

**NOTICE OF DECISION  
TOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD**

**APPLICATION:** T-3824-07  
**APPLICANT:** Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont  
**LISTER'S NUMBER:** 31.02.15.  
**LOCATION:** 473 Woodstock Road

On May 22, 2007 at 7:30 P.M. in the Village of Woodstock, the Town of Woodstock Development Review Board held a duly noticed final public hearing pursuant to Section 709, Section 710 and Section 313 of the Town of Woodstock Zoning regulations, to consider the above application for Planned Residential Development, Conditional Use and Site Plan Approval to construct 36 dwelling units, rental and owner occupied, in 12 duplex structures of varied design and 3 triplex structures. Three dwelling units will be developed within the existing Old Grange Hall structure (The Rock Church). The proposal is for an existing, undeveloped 7.51 acre parcel (31.02.10.) and 0.51 acre parcel with the Grange Hall (31.02.15.). The property is located at 473 Woodstock Road and is zoned Residential Medium Density.

***On February 27, 2007 the Board received the following testimony for the formal application:***

1. Mr. Pacht, noted that his brother is an employer with the Twin Pines organization that could possibly provide maintenance of the facility once constructed. He stated he could be fair in his review of the project and felt he did not have to step down. There were no additional comments.
2. The TDRB reviewed numerous renderings, photographs and site plans of the proposed 36 unit residential project.
3. Two documents were made available for distribution, a list of questions assembled by Vice-chair Cleveland and responses to each from the project architect.
4. Ms. Owens, Housing Vermont, presented the affordable housing team.
5. Mr. McWilliams, Interfaith Housing Coalition, gave a brief introduction to the need of housing in Woodstock.
6. Ms. Ruch, Interfaith Housing Coalition, presented a short history of the Interfaith Housing Coalition work with this affordable housing project.
7. Ms. Highberg, Woodstock Community Trust, noted that her organization purchased the property.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 2**

9. Mr. Wisniewski, Project Architect, compared the conceptual proposal approved last year with the current proposal. Parking spaces were reduced by 35. The Rock Church was converted from a potential community center to three residential units.
10. There would be sixteen structures on site. Forty photographs of the Route 4 homes within the immediate neighborhood were shown. These were used as the architectural basis for the new homes. The largest unit would be a triplex instead of the previously proposed quads. The majority of the homes have front porches. Homes are smaller and more compatible with the immediate neighborhood.
11. The large parking lots of the previous design have been removed. Parking is now located next to each unit. Some structures have stacked parking, one behind the other. All garages have been removed thus reducing the bulk of the structures. There are 80 parking spaces provided, 72 are required.
12. A computerized mockup of the developed site, as an aerial view from above Route 4, was shown.
13. Mr. Wisniewski discussed storm water control. There would be a slight regrading of the back hill to refocus water. Within the central green, below-grade infiltration devices are placed to both filter and drain the storm water.
14. All roads meet emergency turning radii requirements.
15. Site lighting was designed to be minimal. One pole-mounted light would be placed at the driveway junction with Route 4. Bollard lights, approximately three feet tall, would be placed at each pedestrian crossing. Each porch would have a recessed light in the porch ceiling, to be controlled by resident. Public lights would be placed on a timer to limit hours of operation.
16. Six-foot tall coniferous trees planted four-foot-on-center would be placed along the southern border, creating a hedge-like screen. Deciduous trees would be placed within this hedge and along the streets and pedestrian ways. Existing trees would remain essentially untouched.
17. A central mail box would be placed on the green.
18. The side walks do not loop entirely around, but would connect each parking area to its associated unit.
19. A separate shed for dumpster and recyclables would be placed on the west side near the entrance.
20. The previous traffic study showed 35 peak users (peak hour volume). This has been reduced to 24 peak users with the elimination of the community center.
21. Mr. English asked what is happening to the Grange building.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 3**

22. Mr. Wisniewski stated the Grange would be changed to three residential units with minor exterior changes.
23. Mr. English asked to have screening placed between his property and the Grange.
24. Mr. Wisniewski said that can be achieved.
25. Mr. Richard Roy felt the Grange should have been left as a community center.
26. Mr. Minotti asked if the Grange residences reduce the total number of residences.
27. Mr. Wisniewski said no.
28. Mr. Dave Roy noted that an advisory board with the applicant had been set up to address the concerns of the West Woodstock residents. WW representation was reduced from six to three and they were not allowed to discuss the number of units. Mr. Roy felt WW residences do not like the 35 units, they are too dense and too many.
29. Mr. Shahi, attorney for a number of West Woodstock neighbors, asked who was involved with the funding of the project.
30. Ms. Owens stated that Housing Vermont is funding the project. State and federal funds are being used. There are actually many different grants and loans available to fund this type project. Interfaith Housing does not have a financial interest. WCT owns the lot.
31. The TDRB stated that the financial component of the project is not a zoning issue.
32. Mr. Wisniewski noted that per zoning, 70-90 units could be allowed on the site.
33. Mr. Shahi asked why the Grange building had not received conceptual approval of the change to residences and stated an objection to proceeding.
34. The conceptual approval is just that, conceptual. The current plan represents recommendations from the earlier hearings.
35. Mr. Hirschbuhl felt rental housing is not needed in Woodstock. He has tried to rent a place for months without luck.
36. Mr. Dave Roy asked if the project is directed to Woodstock residents or workers.
37. Ms. Owens stated that Housing Vermont has made it a priority to rent to Woodstock residents and workers. The application process involves not only an assessment of ones financial need but would also weigh in favor of local residents and workers.
38. Mr. Stanglin asked for a repetition of the traffic analysis.

39. Ms. Hummel asked how many adults and how many children are expected.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 4**

40. Ms. Owens noted there are a total of 72 bedrooms. A 1.07 ratio per bedroom equals a total of 80 persons. Of this total, 20-36 children are expected.

41. Mr. Hirschbuhl felt the density was the same for the 2007 and 2006 plans.

42. Mr. Wisniewski stated that each unit is between 750 sq. ft. and 1400 sq. ft. With the parking removed from underneath, the buildings are much smaller.

43. Each unit has a shed within, some may have basements for storage.

44. In responding to wheelchair accessible units, Mr. Wisniewski noted that a total of six units would have such access. State law requires that three units be so.

45. The total living unit square footage is not changed, it remains 36,000 sq. ft.

46. Mr. Hirschbuhl questioned the sidewalk along his property as there is no sidewalk along Route 4.

47. The conditional use criteria were then reviewed.

48. The applicant has received letters on water, sewer, police, ambulance and school as it relates to service capacity. A letter from the fire department is pending.

49. Mr. Wisniewski noted that the new proposal tackled the character of the area issue head-on. All buildings were redesigned and placed to resemble the WW neighborhood. Open space has been maintained.

50. Mr. Dave Roy noted the proposal would block the view of the Vydra barn, a historic structure. The Town Plan supports the unique esthetic qualities of Woodstock.

51. It was noted that the trees over the years have grown up to screen this barn, especially in the summer months.

52. Mr. Richard Roy felt the aerial view shows that the proposal does not fit the character.

53. Mr. Minotti echoed Mr. Roy's comments.

54. Mr. Debevoise felt it depends on how you look at it. Commercial development would change the character. A residential development with equal WW density does not detract from the character.

55. Mr. Hirschbuhl, noted WW is a strip and not a cluster.

56. Ms. Owens stated that a Federal Section 106 review requires a historic character review.

This project was reviewed and was found not to detract from the historic structure and context of the neighborhood. A letter from a Ms. Pritchett supports this. It is not included with the local file, as it is a federal requirement for funding purposes.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 5**

57. Mr. Howardell asked about parking.
58. Mr. Wisniewski noted that 105 spaces were approved in the conceptual approval. This has been reduced to 80 spaces. There are eight additional spaces above the required 72 spaces.
59. Mr. Shahi asked what is the lowest number of units to be compatible with the neighborhood.
60. Mr. Minotti stated the neighbors disagree that this proposal is compatible.
61. Mr. Wisniewski responded to a question on trees, deciduous trees would be 3 inch caliber and coniferous trees would be six feet tall.
62. Traffic has been reduced from 35 to 24 vehicles per hour at peak volume which occurs at 4:00 pm.
63. Mr. Dave Roy disagrees with the trip study due to the heavy high/middle school traffic. He worries about resident students crossing Route 4.
64. Mr. Richard Roy is also concerned with school traffic.
65. Mr. Stanglin stated that it is hard to believe that the addition of 72 vehicles to Route 4 does not have an undue adverse impact.
66. The traffic consultant was not present to respond to specific questions.
67. Mr. Shahi asked if there would be any traffic control on site and who is liable for accidents.
68. The bylaws in effect were then reviewed.
69. Mr. Wisniewski noted the applicant is not asking for additional items or special exceptions due to a PUD/PRD review. There is no need, the proposal fits well within the standard zoning requirements.
70. Mr. Hirschbuhl feels the density is not intended by the zoning, as only four acres are being used.
71. Mr. Wisniewski, responded that PRD requires both clustering and open space.
72. Mr. Shahi asked if the project meets the affordable housing definition.

73. The project is not asking for the affordable housing density bonus and therefore does not need to meet the definition, which was read by Vice-Chairperson, Charlotte Cleveland. The question remained unanswered.
74. Renewable Resources were reviewed.
- Town Development Review Board**  
**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**  
**Page 6**
75. Maintenance of open space and clustering of all buildings creates a minimal amount of disturbance to the land. All buildings would have southern exposure for solar access. Efficiency Vermont will review the project and make recommendations.
76. The project exceeds all setbacks, 60 - 90 feet are proposed where 35 feet is required.
77. There are no loading zones except for the dumpster.
78. The sidewalk along the entrance drive is located 3 feet to 4 feet off of the Hirshbuhl property line. This area is a green belt without proposed trees. Trees would be planted between the sidewalk and the driveway.
79. Mr. Shahi asked how parking is enforced.
80. The home owners association would control.
81. The driveway would be eighteen feet wide.
82. Landscaping and fencing were discussed.
83. Three and half acres of the back section would be left in a natural state.
84. A coniferous hedge would be planted along the south border. A treed alle´ is to be provided as access to Route 4. The southernmost trees would be planted so as not to interfere with vehicular sight lines.
85. No fences are proposed.
86. Mr. Stanglin asked about wildlife habitat.
87. There are no critical wildlife habitats known to exist on site. The area to be developed was used as a parking lot and soccer/lacrosse field for years.
88. Mr. Minotti felt lights would shine directly into his house, located south of Route 4, as cars exit the site turning west onto Route 4 at night.
89. Mr. Dave Roy felt car lights would shine through the proposed hedge to his home. This would destroy the only private portion of his home, his back yard.
90. Mr. Wisniewski stated he is willing to add more trees to make the hedge more solid to block the car lights.

91. Mr. Wisniewski noted that some trees along the west edge of the project may be removed, but that additional trees would be planted to replace those removed.
92. Mr. Hirschbuhl asked for additional screening between the proposed sidewalk to Route 4 and his property.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 7**

93. Mr. Wisniewski stated he is open to providing additional screening.
94. Mr. Shahi asked about wildlife habitat.
95. Ms. Owens noted that Act 250 would review wildlife and wetland issues. At the moment none are apparent.
96. The Town Planner noted there are no mapped deeryards or wetlands on site.
97. Access and circulation were reviewed.
98. There are no slope issues.
99. The site plan criteria were reviewed.
100. Mr. Shahi questioned pedestrian safety and pedestrian volume. He noted there is no sidewalk on Route 4.
101. Mr. Hirschbuhl asked why have a sidewalk to nowhere?
102. The Town Planner noted that a Route 4 sidewalk in West Woodstock is a prioritized item in the Town Plan. A recent enhancement grant with the state's transportation agency was denied due to lack of funding.
103. **After discussion, Mr. Howardell with a second by Mr. Pacht motioned to continue testimony to March 27, 2007 at 7:30 pm at the Town Hall. The motion was passed with a 5-0 vote.**

***On March 27, 2007 the Board received the following testimony:***

Testimony was continued from the last hearing, February 27, 2007.

1. Chair Billings noted that he has reviewed all testimony, attachments and minutes of the February 27, 2007 meeting.
2. Mr. Shahi objected to Chair Billings participation.
3. The hearing picked up with the questions raised at the February 27, 2007 meeting.
4. Screening was increased for immediate neighbors. An updated site map was viewed which noted the areas in question. A six foot high conifer hedge would be placed six feet

on-center along the English property line. Hedges along the David Roy and Hirschbuhl properties were noted on the updated site plan.

5. Ms. Owens, Housing Vermont, noted that although the project is not seeking a density bonus, the project does meet the affordable housing definition per zoning regulations. The project has a mixed income target. Twenty-two of the rental units meet the definition. Five of the ten for-sale units, meet the 120% HUD standard. The affordability would be preserved in perpetuity.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 8**

6. A screening plan for the Hirschbuhl property was discussed. A four-foot stockade fence with two foot lattice is proposed on the east and north sides of the Hirschbuhl property. A photograph of the Route 4 Tom Lensing fence was shown as an acceptable model.
7. Traffic impact was next discussed.
8. The applicant's traffic expert had a stroke over the weekend and could not be present. The applicant noted the existing traffic report is on file, traffic would be reduced from the previous level which was deemed acceptable.
9. Mr. Shahi submitted a short traffic page and a half report from a Professor Wolfe, traffic consultant, which indicated the Grange Hill traffic report to be inadequate.
10. The proposed conifer hedge behind the David Roy property was double in thickness to screen both light and noise from entering.
11. A March 22, 2007 letter from Dufresne and Associates concerning critical habitat, noted that there are no critical habitat areas on-site per state maps.
12. A letter from a historic preservationist noted no negative impacts on area historic structures.
13. Mr. Fuller, PE, Dufresne & Assoc. presented the storm water drainage plan. The site is unique in that the area to be developed is low, making it difficult for natural outflow. Storm water retention devices are proposed which would also filter the water. It was noted that the base soil is quite permeable, having been a river bed many years ago.
14. There is a current drain that carries water across the road in a southwesterly direction. The culverts may require upgrading.
15. Per State regulations, the site has to handle on-site water whereby existing flows are maintained and off-site water is not increased. There should not be a greater flow of water off-site.
16. Mr. Fox, owner of land across Route 4, did not want additional water to flow onto his property. He noted the State placed a culvert two years ago across his property and he did not want this to be increased.
17. A State storm water permit is required.

18. Mr. Dufresne noted that there may be more storm water flow due to upland flows.
19. Mr. Hirschbuhl objected to increased water off the hillside as it may affect his property.
20. Mr. Fuller noted that his and neighboring properties should be drier due to the enhanced treatment.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 9**

21. Mr. Minotti noted that as a downstream abutter to Mr. Fox, he too would be impacted by additional storm water.
22. Mr. Shahi asked for pre flow and post flow storm water numbers.
23. Mr. Fuller noted final number are not yet generated.
24. The lighting plan was discussed by Mr. Wisniewski. Two additional bollard lights would be placed at pedestrian cross walks. Two pole lights would be added to the two larger parking lots. The pole lights could be timed to go off in the early morning hours, but could remain on all night.
25. Mr. Hirschbuhl did not like the additional pole lot light near his house.
26. Mr. Wisniewski noted that the light could be adjusted to shine only on the parking lot.
27. Mr. Shahi was asked to bring additional traffic information for the proposed April 12, 2007 meeting.
28. Mr. Hirschbuhl noted he had talked to the Conservation Commission about the project.
29. He noted that the Conservation Commission would offer their advice if requested by the TDRB.
30. Ms. Kachadorian wrote a personal letter in opposition to the project.
31. A letter from Ms. Miller, Planning Commission Chair, in support of the affordable housing project was submitted.
32. Mr. Dougherty noted in response to Mr. Shahi that the letter was written after discussion and approval by the Planning Commission.
33. After discussion, the hearing was continued to 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 12, 2007.

***On April 24 , 2007 the Board received the following testimony:***

1. It was noted that Mr. Pacht was absent at the last meeting. Mr. Pacht stated that he has reviewed the minutes and documents of the March 27, 2007 meeting to bring himself up to date.
2. Mr. Shahi, neighbor's attorney, objected to Mr. Pacht's appearance and that no notice was

granted that the applicant's traffic consultant would be present. He felt he should have been granted time to prepare.

3. TDRB members stated that traffic was a specific item that had been carried over and that the minutes reflect this.
4. Chair Billings noted that it was stated at the last meeting that the traffic consultant would be present.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 10**

5. Traffic:  
Bob Alexander, project Traffic Consultant, presented an updated traffic study, which is not yet available in a written format.
6. Peak traffic flows were reviewed. He noted the state highway department has a counter on Route 4. This serves as a good basis for the traffic study. The state also has turn counts from time to time in the area. He sat in his car at the project driveway and observed traffic on a Friday during the school morning rush period.
7. The worst scenario is a left turn towards Bridgewater out of the school at the morning drop-off period. He felt traffic was built up on Route 4 mainly because people are allowing left turns out of the school when they shouldn't.
8. The left turn lane on Route 4, heading west, has a five-car storage capacity.
9. The primary study is a gap study. This is done via a computer program.
10. Studies show the waiting line heading west on Route 4 for entrance into the school will not back up to the Rock Church driveway 95% of the time.
11. Traffic exiting Rock Church has an easy right turn as traffic is flowing, the left turn needs a gap, but there is no blockage from school traffic.
12. There will be no level of service change on Route 4. It is currently "B." There are adequate gaps for pullouts. The Route 4 traffic will not be delayed, although people pulling out of the project could suffer delay.
13. Mr. Alexander stated that peak school traffic lasts from 7:15 a.m. to 7:45 a.m..
14. Mr. Hirschbuhl asked why a traffic light was recommended at the school entrance to maintain flow.
15. Mr. Alexander noted that a traffic light at peak hour times could improve the morning and afternoon school traffic. The light could then be utilized as a flasher at all other times.
16. Mr. Dave Roy asked which Friday was observed. He believed traffic to be much worse then stated. He questioned the program used to compute the data.
17. Mr. Shahi implied that the traffic light was to be placed at the project entrance and that a school light was necessary because of the project. He also noted that new traffic

information on the morning peak hour had been done, but not submitted. He asked for the data so his experts could review it.

18. Mr. Alexander stated that no light is recommended for the project driveway and that the project would not have a negative impact on the Route 4 as the numbers were too small to be significant.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 11**

19. Mr. Alexander felt the driveway would have three lanes out, not marked. The connection to Route 4 would be a flared entrance. The extra width would extend ten to twenty feet back from Route 4 pavement edge. The flare would be within the Route 4 right of way.
20. Mr. Alexander restated that exiting numbers would be reduced from those submitted in 2006 traffic report due to the removal of the community center in the Rock Church.
21. Mr. English asked about traffic gap.
22. Mr. Dick Roy felt the report was extremely technical and asked for it in laymen's language.
23. Mr. Hirschbuhl agreed.
24. Mr. Hershenson, applicant attorney, noted that the traffic report would be made available in writing within a week, and he asked that comments from the Shahi expert be made within 14 days.
25. Mr. Shahi mentioned that most schools have multiple entrances, whereas this school has one entrance.
26. Surface water design:  
Mr. Dufresne, civil engineer, presented how the project meets the state's storm water regulations. The state storm water permit is pending.
27. Mr. Dufresne reviewed a site map pointing out the two catch basins along Route 4 in front of the church, the swale along the hill, the proposed underground drainage, and the two reservoirs (one to hold and one to filter the storm water).
28. Pre-project storm water comes down the hillside. This would be collected in a two foot high swale at the bottom of the hill to flow under Route 4 and eventually enter into the Ottaughquechee River.
29. Numerous collection basins on the developed area would gather project water and place it through a filtering type underground reservoir which gradually percolates through the coarse gravel under the site. This was designed to handle a 10-year event.
30. An overflow would be provided for events that exceed the 10-year threshold. This would be connected to the hillside swale system at the southwest corner of the current parking lot.
31. Mr. Dave Roy noted that currently the water runs through Neal Fox's property and that he

doesn't believe that Mr. Fox has approved additional water.

32. Mr. Dufresne stated the water table is seven feet below ground level. He is currently monitoring the table via numerous small monitoring wells.
33. The holding tank is six feet deep below ground level. Storm water is then pumped into the filtering reservoir.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 12**

34. Mr. Dufresne felt there would be more water flow across Route 4 and that the applicant is looking for right of ways from local property owners to accept the additional flow.
35. Chair Billings asked the applicant's position on the requested fence and the proposed pole light. Both are to be located to the rear Hirschbuhl's property.
36. The applicant agreed to place a bollard light instead of the pole light and deferred on the additional fence request.
37. Chair Billings asked Mr. Dave Roy if the additional screening behind his home was satisfactory. Mr. Roy did not give a specific answer.
38. The TDRB questioned snow removal.
39. The applicant noted there would be a contract removal service.
40. Mr. Dufresne pointed to various areas on the site map as capable of accepting snow storage. When snow exceeds capacity, it would be removed from the site.
41. Chair Billings asked if there would be a maintenance person or other individual on-site.
42. Applicant noted that a property management firm would be hired, but that a manager is not expected to live on-site.
43. Mr. Dick Roy asked that driveway and parking areas not be paved. He suggested the utilization of hardpack to give it a more rural character feel.
44. The applicant was amenable but wanted more discussion.
45. Ms. Barr stated that she did not like the idea of pavement. She felt storm water would be more problematic with pavement.
46. Mr. Hirschbuhl preferred no snow storage on his property line to avoid possible water problems as the snow melts and asked for an onsite manager or contact person.
47. Mr. Shahi did not like the potential for conditioning approvals on state or other future permitting processes.
48. Mr. English asked if his property would be affected by snow storage.
49. Schedule of construction:

Ms. Owens, applicant, noted that the project will take 14 months to construct. It could start this fall if permits allow. Construction would proceed from start to finish.

50. Mr. Hirshbuhl asked if there were time limits, so construction does not start too early or run too late.

51. The TDRB noted traffic is still under discussion awaiting review of the updated Alexander report.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc. / Housing Vermont**

**Page 13**

52. The hearing was continued to Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Hall.

***On May 22, 2007 the Board received the following testimony:***

Testimony was continued from the April 24, 2007 hearing.

1. It was noted that the neighborhood group did not respond to the applicant's traffic report within the time frame laid out at the last meeting.
2. The applicant stated they did not have any updates on traffic or storm water.
3. Mr. Shahi stated he had forwarded the applicant's traffic report to his traffic expert. The expert felt the data was too anecdotal to be valid.
4. Mr. Dougherty mentioned that he strongly disagreed with a letter published in the May 17, 2007 Vermont Standard that insinuated renters would become a major police problem for the community.
5. Mr. Hirschbuhl, abutter, asked that the TDRB review all issues and not pass judgement onto the state. He felt the zoning regulations require a local decision.
6. Mr. Hershenson, applicant's attorney, made certain that the TDRB had received a May 1, 2007 letter addressing snow plowing and maintenance.
7. Testimony was voted closed.

***Deliberations:***

After discussion, the following findings of fact were established:

1. A preliminary concept plan was approved at the October 24, 2006 TDRB meeting.
2. The TDRB reviewed numerous site plans, elevations and floor plans for the proposed 36 unit planned residential development.
3. The land area is a total of eight acres, zoned Residential Medium Density which allows one unit per 8,000 sq. ft. (43 units).
4. The project has direct access to Route 4 via a 22.9 foot driveway and a 28' right of way for a total of 50.9'.
5. A 22' wide driveway with a five foot sidewalk, west of the drive, would be placed as the main entrance from Route 4.
6. All roads meet emergency turning radii requirements.

7. The neighbors suggested that the parking and driveway areas be hardpacked and not paved.
8. There are 80 parking spaces provided, 72 are required. Most parking is located next to its associated unit.
9. There would be sixteen structures on site; 12 duplexes, three triplexes, plus the existing Rock Church building would be converted to three residential units.
10. The units would be connected to municipal sewer and the Woodstock Aqueduct.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc.**

**Page 14**

11. Letters were submitted from applicable town services (fire, water, sewer, schools, ambulance and police) indicating no undue adverse impact.
12. The designer used architectural features from the immediate neighborhood, placed porches on the fronts, and made the homes as small as possible to be somewhat compatible with the architecture character of the area. Many of the area homes are noted in the Town of Woodstock Historic Survey completed in 1997.
13. A Federal Section 106, historic character review was conducted with a finding that the project would not detract from the historic structure and context of the neighborhood.
14. To address storm water, there would be a slight regrading of the back hill to refocus water along the western side of the project to eventually cross Route 4. Within the proposed central green, below-grade infiltration devices would be placed to both filter and drain the storm water. An overflow pipe, based on a ten year event, would connect to the hillside drainage and cross Route 4.
15. The site engineer felt the storm water implementations would be an overall improvement for the immediate neighbors by removing existing storm water that currently is handled naturally via evaporation and percolation on the existing playing field.
16. Storm water control will require state permitting. A final plan was not yet approved by the state.
17. Site lighting was designed to be minimal. One pole-mounted light would be placed at the driveway junction with Route 4. Bollard lights, approximately three feet tall, would be placed at each pedestrian crossing. Each porch would have a recessed light in the porch ceiling, to be controlled by resident. Public lights would be placed on a timer to limit hours of operation.
18. Six-foot tall coniferous trees planted four-foot-on-center would be placed along the southern border, creating a hedge-like screen. Deciduous trees would be placed within this hedge and along the streets and pedestrian ways. Existing trees would remain essentially untouched.
19. The landscape screening plan was updated to double the screening proposed along the southern boundary and to include screening along the west boundary of the existing Rock Church building.
20. Housing Vermont has made it a priority to rent to Woodstock residents and workers. The application process involves not only an assessment of ones financial need but would also weigh in favor of local residents and workers.
21. The applicant noted there are a total of 72 bedrooms. A 1.07 ratio per bedroom equals a total of 80 persons. Of this total, 20-36 children are expected.
22. Each unit would be between 750 sq. ft. and 1400 sq. ft. Each unit has a shed

