



Village of Manchester, Vermont

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Development Review Board Held on the 6th day of October 2021.

Members Present: Chair Craig Powers, Vice Chair Tom Deck, Donald Brodie, Gordon McClellan, Renee Waller, Dana McCloskey, Jack Morris

Member(s) Absent: None

Others Present: Orland Campbell, Audrey Kolloff, Mike Pugliese, Elise Redmond, Ryan Foster, Ramsay Gourd, Pat McManus, Jennifer Woolf, Administrative Officer

Chair Powers called the meeting to order at 10:01 A.M.

Minutes:

Approve the draft minutes of the September 1st meeting.

On a motion by Morris, seconded by McCloskey, the Development Review Board voted to approve the minutes of the September 1st meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Applications:

21-34, Whitney and Aliza Kraft, 282 Ways Lane: Addition/Alteration.

Woolf went over the DAC criteria for approval which recommended approval for the project. Mike Pugliese of Peter Conrad Construction presented on behalf of the Krafts. Pugliese presented the plan to renovate the dilapidated Barn on the property to turn it into a two-bay garage with a living space above it. The only proposed change to the footprint of the structure would be the exterior stairs which are to be placed on the backside of the structure to maintain curb appeal. Pugliese presented color and material samples: The body and trim are to be painted "Chrome Green" in an attempt to match the aesthetic of the "Perkins Barn" and the standing seam roof is to be a "Dark Bronze". Pugliese presented a letter of approval and encouragement from the neighbors as the barn sits very close to the property line.

Brodie asked if the structure was going to be used solely as a garage, Pugliese answered that it will also be a living space for family. Brodie asked if the structure will have running water, Pugliese answered that they are hopeful about being able to connect to the water and septic systems used by the main house but at the present time are planning on constructing without running water and will go through the proper permitting processes when the time comes to add water and septic to the structure. Morris specified the property's location within the preservation overlay and stated that the bylaws prefer homes within the preservation overlay to be white or subtle colors, which the presented "Chrome Green" is not.

Brodie made a motion to accept, seconded by Waller, the Development Review Board voted to approve. Motion passed unanimously.

21-36, Elise Redmond, 57 Taconic Road: Alteration

Woolf went over the DAC criteria for approval which recommended approval for the project conditional upon presentation (and acceptance by the board) of a color palette. The DAC also recommended that the applicant present a landscaping plan as well as a plan for any outdoor

lighting. Ryan Foster presented the historic restoration of the home with Elise Redmond present to answer any questions presented to her as the homeowner. Foster explained that the goal of the alteration is to restore the historic home to its former glory and that only minor exterior alterations would be made and that those alterations would not detract from the home's historic nature. Foster explained the minor alterations mostly being the removal of "sleeping porches" which are blocking original historic features of the home, like the chimney and the arched window near the top of the home. Foster also explained the most significant alteration, the addition of a garage which would replace a sleeping porch and deck but maintain the roofline. The aforementioned porch would provide parking that is not visible from the road, something that does not exist at the present time.

Foster presented the plan to replace most of the windows for the purpose of energy efficiency and insulation however a few key windows would be retained due to their historic nature. The home's original historic roofline would be restored with the main entry stair (facing Rt. 7) with the removal of a sleeping porch. The Port Cochere (car port) would be slightly altered to fit modern-sized cars but the exterior of it would remain the same, the only alteration being the changing location of the stairs. The chimney is to be restored to its historic glory with the removal of a sleeping porch. The porch facing Rt. 7, will be extended towards the rear of the house creating a 3-season indoor/outdoor space, the planned porch addition will maintain the current roofline and will just extend that, that addition will create a "backyard" that is on grade.

Foster explained that at the present time there is no landscaping plan, nor an outdoor lighting plan, however they will come in due time. Foster stated that the landscaping plan will attempt to match the landscaping that can be seen in the historic photos of the property. Foster presented the historic photos of the property.

Brodie asked for clarification on the district, Woolf specified historic core. Powers asked for colors and materials. Foster presented the color palette ("Stillwater lightened 75%") and explained that in the historic photos of the house, even though they are black and white, you can see a 3 tone color palette, Foster believes that the use of the aforementioned color will achieve that desired 3 tone look that can be seen in the historic photos. *the color is a blue-gray*. Foster explained that the roof will match the currently used materials of slate (color will be matched as closely as possible) and flat seam copper will be added where there is currently a flat seamed metal roof. Woolf asked if there were any additional color palettes to present as recommended by the DAC, Foster answered that the only color being presented was the "Stillwater 75% lighter" to create the desired 3 tone contrasting look. Redmond commented that the proposed color will compliment the "grey weathered look" of the Carriage House on the property. Brodie asked if this will be the family's main residence as opposed to the carriage house which has an intended use of AirBNB, Redmond answered that her large family will utilize the house well and the carriage house, being smaller, will be a terrific, easily livable, space in their old age. Redmond clarified that the carriage house was never intended to be an AirBNB. Brodie asked if the proposed addition is allowed in the Historic Core. Powers stated that the bylaws relating to the historic core state that additions are allowed as long as they are "non-character defining elevations". Unbiased architect Ramsay Gourd commented that it appears to fit the requirement described by Powers. Powers stated his opinion that removing the sleeping porches, which were common in the 1920's and 1930's will restore the home to its *true* historic character.

