Montpelier Design Review Committee  
March 24, 2009  
City Council Chambers, City Hall  

Subject to Review and Approval  

Present:  Stephen Everett, Chair; James Duggan, Vice Chair; and Nancy Mears.  
Staff:  Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator.  

Call to Order:  
Stephen Everett, Chair, called the March 24, 2009 Montpelier Design Review Committee meeting at 5:30 P.M.  

I.  7 Langdon Street – CB-I/DCD/FP  
Applicant:  Paul Snyder/Onion River Kids  
Owner:  Leeds Brewer  
Sign.  

Andrew Brewer said he photocopied a picture of their sandwich board which depicts the colors.  He said that two weeks ago there was a personnel change.  The dimensions of the sign are 24” x 36”.  There is an existing wrought iron hanger right now they plan to hang the sign on.  It will be a rectangular sign.  

Mr. Everett asked what was the dimension of the Global Gifts sign located there before.  

Mr. Brewer replied he didn’t know.  They just moved their sign down the block.  Mr. Duggan said their sign was more oval shaped.  

Mr. Brewer said it is a wooden sign with no lighting, and it is going on to an existing bracket.  

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application met all of the criteria.  The application passed unanimously on a vote of 3 to 0.  

II.  28 State Street – CB-I/DCD/FP  
Applicant:  DCP One, Inc/Subway – David Parker  
Owner:  Jeff Jacobs  
64” x 96” deck at rear of building.  

Mr. Parker said he had been working with Clancy on this project.  Mounted to the building are two steel brackets that appear to have been the fasteners to the building for the previous deck which had rotted away and is gone now.  It appears to be about 8 foot long.  What they patterned their deck after size wise is the picture on the back, which is Woodbury Mountain Toys.  Their level is a little higher than theirs is, thus the need for railings, etc. to make it a little safer.  They intend to have their customers as well as their deliveries come through that door.  Their city building permit with Glenn Moore has allowed them to make the modifications inside the building to accommodate that, but they cannot do those renovations until they have this piece of the puzzle in place.  As it stands they are on hold for any interior modifications until they have this approval.  Trying to get into the back parking lot has created some issues, so an extra entrance would help them.  Their intention would be to build the deck out of as many renewable parts as they could mean Trek recycled plastic.  They intend to do the framework of the deck with pressure treated lumber and have the decking and everything on top make out of Trek.  If they could get away with pressure treated lumber they would do it that way, but they are against spending the money to have it be safe and a quality product, also.  

Mr. Everett said that either pressure treated lumber or Trek would be acceptable for flooring.  

Ms. Mears said perhaps not for the railing.  

Mr. Duggan said in general they have tried to avoid product like Trek just because they don’t have the benefit of seeing how they weather over time.  In this case it’s a service entrance and in the parking lot.
Mr. Parker said they want to make it as safe as possible. They don’t want people slipping and falling. If they did use pressure treated lumber you can buy sandpaper tape to put on it to give it some grip so there won’t be a lot of ice buildup. They thought walking up the steps they would keep the steps away from the door so you wouldn’t be walking straight up the porch onto a small platform with the door potentially hitting you as you are walking, so you would be coming up the steps and the door would be swinging out. The door is existing in place there. It is very old, but they would keep it intact. Down the road if they did need to change it, certainly they would come back to the DRC. Mr. Parker said there is a small amount of concrete work that needs to be done on the foundation. It is just basically cosmetic on the top of the foundation where it has chipped away.

Mr. Everett said his only suggestion is depending on whether code allows it, only because he is bringing stuff in, is to either move the stairs over and then he could have two railings, a narrow railing so people could walk up on one side and do deliveries on the other side. Or, they could have the railing system so it swings out like a gate so they could open it up for deliveries and then close it again.

Mr. Parker said they had just talked about that. Mr. Moore had some concern about the length of the railing with hinges, but they thought they could make it a pocket, also, where you drop it down in and then when the delivery comes you pop it up, get your stuff, and put it back down in.

Mr. Duggan said he believed that would be preferable to have it open. He would be worried about someone coming out of the door and running into the railing. The rail will come across the front, but then it is going to have to return back to the top of the steps.

Mr. Everett said if they build the supports for the outer edge of the deck using 4 x 4s or 6 x 6s, then they could run their railings down the stairs. They could have the railing either hinged with a gate latch so it swings out of the way for deliveries, or they could have the pins and hooks so it drops down in. Would code allow him to just run the stair all the way across? They might have to put another rail in the middle depending on the width. If there was a rail in the middle they would have two choices of walking up either side.

Mr. Parker said that would be fine with him. Would a metal railing in between be acceptable?

Mr. Everett said it shouldn’t be a problem for a service entrance. They could put a wood post in the middle so there would be one wide stairway that would be divided with an extra rail.

Mr. Duggan said maybe he could find out what the maximum permissible width is for code to have a railing at each end.

Mr. Parker said at this point of the project they are open to all suggestions. Obviously, time is of the essence. He asked if it was the DRC’s opinion that if they talked to Glenn Moore and he said code is okay for 8 feet and to split it in the middle and have three railings.

Mr. Everett said that would be fine.

Ms. Mears asked what was going to happen to the compressor.

Mr. Parker said just to the left of the compressor. When the plow comes through it is pretty dangerous to have an expensive piece of equipment just sitting there like that so they need to get it up into the air. At the same time they would raise these up and put the unit underneath and build some sort of protection for that. He doesn’t know if that would require a permit or not. Their proposal would be to build them up on a platform and get them off the ground and put the air conditioning condenser underneath the deck to protect it.

Mr. Everett said if it was underneath the deck they could on the right hand side they could frame it. If they put a pressure treated deck over that it will trap the heat in. It is the same type of grading you see on the stairs out behind Heney’s building on the corner. It is a galvanized steel grate. They could remove it for servicing the unit and again for ventilation.
Mr. Parker said their proposal would be to go with the DRC’s recommendation pending talking to Glenn Moore about code that they would go with an 8 foot wide deck 64 inches deep with full steps across the front with railings every 4 feet on the end and middle.

Mr. Everett said they could even use the metal grates for the stair treads so the snow and ice falls through and you wouldn’t have to shovel it.

Ms. Mears said the way it is pictured here is probably better for code because they like you to be able to step out onto a platform before you step down the stairs.

Mr. Parker said the question he would have for the Design Review Committee is, based on what they know and how they are adjusting the application is it easy as getting an okay from Glenn Moore and proceed to the next meeting on April 6th for final approval?

Mr. DeSmet said he wouldn’t need to come back before the DRC. They will write it such that he can do it.

Mr. Everett said the DRC is looking at the proposal as applied for, and then at the applicant’s discretion we are saying that the access stairs may extend the full length of the service entrance deck with either two or three sets of stair rails to satisfy code requirements. Then, the deck flooring may be a combination of pressure treated wood and/or steel grating over the area of the location of the air condition compressor unit. Because he is going to build a platform to raise the compressors up for the refrigeration that attached or detached platform may be constructed out of the same materials.

Mr. Duggan inquired if there was a light back there.

Mr. Parker said there is no light back there and they would love to have one. That is not in the application. He asked what type of light would be permissible in the back of the building. At the store in Waterbury they just have a gooseneck light just over the door.

Mr. Everett said they could put a motion detector light back there.

Mr. Parker said what he would prefer to do is with whatever they put up they can put on a timer. He would be fine with that.

Mr. Parker said he had a question for the DRC. He has an office area in the back of the building. There is a window that is 70 to 80 years old. He asked what the process would be for him to pull that window out and replace it with something of the same size that aesthetically matches what is there already. The window is in such disrepair. There is a one inch gap at the top that is open and energy efficient wise it is terrible. It is painted shut right now.

Mr. Duggan said they should consider it now so he doesn’t have to pay for another application.

Mr. Everett said it looks like essentially a 4 x 4 wide window and he could put something in that replicates what is there. Obviously, there is no architectural detail to that window.

Mr. DeSmet said he didn’t see any problem if the DRC gives him the option of replacing the window to make it look exactly like it does.

Mr. Everett said it should be wood, either with a wood exterior or wood with a clad exterior. A metal clad would probably work better than the fiberglass and vinyl clads don’t last very long.

Mr. Everett said there is a combination of a service area platform plus a pedestal for the compressor units, plus a light over the doorway to light up the platform, and then replacing the large window on the right of the doorway.
as you face it with a single 4 x 4 or two 2 over 2 windows that are wood or wood clad that match the detail of the existing window.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the criteria. The adjustments are as follows:

- The access stairs may extend the full length of the service entrance deck with either two or three sets of stair rails to satisfy code requirements.
- Deck flooring may be a combination of pressure treated wood and wood or steel grating over the area of the location of the air conditioner compressor unit. Attached or detached platform for refrigeration compressors may be constructed out of the same materials.
- The large window on the right of the doorway may be replaced with a single 4 over 4 or 2 over 2 wood clad windows which match the detail of the existing window.
- A down lighted motion detector light fixture with a 65 watt maximum bulb may be installed over the doorway.

The application was approved on a 3 to 0 vote.

III. **9 School Street & 90-98 Main St. – CB-I/DCD/FP**
Applicant: Bohler Engineering, LLC – Daniel Clarey
Owner: TD Bank
New signage.

TD Banknorth is making a big change and going to TD Bank. Essentially, it is an 800 bank program of $93 million. They are rebranding all of their North American banks to be in common. They have made a number of acquisitions in the last couple of years and they are in the middle of the rebranding process which will be completed by September of this year. Bohler is handling a lot of the permitting for that. There are two locations which is 90 Main Street and 9 School Street, which is the drive through component for the main bank. For the 90 Main Street location they are essentially replacing the two façade signs, one on each street. The details of the signs are included in the member’s packets.

Mr. Duggan asked if the signs would be the same size.

Mr. Clarey said they are replacing an existing 17.42 square feet panel with a 14.5 sign, and the other is the same. They are a little smaller. The signs will be essentially in the same location. When he originally talked to Clancy about the location he mentioned that one of the items of sensitivity would be poking additional holes into the granite. He has already noted that on the issues list with them and they have agreed to use the existing anchors when they manufacture their signs so they aren’t putting any additional holes in the granite.

Mr. Duggan asked how they would do this.

Mr. Clarey said he didn’t know on this specific location. They have noted the sensitivity of this particular façade and he has put it into the notes for the sign manufacturer. The granite façade is not to be altered in any form, and if they do any repairs they will be cosmetic in nature.

Mr. Clarey said the 9 School Street location again existing façade signs are being replaced. In this particular case, on the first sign they are going from a 22 square foot sign to a 25.69 square foot sign, which is a little over 3 feet larger. They are replacing the 24 hour ATM sign with another TD Bank – Open 7 Days sign, going from 14.67 to 25.69. Then, they are replacing their ATM directional sign with their standard directional pylon sign, which is 3 feet tall by 3 feet wide at the top and a 1.5 foot base. That will be replacing the existing sign out there. They are taking off some of the window stenciling and replacing that with a small 2.66 square foot wall panel with hours
posted on it. The same thing at the drive through location. They will replace the stenciling on the window with a panel that goes on the column at the drive through.

Mr. Duggan said the sign that is getting bigger is going up to 25 square feet. Is that permissible?

Mr. DeSmet said they need a lot of frontage.

Mr. Everett inquired how large is the sign band at that location. Does it completely fill the sign band?

Mr. Clarey said he didn’t think so.

Ms. Mears said this one is smaller than the sign band.

Mr. Clarey said he suspects the answer is there are certain standard designs they have given certain conditions, and he guesses the fact they are adding the open 7 days on the sign makes it fit into a certain category which then fits within the sign band. He doesn’t think the sign is necessarily trying to gather more attention.

Mr. Everett said the sizes of the signs are within the limits of the requirements for frontage and square footage.

Mr. Clarey said given that this is a very large program the DRC should make it a condition of the permit that they use existing holes. That should be included in the permit.

Mr. Everett said they could consider both buildings at the same time with the criteria since most of the details are the same at both locations. Some are smaller and some are larger, but all within the scale.

Mr. Everett asked how they wanted to word the repair issue. He put that all signs are proposed to be mounted using existing mounting hardware, particularly on the granite sign band. Any resulting damage or remaining holes to be repaired with compatible material repairs. Mr. Duggan said if there were big holes he would repair them with epoxy and stone dust. If it is just a thin crack he wouldn’t do too much. It should at least give the appearance of stone.

Mr. Duggan asked Mr. Clarey if they would be contracting with local people or with a crew that does a number of signs.

Mr. Clarey said his understanding is that there will obviously be a number of contractors and somebody who is regional.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application acceptable. The application was approved on a 3 to 0 vote.

Approval of March 10, 2009 Minutes:
The minutes of the March 10, 2009 Design Review Committee were approved with a minor change on a vote of 3 to 0.

Adjournment:
Upon motion to adjourn by Mr. Duggan and Ms. Mears, the Design Review Committee adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack