

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**November 7, 2006**  
**Planning Department, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Margot George, Chair; Stephen Everett, Vice Chair; Vicki Lane; and Eric Gilbertson. Staff: Stephanie Smith.

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

**I. Design Review for Sign Permit – CB-II/DCD**

191 Barre Street

Applicant: CBCLT, Garth Genge

- Projecting address identification sign

Ms. George said this is an application they have seen before with the same materials. There is no lighting on the sign. The DRC reviewed the sign review criteria and found it conformed to all of the criteria. The application for the sign at 191 Barre Street was approved as submitted unanimously by the DRC.

**II. Design Review for Sign Permit – CB-I/DCD**

11 Main Street

Applicant: Ian Duverray

- 33.75 square foot sign within sign band

Margot George recused herself from participating in this application.

John Miller of sign design represented the applicant. Mr. Everett chaired the DRC relating to the application for a sign permit for the tattoo parlor. Mr. Miller said the existing sign band will be repainted and the letters cut from ½" thick white foam similar to what is used at the Capitol Plaza. They will be attached to the building.

The DRC reviewed the criteria. They found that the sign lettering within the sign band is common in the district and that milled foam is a common sign material. They also found that it is the continuation of the same style sign on the building.

The application for the sign at 11 Main Street was approved 3-0.

**III. Design Review for Sign Permit – HDR/DCD**

9-11 West Street

Applicant: 9 East Network

- 10 square foot single sided ground sign
- Interested Party: Susan Kimmerly

The signs are plywood white over laminated semi-gloss. The letters are vinyl appliqué, and then there is some gold leaf on the bar in the middle. The balls at the top are gold paint. The size of the sign is 30" high and 48" wide. It is 30" off the ground. The issue with the sign is they are still going with the concept of the Union Institute & University look and aesthetics, approved previously. Ms. George said it seems that Union Institute & Vermont College has a pre-approved sign system they should be signing on to, and they really aren't supposed to deviate from that plan. Ms. Smith said she had the master plan. "The existing signs utilized by Vermont College is a routed wooden sign with blue background and gold lettering. Two types of signs are allowed on campus, a post mounted sign and hanging sign. A post mounted sign is a maximum of 2 feet by 5.5 feet wood with routed 4" maximum times roman letters. The

sign background shall be painted blue with gold letters and trim. The posts will be 6 x 6 in concrete footing with 8" square x 2" wood cap." This is for a single post sign, and not a double post sign. This is for the Vermont College campus. Ms. Smith said there is a footnote that says the College would like to allow its various tenants the flexibility of changing the background color of their signage to differentiate between the college and other uses. Union Institute replaced all of the blue and gold color choice with gold and green.

Ms. Smith said the proposed signs are to have an off-white background with dark green trim and lettering outlined in gold leaf.

Ms. Smith said if she were to administer this as if it were a zoning regulation, we have the pictures that show a rectangular sign. However, there is a dimension here that talks about minimums and maximums. It doesn't explicitly talk about shape. Mr. Everett said new signage at Vermont College shall continue the existing patterns.

Ms. Lane asked if Union Institute was working on another master plan. Ms. George said no, that this had just been approved for the next four or five years. Ms. Smith said this amendment would have extended the sign approval. There is nothing in the plan that talks about allowing or disallowing a peak on a sign.

Part of the review from the Design Review Committee is that they could make a finding that it is linear, horizontal, and the peak is a minor deviation from a rectangle, and it is a building that is not affiliated with the university. It is a clear identifier of a separate occupant. Then, if someone was to occupy the school, potentially you could have a harder line saying there needs to be more uniformity.

Ms. George said she didn't find the sign offensive. Ms. Smith said if they were within the size requirements then it would appear to meet the approved sign plan.

The DRC reviewed the sign review criteria. They found that the sign is generally compatible with Union Institute signs. Wood signs with vinyl letters are common. The colors of the sign will be pre-approved Union Institute colors, and the design is like the pre-approved master plan. The application for a sign permit for 9 East Network at 9-11 West Street was approved by the DRC unanimously.

#### **IV. Design Review for Sign Permit – CB-I/DCD**

70 Main Street

Applicant: Jeffrey Jacobs

- 1.25 square foot sign on valance of awning

Margot George recused herself from participating in this application.

The applicant would like to add the letters "Charlie-O's World Famous Bar & Fine Dining" to the awning. These are 3" letters on the awning. They have to actually paint the letters onto the polyester awning material.

If you retract the awning, the lettering would be visible. Ms. Smith said this could be considered as a wall sign.

Ms. Smith said they were reviewing the font on the awning, which is centered over the door but not necessarily centered on the awning. The color is school bus aluminum yellow.

The DRC reviewed the review sign criteria. The awning and awning letter is common in the district and the awning is existing. The proposed awning lettering is an extension of the existing sign and is a traditional method for signage on awnings. The awning does not obscure architectural details. The individual letters are painted on the awning structure. The application was voted favorably 3-0.

**Minutes:**

The DRC reviewed the minutes of October 17<sup>th</sup>. In paragraph 3 Ms. George said she referred to most **new** windows. Under other business it says that Ms. Smith updated the DRC on Verizon. That should state **the Verizon building at 23-25 School Street**. Ms. Lane pointed out that the minutes of the October 3, 2006 meeting **were** approved, and not was approved. It should also read **unanimously**. The minutes should also reflect that Steve Everett was present at the meeting.

With the above mentioned changes in the minutes the DRC approved the minutes of October 17<sup>th</sup> unanimous.

**Adjournment:**

The DRC was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Smith  
Administrative Officer

Prepared and Transcribed by:  
Joan Clack, City Clerk & Treasurer's Office