

Montpelier Design Review Committee
August 24, 2004
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Vicki Lane; Eric Gilbertson

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George at 5:35 PM.

I. Design and Site Plan Review

Property Address: 56 College Street

Applicant: New England Culinary Institute and the Union Institute and University

Zone: HDR/DCD

- Building addition and site alterations for an increase in office space.

Mr. Ancel summarized the changes to the plans and the applicants' responses to the issues that remained outstanding from the last meeting:

- Dormer on the connector - The dormer has been made larger to allow for additional light.
- Paint color - A scraping of the original building color has been matched. A sketch with chips showing the color was provided.
- Entry - The trellis has been reduced in size and has been pulled away from the porch and barn. It will not be attached to the building. It will be constructed of ironwood and allowed to weather naturally. The trellis is now proposed as a separate element and will not be attached to the post.
- Windows - The existing windows will be refurbished. Marvin windows or an equal will be used for the new windows.

Ms. Lane said that she was concerned that the trellis and vines will compete with the porch roof line.

Mr. Ancel said that the drawings provide a more accurate representation of the trellis in relation to the building than the model provides. The frame of the trellis will be painted white. Mr. Grayck, a resident across the street from the subject building, said that the trellis will help to reduce the institutional look of the addition. Ms. Lane asked about landscaping. The Mr. Ancel said that honeysuckle is proposed as the vine for the trellis. A maple tree will be planted. Day lilies will be planted on the west side of the building and six cedar trees will be planted to screen the air-conditioning unit.

Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the applicant was happy with the currently proposed building color. Mr. Ancel said that they were happier with the originally proposed color. Ms. George said that she was concerned about the element of red proposed on all of the window trim. The white would be more appropriate. Mr. Gilbertson added that a dark green would also be appropriate on the trim. Mr. Ancel said that he understood that the DRC would like to see either white or dark green for the window trim. The previously proposed red paint on the door would change also. The oak door would probably remain with a clear finish or would be painted white. Ms. George and Mr. Gilbertson said that the historic paint color was acceptable.

The relocation of the carriage barn was reviewed, which is intended to align it with the main building so it could be better connected to the main building by the addition.

Ms. George noted that the proposal would result in the loss of two sets of windows on the back of the

building. Mr. Ancel explained that those windows were already removed as a result of a shed addition on the back of the building. Ms. George and Ms. Lane expressed concern about the skylights proposed on the State Street and College Street sides of the building. Mr. Ancel said that the skylights are needed to bring light into a workspace on the upper floor. It might be possible to eliminate the skylights facing State Street by putting glass into the existing vents on the building.

Mr. Gilbertson asked whether any signs were proposed. Mr. Ancel said that the applicant would have to come back before the committee for any proposed signs.

Ms. George asked why the circular drive was proposed. Mr. Ancel said that the drive is an element of the original building and will be used for fire access, deliveries and drop-offs. The parking area will be across the street. Ms. George said that she was concerned that the drive would be used for parking in front of the building. Mr. Seidel said that parking will not be permitted along the drive. Mr. Grayck said that he would like to see some written specification that the driveway will not be used for parking. Mr. Seidel said that he had no problem with incorporating such a specification into the application.

Mr. Ancel said that the doors on the carriage barn will be replaced with more appropriate doors. The doors will be custom doors as shown on the drawings. Ms. George noted that the windows proposed on the carriage barn are one-over-ones. Mr. Gilbertson said that he would rather see those than new windows with simulated divided lights. Mr. Ancel said that he prefers the one-over-one windows and believes that the Department of Interior will also prefer those.

Mr. Ancel said that some lighting was proposed in the soffit on the carriage barn. Ms. George said that the lighting did not appear to be necessary except by the handicapped door. Ms. Lane agreed. Mr. Ancel said that there will also be lighting in the trellis at the main entrance. The existing flood lights will be removed. Ms. George said that, based upon the discussion, she understood that the applicant would not be proposing the soffit lights on the carriage barn, but still proposed a wall light near the handicapped door, and lights are proposed to be placed under the beams of the trellis.

Ms. George went through the design review recommendation form. She said that the optional changes would be:

1. The window sashes will be white or green.
2. Original windows on the carriage barn will be used where they exist. One-over-one windows will be used on the carriage barn where no original windows exist.

The changes to the scope would be:

1. The building will not have skylights on the East State Street side. Glass windows will replace the louvers in the cupola on the back and north side.
2. The front door will remain natural or be painted white with white surrounding trim.
3. Vines on the trellis will be substantial with some appearing year round.
4. Parking will be limited to the two spaces designated on the south side of the carriage barn only.

The Board voted to recommend approval of the application with the changes.

II. Design and Site Plan Review

Applicant: James Blouin
Property Address: 41-45 Court Street
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Addition of three windows and removal of door
- Expansion of rear deck

Mr. Blouin explained that there is a problem with snow and ice buildup along the back of his building. His proposal is to expand the deck above the rear entrances. Ms. George asked whether the purpose of the deck was primarily to catch snow. Mr. Blouin said yes. He is no longer proposing the removal of a door and replacing it with a window. He is still proposing to install the other two windows to match locations where windows were located in the past.

The Committee members discussed the proposed location and design of the propane tank enclosure and determined that the tanks and enclosure may be repositioned in accordance with any applicable safety regulations.

Ms. George asked if the applicant was proposing blue stone pavers on the ground under the proposed decking. Mr. Blouin said that he may be installing the pavers in the future. The Committee determined that the blue stone pavers were acceptable as part of the current application.

Ms. George went over the design review recommendation form. The following optional changes were identified:

1. The gas tanks may be positioned per regulations.
2. Blue stone pavers may be installed under the decking.
3. The rear door will remain.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the application and the optional changes.

III. Design Review

Applicant: Sally Longhi
Property Location: 78-80 Barre Street
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Removal of rear porches and meatroom
- Replace two doors with window and brick

Ms. Longhi said that she looked into options and is proposing to use brick and windows to replace the doors. She said that she will also be installing a platform for the gas tanks and trash containers.

Ms. George read suggestions that were provided by Steve Everett, who could not be at the meeting. He suggested screwing the doors shut rather than replacing them with brick in order to allow for access to a porch in the future and to retain the historic location of the doors. Ms. Longhi said that the Department of Labor and Industry and the Fire Department have advised her that porches are not acceptable as fire escapes. Ms. George said that she agrees that, even if the porches are not proposed now, she would rather see the doors screwed shut to retain the option for the future and retain the historic location of the doors. Mr. Gilbertson said that another option would be to install a wood panel walls that could be knocked out in the future. Ms. Longhi said that the doors would look better against the brick. She said

the doors are in good shape. Mr. Gilbertson said that there may be a safety issue with the doors causing confusion in a panic situation. Longhi said that she did not believe that there were originally porches on the building, but there may have been fire escapes.

Ms. George asked if it would be appropriate to build a one-sided lattice wall with a wood frame to screen for the trash and gas tanks on the street side. Ms. Longhi said that would be acceptable as long as she could keep the area open and clean.

Ms. George went over the design review recommendation form. She said that the evaluation criteria would be met if the doors remain. The following optional change was recommended:

1. A one-sided lattice wall with a wood frame will be installed to screen for the trash and gas tanks on the street side.

The Committee voted to approve the application with the recommended options.

IV. Design Review

Applicant: Vermont Land Trust (Barbara Wagner, Jeff Stetter)
Property Location: 8 Bailey Avenue
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Replace an arched window on a carriage barn with two double-hung windows.

Ms. George said that the applicant has provided a letter stating that the carriage barn is less than 50 years old. Mr. Stetter said that the building was built in 1982. Ms. Wagner said that the existing window is drafty, is beginning to rattle, and she is afraid it will become a safety hazard. Ms. Lane asked whether the window will be preserved. Mr. Stetter said that they will try to find someone to use the window. Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the windows could be made more narrow in order to better match the other windows. Mr. Stetter said that he is proposing windows that will have the same proportion of height to width.

Ms. George went over the design review recommendation form. The following optional change was recommended:

1. The window will be salvaged for use by another owner.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the optional change.

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes available.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Capels
Director of Planning & Community Development

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

These minutes are subject to approval by the Design Review Committee. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are acted upon.