

**Montpelier Design Review Committee
Minutes of August 3, 2004
City Council Chambers, City Hall**

Members Present: Steve Everett, Vicki Lane, Margot George, Chair (arrived at 6:00 p.m.); Soren Pfeffer, and Stephanie Smith, Staff.

Others Present: Missa Aloisi, Gossens-Bachman Architects; Annie Noonan, VSEA; Kari Bradley and Hope Crifio Hunger Mountain Co-op; and Sally Longhi

The meeting was brought to order by Margot George Chair at 5:32 p.m.
There were no comments from the Chair at this time.

Design Review - CB-II/DCD

155 State Street

Applicant: Vermont State Employees Association

- **Addition of one wood double-hung window adjacent to existing window**

Missa Aloisi and Annie Noonan represented the application of the Vermont State Employees Association at 155 State Street. They request design review approval for the addition of a single double-hung window, which is proposed to be paired up with an existing double-hung window on the western facade of the building, located to the rear. It is proposed to be the same construction as the existing window, trimmed and painted in the same manner. The proposed cedars on the western property line and the construction of the board room on this elevation may obscure the window.

Ms. George commented that this is the only set of paired windows on the building and that it would not be appropriate to the character of the building. She also commented that the new elements approved under separate applications for this property, did not include any exterior alterations to the historic structure. The boardroom addition is new construction, as is the stair tower to the rear.

Mr. Pfeffer, Mr. Everett and Ms. Lane were not concerned with introduction of this double hung window.

Mr. Pfeffer went to on to comment that the proposed window would not impact the view of the building from the street, and felt that adding a window to a building is not a foreign or strange kind of request.

Ms. Lane concurred.

Mr. Everett added that the impact of the window was minimal.

Ms. George continued to contend that the proposed window was not an appropriate introduction to the historic building.

Ms. George reviewed the design review criteria (please see recommendation form).

The committee recommended approval of the application as submitted, 3/1 with Margot George voting against the application as presented.

Design & Site Plan Review - RD/DCD

623 Stone Cutters Way

Applicant: Hunger Mountain Co-op

- **Enclose existing loading dock**

Kari Bradley and Hope Crifio presented the application for enclosing an existing loading dock on Hunger Mountain Co-op at 623 Stone Cutters Way. The reason for requesting this exterior alteration is to provide protection to those employees receive and process products in this area. Up til now these employees perform their duties exposed to the elements.

There was some discussion of clarification of how much of the loading area would be enclosed. The plans showed an area of 488 square feet. The exterior material is proposed to be a pre-finished metal horizontal siding. It is the same horizontal siding located on the front of the building at the entrance. An overhead door similar to the existing one will be installed with the protective bumpers. The door will be painted to match the siding. As part of enclosing the existing loading dock the railings will no longer be visible.

Ms. George reviewed the design review criteria (please see recommendation form).

The Design Review Committee recommended approval as submitted with the optional change, which the applicant can pursue at his or her discretion, that lights may be installed that match the existing fixtures on the building. They can be installed in the ramp area and at the enclosed loading dock area, 4/0.

Design Review - CB-II/DCD

78-80 Barre Street

Applicant: Sally Longhi

- **Demolition of back porches**

Sally Longhi presented the application to the committee. The proposal is to remove existing porches with stairs and a meat room from the rear of a building at 78-80 Barre Street. The porches are in poor shape and are currently used as storage for the residents of the building.

Mr. Everett asked if the porches were a Labor and Industry requirement for means of egress. Ms. Longhi stated that she spoke with Labor and Industry and Norm Lewis with the Montpelier Fire Department and that they were not useful because they paralleled an interior staircase. She hopes to meet fire codes with the installation of sheet rock and doors.

Ms. Longhi thought with the removal of the porches she would seal the doors from the inside.

Mr. Pfeffer thought it would be important to maintain use of doors, and suggested the applicant look into the cost to construct porches on the back of the building. Ms. Longhi said she would look into this option. Ms. Lane agreed that sealing the doors from the inside would look odd from the outside.

Ms. Longhi also thought she could remove the windows and install brick and a double-hung window similar to those that currently exist on the building in each of the door locations.

Due to the three possible scenarios for the rear of the structure and no clear indication of what the applicant would like to pursue, the committee table the application to the next DRC meeting on 8/24/04, pending receipt of additional materials.

The committee reviewed the minutes from July 20, 2004. Besides minor grammatical edits, there were the following substantive edits:

Nine paragraphs down on page 2, the third sentence down beginning with "Mr. Pfeffer..." was removed from the minutes.

#4 on page 3 the end of the line should read "instead of" and not "and."

#5 remove the word "not" and "facade" before "garage."

The minutes of July 20 were approved with the above edits 4/0.

The committee reviewed the minutes of June 8, 2004 and they were approved with minor grammatical edits, 4/0.

The committee reviewed the minutes of June 22, 2004 and were approved with minor grammatical edits, 3/0. Mr. Pfeffer abstained from voting.

The committee reviewed the minutes of July 6, 2004 and were approved 4/0, with minor grammatical edits, and the following substantive changes:

On page 2, bullet #3 should read "small tree may be planted where currently a large stump exists on the front lawn."

Under other business first line "committee" should read "community."

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie A. Smith
Planner