- within, some may have basements for storage.
23. The applicant stated six units would be wheelchair accessible units, state law requires three units to have such access.
  24. A central mailbox would be placed on the proposed green.
  25. All buildings would have southern exposure for solar access. Efficiency Vermont will review the project and make recommendations.
  26. The side walks do not loop entirely around, but would connect each parking area to its associated unit.

**Town Development Review Board**

**Notice of Decision: Woodstock Community Trust, Inc.**

**Page 15**

27. A separate shed for dumpster and recyclables would be placed on the west side near the entrance.
28. Buildings plus paved areas equal 19.6% of the site leaving 80.4% of the site open, easily meeting the 50% open space requirement.
29. The peak traffic exiting and entering was reduced to 24 peak users from the 35 peak user count noted at the conceptual plan approval stage.
30. The applicant submitted two traffic reports, a preliminary report prepared by Mr. Alexander and a supplemental report prepared by Mr. Bruno. Both reports showed no undue adverse impact concerning traffic on Route 4.
31. Applicant noted that a property management firm would be hired, but that a manager is not expected to live on-site. Snow would be removed when necessary.
32. In discussion of the schedule of construction, the applicant noted that the project would take 14 months to construct and that it would proceed from start to finish.
33. The TDRB reviewed the Conditional Use, Site Plan, Planned Development and related bylaw criteria.

**After additional discussion, Mr. Pacht moved with a second by Mr. Hunt to approve with the following conditions:**

- 1. Before construction commences all state and other required permits shall be obtained, a completed state approved storm water design shall be reviewed and approved by the TDRB.**
- 2. The proposed lights located by dumpsters and the southwest parking area shall not be placed.**
- 3. Fencing shall be placed along the entire northern Hirschbuhl property line (tax map # 31.02.16).**
- 4. The landscaped screening along the project's south boundary shall be maintained forever. Dead trees shall be replaced with a minimum five foot tall tree as soon as weather permits.**
- 5. Hours of construction are limited between 7am and 6 pm. Any change in hours of construction shall require prior approval by the TDRB.**

**The motion passed with a 6-0 vote.**

***NOW, BE IT RESOLVED, the Woodstock Town Development Review Board finds the proposal presented in the above application to be in conformance with the requirements of Section 709, Section 710 and Section 313 of the Town's Zoning Regulations and HEREBY GRANTS***

*APPROVAL to construct 36 dwelling units, rental and owner occupied, in 12 duplex structures of varied design and 3 triplex structures. Three dwelling units will be developed within the existing Old Grange Hall structure (The Rock Church). The proposal is for an existing, undeveloped 7.51 acre parcel (31.02.10.) and 0.51 acre parcel with the Grange Hall (31.02.15.) pursuant to the record, submittals, testimony and the following conditions:*

1. Before construction commences all state and other required permits shall be obtained, a completed state approved storm water design shall be reviewed  
  
and approved by the TDRB.
2. The proposed lights located by dumpsters and the southwest parking area shall not be placed.
3. Fencing shall be placed along the entire northern Hirschbuhl property line (tax map # 31.02.16).
4. The landscaped screening along the project's south boundary shall be maintained forever. Dead trees shall be replaced with a minimum five foot tall tree as soon as weather permits.
5. Hours of construction are limited between 7am and 6 pm. Any change in hours of construction shall require prior approval by the TDRB.

*The matter is now remanded to the Environmental Court pursuant to the prior order.*

Dated this            day of June, 2007

**Members Participating:**

Franklin Billings, Jr.  
Laurance Lombard  
Charlotte Cleveland  
Emo Chynoweth  
Michael Pacht  
Fred Hunt

---

Franklin Billings, Jr., Chairman  
Town Development Review Board