Montpelier Design Review Committee
September 28, 2010
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Stephen Everett, Chair; James Duggan, Vice Chair, Eric Gilbertson, Kate Coffey, Jay White, and Muffie Conlon.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:
Stephen Everett, Chair, called the meeting of the September 28, 2010 Montpelier Design Review Committee to order at 5:30 P.M.

Mr. Everett explained the advisory role of the DRC to the Montpelier Development Review Board and vote approval based on criteria they committee must follow.

I. 7 Main Street – RIV/DCD
Applicant: Pomerleau Real Estate
Owner: Pomerleau Family, LLC
Amend Site Plan to re-route drive thru.
Interested Party: Steve Ploesser

Mr. Ploesser said some have been a little bit inconvenienced by the railroad track being reopened and used and part of them shutting off the lease agreements with everybody as we are not allowed to drive the cars through the drive thru bank and use the tracks as they have for years. Trying to keep a tenant in the building and accommodate them with a drive thru they have worked with a local architect and engineer to come up with a unique way to keep what they have there and reutilize it. The bank does not have the traffic they have had in the past with drive thrus and ATMs because of the online banking now. They get approximately 20 to 25 cars a day through there. The three gates were put when it was Vermont Federal 10 years ago in 1997. Their proposal of what they would like to do is just reverse the traffic to come through the end of the building and out and back on to Main Street. They were trying to go the other way so the traffic stares at the teller so they don’t have to alter the building. The only thing they are doing is removing one column. It will be structurally supported so there is just one column being removed and reconfiguring the parking. It will take out four parking stalls to create the drive thru underneath the existing canopy. There will be an ATM and the teller vacuum tube right by window and then they will exit out the side. The four parking stalls they are losing they are accommodating right here. Presently the sidewalk comes off and straight across over to Sarducci’s. It will come down and come across between the ATM and the parking and come over to the bank.

Ms. Conlon asked if they were moving the handicapped ramp.
Mr. Ploesser said everything will slide a little bit because they have to allow for the accessibility. The ramp is moved right now about four feet. It will still meet ADA code, but until they get this laid out they may only have to go 2 or 3 feet. Definitely their first concern is the safety of anybody walking through or coming out of a car and getting to the ramp.

Mr. Everett asked if the sidewalk would be ramped down.

Mr. Ploesser said they thought they had to get an elevation to get something together for this. They couldn’t get the sidewalk laid out. They will be meeting ADA requirements. Their request is to redo the concrete coming down. This would remain black top all the way across so it would be all ADA accessible curbed on both sides. They wanted to swap the landscaping islands after because then the cars will be hanging over that curb so anybody on a bicycle or walking a dog we would be better to put the landscaping island on this side and move the sidewalk a little closer.

Mr. Duggan said he mentioned they are going to be removing a post.

Mr. Ploesser said the shadow line is the existing canopy. This represents one of the existing islands under the yellow post. Right now the engineer is wrapping the existing wood beam with steel and they will paint it green. They will take the beam that is missing and move it right up against the edge of the building.

Mr. Gilbertson said that was put on there probably in 1980.

Mr. Ploesser said it was updated in 1997. They added a third one on and put the landscaping island on the end. There are six columns, three in the front and three in the back. The two front ones will remain. One will be removed so the cars can come out. The back three will remain. Along the back edge they will create a curb and some kind of landscaping for water to run off and some lights so people won’t just walk through. They are just trying to get the bank in play with their drive thru.

Mr. Gilbertson said he has yet to see one of the trains go through.

Mr. DeSmet said he lives on Barre Street and sees them all of the time.

Mr. Everett said he saw pictures of signs. Are there any additional signs and where are they going to be located?

Mr. Ploesser said the signs should be depicted on the drawing and numbered out. They presently have three drive thru signs and will be going down to one. They are going to keep the existing lighting under the canopy. They are in a flood zone so all the electrical is high and comes down to just the new ATM. They are going to use the existing vacuum tubes and
just swing over with another elbow on it. The only disruption to this is one post. They aren’t changing any colors or roofing and just shifting parking over.

Mr. Gilbertson said they aren’t going to put the grass under the canopy.

Mr. Ploesser said it won’t be under the canopy. It will probably be a bark mulch. They are going to dig up the roses and disperse them around. There are also one or two spreading yews over there and they will relocate those or replace them with existing kinds. The bank has asked us not to put in trees or taller shrubs close to the ATM due to the fact of security.

Mr. White said they said they are going to move the sidewalk closer to the machine and have landscaping between the sidewalk and the head of the parking.

Mr. Ploesser said not a lot of landscaping. It is more of a landscaping island. It is the buffer.

Mr. White inquired about the size of the parking spots.

Mr. Ploesser said they are 18 feet deep and 9 feet wide. With all of the unknowns down on Stone Cutters Way if he made the cars go this way it would be like closing it off.

Mr. Gilbertson said he thinks it is a good solution to a difficult problem.

Mr. Ploesser said their other option was to put a gate in. The Railroad Department said they could put gates in but it was a huge expense.

Mr. White said it is much better to do it from a design point of view and not rely on the mechanics of a gate. Closing off across the tracks is a good idea.

Ms. Coffey said there isn’t grass under the canopy. She wonders if he would consider putting a stone or concrete pad under the columns.

Mr. Ploesser said all of the columns are supported by concrete footings. There are cement pads there. They are going to cut out the center islands where the curbs are and paving right over the concrete. All of the columns will remain where they are on their existing footings. The columns will be above the grass line.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0.
II. 186 Main Street – CB-II/DCD
    Owner/Applicant: Laura Peer
    Exterior Paint

Laura Peer said the main color of the house is going to be India Trade. The architectural trim that is red right now is going to be a pumpkin color. The dark trim is called Jewett White. For a pop of more color blue for the doors.

Mr. White asked what the storm windows on the porch are.

Ms. Peer replied they are white vinyl. That is why they chose the white trim to connect them.

Mr. Duggan said the door will be blue and then the trim will be the white.

Mr. White said if she makes the side lights in the door the same it would look better. How about the lattice work underneath the porch. Will that be painted?

Ms. Peer said they are going to do pumpkin and the stairs will be pumpkin.

The DRC members inquired if she proposed any additional lighting. They provided an option for a wall mounted exterior light fixture either over the doorway or on both sides of the front doorway with a 60 watt maximum bulb size.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application on a vote of 5 to 0.

III. 16-18 State Street – CB-II/DCD
    Owner: Scott Fitzgerald
    Replacement of Windows

Mr. Fitzgerald said as of their last meeting he was investigating the windows he has and seeing about an external divider. He has been talking to Portland Glass and that particular dividers are between the two panes of glass. They said they could do something that would do the dividers but it would be a snap-on type thing. He was thinking about changing his request to have open panes over open panes. Next year he can do his second floor windows and have them all be the same. He didn’t know if that would be acceptable or not.

Mr. Everett asked if the 3 over 3’s were the original style of the window in the building.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied yes. Portland Glass said they could do a snap-in divider on the outside of the window. He wouldn’t have the money to do all six windows this year but he could do them all the same in the spring.
Mr. DeSmet said he wants approval for this style window throughout.

Mr. Gilbertson said he would vote no on that because they really take a close look at windows downtown and he has his original 3 over 3 windows in, and that is what they are looking at replacing them. Sometimes they glue the dividers on the outside.

Mr. White said there are some pretty good adhesive tapes they are probably looking at. That may work for you.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked what he should bring back for the committee to look at.

Mr. White said first of all as the owner he needs to be comfortable that it would work for him. Then, he would recommend that he put that in the application.

Mr. Everett said they would need a cut sheet that would give the dimensions of the muntins they will apply to the windows. Specialty glass shops like Glass Works on Route 2 do a lot of custom work and use polyurethane glue when they are building a special window. He has windows that have been broken that have applied muntins and they can lift that, replace the glass and reapply the simulated dividers.

Mr. Duggan asked if there was a possibility of ordering different windows.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied no. He said he has already purchased these.

Mr. Duggan said he has a hard time voting for vinyl windows in general because it is not a suitable replacement. He would be more inclined to approve a fiberglass window or a clad wood window, but he doesn’t have faith that a vinyl window is a suitable replacement. He personally would not vote for the types of tweaks that have been suggested. He thinks that is a band aid.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he has a good friend who works with windows and he says that a lot of the new replacement windows – fiberglass, wood and vinyl – the only way you can tell what the material is would be if you cut into it or drill it.

Mr. Duggan said he would disagree with that.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he disagrees with him 150 percent. It is also up on the second and third floor, and he can’t tell him that by looking at it from the ground what it is either.

Mr. Duggan said he has already purchased these windows.
Mr. Gilbertson said he purchased three and put two in. They are trying to come to a reasonable compromise. He would rather see him get new windows. Vinyl is the bottom of the line.

Mr. Fitzgerald said there is a big stigma with and everybody he has talked to in business with it says that it is as good as anything else or better. They sell vinyl and they sell fiberglass.

Mr. Duggan said the places he goes have always steered him away from vinyl. He has seen them both new and after 20 years. What is nice about a wooden window is that it can be repaired in perpetuity.

Mr. Fitzgerald said these windows have been repaired on multiple occasions.

Mr. Everett said part of the issue is that historic buildings are generally made out of quality materials. You are buying a 20 to 25 year window with a vinyl window and these wooden windows have been here for 50 to 100 years. He is pretty sure they are the original windows. They try to replicate the quality of the historic materials. They are trying to be reasonable about it.

Mr. Fitzgerald said the last time he was here they did a straw poll about vinyl windows and nobody said anything. Mr. Duggan is the dissenting vote on it. He doesn’t know where he stands on his application.

Mr. Everett asked what he would think about it with a properly applied muntin even though it is vinyl.

Mr. White said he could agree to that if it worked properly and looked properly from the outside. He isn’t a purist on that because he also leans towards owner’s rights.

Ms. Coffey said she doesn’t think the vinyl window will meet the criteria for approval.

Mr. Gilbertson said he is on the fence about it. He certainly needs to come back with a cut sheet and profile of the muntins and with measurements of the existing ones. He doesn’t like vinyl windows and he doesn’t think they have approved them in the downtown before. They have approved a lot of aluminum clad windows.

Mr. White asked what kind of storm windows he has on the existing windows.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they are aluminum on the outside. The glass is all broken.

Mr. White said in order to get an energy efficient with the existing windows you would also need to be looking at some type of a storm window inside or out.
Mr. Fitzgerald said he wasn’t planning on it because he wanted to use an insulated glass without a storm window.

Mr. White said part of his compromise position is that he shouldn’t compromise on the lack of the muntins because it is critical to have the 3 over 3, but he also has really never liked the look of an applied aluminum exterior storm window because it cheapens the whole building. That is why he could support a vinyl window.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he thinks the windows on the back side of the building have been replaced and they are actually metal.

Mr. Everett suggested that the DRC is advisory to the Development Review Board so whether the DRC approves it or doesn’t approve it he could still go forward with the application. He agrees with Eric. His suggestion would be to actually bring the sash in and see what it looks like. Then, he can find out what the cut sheet on the applied muntins is. How is it going to be applied? It should be able to be glued on and they should be able to give him that information.

Mr. White said he should also bring an existing window, one of the ones he removed.

Mr. Everett said that would be his best shot. Bring in an existing window that has the muntins; bring in an actual sash of the other one and some cut sheet or detail showing how they can apply the muntins so it will replicate the existing window.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he will wait until he gets that and come back and talk to the DRC.

Mr. Everett said if they have more than one option can you give Portland Glass one of your old window sashes and have them take it to Harvey Windows and match this.

Mr. Fitzgerald said he has the other window upstairs and he can take half out and bring the application in here.

The application remains tabled.

**Adjournment:**
Upon motion by Mr. Gilbertson and Mr. Duggan the DRC adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning and Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack