

Montpelier Design Review Committee
August 23, 2011
Memorial Room, City Hall

Approved

Present: James Duggan, Vice Chair, Eric Gilbertson, Jay White, Zachary Brock and Tim Senter.
Staff: Audra Brown, Planning Department

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by James Duggan, Vice Chair. Mr. Duggan explained the Design Review Committee's process is advisory to the Development Review Board. The DRC will be evaluating the proposals in accordance with Cityscape and the preservation ordinance downtown. They will vote on the projects and approve or make recommendations and then forward to the DRB.

I. 153 Elm Street – CB-II/DCD:

Owner/Applicant: Laura Bozarth
Design Review for Extending Dormer and Repairing ADA Ramp
(As previously approved)
Interested party: Flor Diaz

Ms. Diaz presented some sketches of the project to the Committee. They want to extend the dormer out. It is used as a bedroom but very small. They want to extend it out 5 feet and add 3 windows. There will be 3 individual windows instead of 2 doubles. They are going to use one casement window in case it is kept as a bedroom for egress. Right now the back of the building totally neglects the river which is the most private part of the building.

Mr. White commented that he thought it was a good improvement.

Ms. Diaz said the handicapped porch is falling apart. They aren't doing any of the paving they submitted the first time until next spring. The ramp isn't long enough and isn't in good condition. There will be some structural improvement to the existing deck.

Mr. Duggan asked if she would be replacing the ramp as it appears now.

Ms. Diaz said they would take away all of the pressure treated lumber so it would be a regular railing. They would replace it completely with wood.

Mr. Gilbertson said if it is the same as it is now they won't need to come back to the Committee.

Mr. Duggan asked if the window would be the same size approximately.

Ms. Diaz replied that is what they want. The dormer will have white clapboards to match the existing clapboards on the building. They are maintaining the existing lighting on the back of the building.

Mr. Gilbertson said it looks great.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0. As an adjustment the applicant may install a fourth window on the south side of the building if necessary and

the handicapped ramp with a wood railing to meet the building codes or metal as submitted in the picture.

II. 100 State Street – CB-I/DCD

Owner: Capital Plaza Corp.

Applicant: Sammel Sign Co.

Design Review for a Ground Sign

Roger Sammel represented Capital Plaza and the Northfield Savings Bank. Northfield Savings Bank is their direct client and when they decided to change the free standing sign on Taylor Street Capital Plaza also expressed interest in doing a joint combined sign there as well. They are looking to replacing the existing Northfield Savings Bank sign with a combination.

Mr. Gilbertson said the sign in the project is a lot taller, 10' x 6". They had issue with another sign that got pretty tall and he doesn't know whether it is approaching billboard status or not. The existing Northfield Savings Bank sign is low to the ground. You can see over it if you are walking and this one you can't. He doesn't know what the ordinance allowances are.

Ms. Brown said Clancy will get input from Tom McArdle for the Development Review Board.

Mr. Gilbertson said it seems like a big sign to him. There is no directional arrow on the Northfield Savings Bank sign. He thinks a directional arrow is pretty important to get people where they want to do.

Mr. Sammel said they could include that on the sign. They could put an arrow on the sign and he is sure the bank would not object to that whatsoever. They have added arrows to other signs.

Mr. White said the sign goes into the beginning of the driveway into the whole parking area. He doesn't think the arrow will add anything to it.

Mr. Duggan asked if the pressure treated planter box stay.

Mr. Sammel replied that will be going away. He likes to leave 2 feet below the sign for snow and they have 2' 4". They could reduce that by 4 inches and they could also tighten up the top sign to the lower sign by a couple of inches.

Mr. White asked how wide the current sign is.

Mr. Sammel replied he thinks the existing sign is 72 inches. The new sign is 8 feet. It is 2 feet wider but it well within the allowed square footage for the property.

Mr. Gilbertson said he isn't sure why it has to be so big. It's not a high speed traffic area.

Mr. Duggan asked if it was possible to scale it down slightly and still maintain the proportions that are there.

Mr. Sammel said they could scale the entire project down.

Mr. White said adding the Capital Plaza sign is good but it does then require that the whole sign be scaled down. The proportions are good as it is. He would not lower the Capital Plaza sign to try to get

it to be closer to the other one. You need the space between the two, especially with the shape of the logo of the bank's.

Mr. Sammell said originally they had proposed that the Capital Plaza sign would be under the Northfield Savings Bank sign so the oval was the top element.

Mr. Duggan said that would make the LED lights a little harder to deal with, correct?

Mr. Sammel replied no because the LED lights on the Northfield sign are basically from the wings down below.

Mr. Duggan inquired if each sign had lights.

Mr. Sammel replied they do. Capital Plaza decided they wanted top billing since it is their property.

Mr. White said he thinks the smaller sign on top actually looks better in the proportions. He would recommend it come down about 60 or 75 percent of what it is and then it would be an appropriate sign for that spot. Shrink the whole sign down to about 8 feet tall.

Mr. Gilbertson said they had never dealt with lights like this before. They will just shine on the sign and not be visible.

Mr. Sammel replied that is correct. The fixtures themselves are designed as replacement lamps for vertical refrigeration display cases. You can order them with an LED pointing 45 degrees in either direction. The lights are only pointing towards the sign base and it basically just shines on the sign. He uses a 4,000 light which is a nice light even light and it doesn't affect the color of the sign.

Mr. Gilbertson asked how they were going to deal with the sign reduction, give a percentage reduction?

Mr. Sammel said he could resubmit a drawing with the new proposed size.

Mr. Duggan said they agreed it would be 72 inches overall width and proportion the height to what has been presented.

The DRC reviewed the sign criteria and added an option that a directional arrow can be added to the sign if needed. The adjustment is the overall size of the assembly will be reduced to an overall width of 72 inches and height adjusted to the proportions as presented. The planter is not going back. The application was approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

III. 150 Main Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner/Applicant: Carol Vassar

Design Review for Replacing Porch Railings

Ms. Vassar said they had to have a grand piano moved over the railings in the balcony and he said the wood was rotten so she has to replace the railings and supports. Because she is changing it she needs to bring it up to code and it is short and needs to be brought up to 42 inches. To make it less like a prison she wants to use a wood that is about 1.5 inches and put a 4 inch gap.

Mr. White said that is a good way to do it. How is she supporting the top rail?

Ms. Vassar said there will be a couple of uprights and whatever it takes to hold it up. Her thought would be to place it either directly above one of the railings there or exactly in the middle between the railings but not so it is one third of the way.

Mr. Duggan said it should be consistent in each bay, and if it makes sense visually it would be okay. He doesn't have any preference. He asked her about the garage door.

Ms. Vassar said she couldn't remember what the agreement was about the garage door. She was interested in painting some of the panels partly gray. The paint they have on there now is going to stay. If she adds paint it will peel and require more painting.

Mr. Gilbertson said they could include that as an alteration.

Ms. Vassar said they could scratch it off.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0. The new railing will match existing rear railing in style and the color will match the existing adjacent trim.

IV. 23 Cliff Street – LDR/DEC

Owner/Applicant: Jeanne Kern

Design Review for a Porch

Jeanne Kern said they want to put a little porch on the west side of the house. There is an existing concrete stoop but there is no protection above the door. They would like to remove the concrete and put a porch with a roof there and it is the same size as the existing stoop. It may be a foot further out into the yard.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if she was going to do an asphalt shingled roof.

Ms. Kern said there will be clapboard on the porch. The proposed porch would mimic the style of the existing so it would have the same posts and looks.

Mr. Duggan asked if there was a railing plus the clapboards. Is that what he is seeing?

Ms. Kern replied there are clapboards here and they would like to finish off the top of the porch to mimic the existing porch.

Mr. White and Mr. Gilbertson agreed it would make a nice addition to the house and make it easier to get in and out.

Ms. Kern said there are wooden exterior doors and they are hesitant to put the screen in during the summer time because they don't want the rain on the door. In the winter time the moisture builds up and sometimes the door freezes and they can't get in or out.

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

V. 149 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner/Applicant: 143 Barre Street Associates, LLP

Design Review for Complete Window Replacement

Interested Party: Sheila Valley

143 Barre Street owns the property at 149 Barre Street and they would like to replace the windows. It is a single family home they had been renting until July 1st when the tenant moved out. Most of the windows are one on one's except there was one window that has six on one. There is a lot of leakage into the building.

Mr. Gilbertson inquired if these were original windows.

Ms. Valley replied no. Someone came to look at the windows and he guessed these windows were probably done in the 1940's or 1950's and the old metal storms in 1960. You can't keep them on the track.

Mr. Duggan asked if the existing windows were wood.

Ms. Valley said they are wood on the inside with a metal storm. It is vinyl siding. They purchased the building in 1995 from Madeline O'Brien. She has been working at the office for 25 years and it has always been vinyl siding.

Mr. Gilbertson asked why she was replacing the windows.

Ms. Valley replied the majority of the windows are rotten and they have leakage coming through the windows.

Mr. White asked if she was going to remove the storms and put in an insulated window without storms.

Ms. Valley replied that is correct. They will be wooden windows. They hope to replace the existing roof as well.

Mr. Senter asked if they had identified where the water is coming from.

Ms. Valley said the roof is 35 years old and hasn't been replaced.

Mr. White asked if the water leaked through the windows themselves or between the top and bottom sash.

Ms. Valley replied yes.

Mr. Duggan asked if the window casings were covered with aluminum or vinyl or does the siding terminate around the face of the windows. Are they just sash replacements?

Ms. Valley replied they are full window replacement inserts. They will be the exact same size as what is there presently. They aren't changing the sizes. It will be done in wood. They are trying to stay with exactly how the inside of that window is. It is a very simple style.

Mr. White said he approves of what she is doing.

The DRC reviewed the evaluation criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0. The windows are to be one over one's to match the existing which is replacements.

An adjustment will be if necessary any rotted trim boards will be replaced with wood and painted to match the existing building.

Ms. Brown said as long as the roof is going to be the same color and material she won't need a permit. She should talk to the Building Inspector because it is not a single family home but a rental.

Ms. Valley replied it will be identical.

Review and Approval of August 9, 2011 Minutes:

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Gilbertson and Mr. White the Minutes of the August 9, 2011 DRC they were approved on a vote of 4 to 0.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Gilbertson and Mr. White the DRC adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack