

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**Minutes of May 25, 2004**  
**Memorial Room, City Hall**

**Members Present:** Steve Everett, Vicki Lane, Margot George, Chair; Valerie Capels, staff  
**Others Present:** Patrick Mullikin, William Shouldice, Duane Wells, Rick DeAngelis

The meeting was brought to order by Margot George, Chair at 6:55 p.m. There were no comments from the Chair. With each application, Ms. George explained the Design Review process to those that were present.

**Design Review and Sign Permit-CB-I/DCD**  
**30 State Street**

**Applicant: Patrick Mullikin**

Application: exterior painting of trim and door and installation of a wall sign.

Patrick Mullikin explained that he is moving from his Langdon Street location to Main Street and proposes to adapt his current hanging sign to the proposed wall sign. He also proposes to paint the storefront a green similar to the nearby storefronts.

The DRC recommended approval as submitted.

**Design Review - CB-I/DCD**  
**68 Main Street**

**Applicant: William Shouldice and Duane Wells**

Application: reconstruct replace of the fire-damaged shared wall with former brick building.

William Shouldice and Duane Wells presented the application. The former shared wall on the south side is proposed to be sided with wood clapboard and windows installed to match the style of those in front, but they will not have shutters. The roof is proposed to be repaired with the same type roof. There was discussion about whether vinyl or wood siding would be appropriate for the rear.

Mr. Shouldice said that the Country Store will not be reopening there. He intends to put the space up for rent; he does not currently have a tenant in mind.

The DRC recommends approval of the application with the following adjustments:

- a. that the rear wall will be vinyl siding of a color to match the wood siding as close as possible, with a two year review for replacement with wood or continuance of the siding; and
- b. that the roof color can either be the present silver or, at the applicant's discretion, be changed to a color from the dark palette ( brown, green, charcoal, bronze, flat black).

**Design Review - LDR/DCD**  
**24 Cliff Street**

**Applicant: Rick DeAngelis**

Application: replacement and expansion of an existing porch.

Rick DeAngelis presented the application. The porch is proposed to be slightly enlarged and sided with wood clapboard painted white to match the house. A lattice skirt is proposed similar to that found at 23 Cliff Street across the street, also painted white. The existing vinyl siding on the west side of the house is proposed to be removed to the original clapboard with the intent to restore or install wood clapboard in its place, painted white to match the house. Removal of the vinyl on the other sides of the building will happen at some future stage. Exterior mounted wiring and other appurtenances will be removed or concealed. The interior surface of the porch is proposed to be tongue-and-groove siding, unpainted.

There was discussion about whether it would be more appropriate if the interior porch wall be painted. There was also discussion about the possibility of a hip style roof as a better alternative to the proposed shed roof.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval with the following adjustments to the scope of the proposal:

- a. That cove molding be used beneath the cap of the wall system where the clapboards meet the porch rail on the inside and outside;
- b. That the wood railing will be at least 36 inches with a wood balustrade;
- c. That the interior of the porch be stained or sealed, but that the applicant may choose to paint it white to match the siding without further review; and
- d. That a hip style porch roof design is an acceptable alternative that the applicant may pursue at his discretion.
- e. The DRC also supported the installation of recessed light fixtures in the porch roof and possibly using a metal, open weave tread on the stairs to reduce slickness in the winter, though the risers would remain wood.

#### **Other Business**

Ms. George announced the advertisement of two vacancies on the DRC. She also reported that Mr. Gilbertson is expected to be absent from the committee for a number of months while he recuperates from a medical procedure.

The Committee reviewed Stephanie Smith's May 14, 2004 letter.

There was much discussion of the Development Review Board's review and approval of the law office sign on Court Street. One of the key criteria was compatibility and the fact that the other signs in the area are smaller. It wasn't emphasized enough that the issue was compatibility--just because the ordinance allows for a 6-foot sign doesn't mean that it's appropriate. The Committee had spent a lot of time on the fact that Court Street is still a residential street. Members expressed frustration that the applicant agreed to the changes at their meeting but presented something different to the DRB. They felt it should have been required to go back before the DRC for further review. Perhaps the statement "I agree to these changes" should be added to the form that the applicant signs. Members observed that more conflicts arise with free-standing signs; signs located in sign bands are usually more straightforward, but free standing signs relate to buildings in a different way.

Members expressed their view that the DRB was unreasonable concerning Mr. Hitzig's power saw noise. He did not propose anything that anyone else cannot do.

After much discussion about the representation of their 56 College Street review, the committee tabled approval of the May 4, 2004 minutes pending a more complete representation of the discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Capels  
Planning & Community Development Director