

Montpelier Design Review Committee
Minutes of March 23, 2004
Memorial Room

Members Present: Steve Everett, Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Vicki Lane, Margot George (arrived at 6:10 p.m.), Gail Lawson, Administrative Officer; Stephanie A. Smith, Planner.

Others Present: Shane Farrell, Paseo, and Tom Quinlan, Quinlan Signs

The meeting was brought to order by Steve Everett, Vice Chair at 5:50 p.m.
There were no comments from the Vice Chair.

Design Review for a Sign Permit - CB-I/DCCD

5 State Street

Applicant: Shane Farrell, Paseo

Wall signs

Participating members: Steve Everett, Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Vicki Lane

Tom Quinlan of Quinlan Signs represented the application with the applicant. He told the committee the intentions of keeping the proposed sign within the 8 3/4 sign band. The proposed sign would be centered over the doorway to the store.

Mr. Everett asked why they didn't utilize more of the band horizontally. Ms. Farrell stated that there were two signs present in the windows, and that including the proposed sign over the door there was a triangular relationship between the three signs that they thought worked.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if one would see the sign band to the top and bottom of the sign. Mr. Quinlan answered yes, approx. a quarter inch would be visible.

Mr. Quinlan went over the design of the sign, the materials, and how it would be attached to the building. They are proposing to install the sign at an angle from the building. Mr. Gilbertson thought that this might promote damage to the sign and allow water to collect and maybe birds to nest. Mr. Quinlan assured the committee that the sign would not extend beyond the molding above the sign.

Mr. Everett reviewed the criteria.

Preservation or reconstruction of the appropriate historic style if the proposed project is in the historic district or involves an historic structure: Acceptable. The sign design and placement preserves the historic integrity of the building.

1. Harmony of exterior design with other properties in the district: Acceptable. The sign is within the sign band, this is common throughout the district.
1. Compatibility of proposed exterior materials with other properties in the district: Acceptable. Proposed sign materials, wood and high density sign foam are compatible with other properties in the district.
1. Compatibility of the proposed landscaping with the district: N/A.
2. Prevention of the use of incompatible designs, buildings, color schemes, or exterior materials: None noted.

5. Location and appearance of all utilities: N/A.
6. Recognition of and respect for view corridors and significant vistas including gateway views of the city and State House: N/A.
7. Conformance with *Cityscape* placement and design recommendations: Acceptable. The proposed sign is within the sign band and conforms with the *Cityscape* recommendations.
8. Compatibility with subject property and adjacent properties: Acceptable. The proposed sign is compatible with subject property and adjacent properties.
9. Shall not obscure significant architectural details: Acceptable. The proposed sign does not obscure architectural details.
10. Consistency and uniformity of multiple signs in CB-II and OP districts: N/A.
11. Illumination: internally lit plastic signs are prohibited. N/A.
12. Pennants and banners are prohibited, except as public announcement in §811.B(e). N/A.
13. Individual letters affixed, painted or engraved directly on the building or structure, are encouraged: Proposed sign with use of business logo and individual letters mounted on wood panel is acceptable.

The Design Review Committee recommend approval of the sign as submitted, 3/0.

Gail Lawson had some questions for the committee concerning some proposals on properties in the Design Control District.

- 1) The Trinity Church is interested in installing some informational signs on the property to deter people using their designated parking spaces, and
- 2) a property owner on Corse Street is interested in installing solar panels.

Ms. George commented that the committee would normally see such applications to insure that the installation of such items would comply with the design review criteria. Mr. Gilbertson commented that the DRC will accept the Administrative Officer's determination as to whether or not DRC review is required for these types of proposals.

Ms. George briefly reported on the Permit Review Committee's progress.

Mr. Gilbertson made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Everett seconded it. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.