

Montpelier Design Review Committee

August 26, 2008

Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Soren Pfeffer, James Duggan and Guy Tapper.
Clancy DeSmet, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:

Margot George, Chair, called the meeting of the Design Review Committee to order at 5:30 P.M. She explained the advisory role of the Design Review Committee to the Development Review Board.

I. 11-13 Berlin Street – GB/DCD

Applicant: William Parker

Owner: William Parker

Repaint building with new colors.

Ms. George said 11-13 Berlin Street is the building next to the gas station on the corner. The application shows his building he wants to change, the brick building on the corner of Berlin Street, and 5 School Avenue and 2 Prospect Street so the DRC can see other colors in the neighborhood. He also included some paint chips for the committee to review. He is looking at basically three colors, a tan, taupe and a darker reddish brown. The body is going to be the taupe color, beige trim and the door the dark brown. The original building is a “pinkish” taupe, so he is changing that a little bit. She asked if he planned on doing anything with the railings and stair cases.

Mr. Parker said he just planned on using a clear sealer. The steps are pressure treated.

Ms. George asked if the windows were staying the same with the regular frames and wooden storms.

Mr. Parker replied yes.

Ms. George asked if he was going to be treating the storm window units as a trim or body color.

Mr. Parker said he planned on using the trim color.

Mr. Everett said the Committee may want to give him the option of painting the stairs and railings with either trim or body color.

Mr. Parker said he would appreciate that because that is what he intends to do, to pressure wash it and then clear seal it.

Mr. Everett said they could also give him the option to use the accent color on the window sash. Sometimes if you paint the sash a lighter color moisture condensation creates dark spots on lighter colored sash. Historically, many of the older buildings have darker sash for that very reason.

Mr. Parker said they are all going to be the same trim color.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application acceptable. The optional changes are that the window sash and storm can be the body or accent color, and the stairs, posts and railings and deck may

be body or trim color. The application with the optional changes was approved by the Design Review Committee on a 5 to 0 vote.

II. 31 Barre Street – CB-I/DCD

Applicant: Sign Design, John Miller

Owner: Jeffrey Jacobs

Ground sign.

Chair, Margot George, recused herself from participating in the application. Stephen Everett chaired this portion of the meeting.

Mr. Miller said his understanding is that Jeff Jacobs is converting the building to offices. The driveway that separates his building from the building he is in also separates CB from CB-II. He has decided to take advantage of that and make it a more commercial building. He believes he is going to have two, and possibly three, professional offices in that building. The picture in the drawing shows three boxes, and the separate picture shows four boxes. That is because they see the entire panel being somewhat flexible for the tenants' use. The header is just to define the building and create a presence for the building.

Now the upright posts that support the sign will also be painted the same grey as the building.

The wheelchair sign will be put on immediately to advertise there is handicapped accessible parking. There is a handicapped accessible ramp in the back.

Mr. Miller said the colors are various shades of dark green, and they are going to use a sage green for the trim and number 31. The dark pine color is for the words "Professional Building." The sage green is used for the number 31 and the trim. Barre Street is in black. The tenant names will be on 9" x 40" panels.

Mr. Duggan asked if the panels would be attached into a board unit.

Mr. Miller said he was sure they would be attached on both sides and completely flexible. It is going to function as a directory, similar to what Tim Heney has down on Main Street.

Mr. Everett said it says the height is 72 inches. Mr. Miller said that is the height of the panel. There is a space directly in front of the sign and one directly behind it. As you can see coming from downtown, as you get a little further back, there is a school children sign that swings directly in front of it. He said he would ask for 11 feet just to be on the safe side. Obviously, they would like to get by with less. The posts will be 6 x 6 with a pyramid cut on the top. They will be painted grey. The maximum sign height will be 11 feet.

Mr. Duggan said if a business were to go in here with a logo with predetermined colors, such as red, would that become an issue, or would the logo be permitted just because it is part of the business.

Mr. DeSmet said if it conforms to the dimensions they are applying for it would be okay. They would need to get an amendment to the sign permit.

Mr. Miller said Clancy talked about another way to approach this which is you would permit everything in advance and then make changes. Mr. DeSmet said either way each sign has to be approved because it

is a new use coming in. Mr. Miller said he thinks the sign creates significant attention to the building for what Jeffrey envisions it being used for.

Mr. Pfeffer inquired if there was going to be lighting on the sign.

Mr. Miller replied no.

Mr. Pfeffer said he personally thinks as long as the address of 31 Barre Street is above the cars the rest of the sign doesn't need to be that high. Mr. Miller said it would be nice to have a ground sign. If the building were set back another 20 feet and had a big lawn the sign could be planted in the lawn. In this location the sign being obscured is an issue.

Mr. Everett asked if there was any consensus on the height of the sign.

Mr. Pfeffer said he thinks it looks too tall proportionately for the building and the neighborhood feeling. Aesthetically, it would be ideal to have it centered in that space where the columns are between the fascia and the railings of the porch.

Mr. Miller said it is centered horizontally. He thinks Soren is saying to drop the sign down so it is half way up the porch. That would be a mistake from the owner's point of view.

Mr. Duggan said he is feeling neutral about the height. He thinks it is going to look rather big in that space. It would be nice to see it a little shorter, but that would also restrict the number of tenants they could display.

Mr. Miller said they could probably stipulate the 4 foot clearance, which would restrict the sign to 10 feet. That would drop it down below the fascia board of the porch.

Mr. Everett said they are back to the 10 foot to the peak of the original proposal.

Mr. Duggan asked if the angle at the top of the sign matched the angle of the dormer. Mr. Miller replied no. They try not to make sign roofs look like building roofs if they can avoid it.

The DRC reviewed the sign criteria. Mr. Everett asked the applicant if Mr. Jacobs would like the option to extend the shrubbery out under the sign. An option to extend compatible shrubbery plantings around the base of the sign. The proposed sign is compatible with the building and other ground signs in the district. The application received a favorable vote of 3 to 1, with Soren Pfeffer voting no. Mr. Pfeffer said he was opposing it because of the height.

Margot George resumed her chair duties of the DRC.

Approval of August 12, 2008 Minutes:

The Minutes of the August 12, 2008 Design Review Committee were approved on a 5 to 0 vote.

Adjournment:

The Design Review Committee adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning and Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack