

Montpelier Design Review Committee
September 7, 2004
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Vicki Lane.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George.

I. Sign and Design Review

Property Address: 28 State Street
Applicant: Jeanne E. Mandeville (sign), Prineet Amin (Exterior Changes)
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Wall sign
- Exterior changes to rear facade

Interested Parties: Monique Gastis, Twin State Signs; Luke Shullenberger

Ms. George described the Design Review Process.

Review of Wall Sign

Ms. Gastis described the proposed "Quiznos Subs" sign. She said that the sign would be a sandblasted wood panel. She said that the proposed sign would be 12' long by 27" high and 1.5" thick. The cream-colored background will be a flat paint, but the lettering will have a sheen. She said that there is an existing bar light on the building and said that no new lighting was proposed.

Ms. Lane asked for clarification regarding the sign lighting. Ms. Gastis said that the prior sign had exterior illumination and that lighting would remain. Ms. George said that if the applicant wanted to change the lighting, the Committee would like to see gooseneck lights that are similar to other lighting on the street. Mr. Shullenberger said that the applicant would probably not object to the use of the goosenecks. Ms. Gastis said that, if gooseneck lights are installed, she would like to specify a reduced head size on the lights in order to avoid hiding portions of the sign. Ms. George said that the Committee would need to see the cut-sheet for the reduced head lights. She said that the Committee could approve the change to the gooseneck lights tonight with the understanding that the heads could be reduced in size, but would have a shape similar to the other lights on the street.

Mr. Everett said that the applicant could keep the existing bar light or change to goosenecks with flared heads. He said that if the existing light is used, he would suggest painting it a flat black color.

Ms. George said that she was concerned with the proposed 27" height of the sign. She said that the Committee has regretted signs that are more than 24" high. Mr. Shullenberger said that the applicant is actually reducing the size of the sign from the prior "Moon Mountain" sign. The Committee members discussed the size of the sign that the previous "Moon Mountain" business had placed on the building. They also considered the sizes of other wall mounted signs near the proposed sign. Mr. Everett said that a large sign is not needed at this location because of the slow vehicle speed and predominance of pedestrian traffic. Ms. George asked if the applicant's representatives agree to a height change or whether they wanted to have the Committee act on the

original sign dimensions. Mr. Shullenberger said that he could accept the reduction to the 24" height. Ms. Gastis said that if the sign height was cut down to 24", the lettering size and length could remain the same by reducing the width of the border.

Ms. George went through the design review sign recommendation form. She noted that an adjustment to the proposal would result in the sign dimensions not exceeding 24" in height or 12' in length.

Ms. George noted that a letter from Mr. Jacobs attorney requested that she participate in the vote on this application rather than recusing herself. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application with the change.

Design Review

Mr. Shullenberger provided a new project narrative. He said that no changes are proposed to the front exterior. Mr. Everett asked if the wood trim will be painted. Mr. Shullenberger said that he was not sure. Ms. George said that the trim can be repainted using the same color without further review by the DRC.

Mr. Shullenberger described the proposed changes to the rear exterior. He said that some of the windows will be infilled using concrete board and some of the transoms will be replaced with louvers. Ms. Lane said that the applicant should be aware that changes to the parking area are being considered that might result in people seeking to use the rear as an entrance.

Mr. Shullenberger said that elements on the rear of the building will be painted a color to complement the exterior. Ms. George said that the colors must be specified. Mr. Shullenberger said that the existing white color would be used or, as an alternative, one of the colors shown on the louver specifications would be used. Ms. Lane said that any of the four louver colors would be acceptable. Mr. Everett said that those colors and the colors called "shelburne" and "sahara sand" were all acceptable.

Mr. Shullenberger said that no dumpster is proposed as arrangements will be made to use an existing dumpster serving other businesses. Ms. George asked if there will be any screening of the condenser. She said that the Committee could approve framed lattice panels as an option. She said that the applicant would not be required to install the screening, but that it could be approved as an option. Ms. Lane said that she would like to see some planters installed. She said that the goal is to make the back of the building as inviting as the front.

Mr. Shullenberger said that no lighting was proposed.

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

1. Framed lattice panels may be installed at the condenser.

The following adjustment to the scope of the proposal was noted:

1. The color choices for the wood elements will be similar to the existing color or will be one of the four colors identified for the louvers or the shelburne or sahara tan colors shown on the louver paint colors.

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

II. Design Review

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

- Installation of air conditioner unit

Interested Parties: Sally Longhi

Ms. Longhi described the request to modify a previously issued permit to address the installation of a replacement window that was smaller than the original window and the installation of an air conditioner over the window. Ms. George went over the design review recommendation form.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the application.

Approval of Minutes of the August 24, 2004 meeting

Mr. Everett said that he would abstain from voting on the minutes since he was not at the meeting. Ms. George said that there was not a quorum of the members who had attended that meeting. She said that the minutes would have to be approved at another meeting.

Ms. Lane said that the summary of the 56 College Street application should note that Mr. Grayck is a neighbor to the project. Ms. George said that such a note was in the body of the minutes. Ms. Lane said that the third paragraph should include some preamble explaining that scrapings of the building were used to match the original paint. Ms. George said that fact was noted elsewhere. She said that the sentence in that paragraph should be modified to read "Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the applicant was happy with the **newly** proposed building color."

Other

Ms. George said that she would not be at the next DRC meeting. Ms. Lane said that she may also be unable to attend that meeting.

Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon

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