



# Village of Manchester, Vermont

## **Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Development Review Board Held July 6, 2022 at 10:00am**

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

**Member(s) Absent:**

**Others Present:** Zoning Administrative Officer Curan VanDerWielen, President of the Board of Trustees Orland Campbell, Greg Boshart, Owen Pritchard

The meeting was held both in person at the Village Offices and via Zoom.

Chair Craig Powers called the meeting to order at 10:01am.

### **Applications:**

- 22-30** Owen Pritchard, representative agent for Margaret Pritchard, owner of 3746 Main Street. The application regarded a demolition of the main structure at 3746 Main Street.

Chair Craig Powers began by introducing the permit application, noting that not all of the required materials had been provided yet by the applicant. VanDerWielen then commented that the DRB may consider deferring the application to a later date, given his understanding of the circumstances and progress of the proposed project.

Pritchard now spoke, stating that he understood the logic behind the application's deferral, but wished to speak on a few items regarding the application. Pritchard started by stating that the structure to replace that being demolished would be designed by David Mooney, a local architect, and that while he had explored salvaging the existing structure, its state of disrepair was unsalvageable. Pritchard then described the damaged structure, including extensive water damage, several damaged structural beams, and a hole in the center of the structure reaching from the roof down to the first floor. Pritchard continued, stating that the contractor he had hired to appraise the status of the building had come to a similar conclusion, and that the plan was to perform a demolition and replacement construction to copy the subject structure. Pritchard differentiated this from the rear structure, which he stated was approaching completion and would not be as prominently visible from the street at the forward structure. Pritchard continued, stating that he was the lead on the project and was excited to be working on it with several friends of his.

Powers stated that he believed the structure to be located in the Historic Core District, and that much tighter bylaw restrictions would apply to that lot. Powers mentioned some concern that the structure may appear on the National Historic Register, and further state

or federal restrictions may apply to its alteration or demolition. VanDerWielen commented he believed that either state or federal involvement could occur depending on the status of the structure, and then told Pritchard that they should probably schedule a time to tour the site together. Powers commented that historic structures can often be complex in their permitting, before stating that the Board would like to see a full site plan and elevations before approving the permit, in addition to professional certification by either an architect or engineer that it was not cost effective for the structure to be fixed or maintained rather than be demolished.

Pritchard commented that if someone were to walk into the building, they would find a hole from the first floor up to the ceiling, and that contractors he had already spoken with had already verified that the building was too damaged to salvage. Powers commented that some work had been done in years previous to which Pritchard responded that this had been undertaken by the previous owners. Powers then stated that while the Village would probably be happy to have the subject structure replaced with something else, given its state. Powers then suggested that the Board table the application, for now. Pritchard expressed concern that the application was being withdrawn. VanDerWielen indicated that the application would be deferred, not withdrawn. Powers then stated to Pritchard that upon receiving new designs and additional materials and perhaps a written statement of intent, they could review the permit next month. Pritchard indicated that he could provide such documentation for next month. Powers added that Pritchard should reach out to state and federal agencies to double check on the items discussed during the meeting. Pritchard thanked the Board.

**22-32** Greg Boshart, representative agent for Alex Dichter and Sue Wheeler, owners of 1166 West Road. The application regarded the demolition of an accessory structure used as a garage and greenhouse and a front porch, and the construction of a new accessory garage attached to the main structure via a connector hallway, the expansion of the kitchen area of the main structure, and the planting of one tree. The permit application had already been recommended by the DAC during the week prior.

Powers introduced the permit application, before stating that he was aware that Donald Brodie was a previous owner and resident of the subject structure, and thought it necessary to inform the applicant to ensure that they were comfortable with his participation. Boshart responded that he was confident that Brodie would be objective and that his input would be valuable for the project.

Boshart began his presentation by introducing the provided site plan, indicating that it showed the full extent of the property and highlighting specifically where the existing garage to be demolished was located, in addition to several other structures on the site. Boshart then pointed to and described the tree cover which screened the property from the road before proceeding to depict an image of the existing main structure. Boshart continued, describing the existing design details of the house before stating that part of the demolition project would also include the front deck in an effort to 'bump out' part

of the present kitchen, to make room internally for the connector to the planned new garage structure. Boshart transitioned to describe the existing garage and greenhouse to be demolished, noting a structural failing of the roof and lack of additional living space as key reasons for the demolition. Boshart then moved on to the proposed front elevations for the main structure, describing how the horizontal cedar siding to be used on the home would match that on the garage, except it would be mounted vertically on the latter. The roof on the new garage would be a standing seam metal incorporating as much from the existing garage as possible. Boshart continued, describing the color to be used as a lighter grey to match the existing design details of the home and the new garage doors to match the color of the roof. Three additional downlit lighting sconces would be added too, adjacent to the new doors and a tree would be planted in front of one of the kitchen windows to break up the extended home while preserving accessibility to natural light, internally.

Powers asked Boshart if the drawings of the connector to the garage consisted of all windows or if any doors were to be included. Boshart responded that they were all windows in the drawing, which would have a view of the gardens on the property. Boshart then indicated that the planned footprint was depicted on the second site plan drawing provided, describing how the connector was originally to be avoided by became necessary due to the creation of additional living space on the second floor of the planned garage.

Powers then indicated that the Design Advisory Committee (DAC) had recommended the project before opening the floor up to questions. Renee Waller commented that the connecting doors did not look appropriate, and that perhaps they were too contemporary compared to the rest of the structure, before suggesting that the applicant review possible alternatives. Waller continued, commenting that she believed the deck looked good. Boshart stated that some design details had been selected on purpose to create some contrast in the design. Donald Brodie asked if this was why certain design details had been selected in the manner they were presented. Boshart responded that it was indeed, intending to compliment one another and not clash. Brodie followed up, commenting that while he resided there, there had been a connector between the home and garage that he had demolished. Boshart commented that the different location of the new garage had made it now necessary and less extensive than the original. Powers then asked whether the structure sat in the Preservation Overlay or General Review Design Review Sub-District. VanDerWielen responded that it was within the General Review Sub-District, with an almost 400ft setback from the road. Brodie then commented that it was an old house from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Orland Campbell now asked Boshart about what he had termed 'living space', asking specifically that if it was intended to be used as a dwelling then additional information on the septic system may be necessary. Boshart responded that the intention was not to use the space as a bedroom, and that by living space he had been referring to additional office and game room space. Campbell stated that that resolved his concern, and thought

that it was appropriate to check. Powers then asked the Boshart intended to start the project, to which Boshart responded that he wished to begin as soon as next week, should the application be approved. Powers commented that there was a 15 day appeal period during which work could not begin. Boshart stated that he understood, and would therefore only coordinate preparations before beginning in two weeks.

There being no further questions from the Board, Tom Deck motioned to approve the permit application. Jack Morris seconded the motion. The DRB then approved the permit application with six votes in favor and Brodie abstaining.

**Public Comments:**

There being no further business before the Board, Powers closed the meeting at 10:25am.

The next regular meeting of the Development Review Board will be held on August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022, at 10:00am.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Curan VanDerWielen, Zoning Administrative Officer