

Montpelier Design Review Committee
January 04, 2005
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Vicki Lane; Eric Gilbertson
Staff: Kathy Swigon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George. Ms. George explained the design review process. She said that the Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board. She said that the Committee will look at applications in relation to the design guidelines and evaluation criteria. She said that the Committee's determinations are advisory only.

I. Design Review

Property Address: 148 Main Street
Applicant: Vermont Association of Hospitals and Health Systems
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Replacement of door and window unit
- Replacement of windows
-

Interested Parties: Carol Mielke

Ms. Mielke said that internal changes to the building result in the need to relocate the door and window unit and that the windows on the existing structure need to be replaced anyway. She said that the proposed replacements will allow more light into the building. Ms. George asked which windows would be used as replacements. The applicant said that 6 over 6 windows would be used if they are available. She said that the existing windows are 6 over 6. Ms. Lane noted that the application said that simulated divided lights would be used. Ms. Mielke said that they would be simulated, but would not be the type with the divider that snaps out.

Ms. Meilke said that the existing door would also be replaced and relocated slightly. She said that the specific door had not been chosen, but that could be finalized that night. She said that there are no other doors on the rear of the building. She said that door #S92 from the cut sheet would be used if the Committee agreed. Mr. Gilbertson said that he was not concerned with the door since it is screened by the existing lattice. He suggested that a simple door be used.

Ms. Mielke said that the rear bathroom window will be removed and a smaller window will be installed. Mr. Gilbertson recommended using a 1 over 1 window. He said that divided lights would not be appropriate because of the small size of the window.

Ms. George asked what colors will be used. Ms. Mielke said that the colors will be the same as the existing building. Ms. George asked if any lighting will be installed. Ms. Mielke said that there is an existing bare, overhead bulb and that it will probably be replaced with a simple light fixture.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. They voted 3-0 to recommend that the DRB approve the project with the following adjustments to the scope of the proposal:

1. The replacement bathroom window shall be 1 over 1, and
2. The ceiling light fixture on the porch will be a simple, unobtrusive design.

II. Design and Conditional Use Review

Property Address: 9-11 West Street
Applicant: Susan Kimmerly
Zone: AI-PUD - HDR/DCD

- Development within an approved AI-PUD
- Installation of a dumpster, additional parking, other site changes

Interested Parties: Susan Kimmerly

Ms. Kimmerly said that the application involves the addition of three parking spaces and a dumpster. She said that an existing drive off of East State Street will be used to access the parking spaces. Mr. Gilbertson asked about the surface of the area to be used for parking. Ms. Kimmerly said that the surface is gravel and grass and that no new surfacing was planned. Ms. George said that she believed that the Development Review Board will want to see some type of surface. Ms. Kimmerly said that the cars will just be parking in the driveways to the existing garages. Mr. Gilbertson said that it should be no problem if the driveways were used as parking, but he said that he would like to see the parking defined to avoid parking on the lawn areas.

Ms. George said that the Committee preferred dumpsters to be enclosed to shield the view. Mr. Gilbertson said that a simple wooden fence would be acceptable. Ms. George suggested tabling that part of the application so that the applicant could return to the Committee with a specific proposal. Ms. Kimmerly asked whether the screening was a recommendation or a requirement. Ms. Lane said that dumpsters have to be screened. Ms. George said that the Committee could approve the location of the dumpster subject to the submission of a specific design. Mr. Gilbertson said that the design should specify the actual dimensions of the enclosure. Ms. Lane suggested that the enclosure could be screened with plants. Ms. Kimmerly said that she would submit a separate proposal at another time if landscaping is proposed.

Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the application could be tabled. Ms. George said that the applicant needs to bring the application to the Development Review Board. Ms. George suggested approving the locations with the condition that the applicant come back to the Committee for the enclosure.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. The Committee voted 3-0 to recommend that the location of the parking spaces are appropriate as they are in front of garages and historically used. The following adjustment to the scope of the proposal was also recommended:

1. The applicant will return to the DRC for final dumpster enclosure design and possible landscaping around the dumpster and parking spaces for three cars.

