

Montpelier Design Review Committee
December 20, 2005
Planning Office, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Eric Gilbertson; Guy Tapper; Soren Pfeffer
Staff: Stephanie Smith

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ms. George

I. Design Review

Property Address: 89 State Street
Applicant: Vermont Mutual Insurance Company
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Replacement of windows, removal of single window and installation of another
- Installation of rooftop HVAC units

Greg Lord, representing the applicant described the application which involves interior renovations and energy upgrades to the Tucker Wing. He said that the existing windows will be replaced with new aluminum clad, double-hung windows that will match the widows that were approved in the previous application for other renovations. He said that the HVAC system will be upgraded and new HCAC units will be mounted on the roof. Mr. Lord said that the HVAC units will match the previously installed units with a “non-shiny” exterior finish. He described the locations of the proposed units and their visibility from nearby streets.

Mr. Gilbertson asked whether any noise calculations had been done. Mr. Lord said that the manufacturer has established some noise levels for the units. Mr. Lord said that he did not expect a noise problem. Ms. Smith said that the City codes contain specific noise limitations. She read the applicable portion of the code. She said that the applicant should check for compliance with the standard as the Development Review Board will be concerned with this issue.

Ms. George asked Mr. Lord to discuss the windows. Mr. Lord said that the replacement windows will use the same window openings. Ms. George asked whether the windows would have true divided lights. Mr. Lord said that he believed that they would have divided lights. Mr. Everett noted that the window detail showed that the dividers would be applied to the glass. Ms. George said that the windows would then have simulated divided lights. Mr. Lord said that he believed that the proposed windows were the same as the windows that were used in the earlier phase of renovations. Mr. Everett said that the detail for those windows showed a grid inside the glass. Mr. Pfeffer said that the window detail appeared to be the same as the detail submitted with the prior phase. Ms. Smith said that she thought that the detail might be wrong, but the proposal was correct. She said that the intent is to replace the windows with new windows that would be the same as the windows that were recently installed in the prior phase. Mr. Gilbertson said that he was not sure that the muttons mattered since this was not a historical building.

Ms. George asked why the one window had to be removed. Mr. Lord said that as a result of renovations, there would be a partition in the middle of the window. Mr. Gilbertson said that the traditional way to deal with the removal would be to set the bricks back in the window opening and to leave the sill in place. Mr. Lord said that he was sure that the applicant would want to use that approach. Ms. Smith said that an alternative would be to install backing behind the window and to install the wall behind the backing while leaving the window in place. Ms. George said that she would rather see the window remain. Mr. Gilbertson

said that either approach was acceptable to him. Mr. Lord said that the applicant would prefer to fill the window opening with brick.

The Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria. The Committee voted 5-0 to recommend approval of the application with the following adjustment:

The opening of the window that is removed shall be recessed brick and the sill will remain to preserve the opening.

II. Design Review - Sign Permit Application

Property Address: 9 School Street
Applicant: NW Sign Industries for Banknorth Group, Inc.
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- 5.57 square foot sign

Ms. Smith explained that, as part of a prior application, the applicant proposed to remove the ATM sign on the bank. She said that the applicant did not remove the sign and now would like to keep it. Ms. George said that there is too much visual clutter on the building.

Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes of the August 2, September 6, September 20 and October 18 meeting minutes. The August 2 minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 (Mr. Tapper abstained). The September 6 minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 (Mr. Everett abstained). The Committee agreed that the September 20 minutes should be corrected to show that Mr. Gilbertson was present. The minutes were approved with that change by a vote of 3-0 (Ms. George abstained). The October 18 minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 (Mr. Tapper abstained). Action on the minutes of the November 22 and October 4 meeting minutes was deferred.

Adjournment

The Committee unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Smith
Administrative Officer

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.