorset Exchange and the Buber home and along the south side and along the driveway which will enclose the yard. 5.9 (only applies to Church St).

Discussion:

1. Deck relates to **Criterion 4.2.8**: “New porches, decks or entrances may be introduced only on non-character defining elevations and must be attached in ways that minimize the loss of historic fabric.” 14’ x 9’ deck on back is not visible from anywhere except their own back yard and is small enough that it is essentially a landing. Proposed deck conforms to this criterion.
- 2,3,4 Replacing porch door, picture windows, and one over one windows with materials recycled from house at entrance to Lower Hollow Road (which was demolished recently and contained doors and windows from the early part of the 1900’s). **Criterion 4.2.4**: “New exterior wall features, including doors, windows... may be introduced only on non-character-defining elevations. Such feature must be located so that they do not diminish the original character of the historic structure or damage historic wall materials.” Porch door and window replacements are true divided light design, which is required in the historic district, and these conform to this criterion.
5. **Criterion 5.9**: Fences and Walls Criterion (see previous application) Fences will match those approved last year for Sharon Connell at 3259 Route 30, next door. Fence criteria do not apply to Route 30 and these fences are not across the front of the house.

A. Gotlieb moved to approve the application as presented. L. Bowden 2nd . Approved

Sharon Connell: Add retractable awning, add railing to deck
3259 Route 30

Sharon Connell, applicant spoke to the project

- The patio in the back of the house gets a lot of sun. They would like to install a retractable awning on the side of the house to shield the patio from the sun.
- The awning will not be open all the time, for the material is not supposed to be out in the rain.
- Discussion of color. Applicant’s original choice of yellow is too bright for, according to the criteria, the awnings are to be “appropriate in color and style”.
- The Sunbrella natural white is the best, although the DRB also suggested a black/gray/white striped awning. (The day after the meeting, Sharon notified the chair that the natural white color didn’t match the house. They asked if they could revert to the black, grey and white color proposed at the meeting. The chair contacted each member of the DRB, all of whom agreed to this change.)
- Size: 17' x 11' 8"

Add a railing onto the north side of the house on the porch

- White with 1 3/8" wood spindles
- 9’ 4” wide and 30” tall

Discussion

- Awning relates to **Criterion 4.2.7**: “If desired and historically appropriate in color and style, fabric awnings over windows, entrances, or porch openings may be installed in a way that does not damage or obscure historic features.”
- The awning conforms to this criterion.
- Porch railing related to **Criterion 5.5.4**: Molded or shaped rails with turned, jig sawn or square balusters are preferred.’ This railing conforms to this criterion.

Motion: J. Clubb moved: to approve the awning as presented (with the color of the awning since changed as mentioned above) and the railing as presented. L. Bowden 2nd . Approved

Callen 'Old Manse' Renovations
108 Church Street

Glenn Callen, applicant with Merrill Bent, attorney spoke to the project. They submitted a new application in which they listed completed projects which had been approved by the DRB on 5/20/15 and also submitted a new design for front porch columns to replace both the originally approved column design and the columns which Mr. Callen installed in violation of the original permit.

. G. Callen already had approval for the following, which have been completed:

- Replace porch roof with standing seam roof
- Replace storm windows to conform
- Remove solid wall below porch railing

The applicant met with Jed Pellerin, local architect who said the square columns which Mr. Callen originally constructed do not fit the character of the house. Mr. Pellerin asserts that he has built many buildings in the Shingle, Victorian and Dutch Colonial styles similar to 108 Church Street and that round, tapered columns supporting the roof are appropriate. He therefore suggests and Mr. Callen requests the following:

- Replace original shingled columns with round columns

Glenn made a presentation about what he wants to do to his house, saying that he only wants to improve what is already a beautiful street. He indicated that other houses on Church Street have undergone significant changes (specifically referencing the Hathaway house porch renovation in 2000 and the current work being done at 86 Church Street) and his changes were not as significant as these.

- J. Clubb spoke about the difference with the two projects:
 1. 86 Church Street discovered structural deficiencies after their application was approved, and immediately ceased work and came back to the DRB with a revised application to remove the damaged areas and to reconstruct the building *exactly* as was approved in the initial application.
 2. The Hathaway porch renovation of 2000 involved removing Victorian columns (which were not original to the house but were rather added years after the house was constructed) and replacing them with square columns more in keeping with the overall design of the house and its historic era.
 3. The project at 108 Church Street was not similar to either of those projects. What happened was the following:
 - In the initial approved permit, shingled columns with a distinctive curve at the top were to remain the same. This represented a compromise hammered out at a very long meeting which involved changes to a variety of facets of the house.
 - The builders found rot in the columns.
 - They decided to change the shape of the columns to their originally proposed square ones, which had been rejected by the DRB at the May 20, 2015 meeting.
 - The applicant acknowledges that he should have come back to the DRB but says that he didn't think it was a big deal at the time.

Further discussion

- Applicant asserts that the letter from Kit Wallace of February 5, 2016 asking that the process be "rebooted" meant that the initial permit was moot and therefore the applicant could start from scratch. Kit Wallace noted that the rest of the paragraph with the "reboot" line referred to the process followed by the applicant at 86 Church Street in which a detailed revised application was submitted which did not change any approved design elements, merely requesting that some of those elements be removed

and replaced to allow for structural integrity. She further stated that allowing such a definition of “reboot” would mean that any applicant could ignore an initial permit, build what they wanted, and then submit a revised application based upon that as-built structure. That would effectively make the DRB an ineffectual board with no authority.

- Jim Clubb indicated that he felt both the DRB and the Town of Dorset have an obligation and even potential liability if the rules of the Historic District are not enforced. He particularly identified homes recently purchased and what has been invested in renovations on Church Street around the Callen residence. Clubb cited the current project to the East of the Callen property, the Whalen/Thompson home across the street, and the Colony House. Clubb indicated that there are numerous studies indicating that homes in historic districts retain and increase in value faster than those not in historic districts and how existence of rules and enforcement of these rules contribute to this economic result..
- The tapered, round columns referenced by Mr. Pellerin were appropriate for new construction of shingled houses, but do not fit with the historical architecture of 108 Church Street. The entire house has very specific, detailed features relating to the shingled style which, taken together, make this structure unique in the village.
- Not only did Mr. Callen change the shape of the front porch columns, but he also replaced the distinctive curved shingled edges of the porch on the east and west ends with flat modern trim boards and he removed from the front porch exterior the saw tooth herringbone feature which wraps around the entire house.
- The original permit expressly says to keep the original columns and said nothing about changing other features of the porch.
- Once rot was discovered, subsequent changes would fall under repair and maintenance **Criterion 4.1.1**: ‘Repairs must replace in-kind deteriorated or damaged features to match the original in design, size, shape, material, dimension, pattern, texture, color and detail.’
- **Criterion 4.2.4**: ‘New exterior wall features...may be introduced only on non-character defining elevations.’
- In light of the above, the DRB requires the applicant to comply with the originally approved permit.

The board was in consensus that the application as presented today be denied.

G. Callen asked what the next step would be. T Yandow said he would have to consult with the Town Attorney for clarification.

A Gottlieb moved that we deny the application in its entirety - the decision was already made on the original application, which was ratified by the Planning Commission.

P Palmer 2nd. Discussion: K. Wallace: We can deny it because we feel the new application does not meet the Criteria. The Board unanimously approved the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Kit Wallace, Chairman

cc: T. Yandow, and the Design Review Board Members, Glenn Callen, Merrill Bent, Beverly Buber, Gary Baierlein, Sharon Connell.