

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**March 29, 2011**  
**Memorial Room, City Hall**

*Approved*

**Present:** Stephen Everett, Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Kate Coffey and Jay White.  
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

**Call to Order:**

Stephen Everett, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

Mr. Everett explained the Design Review Committee is an advisory committee to the Montpelier Development Review Board. The DRC will hear their applications and vote on it and they will attend the DRB at their next meeting.

**I. 107 State Street – CB-I/DCD**

Owner: John D. Russell  
Applicant: Caroline Earle  
Design Review for a Sign

Caroline Earle said the Thrush Tavern has been vacant for a year or two. She has entered into a lease with John Russell, the owner of the building, to open up her own law firm on the second floor so she is currently occupying the entire second floor of the Thrush Tavern and has been since February 6<sup>th</sup>. She is submitting the application so individuals who are passing by on the street and visitors who are coming to see her for her business will know where to locate her. She has worked with Sign Design to come up with a sign that complements the historic nature of the Thrush Tavern. They talked about colors that would complement and do honor to the old Thrush Tavern sign so they have chosen a black background and gold letters for her law office sign. The background would be black and the letters themselves would be gold and the trim would be a gold color as well. She designed the sign to be both dignified and complementary to the surroundings. She hopes the DRC will review and approve her sign. She has talked with Clancy and understands her sign is within the requirements of the DRC. She talked with John Kerin about making a sign to fit with those proportions but because she has a long name it is a little longer.

Ms. Coffey asked if it would be attached to the mortar joints.

Ms. Earle replied yes, as the old sign did. She understands the sign can be affixed with the same anchor bolts, but if he did need to use new ones he would do it according to the guidelines. It's a thin sign so it won't be heavy and made of plywood.

Mr. Everett said they would make a notation on the criteria sheet saying that the entire sign will be placed on the mortar joints between the bricks so it doesn't destroy any of the brick work.

Mr. White said the sign looks good and it is better that it is longer than the other sign.

Ms. Earle said she thought it would complement the other sign nicely in terms of the old historic Thrush Tavern sign.

The DRC reviewed the sign criteria and found the application acceptable as proposed on a vote of 4 to 0.

**II. 1 Granite Street – RIV/DCD**

Owner: Peter Merrill  
Applicant: Dan Clar

The alley in between 1 Granite Street, which is the building he is in and the adjacent building which is Allen Lumber the access to his building is through that alley. He would like to have a sign on the side of the building that faces Stone Cutters Way. When he played around with design as to the location of the sign he thought it looked nicer where he put it.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if it was going above the red door in the corner.

Mr. Clar said it on the façade of the building. He is asking for a variance because of the size and height of the sign on both which are not in conformance with the standard for projecting sign requirements. The requirements say it is supposed to be on the first level but being over an alley it wouldn't permit trucks to get in and out of there.

Mr. White said the variance is for the height and location of the sign and not the size of the sign.

Mr. Clar replied both of those things. The sign he has in there is 48 x 30 and he believes the permitted projecting sign is a couple square feet smaller than that.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if it was going up in front of the alley way.

Mr. Clar replied that is correct.

Mr. Gilbertson said he thinks it is appropriate to have a larger sign there given the scale of the building.

Mr. Everett asked if he occupied the whole section of the building.

Mr. Clar said ironically it is not the section of the building he occupies. The section of the building he occupies is deeper into the alley but this is the only way to get to it.

Ms. Coffey inquired if he had a light present.

Mr. Clar said there would be a gooseneck light fixtures.

Mr. White said he thinks the sign is fine but it should be pushed back far enough that the front of the light is also behind the corner and not right on the corner board. Then, the light would overhang.

Ms. Coffey inquired what colors he wanted.

Mr. Clar said the background wouldn't be a light background. It would be an off white background with black lettering. The bracket would be painted black and the lamp is black

Mr. White said it is a rectangular sign so where is the border for it.

Mr. Clar responded by saying it isn't too far off from what it truly is.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if there would be a border around the sign.

Mr. Clar replied the border will be the steel bracket that is supporting the sign.

Mr. Gilbertson said they often specify the wattage of the light they want there but this merits more wattage than their usual lighting for a sign. He thinks 60 watts would be plenty.

Mr. Everett said he made a notation that the sign will be placed back from the corner of the building so the illuminating light fixture will not project beyond the corner of the building. The maximum wattage of the light fixture will be 60 watts.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application as proposed was acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0.

**III. 55 Barre Street CB-II/DCD)**

Owner: City of Montpelier Recreation Department

Applicant: Arne McMullen, Recreation Department

Design Review for Replacing Roof

Arne McMullen said they are looking to replace the rubber membrane on the roof. As they talked about doing this the past year they were looking at just replacing it as it is but working with Garth he had an energy come in and do an energy review of their building. One of the recommendations was if you are going to redo your roof to add insulation to the roof to try to help with energy conservation. They want to add 6 inches of isoboard insulation to the exterior of the roof. They are going to take off the old rubber roof itself, leave the 1 inch isoboard that is on there and add 6 inches of the 2 to 3 inch pieces of the isoboard that will overlap each other, and then put the rubber membrane back on the roof to seal the roof. They are looking at adding approximately 6 inches to the height of the building as a result of the insulation, but they are only adding the portion of the roof that is over the gym area and the stage. It will still be lower than the roof that is over the office section of the building.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if they were going to do the roof on the office.

Mr. McMullen said that was done at a later time and still in very good shape.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if anyone had looked at the structural system to see if it can carry additional snow load.

Mr. McMullen said they had an engineer look at the roof and felt it would handle the additional snow load. Garth asked them to go up and check a couple of spots in the rafters where they had leaks to make sure there was no rot. The structure of the building is able to handle the roof.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if they were going to keep the vents.

Mr. McMullen replied the vents are going to be removed. That was recommended by the energy company because right now they are stuck open so a lot of air flows through. Their recommendation was that it being an old building air flow isn't always a huge problem. Every time you open the door you get fresh air in the gym but they said they could add at a later time heat recovery ventilators to provide ventilation if needed. Moving the vents on the top would prevent a lot of air. The roofers said if they were to leave the vents on the top they might as well not add any insulation because they would be throwing their money away.

Ms. Coffey inquired if the vents were copper.

Mr. McMullen said they are galvanized steel.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if it was a dark bronzed color.

Mr. McMullen said it will match the existing.

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

**Review of March 15, 2011 Minutes:**

Not available.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion made by Eric Gilbertson and Kate Coffey the Design Review Committee adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Clancy DeSmet  
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack