

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

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

**DORSET DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**  
**June 15, 2020**

Members present: Kit Wallace, Chair, Arnie Gottlieb, Jim Clubb, Michelle Pagán and Ruth Tanenhaus

Absent: Lindy Bowden

Also present: Tyler Yandow, Zoning Administrator, Rob Gaiotti, Town Manager, Kevin O'Toole for Michael Smith and Michael Smith, the Applicant.

Minutes: R. Nawrath

Chair K. Wallace opened the meeting at 5:32 PM via Zoom

**(Continuation) Request for Amendment: Village Residential and Design Overlay District Permit 002-2020BU-Garage Door Design Michael Smith-Applicant and Owner 40 Cheney Road**

Kevin O'Toole representing the applicant

- The drawing I sent this afternoon is not new. Any reference to Bob Escher is deleted.
- There are two alternative garage designs. The DRB wanted more finished schematic designs.
  - First one has two rows of windows with the top one arched in shape. This will allow more light to come in. Archway is 8'6" and the Smith's prefer this design.
  - Second drawing has one set of rectangular windows.
- We tried to answer questions by having drawings for each design.

Comments:

- A. Gottlieb: He was looking at Criterion 9.4.4.2: Alterations and Additions: 'it is not allowed to add cover, or remove a window or door opening on an historic structure's character-defining elevations unless required for an accurate restoration...' I have the feeling that we went too far.
- He quoted "It is not allowed to remove a window or door opening in an historic structure". We are obviously past that. I mentioned this before: I've never been bothered with the roll up idea of the garage doors. Because of snow we cannot insist on open or swing-out doors. If we are going to have roll ups; we must adhere as much as we can to the original doors. Each door is essentially a square door with 4 windows in each. I am hesitant to allow a change to arched windows especially. It will drastically change the look of the historic door.
- The historical references to the front of the house are important. I know replicating exactly the windows is difficult as we do not have the materials that were available a century ago.
- K. O'Toole: the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternative was meant to be closer to what was there originally. He mentioned that the building he is in has a flat roof. That's a 100-year-old mistake!
- M. Pagán: I feel the same way as Arnie does. Is it the plan to use mahogany? Answer: Yes. Can you hire a craftsman to make the right thing? An exact copy? To the DRB: it seems to me, our job here is to maintain the things so that 100 years from now, we look pretty much the way things are now. You can wreck things, bit by bit and they really shouldn't be there. Our job is to make sure this doesn't happen. Why can't you hire a craftsman to make an exact replica?

- K. O'Toole: as it stands, this plan costs a lot more. We are working with a door company. We are going back to white doors, as they were shown to be white in historical photos.
- J. Clubb: the doors were green when the design district was formed. This discussion sounds like the Callen's house, where the Callen's changed the columns (against our explicit refusal) because they did not "like the look of them". We made the client change the columns back to the original design.
  - He cited the criteria again about do not "add, cover, or remove a window or door opening."
  - K. Wallace: Yes. These criteria are what we have to go by.
  - K. O'Toole: The New Jersey company we spoke to does not do sectional doors, so it was a non-starter.
  - M. Smith: swing-out doors are extremely expensive. The garage door company has to do their own building. No craftsman could do it. The catalogues don't have anything similar to what was here originally.
- A. Gottlieb: in re: Kevin's building: when the historic district rules were instituted, it was to make sure things did not go awry. So, now we are in a different time and need to maintain this historic district.
- M. Smith: we cannot find a company to make the doors we need. (BTW: Historic districts can be revoked!) \$15,000 is cost of Rutland Door company creating the doors proposed..
- J. Clubb: the person who built my garage doors was great. I will give him that name.
- A. Gottlieb: If we cannot make these, make them all solid, have someone cut in the windows, and it might be cheaper.
- M. Smith: bears some looking into:
- A. Gottlieb: the windows can be a hair bigger to fit the larger size of the doors.
- K. Wallace: if you look at the house today, the windows are taller than wider: Do they mimic the doors?
- M. Smith: I am not sure you can cut into a door that is made.
- T. Yandow: you really cannot cut windows into an already made door. In re: making a custom door: because there are roll up doors with mechanical parts, you cannot just ask someone to make a door and ask someone else to attach the mechanics to it. You will be restricted by the height of each of the panels. More discussion on panels and cutting into an already fabricated door.
- K. Wallace: can we look into this? Find out if the company can make this. Can the windows fit into one of the panels? Perhaps. Overhead Door Company would need to do an actual drawing of what they propose and give it to us.
- M. Smith: the second drawing comes closer.
- K. Wallace: the look is horizontal rather than vertical. I am concerned that if we let this go and change a character defining part of the house, someone else will come forward with more changes to their house and point to this as something already approved.
- K. O'Toole: How does the rest of the board feel? This board is advisory to the Planning Commission. My client has taken quite a bit of time and perhaps we should have some resolution of this tonight?
- M. Pagán: I can put you into contact with a local guy who specializes in restorations of old houses.
- K. O'Toole: do you, Michael, want to have the board consider this now? Or wait again? You can have the board take a vote now, then go to the Planning Commission and state your case to them and see what they approve.
- A. Gottlieb: As it stands now is it currently our position to have a roll up door? Last meeting everything was tabled.
- K. Wallace: As it stands now, we have permitted a one piece pivot door. We can change it. Are we at a one piece door? Yes.

- J. Clubb: go to Planning Commission? According to the criteria, we cannot approve what is put forward to us now. We can approve replacing like with like: We have never deviated from requiring the window configurations to be the same.
- A. Gottlieb: Kevin, do you want us to vote now or wait?
- K. O'Toole: suggested to Michael: if the board were to table this now it would afford me time to gather more information. Or we ask for a Yea or Nay.
- K. Wallace: I would be willing to see a drawing and have a special meeting. When you buy into the Historic District, you have to maintain the historic nature of the house. Michael? Are you willing to table and wait? M. Smith: yes.
- K. Wallace: Kevin and Michael will talk to the person Michelle suggested.
- J. Clubb: if you keep the windows proportional, you might be able to slot the windows in. He will give the name of his artisans.
- M. Smith: We welcome that. This issue is tabled for now to give us a bit more time.

Motion: Arnie: Move to table

Kit: 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Approved unanimously

**Application: Village Residential: Enlarge existing deck and enclose as a screen porch-Applicant and Owner - Shelly Buber and Robert Krivicich**  
**3444 VT Route 30**

Shelly and Robert spoke to the project:

- They want to convert a 12'x24' deck to a screened-in porch. They will replace some steps on the front and side porch which are now concrete and replace with wood, which is more in keeping with the historical district.. They will put in two skylights as well.
- The original size is 12'.5" X 24'.5" and the new size is 16'.5" X 24'.5".
- This is a back porch and part of a side porch.
- Criteria 9.4.4.2: “ New porches, decks or entrances may be introduced only on non-character defining elevations...” This is not a character defining elevation. It is not visible from Route 30.
- A. Gottlieb: (he is their neighbor) It is virtually impossible to see this from the street. It's a no-brainer.
- K. Wallace: will the roof line match the roof line of the side porch?
- S. Buber: Yes. It will look a bit like a wrap around. Screened porches are a bit more historical than decks. We will remove the cement steps at both porches and make the new ones with wood. The side porch is part of the 1910 addition. The roof in the application is slate, but they are requesting that shingles be allowed. shingles should be architectural grade for the roof.
- K. Wallace: It is possible to get architectural grade shingles for the roof, which look more like slate., This is what we recommend (we cannot require this). You may use traditional shingles as it replaces like with like.

Arnie moves we approve the application with the change that it will not be a slate roof and may be shingles instead of slate as proposed.

M. Pagán 2<sup>nd</sup>: Approved unanimously

Arnie moved to adjourn, Jim 2<sup>nd</sup> . Adjournment: 6:35 PM

Kit Wallace, Chair