Powers requested that Foster and/or Redmond come back to the board with landscaping and outdoor lighting plans. Brodie made a motion to approve, seconded by Morris, the Development Review Board voted to approve. Motion passed unanimously.

21-38, Phillip and Carol Goldsmith, 251 West Fields: Addition

Woolf went over the DAC criteria for approval which recommended approval for the project. Ramsay Gourd presented the plan to build a 16x16 screen porch addition on the Goldsmith's home. Gourd stated that the home and proposed addition are well within the required setbacks and the addition will not be visible from any public streets. Gourd stated that the roof pitches and materials will match those existing and the porch will use a charcoal grey, fiberglass, heavy-duty, pet-proof screen. Gourd stated that there will be no landscaping or exterior lighting related to this project.

Brodie asked if the HOA has approved the proposed addition. Powers clarified the property's existence in the general review district.

Waller made a motion to accept, seconded by McCloskey, the Development Review Board voted to approve. Motion passed unanimously.

21-28, Adnrew and Marguerite Putney, 1083 West Road: New Construction

Pat McManus of Suncommon presented the proposed solar canopy installation. Brodie asked why the application was not brought to the DAC as it appears to be a structure, Woolf responded that as it was presented to her as a ground-mounted solar installation it did not need to go to the DAC. McManus stated that the canopy will serve a dual purpose as a double-bay covered parking structure that will not be very visible from the road (if at all) and will be tucked away behind the house. Brodie stated his thoughts that as a structure it should have gone through the DAC and the Planning Commission's energy group should have been consulted. Brodie stated that the site plan is not clear and neighbors should be notified as it is such a massive structure. Morris questioned the height of the structure and asked if it is necessary for the solar utility or is the height driven by the desire to add parking spaces below, McManus replied that the height is driven by the desire to add parking spaces below. Deck requested a clarification of bylaws regarding this. Waller stated that she believes this application needs to go to the Planning Commission. McClellan stated that he supports solar but this has a huge footprint, therefore he supports the idea but has concerns. McManus stated his beliefs that this is more attractive than traditional ground-mounted solar. McClellan asked if this would be a full offset for the home or only partial, McManus responded that this is net-metered and the Putney's energy needs may change in the future but at the present time he estimates it will cover 80% of the property's energy usage. McClellan asked why this canopy and not solar shingles, McManus answered that a solar roof is expensive and very intensive to install as it is a young technology. McCloskey asked if the primary purpose is parking or solar, McManus answered that by elevating the panels it provides dual-use even though it is a utility. Woolf stated that the application does not explain the "dual-use" and that it was described solely as a solar installation. Powers clarified the bylaws that state solar installations cannot be limited or regulated, however as a structure this project should go through the DAC. Powers raised concern about solar glare on northbound neighbors, McManus replied that the solar panels face south so that is not an issue. Powers stated that he just wants to assure adequate neighbor and road screening, McManus commented that additional screening could inhibit the amount of sun the panels receive and therefore decrease their effectiveness. Orland Campbell, member of the public stated that Vermont State Laws need to be looked at as this may be protected and state law always comes before village bylaws, furthermore as the Planning Commission has not yet created any bylaws regarding this State Law must be considered. Powers asked Audrey Kolloff, member of the public and chair of the Planning Commission to share any knowledge she may have regarding the state laws on a situation like this. Kolloff stated that the PUC (Public Utility Commission) is the final word on solar installations and the village can only hope that their input is considered. Kolloff stated that this being a structure it should have gone to the DAC and elevations would be useful especially since the Putney's property borders the Southern Vermont Arts Center. Kolloff compared the proposed structure to the one recently built at the Crooked

Ram restaurant with the only difference being that the proposed structure has solar panels on it. Powers asked McManus if he had gone to the PUC yet, McManus answered that he had approval from the PUC and a certificate of public good, however neither were presented to the Board. McManus explained that he received this PUC approval last winter and only had a year to complete the installation with no option for extension, since the installation is net-metered waiting longer would hurt the customer financially. McManus was asked why he is seeking a permit in October if he received PUC approval last winter. Powers requested an improvement of the presentation by the applicant including a better site plan, a landscaping plan, and elevations. McManus was given 3 options for proceeding: 1) table the vote until next month's DRB meeting, 2) have the board vote now, or 3) withdraw his application; McManus decided to table the hearing until next month.

Brodie made a motion to table the discussion until next month's meeting, seconded by Morris, the Development Review Board voted to table the discussion until next month's meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business:

There being no other business, Powers closed the meeting at 11:49 A.M.