

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

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

TELEPHONE (802) 362-4571

FAX (802) 362-5156

DORSET DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

December 21, 2020

Members present: Kit Wallace, Chair, Arnie Gottlieb, Jim Clubb, Lindy Bowden, Michelle Pagán and Ruth Tanenhaus (Alternate, nonvoting).

Also present: Tyler Yandow, Zoning Administrator; Rob Gaiotti, Town Manager; Ryan Foster, architect for the homeowner; Mr. and Mrs. John Harding, applicants; Gay Squire from the Planning Commission and Attorney Merrill Bent, interested party.

Minutes: R. Nawrath

Chair K. Wallace opened the meeting at 5:35 PM via Zoom

Application: Agricultural and Rural Residential:

Mr. and Mrs. John Harding: Renovations to the Carriage House
3142 Dorset West Road

K. Wallace asked the applicants and architect to give us an overview.

R. Foster is the architect for the project.

- J. Harding: The building is 100 years old. This project will involve renovations to a 2-bedroom, 2 bathroom existing carriage house. The existing foundation of the main portion of the building will remain, the existing north side shed roof addition will be reconstructed as a 1 ½ story addition using the existing footprint but with a new foundation. The existing slate roof will be salvaged, and all new roofing will be new slate to match the existing roof.

R. Foster, architect:

- The defining features of this building are the arched garage doors and the bird cut-outs on the shutters. The intention is to keep the Dorset green color for the shutters and the bird cutout of the shutters.
- On the west side there is a nice arched window that will be replicated and installed on the east side over new sliding glass doors.
- Off the back (north side) is a shed addition which will be removed. We will match the existing footprint of the shed but install a new foundation for a 1 ½ story gable end addition which will be more in line with the character of the building.
- On the south side, the arched garage doors will be repaired and restored, but will be fixed in place. We will restore the shutters on the south side, replace the windows and put on new siding.
- We are replacing all windows with like windows.
- The entrance with the sliding glass doors will face away from the West Road towards the main house.

Question: Are garage doors used now?

Answer: They are functional and swing outward. They will be restored but fixed in place with an insulated wall inside. The trim, hardware and windows will remain the same.

Question: Will the replacement windows be the same size and configuration?

Answer: Main windows on front: yes. Windows on back are similar proportions but not exactly the same. The overall opening is the same.

R. Foster: What is being removed is non-historic and non-conforming and is being replaced with an historic look.

Question: Regarding the windows: Will they be casement windows instead of double-hung windows?

The character defining window is the arched window. Plus the garage doors are character defining.

Should the windows be 6 over 6 as are the only 2 double hung windows on the building?

Answer: J. Harding: I'll leave it up to the committee as to which windows would be preferable. Six over six instead of casement could work. There was a fair amount of discussion regarding windows, openings, historical character, etc.

Question; Now, how about shutters? Would you consider putting shutters on the windows that we are discussing. You could use the same bird cutout design.

Answer: J. Harding: That is fine with us.

A. Gottlieb: Can we approve this project pending receipt of the window specs? I'd suggest that.

Question: J. Clubb: In considering the windows, do you have adequate egress? Is this for rentals? Any safety issues?

Answer: J. Harding: It's ok. The original elements will remain intact, while non-original elements are removed.

Several questions about what windows we are talking about and whether they should be casements or double-hung windows.

J. Harding: We don't have strong feelings about these windows except for the size. Let's do the work. Let's get the next level of detail.

G. Squires commented that this project looks good.

Criteria in question:

- 9.4.4.2
#12: New additions must be compatible with the historic building in massing, height, form scale, proportions, roof shape and relationship of solids to voids in exterior walls. New additions must also be compatible with the historic structure in terms of the placement, spacing, proportion, orientation, scale, and size of window and door openings. Windows and doors should be the same in configuration, material, and detail with the windows and doors of the historic building and the materials and finishes characteristic of the historic building with regard to scale, composition, module, texture, pattern, detail, color, and surface finish.
- #11: *New additions may be added on non-character defining elevations in such a manner as not to visually over-power the historic structure and the structure's historic setting. New additions must be consistent with the historic building*

J. Harding: The character defining elevations are the garage doors and the arch window. These garage doors are modeled after the historic garage doors on our house.

The house is structurally failing so: Improve or Remove! We are flexible with our schedule because of the current situation of the current marketplace and the trades.

K. Wallace:

Windows: 6 over 6 double-hung would have smaller window panes than casements. More discussion. The three windows on the north facing side and one on the west are the ones in question - 4 windows.

Arnie Gottlieb moved that we accept the project as presented, provided the 4 casement windows on the north elevation be reviewed at a later date by the DRB when the owner and architect can present us with specs and options.

Jim Clubb 2nd

Motion carries.

Next issue – past decisions and enforcement:

T. Yandow's memo in re: 40 Cheney Road. (**Attach Tyler's memo to the minutes.**)

The overhang of the garage at 40 Cheney Road wasn't built how the board and the PC approved it. T.

Yandow's opinion on the final version of the house is that it doesn't rise to the level of a violation as it does not significantly deviate from what was approved.

With respect to the garage lighting, which was also not approved, J. Clubb expressed his concern that, just because there are other houses with this style lighting, it doesn't mean that they were properly permitted.

There was quite a bit of discussion having to do with projects that aren't built to what was specified in the original application. A comment was made by an attendee (lawyer) that something is either permitted or not.

J. Clubb:

The problem is when people have finished things, it's expensive to fix. This is a case in point: make sure, once a product is approved, that is it being built as permitted (do not wait to review until it is finished). The correct procedure for an applicant is this: if in the process of construction you need to make changes to your approved application, you must go back to the DRB and request a modification. (Example of applicant who did this: Daniels on Church Road)

J. Clubb also asked about the Raspe's lights. What is happening there?

T. Yandow: nothing is happening with the Raspe's. The PC denied the Raspe's light application so the lights they installed are not permitted. The fixtures have not been removed, but they could be capped. T. Yandow said the actual fixtures, when not lit, do not compromise the historic character of the property.

R. Gaiotti, Town Manager, summarized:

You have to formally request in writing (letter or email) that the ZA investigate perceived violations from approved applications. The board can make a request, as can individuals, neighbors, etc. If you don't like a decision, you can appeal it. Generally, enforcement is tough and difficult and there is a formal process.

The Zoning Administrator has the job to issue a notice of violation when he sees a problem.

Enforcement left to ZA; appeal to Zoning Board of Adjustment; then to the Environmental Court.

Also, a neighbor can request a determination from the ZA.

Raspe's? Do we need another letter to them? The ZA would be the one to send the letter to them regarding removing their lights.

There was a lot of discussion on enforcement.

The final word is that any citizen can contact the Zoning Administrator and discuss whether they should appeal the decision of the Planning Commission (the DRB only advises the PC). With respect to 40 Cheney Road, Tyler's memo is on file and it would be up to an individual to follow the formal process to contest what the ZA has deemed to be an insignificant change to what was approved by the DRB and the PC.

Lindy: did the letter about the need to comply with the criteria go out to all residents in the Design District?
Rob: It's in the mail today!

The Planning Commission is going to go over the section of the by-laws concerning the DRB at the February meeting. Each of the DRB members should review the revised Criteria and we will meet with the consultants prior to the February PC meeting.

A. Gottlieb moved we adjourn
J. Clubb 2nd
Adjournment: 6:55 PM

Kit Wallace, Chair