

Montpelier Design Review Committee
February 22, 2005
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George.

I. Design Review

Property Address: 73 Main Street
Applicant: Tim Heney for Heney Family Main St. Ltd. Partnership
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Replacement of 69 double-hung windows

Interested Parties: Tim Heney

Ms. George said that, at its last meeting, the Design Review Committee tabled the application so that the applicant could provide details on the type of proposed windows and the window mullions and to allow the committee members to visit the building to look at the existing windows. She asked the applicant if he had additional information. Mr. Heney provided a cross section detail of the proposed window. He said that simulated divided lights would be used. Ms. George said that, up to that point, the type of divider proposed had not been clear. She said that the Committee members had received an e-mail from the staff indicating that the application was for true divided lights. Mr. Heney confirmed that simulated divided lights were proposed.

Ms. George said that she had visited the site. She said that the outside profile of the existing window mullions were fairly simple and a little deeper than what was proposed, but the mullions were more detailed on the inside. She noted that the proposed paint colors will match the existing colors.

Mr. Gilbertson said that he still believed that true divided lights would be appropriate for the replacement windows. He said that he had visited the site and Mr. Everett's building. He said that he believed that there was a difference between the simulated divided lights and the true divided lights. Ms. Lane asked whether the existing windows were original. Mr. Heney said that they probably were original. Mr. Gilbertson said that a state grant was previously issued for the installation of storm windows on the building.

Ms. George said that she did not have as much of an issue with the use of simulated divided lights because the windows are on the upper floors. She said that she would have a problem if the windows were proposed for the first floor. Mr. Gilbertson asked whether Mr. Heney had priced the cost of the true divided lights. Mr. Everett said that the energy efficiency of the simulated divided lights is significantly better. He said that he did not think that the shadow caused by the simulated dividers was really visible. Ms. George asked whether there could be a compromise in the addition of a spacer to fill in the space between the sheets of glass at the dividers. Mr. Gilbertson said that would be better. He suggested that the applicant could use true divided lights on the front of the building and use the simulated lights on the sides and rear of the building. Mr. Heney said that the current application was only for the front and sides of the building. Ms. George said that she had been through these issues with her building. Mr. Heney asked what windows Ms. George had used on her building. She said that she used simulated divided lights with the spacers. Mr. Heney said that

he looked at the windows on Mr. Everett's building and could not see a difference.

Mr. Gilbertson said that he looked at the windows straight on and from a car and thinks that the simulated dividers make a difference. Ms. George said that the spacers would help and will not increase the cost too greatly. Ms. Lane said that the spacers would help.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Gilbertson said that he would vote against the proposed use of replacement windows with simulated divided lights because he did not think that the use of those windows was appropriate for a prominent building on Main Street. He said that the committee did not have a basis for comparison because the applicant had not provided information showing the price difference between the true divided lights and the simulated divided lights. Mr. Everett said that he recalled that the true divided lights cost about 40% more. Ms. George said that she had estimated that they would cost about 30% more. She said that she was concerned that the committee did not ask for the information at the last meeting. Mr. Gilbertson said that, at the last meeting, he did ask for details on the profile and dimensions of the existing and proposed mullions and for cost comparisons. Mr. Heney said that, at the last meeting, he understood that the information that the Committee wanted was the additional details on the mullions.

Ms. Lane asked what would happen to the existing windows and whether they could be reused elsewhere. Mr. Heney said that he might be willing to try to offer the windows for someone to take away. He said that the windows were so old that they might not come out in one piece.

Ms. George said that true divided lights would be the most appropriate choice for this prominent building. Ms. Lane said that the use of spacer bars in the simulated lights would meet the criteria more closely than the windows without the spacer bars. Mr. Everett said that he was not concerned with the spacer bars. Ms. George asked whether Mr. Heney would be willing to use the spacer bars on the front windows as a compromise. Mr. Heney said that he would be willing to look into the cost of adding the spacer bars, but the scale of the project was so great that an incremental increase in cost would be significant. Mr. Gilbertson suggested that Mr. Heney look into tax credits for the work on the historic building. Mr. Everett said that he believed that they would add \$30 to \$40 dollars per window. Mr. Heney said that he would look into it, but was not inclined to propose the change at present.

The committee voted on the recommendation for the Development Review Board approve the application for the replacement of the windows using proposed windows with simulated divided lights without spacers. Mr. Everett voted in favor of the motion. Ms. George, Mr. Gilbertson and Ms. Lane voted against the motion.

Mr. Heney said that he had wasted two weeks because the DRC could have made the same decision two weeks ago. Ms. George said that the DRC did not have enough information at the last meeting. She said that the staff had advised the Committee that true divided lights were proposed. Mr. Gilbertson said that, at the last meeting, he asked for profiles on the existing mullions. He said that Mr. Heney also did not have the prices for the different windows. Mr. Gilbertson said that the minimum amount of information had been brought to this meeting. Mr. Heney said that he brought the information that the Committee requested. He said that the Committee members said that they would visit the site to look at the windows and the profiles so that details did not have to be drawn up. Mr. Gilbertson said that he had stated that Marvin Windows should have those details and that he did not want to see the applicant have to hire someone to draw the profiles. Mr. Heney said that he called Marvin and has submitted the detail that they provided. Mr. Gilbertson said that the two weeks would not have been wasted if the cost information and other details had been brought to this meeting.

II. Conditional Use and Design Review

Property Address: 623 Stone Cutters Way
Applicant: Hunger Mountain Coop
Zone: RIV/DCD

- Temporary 28' x 9' refrigerated trailer

Interested Parties: Rowen Hurley

Ms. George asked whether the trailer would be in place for more than two years. Mr. Hurley said that it was expected to be in place for about 6 months, but would rather have an 8-month period to provide a safety factor on the time frame. Ms. George said that an application for the continued use of the trailer would have to be submitted if it is not removed from the site in 8 months. Mr. Gilbertson said that the proposal was acceptable provided that it is temporary. He said that the trailer would be in an obscure location on the site.

Ms. Lane said that the committee needed to address the relocation of the dumpster. Mr. Gilbertson said that it will be located at a part of the building that is not very visible. Ms. George added that the location is also temporary. Mr. Hurley said that the applicant would like to install a fence to provide screening after the trailer is removed. He said that would be the subject of a future application.

The committee reviewed the design review and conditional use criteria. The committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Development Review Board approve the application with the adjustment that the trailer be removed within 8 months.

Other

Sky Yardley discussed his proposal to develop a house at the corner of Bingham and East State Street. The committee discussed the application process and the review criteria with him.

Action on the Minutes of the October 19, 2004 and February 8, 2005

Mr. Gilbertson made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 8, 2005 meeting. He said that he would like the discussion of the application at 73 Main Street to be corrected to reflect his request that a profile of the mullions be provided. Ms. George suggested that could be accomplished by adding "including an actual profile of the existing mullion" at the end of the fifth sentence of the second paragraph. Mr. Gilbertson said that he wanted to be sure that tonight's minutes reflect his comments. He said that the committee needs to be sure that it has all of the details needed to make decisions when it is reviewing changes to a major downtown building like 73 Main Street. He said that he would have been more willing to vote for the application if adequate documentation was included with the application.

Ms. George also said that the fifth sentence in the first paragraph should be corrected to say "Mr. Heney said that he thought that they would be true divided lights, but was unsure."

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 8, 2005 meeting with the corrections.

Adjournment

The Committee voted to adjourn the meeting.

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.