Action on the Minutes of the October 19, 2004 meeting and December 8, 2004

The Committee members reviewed the minutes of the December 8, 2004 meeting and marked up a copy with written changes. They voted 3-0 to approve the minutes with the revisions (a copy of the revised minutes is attached). The review of the minutes of the October 19, 2004 was tabled until the Committee's next meeting due to the lack of a quorum of Committee members able to participate in the review.

Adjournment

The Committee voted to adjourn the meeting.

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

These minutes are subject to approval by the Design Review Committee. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are acted upon.

Montpelier Design Review Committee
December 8, 2004
Memorial Room, City Hall

AS REVISED AND APPROVED

*(Revisions in italics, additions in **bold**, deletions shown as ~~strikeouts~~)*

Present: Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Vicki Lane; Soren Pfeffer; Eric Gilbertson
Staff: Stephanie Smith

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George. Ms. George explained the design review process. She said that the Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board. She said that the Committee will look at applications in relation to the design guidelines and evaluation criteria. She said that the Committee's determinations are advisory only.

I. Design and Site Plan Review

Property Address: 1 Granite Street
Applicant: National Clothes Pin Company
Zone: RIV/DCD

- Add new building entrance
- Remove exterior stairway and second floor door

Interested Parties: Peter Merrill

Mr. Merrill said that he is proposing to install a Labor and Industry approved entrance on an existing building. He said that the safety improvements are proposed in association with a plan to rent some of the space. Mr. Gilbertson noted that the exterior fire escape would be removed. He asked what would happen to the door at the base of the fire escape. Mr. Merrill said that the door has been inoperable for about 20 to 30 years. He said that plywood is screwed over the door on the inside of the building and that he intended to leave the door in place.

Ms. George asked where the proposed door would be in relation to the window and trim board. Mr. Merrill said that the door would be centered between those elements. Ms. George asked whether all of the materials would be painted wood. The applicant said that it would be and that he assumed that the Committee would prefer a wood door. Ms. George said that a wood door would be appropriate if that was what the applicant wanted to use.

Ms. George asked if there were any other doors with windows on the building. Mr. Merrill said that there were. Ms. George said that as an option to the proposed door, the applicant could use a door similar to #CC48 on the cut sheet. Mr. Merrill said that he had been trying to match the glass in the windows, but a single pane might be simpler.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation and demolition criteria. They voted to recommend approval of the application with the following adjustments:

1. A single pane of glass will be used in the proposed door, and
2. The inoperable door at the bottom of the removed stairway will be retained.

II. Design Review

Property Address: 65 Main Street
Applicant: Montpelier Downtown Community Association
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Temporary civic announcement banners

Interested Parties: Paul Carnahan, John Anderson

Mr. Carnahan said that the Downtown Community Association is proposing to create a location for hanging civic announcement banners on an existing building wall. He said that only one banner would be hung at a time and that they would be changed every two weeks. He said that the maximum dimensions for the banners would be 18' x 5' and that he was proposing to modify the minimum size to be 6' x 3'. He said that the banners would be mounted on an existing blank wall at a location where a sign had been painted over.

Ms. George asked for clarification to the statement in the application that a banner will be displayed no more than four times per year. Mr. Carnahan said that the guidelines provide that each party will be limited to displaying a banner four times per year. The applicant said that the guidelines limit the number of logos to two per banner. Mr. Pfeffer said that he was concerned about the size of the lettering, but that it seemed that the limits were adequate. The applicant said that, if there were problems, the guidelines could be changes. He added that the approval could be for a limited duration of time to give the Committee an opportunity to revisit any aspects that were shown to raise issues. Ms. George said that would be good because the Committee does not know how long the Montpelier Downtown Community Association will exist in its present form. Ms. Smith said that the permit could be specific to the Community Association and require a new application for any new organization. Ms. George said that she believed that is was appropriate to monitor the activity over a period of time to make sure that there are no unacceptable visual impacts. She said that at some point the DRC would want to review the visual impacts and how the banners are administered. She suggested a two-year period.

Mr. Pfeffer said that it seemed that setting a maximum percentage for the logo would be appropriate. There was general agreement that 15% would be an appropriate limit. Ms. George suggested that any approval state that there may be two logos not to exceed 15% of the banner.

The applicant said that the proposed method of attachment has not been finalized. He said that they might use an aluminum bar or hooks installed into the mortar. He said that the building owner does not want screws in the mortar. Ms. George said that the materials installed on the building for attachment should be painted to match the building and installed into the mortar.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. They voted to recommend approval of the application with the following adjustments:

1. Each banner may contain two logos not to exceed 15% of the banner,
2. After two years, renewal of the permit shall be subject to review as to proper administration and visual suitability,
3. The method of attachment shall be painted to match the building and any attachments shall be installed into the mortar, and
4. The minimum banner dimensions shall be 6' x 3'.

III. Design Review

Property Address: 169 Barre Street
Applicant: Michael McCarty
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Installation of a new roof
- Installation of vinyl siding on back and sides of building

Interested Party: Michael McCarty

Mr. McCarty described the application. He said that he installed a new roof *structure* in October. He said that the original roof was very flat and had about eight different pitches. He said that the roof had settled *to a negative pitch* and water was no longer running off of the roof in many places. He said that the water did runoff at some locations where it was not intended to occur, *getting in behind the window lintels and* causing damage to the walls and windows. Mr. McCarty said that the roof was not repairable. He said that he structurally enhanced the roof and installed a new metal roof which allowed for a pitch of about 2:12. He said that the finish work has not been done, but that he hopes to complete it in the spring. He said that he wants to bring the roof line out to **cover** the ~~match~~ the existing windows. *He was then going to build a straight vertical false wall to meet the new roof structure and cover the mansard pitch.*

The Committee and applicant reviewed digital photographs of the building on Ms. Smith's computer.

Ms. George said that there are three components of the application. Those are the roof *structure* that has been installed, the changes to the mansard-style and the vinyl siding. Mr. Gilbertson said that the Committee understands Mr. McCarty's problem and why he did the work, but the mansard roof is a character defining feature. He said that he has real concerns about the changes. Ms. Smith noted that the Fire Chief and Building Inspector may have issues with the creation of a new roof over the existing roof. Mr. Pfeffer said that what was done to the building may have fixed the problem, but was not consistent with preserving the historic character of the building as required in the design review district.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. Ms. George said that, having gone through the criteria, it appeared that there was a good chance that the Committee would vote to recommend that the application not be approved. She suggested discussing options. *The applicant agreed.* Mr. Gilbertson said that the key is to fix the roof while keeping the character of the structure. He said that there is a new rubber material that might work. Ms. George said that she was concerned with the overhang, ~~A~~ *and* that she did not know if there was a way to address it while keeping the existing roofing.

Ms. George advised the applicant that the Committee could act on the application as it was proposed or the application could be tabled to allow for time to work on some of the issues. Mr. Pfeffer said that, if the application was tabled until the spring, the applicant would be able to talk to the Building Inspector. He said that Labor and Industry might also get involved since it regulates buildings with three or more apartments. Mr. McCarty said that he wants to satisfy the community, but the grade of the roof was unacceptable. He did not see a way to get the roof over the porch without affecting the mansard. He said that he cannot have snow coming off of the roof because of the sidewalk and driveways around the building. He asked if there was a way to pull the overhang back and maintain the mansard. Mr. Pfeffer said that appeared to be complicated. Mr. Gilbertson said that, if the applicant chose to table the application, the Committee could have informal discussion with him to try to work out the issues. He suggested that a hard date not be placed on the application because of Mr. McCarty's military obligations. Ms. Smith said that the work on the building represents a violation, but the applicant is trying, in good faith, to address the issue. The applicant said that tabling the application made sense. Ms. George suggested that the application be tabled to June 15.

The Committee voted to table the application until June 15, 2005.

Approval of Minutes of the October 19, 2004 meeting

The Committee decided to review the minutes of the October 19, 2004 meeting at its next meeting.

Other

Ms. George said that the Montpelier Historic District is applying for a grant to upgrade the National Register Map, but matching funds are needed. She said that the DRC could help by donating time or by allocating any funds that would have been paid for conferences. Mr. Everett proposed that the Committee use funds that it would have received as reimbursement for registration or attendance of any conferences or meetings to serve as matching funds. The Committee approved the motion.

Adjournment

The Committee voted to adjourn the meeting.

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

These minutes are subject to approval by the Design Review Committee. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are acted upon.

