

Montpelier Design Review Committee
February 8, 2005
Memorial Room, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Eric Gilbertson; Stephen Everett; Guy Tapper
Staff: Kathy Swigon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George. Ms. George explained the design review process. She said that the Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board. She said that the Committee will look at applications in relation to the design guidelines and evaluation criteria. She said that the Committee's determinations are advisory only.

I. Design Review & Site Plan Review

Property Address: 3 Pitkin Court
Applicant: Duane Wells
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Addition to existing building
- Removal of existing parking spaces
-

Interested Parties: Duane Wells, Nate Temple

Mr. Wells described the proposal to construct an addition on the east side of the building, or rear, of the building. He said that an addition was previously constructed in 1999 and the currently proposed addition will match the prior addition with windows, lights clap board, trim and paint colors. He said that a second phase of the project would involve the excavation of a hillside and installation of a retaining wall to allow for the development of a parking area. Mr. Wells said that the air-conditioning units will be located on the rear of the building, near the existing air-conditioning units.

Ms. George asked if there would be any change in the roofing materials or roof line. Mr. Wells said that the membrane and shingle roofing would be the same as the prior addition. He said that there would be no changes to the roof line. He explained that, in the review of the prior addition, the DRC had expressed a preference for the use of windows that differed from the windows on the original building. He said that the current proposal is to use the same windows that were installed in the prior addition.

Mr. Gilbertson expressed concern that the addition should be differentiated from the original building. He said that the fact that the last addition generally matched the original building created a quandary. Mr. Wells said that the siding is different and the mansard roof line is different. Mr. Gilbertson said that he would want to see more differentiation if this were a completely new addition, but, because of the prior addition, it would not be appropriate to add a new design. Mr. Everett added that the continuation of the design of the prior addition was also appropriate because the addition is on the back of the building.

Mr. Wells provided a new detail of the proposed railing on the ramp.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. They voted to recommend approval of the application with the adjustment that the additional air-conditioning units be installed next to the existing units.

II. Design Review - Sign permit Application

Property Address: 65 Main Street
Applicant: Norma Segale for the Peach Tree
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Two wall signs over a store front
- Minor store front alterations

Interested Parties: Norma Segale

Ms. Segale described the proposal to install two wall mounted signs. She said that she is proposing to create a box to so that one of the signs would project out 4" from the wall in order to match the other sign and to lower an awning to match the adjacent awning height. She showed paint chips of the proposed sign colors which were Benjamin Moore paints called "mystical grape", "adobe white" and "Broadway lights". Mr. Everett suggested that the applicant might want to consider adding additional pigment to the paint because of the potential for color fading.

Mr. Gilbertson said that the sign band is not the original and that he did not have a problem with the use of the entire sign band.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. They voted unanimously to approve the application with the option that the purple background of the sign may be one shade darker than the proposed color.

III. Design Review

Property Address: 73 Main Street
Applicant: Tim Heney for Heney Family Main St. Ltd. Partnership
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Replacement of 69 double-hung windows

Interested Parties: Tim Heney

Mr. Heney described the proposed replacement of deteriorated windows. He said that the colors will match the existing colors and that the trim color will not change. He said that the replacement windows will be aluminum clad with divided lights. Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the windows would have true divided light rather than simulated divided lights. Mr. Heney said that he thought that they would be true divided light. The Committee members and that applicant reviewed the submitted specifications, but were unable to verify the type of divider that would be provided. Mr. Everett said that the simulated divided lights cannot be distinguished from the true divided light with the Marvin Low E-Argon windows. He said that those windows were installed on his building.

Mr. Gilbertson asked whether the existing mullions would be matched. Mr. Heney said that a Marvin Windows representative had measured up the windows to make sure that they would match. The Committee and applicant reviewed the specifications and catalogue, but did not find specification for the mullions. Mr. Gilbertson said that, because of the prominence of the building, the windows should use true divided lights and have mullions that matched the original windows. He said that he would be willing to table the application to give the Committee members the opportunity to look at the existing windows, to look at the simulated divided light windows on Mr. Everett's building and to allow the applicant to get details on the mullions. He said that he felt that there is a lack of detail on the proposal. Mr. Heney said that the DRC has approved the same windows on other downtown buildings. He said that he thought the Committee was asking for an excessive level of detail. Ms. George said that it was not unusual for the DRC to ask for details on the mullions.

Mr. Gilbertson made a motion to table the application in order to get specifications on the proposed method of dividing the lights and details on the mullions. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action on the Minutes of the October 19, 2004, November 16, 2004 meeting and January 4, 2005

Mr. Gilbertson made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2005 meeting. He said that there was a correction to the last sentence in the first paragraph of the discussion of the 9-11 West Street application. He said that the word “uses” should be corrected to “used”. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the correction.

Mr. Gilbertson made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2004 meeting. The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

The review of the minutes of the October 19, 2004 was tabled until the Committee’s next meeting due to the lack of a quorum of Committee members able to participate in the review.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The election of officers was tabled until the next meeting in order to allow more members of the Committee to participate.

Adjournment

The Committee voted to adjourn the meeting.

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.