

Montpelier Design Review Committee
November 23, 2010
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: James Duggan, Vice Chair; Kate Coffey, Muffie Conlon and Zachary Brock.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by James Duggan, Vice Chair, at 5:30 P.M.

I. 100 State Street – CB-I/DCD

Owner: Capital Plaza Corp.

Applicant: William Foley c/o Northfield Savings Bank

Design Review for an Exterior ATM Machine

Northfield Savings Bank is at 100 State Street in downtown Montpelier. They are looking to add a second ATM. Currently, they have a walk-up ATM but it is extremely busy. Typically on a weekend there are five or six people standing on the sidewalk waiting to use the ATM so they felt it would be good for one's safety and other convenience to the customer to add a second. They looked at the building and reviewed it with the landlord about the best location. They didn't want to change any of the architectural elements of the building and wanted to come up with something that is simple yet effective. They are looking at taking two panes of glass out and replacing it with a metal panel. It is an insulated metal panel. They can get it in a smooth finish but that is a perforated finish to match the existing storefront. They are trying to keep the same materials that currently exist. They would have to cut the existing planter out and take three sections of the sidewalk out, flatten the pad and then continue the slope for safety.

Mr. Duggan asked if it would ramp up to the ATM.

Mr. Foley said based on the floor plan if they take the first section out they can have a flat pad similar to the flat pad that enters into the building. At the second they would start their slope and continue that down to where the existing ramp is currently. The only new material on the building would be this piece of metal.

Mr. Duggan said it looks like they have a canopy above the ATM. What materials will that be?

Mr. Foley said it is a blue cloth on the building now. They needed something for shelter so they used the same material. It will be fixed to the storefront glass. They would fix it to the panel and the two braces would be on the storefront.

Ms. Coffey asked if the bottom of the new canopy aligning with the existing one.

Mr. Foley replied no. It would start there and then drop down.

Mr. Duggan asked what would happen to the other two windows to the right of the permanent affixed canopy. Will there be another canopy to balance it?

Mr. Foley replied they would keep the blue.

Mr. Duggan said Mr. Foley said there were lights underneath the soffit. How will this be lit at night?

Mr. Foley said they wanted to put a wall pack in the center to shine down on the ATM and they would take the lights above out. It is important for safety reasons to have a lot of light in this area. If they didn't have the awning extended then the other lights that are in the canopy now would already be on.

Ms. Coffey said she would like it better if it did extend through the whole bay.

Mr. Duggan asked if there was a way to better resolve the height because it is very linear. He has another question about the panel. He assumes the new bars will be the brushed aluminum to match.

Mr. Foley replied that is right.

Mr. Duggan asked if there were other options. This seems sort of reflective.

Mr. Foley replied there is an option that matches the actual storefront which is the brushed aluminum.

Mr. Duggan said he would suggest they find a color that matched the canopy.

Mr. Foley said perhaps they could do an earth tone.

Ms. Coffey said she would like to see what the other color options are.

Mr. Duggan said if they could see other options for finish and color would be good. Perhaps they could give the committee a photo shop image of the revision of the canopy. That would be helpful. They would table the application this evening and ask him to come back to their next meeting on December 14th.

Mr. Foley said they might push the project to a March start. The ATM takes two months and they didn't want to order the ATM machine until they had received approval for it.

Mr. Brock said when they look at options there is some kind of glass that is translucent.

Mr. Foley said they wanted to match the materials in the building.

Ms. Coffey said she thinks he is on the right track but they need a little more information.

II. 34 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner: James Blouin

Applicant: Vintage Trailer Supply, Inc. – Steve Hingtgen

Design Review for multiple exterior renovations.

This is the former Blouin Paint Store on Barre Street just past the Catholic Church on the left. It has been empty for about a year now. This building is a box that is about 40 feet across the front and it is brick. Their space is 90 feet deep. There is another unit on the back, and if you look at the west elevation you can see there are two existing doors near the back of the building. The right door is the door for the front unit and the left door for the rear unit. The rear unit takes up a very small amount of space in the very back of the building. The building was built in 1950 and it's a contributing structure in the Historic District so they are sensitive to that. There is a brick façade unpainted and that façade carries down 25 feet along the sides of the building, and then it is concrete block. It has a flat roof, one story. What they are proposing to do to the building is on the front they want to replace the right window. The left window has been replaced recently with aluminum storefront frame. The right is an original window. It is wood and it is falling apart. It is in really bad shape so they need to do something with it. What they are proposing doing is putting a three light window in its place. What they proposed was another aluminum storefront frame window on that side with the center being a slider. There is no natural ventilation in this building at all right now. After talking to his contractor this week they feel they are

wasting an opportunity with a slider. It isn't as energy efficient as a casement window. They were thinking to use the same frame with three operable casements. For a lot of people this building may not seem like a big deal historically, but for him it is. They are basically the general store selling parts to people restoring travel trailers in the 1950's and 60's – airstreams. He understands this era and some of the features on this building are very neat in its own 1950's way so they would like to preserve that. They feel that by putting aluminum window on the right side with three lights is a decent match for the left side. They can't do two lights. They can't do an operable window that wide. If there is a design or historic reason why they shouldn't do casement windows and should do sliders they will take the hit on the energy efficiency and do what people feel. His preference is for casement windows.

Mr. Duggan asked if it would be three equal sections.

Mr. Hingtgen replied yes. That is very important to him. That is one of the fights they were having today about casements. That is what they would like from the committee as a condition that they be the same size because it is really a nice balance. That is by far the most significant change they are proposing for the building. The other change they are proposing to the building is adding a narrow overhead door to the side of the building. The building has been re-roofed in the last four years and the downspout is obsolete. They are actually working in an old window opening that many years ago had been blocked over. This building has always had occasional truck traffic to it. When it was a paint store they got a truck two or three times a week in. They will probably have less than that. They think on average they will have one or less semi-trailers a week. When they do come in they may have things on pallets and skids and be able to unload it and get it in the building in the freezing rain or snow without having to unload it on the side of the road.

Mr. Duggan asked if the windows currently operate in any way or are they fixed.

Mr. Hingtgen replied they are fixed.

Mr. Duggan said when he fabricates them in the aluminum can he give the committee an idea of how wide a mullion will be in there. He mentioned he is looking to replicate the windows.

Mr. Hingtgen said he doesn't have that with him. There is an option when you make windows which is you can do a frame and put windows inside of windows. They are going with something that is preassembled.

Ms. Coffey said she would like to see the actual elevation so they can see the site lines of what the casement window does and compare it to the window next to it.

Mr. Duggan said if they could have some sort of mock up so they could see how that might be molded. Personally he isn't against the replacement of these windows with the aluminum, but the key to success would be to not have this smaller collection and have larger vertical ones. He would be in support of the alteration so long as visually they are not creating a very thick aesthetic here.

Mr. Hingtgen asked if the committee's preference be that they go with the non-operable. Would their preference be they have fixed non-operable rather than bulk that up?

Mr. Brock said the center is still fixed and the two sides are operable.

Mr. Duggan said aesthetically it would be better to match this as closely as we can because it is such an austere kind of façade. There is not a whole lot of detail there but he also understands the interest in the fresh air. He hopes there is a balance that can be found.

Mr. DeSmet said it seems the two operables would have a thinner profile.

Mr. Hingtgen said they need to evaluate costs.

Mr. Brock said it would be interesting to see the detail of a new window versus the existing.

Ms. Conlon asked if they were in the building now.

Mr. Hingtgen said no, they don't have their certificate of occupancy. They have a building permit so they are working on the inside of the building only but they are not able to work on the outside of the building until they move through zoning.

Mr. Duggan asked if he would be willing to report back to the committee.

Mr. Hingtgen said he is wondering if based on timing whether they can sever these two things because he can do the window in January, February or March.

Mr. DeSmet said he has two other approvals, conditional use and site plan. Stopping now would be a hardship.

Mr. Hingtgen said if he could get the DRC's approval on the side would be a very practical thing for them.

Mr. Duggan said he is comfortable with that. He asked if he intended to have a sign at some point.

Mr. Hingtgen said there is a sign and they aren't changing it. Their retail tends to be very appointment driven rather than walk-in. They will probably come in for a sign eventually but they aren't ready yet.

Mr. DeSmet said they could remove the window replacement from this application. When he comes in for a sign he doesn't see a problem with asking for a window replacement at the same time.

Mr. Duggan said he doesn't have any issues with any of the other items in the application. If everyone is comfortable with that the committee could vote on that and he could go forward with that and revisit the windows.

Mr. Hingtgen said he thought that was a reasonable approach.

Mr. DeSmet said the proposed window replacement on the front façade is no longer part of this application.

Mr. Duggan said they are applying the criteria to the installation of the door on the west façade, the 5' x 8' overhead door, and the application of color changes to the foundation cornice and entry of the main brick block of the building.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found it acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0.

Review of October 26, 2010 Minutes:

Ms. Coffey and Mr. Duggan moved to table the review of the October 26th minutes.

Adjournment:

The Design Review Committee adjourned on a vote of 4 to 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack