

Montpelier Design Review Committee
October 19, 2004
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Vicki Lane; Soren Pfeffer
Staff: Kathleen Swigon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George.

I. Sign Permit

Property Address: 22-28 Elm Street
Applicant: Lucy and Joseph Ferrada
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- One 3' x 2' wall sign and one 4' x 3' wall sign
- One 29" x 32" ground sign

Interested Parties: Lucy Ferrada

Ms. George recused herself because she is the owner of property adjoining the subject property.

Ms. Ferrada described the three wood signs and the proposed paint colors. She said that one sign will be hung on the porch. One sign will be placed within an existing sign frame. Ms. Ferrada said that the third sign will be mounted on the side of the building to provide visibility from the street. She said that there was previously a sign at that location on the building. She said that she will keep an existing goose neck light at that location. Ms. Ferrada said that there is existing lighting on the porch, but that she was unsure whether additional lighting would be needed there. Mr. Everett said that it was possible that the DRC could authorize a small light to illuminate the porch sign as an option.

Ms. George, spoke as an adjoining property owner. She said that there was a driveway of hers on the side of the building where the wall sign would be mounted. She said that, since the applicant does not own the driveway or adjacent parking areas, it is not appropriate to place a sign at that location. She said that the sign might cause confusion to people looking for parking and encourage illegal parking in the neighboring parking spaces. Ms. Ferrada said that she has the right to use the driveway for deliveries. She said that she wants the sign at the proposed location because it is the only place where the building can be seen from the street. She said that she could put up "no parking" signs. Ms. George said that she is concerned that people will use the parking lot anyway. She said that she didn't want people to be invited onto her property. Ms. Lane suggested that the address could be placed on the building instead of the proposed sign.

Mr. Pfeffer said that he understood Ms. George's issue, but did not think that it is within the purview of the DRC. Ms. George said that the applicant is requesting three signs and the wall sign on the side of the building should be eliminated. She said that the two sided ground sign was put up years ago, setting a precedence for where signs on the property should be located. Ms. Ferrada said that the previous business had placed a sign on the wall because that was the only visible location. Ms. George noted that a driveway lead to that entrance. Mr. Pfeffer said that he believed that this is a decision for the Development Review Board. Mr. Everett explained to Ms. Ferrada that the DRC's decisions are advisory.

Mr. Pfeffer said that he might want to see a decrease in the size of the wall sign. Ms. Lane said that she still believed that having a sign back there will encourage people to drive in and park there. Ms. Ferrada said that she could put up the “no parking” signs. Ms. George said that they will not work.

Ms. Ferrada said that she had no more to say. She asked the Committee to make their decision about the sign. Mr. Pfeffer said that the DRC does not have criteria for the land use issue. Ms. George said that the question for the DRC is whether three signs are excessive.

Mr. Pfeffer said that he thought that the sign is too big for the location on the house. He noted that the DRC is advisory and asked the applicant if she would be interested in adjusting the size of the sign. Mr. Everett said that the consensus of the Committee seems to be that the sign on the side of the building would not be approved as proposed. He said that the application could be split to separate the building wall sign from the other two signs.

Ms. Ferrada asked for a suggestion for an alternative sign. She asked whether a sign that did not contain the logo, but said “Cheshire Cat Art and Artwear” would be more acceptable. Mr. Pfeffer said that the sign should be longer than it is wide. Ms. Ferrada said that it could be like the “KDP” sign shown in the application materials.

Ms. George said that this is a first floor business and the sign should be at a height consistent with the City scape provisions. Mr. Pfeffer said that the sign is proposed to be located too high on the building. Mr. Everett said that there is an appropriate location toward the corner of the building above the windows. Ms. George said that the amount of signage proposed is excessive. She said that she does not know of a building in the City that has three signs. Ms. Ferrada said that the signage is needed to identify the building which is in an obscure location. Ms. Ferrada said that she could modify the sign to eliminate the logo, but would want the sign to say “Cheshire Cat Art and Artwear” and include the address. She said that the sign dimensions could be decreased to 21" x 36". Ms. George said that the light on the sign was not needed. Ms. Ferrada said that the light is existing and that the purpose of the sign is to advertise the building. She said that she would like to keep the light.

The Committee voted 3-0 to approve the signs with an adjustment that the sign on the side of the building will be 21" x 36" and will not include the logo. The approval included the option that a small, dark colored down light may be added on the porch if it is needed to illuminate the porch sign.

II. Site Plan Review

Property Address: 22-28 Elm Street
Applicant: Lucy and Joseph Ferrada
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Extension of brick walkway with lighting along walk
- Change of use from office to retail

Interested Party: Lucy Ferrada

Ms. George recused herself because she owns the property adjoining the subject property.

Ms. Ferrada described the proposal to extend the existing brick walkway using the same type of brick. She showed two types of lights as options, but said that she preferred the “mushroom” type of light. Mr. Everett suggested that the lights be made as sturdy as possible to withstand snow removal. Ms. Ferrada said that the plan showed nine lights, but she would like the flexibility to install a tenth light.

The Committee voted 3-0 to recommend approval of the brick walkway and up to ten lights.

Approval of Minutes of the October 5, 2004 meeting

Ms. George said that the last word of the last paragraph regarding the project at 62 Barre Street should be changed from “floor” to “door”. Mr. Everett said that the last sentence of the third paragraph regarding the application at 44 Main Street should say “Mr. Everett urged that safety glass be used in the door or a protective rail or grid be used for patron protection.”

Other

The Committee members read a letter from Cyndy Jones regarding 535 Stone Cutter’s Way.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

These minutes are subject to approval by the Design Review Committee. Changes are noted above are underlined. These changes were made at the meeting they were acted upon.