

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**December 29, 2009**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Stephen Everett, Chair; James Duggan, Vice Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Nancy Mears and Jay White.  
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

**Call to Order:**

Stephen Everett, Chair, called the December 29, 2009 meeting of the Montpelier Design Review Committee to order at 5:30 P.M.

- I. 8 Langdon Street – CB-I/DCD**  
Applicant/Owner: Andrew Brewer  
Addition of Storm Windows.

Applicant didn't show up.

- II. 101 Northfield Street – CB-II/DCD**  
Applicant/Owner: COPS, Inc.  
Parking Lot Lighting and Sign.  
Interested Party: Dave Dholakia

Mr. Dholakia said they are applying for a permit for a small sign that would go in the center of their entry way. This would be a second sign which would be externally illuminated. The second part of the application is for parking lot lights. With their ongoing renovations they now need some lights to go outside to make the parking lot a little more visible at night for guests. There is quite a bit of area which is still dark. Just for security purposes and aesthetics it is necessary to have the parking lot illuminated at night.

Mr. Gilbertson asked which pole he was proposing for the lights.

Mr. Dholakia said the pole they are proposing is an RSA 4.5 pole.

Mr. Everett said the picture they have shows three different pole styles.

Mr. Dholakia said the light would go on here and illuminate down. He showed a picture of the style of light he wished to use to the committee.

Mr. Everett said there are lights on the building as well.

Mr. Dholakia said the lights on the building go up and down and don't illumine any part of the parking lot. They are just bright enough for the entry way and close to the building where the car is parked. The property is on a small hill and there is a big part of the parking lot which is dark.

Mr. Everett asked if there was any detail indicating how far apart the poles are.

Mr. Dholakia replied about 20 feet or so and then 10 feet apart. The first pole to the top would be 20 to 25 feet.

Ms. Mears said it seems like an awful lot of lights that are not necessarily planned. You would want to make sure that the lighting is enough light for what you need and there is some kind of science to where you are placing it.

Mr. Dholakia said they need one by the entrance to lighten up the area. The whole area up on the hill is really dark.

Ms. Mears asked if it was important to light where he is indicating or where the people park.

Mr. Dholakia said this becomes a safety feature. There is a Green Mountain Power pole here but it doesn't light enough to lighten the whole parking lot. Their building is going to be one building now. The building that is the office building is going to disappear. People will park in front of the building.

Mr. Gilbertson asked how are the parking spaces along the building lit.

Mr. Dholakia said they receive light from the building itself. There are some light fixtures on the building now.

Ms. Mears said it seems like he wants to mark this edge here. He doesn't need a big high pole light. It could be something low.

Mr. Dholakia said it is pretty dark out there and these lights are only 40 watts so they don't give out a whole lot of illumination.

Mr. Everett said if he is getting enough light with spacing with 10 and 20 feet, why 6 feet on the side. It seems close. What is the light pattern that these lights throw at 12 feet? How much ground do they illuminate?

Mr. Dholakia said in order to illuminate the whole parking lot evenly that is how they spaced it out. They need about 14 lights which will spread even light across the edge of the parking lot.

Mr. Gilbertson said the fixture people need a lighting pattern that usually goes out from the center to where it ends. That relates to the spacing. You want to have enough light. It doesn't all have to be evenly, but you want enough light and that is what dictates the spacing.

Mr. Dholakia said each bulb would shine a radius of about 2 to 3 feet.

Mr. White said he drives by the building every day. He has noticed he has very bright white lights on the façade of the building and inside the building there is more of an incandescent color. This looks like he isn't proposing this.

Mr. Dholakia said it is going to be a white light.

Mr. White said if it is 40 watts that is the equivalent of 150 watts of an incandescent color. From the pattern of this kind of light it is designed to flow light in all directions, and if it is a normal 40 watt incandescent bulb on 12 foot high poles he doesn't think he will have nearly enough light down at ground level. If they are up that high the shield that is supposed to shade the lamp itself so you don't see the direct glare of the light is not going to be shield because they are mounted too close to the road. He thinks he should look at a different light style and perhaps have fewer fixtures that are maybe taller that would be less expensive to build. This is a very expensive company and he thinks he could do better with fewer lights.

Mr. Dholakia said the lights they have most of the light is going down and very little is coming out on the sides.

Mr. White said that isn't what is submitted here so they would need to see what that light fixture would look like.

Mr. Everett said they are trying to avoid having too much light and too many poles. That light pattern is really important because that dictates the space. Perhaps their architect could help him with that.

Mr. White said he should do it properly and have enough light so it is safe all around the parking lot. Their interest is not to just eliminate the light. He thinks the business will do better with better lighting and it will brighten that part of the parking lot. He thinks the engineering design of the lighting hasn't been thought through and before the DRC would approve it or not approve it he would recommend they table it until he has more information about exactly how many lights he really needs and making sure it works for him. He thinks it will cost less money than this solution.

Mr. Dholakia said he will ask Tom Latham to propose what would be adequate and resubmit the plans.

Mr. White said he has a scaled drawing that shows the site plan and if the lights are on that drawing instead of a sketch would show it better. He wants to make sure he doesn't have any dark shadows up there and make sure the lighting is spaced both in the height of the pole, the kind of fixture to give a nice even light in all of the areas he is trying to light and he doesn't want to be able to see the source of the light. The other wall lights around the building are completely shielded so you only see the light going up and down.

Ms. Mears said he shouldn't use incandescent lights.

Mr. Dholakia said he will get a better design in a better format.

Mr. Gilbertson and Ms. Mears moved they table the light section of the application so he won't have to come back with a second application. The light application was tabled on a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Everett asked if there were any comments or questions about the sign portion of the application.

Mr. Duggan said he was a little confused with this image because in reviewing the original application he doesn't believe they have seen any of this, particularly the windows and the sign placement. He inquired if this was in the center section.

Mr. Dholakia replied yes. Right below the sign would be their entrance.

Mr. Gilbertson asked how up off the ground the sign was.

Mr. White said he would guess about 25 or 30 feet. It is at the very peak of the second floor.

Mr. Gilbertson said he thinks it would be more effective to show where the entrance is if it was dropped below the windows.

Mr. Duggan said it is completely different than what was proposed.

Mr. DeSmet said if you go through an application process and represent the project as what was approved it is set in stone.

Mr. White said instead of having four doors at the bottom he now has two. Is the canopy still going to be there?

Mr. Dholakia replied yes that there would be a small canopy placed there. It may now have the words Econo Lodge but will still be a canopy.

Mr. White said the DRC approved the canopy with the words on it and that is what they expect to see. Now that the whole façade is different it has a pair of doors, a wider set of windows with a little arch over the middle window and a pre-wired place for another sign at the top, it doesn't look nearly as good as what was proposed in the original design. Why was it changed?

Mr. Dholakia replied this is better. It isn't going to alter any dimensions.

Mr. Duggan said that isn't their only concern, though. They are concerned with aesthetics as well. It was presented as a final design.

Mr. Gilbertson said the committee doesn't understand what he has finally built in relationship to what they approved.

Mr. DeSmet said after he finishes the project notwithstanding the signage and lights he sent the applicant a certificate of compliance that he would come to the property after the project was done. He wouldn't be able to give him a certificate of compliance because he put in a different window and the roof is different. All of those things wouldn't match what he represented to the city as part of the permit. He wouldn't be able to give him the compliance

certificate at this time because he has changed the project. He needs to know what is changed and he needs to resubmit and let the DRC know. He needs the plans resubmitted as built.

Mr. Everett said he came in here with construction drawings which is what the DRC reviewed and expects to come out of it. Unless he comes back to see if he can amend the application to make the changes, it won't be approved.

Mr. Dholakia said he will meet with his architect and resubmit the plans as what is built.

Mr. Gilbertson asked him to bring some photographs.

Mr. DeSmet said they should do it all at once.

Mr. Duggan said he would vote to table the sign permit. Mr. Gilbertson seconded the motion.

Mr. White said he would like to request Mr. Dholakia bring in photographs of what is there and the construction drawings so the committee can see if there is an opportunity to add some windows to the sides of the door which are already built which would greatly improve the aesthetics of the building. What is bad about it from a design point of view is that the entrance is trying to be a strong entrance but it is way too weak architecturally. With a pair of doors and that vast opening of stucco they really get lost. It would help to have the awning and have something on the sides of the door such as more signage that would help give the doors more reason to not just be in the middle.

Mr. Everett said he wants people to focus on that entry way. People want to be able to see inside when they come up to the door.

Mr. White said his whole intent of doing the project is to invite people to stay. For the cost of making the entrance better he could probably do that with seven rooms that might drive in and turn around and go to the Comfort Inn just because they don't like the entrance. If he had a more attractive entrance people would like it.

Mr. DeSmet told Mr. Dholakia he couldn't make changes on the fly without talking to the city. If they are minor changes that aren't substantial then it could happen, but these are quite different from the original conception.

Mr. White said from a cost point of view what they are proposing is less expensive than putting in 15 poles and fixtures. Right there they will more than recover the cost using a less expensive company and fewer fixtures for the outside lighting.

Mr. Gilbertson said they have a responsible serving on the committee to review things before they are built.

Mr. Everett said it is tabled until the next meeting.

### **III. 181 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD**

Applicant/Owner: Ken Pearson

Construct ADA Ramp

Interested Person: Glenn Moore, Building Inspector

Amber DeVoss, Central Vermont Community Land Trust

Mr. Pearson told the DRC they have a historical tenement house they are trying to keep original. In keeping the character they would like to put in a ramp because there are a couple of handicapped people who are looking for a downtown first floor apartment. They are using pressure treated material of 5 quarter stock 42 inches wide with a 28 inch rise. There is a 14 foot turnaround. There are concrete footers 5 feet down with 4 x 4 pressure treated lumber. There will be 3 stringers of 2 x 10 pressure treated with 5 quarter stock pressure treated 1/2 inch space in between them with pressure treated uprights and railings. The materials they plan to use are pressure treated with pressure treated screws. A material list and plans for the project were presented to the committee.

Amber said an apology goes to the committee for doing the work before receiving approval.

Mr. Gilbertson said the last time they looked at this project there were some ideas and suggestions for alternatives. He asked if they could tell the DRC what happened to those.

Mr. Pearson replied there are three reasons why there isn't an alternative. Number one, there are four sides and they can't put it on the west side. It can't go on the south side because there is another floor to go up. There is the north side and the east side. If you put it on the east side you deny the tenants of 14 years, and if you are in the real estate rental business in Central Vermont when you get a tenant for 14 years you are lucky.

Amber said that Glenn Moore recommended this was the only placement for the ramp in terms of access from the inside of the building.

Mr. White said there was also a suggestion to use a porch lift built inside the porch because this still does not address some of the concerns the committee had. Some were aesthetics, which are not addressed here. The height of it is not correct at 34 because it should be 42 inches high. It still has the issue of rain and snow and ice dripping on the ramp. He had proposed earlier that he look at the possibility of building a porch lift inside the porch itself completely covered that can be accessed from either the front or either side. He thinks he would be more in keeping with the historic character of the building and the cost might be similar to a properly done ramp. It might be slightly more than what is proposed here. It would last significantly longer. When they put pressure treated 2 x 4 very cheap ramps on architecturally historic important buildings is something he can't approve. He would vote against it because it doesn't function properly. He does have training as an architect in handicapped access with historic buildings and knows there are other ways to do this that will work better. That is what he would propose he look at.

Amber said she has priced some of those automated ramps and the least expensive version she came across was about \$6,000. They are talking about affordable housing for a couple of low income Montpelier residents.

Mr. Pearson said another thing that is a major issue here is the life expectancy of any tenant in an apartment in Central Vermont is not 20, 30 or 40 years. He is looking at the fact that these tenants may be there 6 months, a year, 3 years or 5 years. He expects to be alive and will have to take down that ramp because he won't be able to hold the apartment open until he gets someone who is wheelchair accessible to rent it. He has put 14 units through the lead abatement program and paid big bucks for that. Nobody comes and rents the apartments because they have gone through a lead abatement program. He is supposed to hold them for someone who is low income that has children if he can find them, but he doesn't have to hold them for 3 years. Very seldom does he get to rent to another family that is low income with children in those units. He doesn't expect the ramp to be there that long. He doesn't want to go in there and bastardize that house with a saw and spend \$6,000 for someone who is only there for a year or two. Where is the proof they will be there for 20 or 30 years?

Mr. White said he thinks he would have difficulty removing a handicapped accessibility feature from a handicapped accessible apartment when there aren't that many available. He doesn't know he would have to get permission to remove it if he put it in.

Mr. Pearson asked if they were telling him he would have to come for permission to remove it.

Mr. DeSmet replied yes because it is demolition.

Mr. Gilbertson said they wouldn't say he couldn't remove it because that would take a handicapped apartment off the market.

Mr. DeSmet said he could still rent it if a ramp was built on it.

Mr. Pearson said he understands that but they are talking about two houses on Barre Street. They are talking about owning two houses that straddle 177 Barre Street where the kids are all of the time running up on the porch. He isn't leaving it there whenever someone who is handicapped moves out of the apartment. He doesn't want that to be a play thing for skateboards. Let's be realistic.

Mr. White said that would be another reason for the lift. You could control the lift with the key.

Amber inquired if there is a material upgrade with the given plans.

Mr. White said they could do a ramp that would have a material upgrade using metal railings, a skirt more in keeping with the character of the building and he would want to see the ramp not able to catch snow and ice either by putting a gutter on the porch or changing the location of the ramp.

Amber replied that changing the location of the ramp is out question.

Mr. Duggan said it says the proposed wheel chair ramp may be built in the front of the building.

Building Inspector Glenn Moore said that is a different ramp.

Mr. Duggan said the alternative proposed was to locate the ramp on the side of the front porch. He understands that is the entrance for the long term tenants. One of the issues he has with the design is that it right on the primary façade of the building and instead of orienting it to be running parallel to the sidewalk to be going perpendicular to the main sidewalk and still accessing the front porch but on the side of it.

Mr. Pearson said some of the reasons for not putting it on the side is there are not enough room on his property to put it on the side.

Amber said there is not an access door into the building. The existing front porch has a bay window.

Mr. Moore said there is a steep slope on this side of the building and then it drops right off to the driveway. The ramp will take the whole width. It is problematic. He looked at two proposals with Mr. Pearson. The height of the guards required is because it is a 28 inch rise there are no guard requirements for this. There are requirements for keeping wheel chair wheels from running off the sides and also a requirement for the handrail at 34 to 46 inches.

Amber said this porch and if they were to access it from the side there is a bay window. Getting a scooter through this area would not work. There is not enough room.

Mr. Gilbertson said they could use a pipe rail and take Glenn's idea that they could put a curb in so wheel chairs can't run off. They could cover this with some type of lattice work and put a pipe rail in. You don't need balusters.

Mr. Moore replied it could either be a rail down by the bottom or a curb so somebody going along with a wheel chair can't get their wheel over that edge.

Mr. White said if they don't have the space to put it in because of the bay window that is new information he wasn't aware of. Therefore, if they are trying to make a ramp work then they could get a ramp to work if they could keep the ice and snow from falling on it or if the surface of it is such that it will drain through. If the railing is actually a metal painted pipe that is supported without the horizontal pieces it will look better and not cost any more than what they are proposing. It could get approved then if the skirt was comparable to a historic lattice work that is underneath the solid railing of the porch now. Then he could agree with that approach if they make sure it doesn't get filled with ice and snow.

Mr. Pearson said let's talk about the paint. Are they going to make him paint pressure treated lumber.

Mr. Duggan said he thinks the walking surface would need some type of traction.

Amber said in the plans they say it is stained.

Mr. Pearson said if they are going to paint pressure treated lumber then they are finished with the discussion.

Mr. Gilbertson said they are talking about eliminating most of the lumber work and making those metal. The metal would be painted. If he puts some lattice work in that should be painted.

Mr. Pearson said it's not going to be painted. It is pressure treated lumber and stained. He isn't painting pressure treated lumber.

Mr. Everett said a solid colored stain would work.

Mr. Pearson said he would put a penetrating stain on it. He isn't going to deal with stuff that is going to peel and peel on pressure treated lumber.

Mr. Duggan asked why not pay the money for something that has more durability and a longer surface life.

Mr. White suggested he could use a cedar lattice instead of pressure treated lumber. Painting pressure treated lumber is not a good solution.

Mr. Pearson said the whole decking is pressure treated lumber. He is going to stain everything a light grey or the color of the committee's choice, but it is going to be stained and not painted.

Mr. White said the committee doesn't have a problem with stain versus paint.

Mr. Gilbertson said he didn't have much problem with the deck part of it, but he is going to have to do something to increase traction on it.

Mr. Pearson said that is what they tried to do with the membrane but the DRC didn't like it.

Mr. White said if you take the pressure treated 5 quarter decking and you space it so you have a space between each board so the water will drain that will give some traction, and then if he stains it with a bit of sand mixed into the stain, it will penetrate into the wood, which he always intended, and the grid itself will give some traction. This will last much longer than the roofing material and look a lot better.

Amber said progress is they need to add a curb, lattice work beneath the porch. She doesn't understand structurally whether they are still have the 2 x 4 uprights.

Mr. White said no, all of the handrail would be painted steel including the uprights between 1.25 and 1.5 inches to meet ADA standards.

Mr. Pearson said he has a problem with the thought that if and when these tenants move out this Board isn't going to give him approval to demolish and take the ramp out.

Mr. Everett said from a design review aspect it isn't an issue.

Mr. Gilbertson said he doesn't see why they wouldn't approve it. He may not have any trouble finding another tenant.

Amber DeVoss from Central Vermont Community Land Trust. They have dislocated these tenants and inconvenienced them, and that is why we are invested in trying to get them into another apartment.

Mr. Everett said she knows the tenant market and if you have a handicapped access unit that is pretty level to downtown.

Mr. Pearson said he sort of knows the market, too. He's been in this business since 1975 in Central Vermont and he has only had one or two people ask about whether they could put in a handicapped ramp into the building and he has said yes. Part of the problem is they find out how expensive it is to put them in.

Mr. Everett said if there is an existing ramp there it is a plus for his apartments.

Mr. Pearson said the people who want it aren't looking to rent it the month it comes open and he can't leave an apartment open for six months waiting for someone to call up in a handicapped situation.

Mr. Everett said they aren't real happy about the ramp going on the front of the building anyway. They are willing to approve something with some modification. He doesn't see any problem with wanting to take it down.

Mr. White said not from a design point of view. He might have a political pressure point of view.

Mr. White said he wouldn't vote on that. If he is still on the committee he would vote on the aesthetics of it and say yes to taking it down. Their charge isn't whether it is politically correct or not. Their charge is aesthetics and functions.

Mr. DeSmet said it would be approved. It would just have to have a permit because it is demolition and it is beyond ordinary maintenance so it technically requires a permit.

Mr. Duggan said the committee's purview here today is looking at how affects the historic character of the building and at that point a number of the committee would see that as an improvement to remove the ramp.

Mr. Gilbertson said he didn't know that anybody would have any legal control over taking it down. It is private property and hasn't been subsidized.

Mr. White said if he was receiving subsidized rent for people that were providing handicapped accessible apartments and you received the money and didn't make it handicapped accessible that would be a problem. He doesn't think there are any boards in Montpelier that would prevent you from taking it down.

Mr. Duggan said it is new construction. It isn't as if he is taking away from the historic fabric of the building.

Amber DeVoss asked what material the E-Z rail was.

Mr. White said it is pre-painted steel and comes in white and black.

Ms. DeVoss said she didn't know whether or not that will end up being an option for them budget wise, but if it worked out then their contractor who has donated his time.

Mr. Pearson said there are three options here. They can approve it, deny it or table it. If they deny it and they bring it back, how much more does that cost?

Mr. DeSmet said if they deny it he can go to the Development Review Board on Monday and ask for approval even though the DRC denied it.

Mr. Everett said the DRC is advisory to the Development Review Board.

Mr. Pearson said he is not wanting to wait another month. He had some culinary students who wanted the apartment and could have rented the apartment a week ago. He felt that Bruce had put in enough time and Amber had put in a lot of time. This proposal is a good faith proposal. It comes in financially in an amount that Amber's organization can afford. He isn't putting any money into this project. He isn't going to sit back and come to this meeting another month. Vote on the proposal the way it is and what happens is the way it is. Then, they will move forward with an appeal or move forward with him paying Bruce for the work he has done and Amber's out of the time and labor and he is out of the time and aggravation, and they can both move on.

Mr. White said there is an interim he could consider. They could approve it with some conditions or alterations in which case he would have a much better chance to get it approved through the Development Review Board.

Mr. Pearson said he doesn't think financially that Amber's organization can do those improvements.

Ms. DeVoss asked if they could possibly say that the condition they are replacing the existing drawing with the E-Z rail, lattice....

Mr. Pearson said no, the lattice will get kicked in by the kids. He thinks this is a good plan, and that is the way it is. There is only so much he is going to accept from that neighborhood. He has deal with trying to fix things up time and time again while the kids come by and destroy it. He thinks this is a reasonable plan for a reasonable period of time that those people are in there. If Amber wants to go with the metal, that is fine, but from a dental standpoint he thinks it has a lot more probability of knocking out kids' teeth than the wood does. He doesn't like the metal there. He doesn't like them climbing on it or hitting their heads. He doesn't think it is a safe thing for them.

Mr. Gilbertson said the issues of whatever he is going to do and not do they can't resolve. He has served on the Architectural Barriers Board for 10 years and a very strong promoter of handicapped access. He would like to see that happen, but they also have responsibilities here in terms of making improvements to buildings that meet the design review criteria.

Ms. DeVoss said let's get something approved if they can. If they can't afford it then they can't do it. If they can get something approved today with the conditions that we are meeting the lattice work conditions and the metal railing and the spacing and stain with the sand in it, if they can put those conditions into the proposal, and we don't know whether we can afford it but at least we will know at the end of the day that it is approved. That would be a really big step for them.

Mr. Gilbertson said that would be fine with him. He would vote for it with those conditions.

Mr. White said he would vote for it.

Mr. Everett said based on the conversation that has happened here it sounds like we could get approval.

Mr. White asked if they could take two votes with one vote for the proposal as is and then one with conditions.

Mr. Everett said they could take a straw vote on as proposed and then with modifications.

Mr. Duggan asked if they could talk about what the adjustments are. He still isn't clear on those.

Ms. DeVoss said there is the curbing. Mr. Everett said the curbing would be required which could be just some framing mounted on the side of the decking that gives you the height needed. They are required to have a 2 inch rise there to prevent the wheels from going over the edge. That can be framing. They can use the same material they are using for the decking as a curb and stick up 2 inches above. That could act as a trim panel for the lattice that can be mounted below that. Pressure treated or cedar lattice. A natural wood would be a preferred material. There is criteria that has to do with materials and design in the Historic District. Sand added to the stain on the planks. That is a matter of function as opposed to design. E-Z rail metal system in black as a preferred color. Ms. DeVoss said she appreciated the committee's flexibility.

Mr. White said that would be the alternative things. Those are adjustments and not options. He thinks if they vote on the application as proposed they would not approve it.

Mr. Everett said based on a straw poll it doesn't sound as proposed would be approved. That is based only on the criteria the DRC is obligated to vote on. The three adjustments would be the addition of the horizontal 5 quarter wood framing added to the sides of the decking to maintain the 2 inch curb for ADA requirements. A rectangular wood lattice would be added below the decking area on the visible sides. It should be a lattice with 1.5 inch spaces between so it more solid and won't be kicked in. Solid wood material or rectangular wood lattice will be added below the decking area on the visible sides. The third adjustment would be all vertical and horizontal railings above the decking would be a black metal material. The middle horizontal railing could be omitted.

Mr. Pearson asked what restrictions they put on if it turns out to be solid wood for the skirting.

Mr. Everett replied none, just solid wood material. Pressure treated wood is okay. The grey stain to match the rest would be fine. All pressure treated wood to be stained a grey color.

The DRC reviewed the criteria. With the four adjustments the proposal would be acceptable. The materials of wood and metal products would be acceptable. The proposal was approved on a vote of 4 to 1 with Mr. Duggan voting no. Mr. Duggan said he doesn't think it is a good sign and an appropriate place for the rent. The application was approved on a vote of 4 to 1 and it can go to the Development Review Board.

#### **IV. 7 Court Street – CB-II/DCD**

Applicant/Owner: Alan Goldman  
Replacing Windows

Mr. Goldman said he would like to replace the windows at 7 Court Street. They were done some time in the 70's. They are a bronzed aluminum double hung with that old kind of storm with the glass you apply on the inside and close the clips. They are miserable and don't close well. He doesn't have any outside storms.

Mr. Gilbertson said when these windows were put in they made the window opening a little bit smaller which looks strange. Is he going to leave it that way or expand it back to the correct size?

Mr. Goldman said certainly on the side it would expand back because they are going to tear out the jams, drill in, insulate that system with foam and then put the new jam packs in.

Mr. Gilbertson said his suggestion would be to make the new windows fit the original openings. He thinks the original windows probably had an arched top. That would make it really expensive.

Mr. Everett said it actually isn't that much more because he did the same thing in another building. They had taken a wood filler at the top and put a square window in. They used the Marvin double hungs and they make an arched top. Actually, they sent somebody from Marvin Windows to come and measure.

Mr. Goldman said in the Marvin book on page 23 they show the original arch, the squared out version and the round top.

Mr. Everett said he went with the round top 4's and it was a clad window so you never had to paint the outside.

Mr. Goldman said he couldn't do that as a replacement window. That would mean he would have to take out all of the jams and change the entire window. He is just proposing to change the jams and the windows as they stand. They will get wider but they won't get taller. There are 84 windows.

Mr. Duggan asked which windows he is proposing.

Mr. Goldman said he on page 29 of the Marvin catalog is the tilt back replacement. He can get it in a wood exterior, clad exterior or aluminum. All of the companies are offering something very similar. Anderson has the 400 series which does something very similar. The nice thing about the Integrity's, which is sold by Allen Lumber, is they can get these in two weeks. That is a big thing when you are under a timeline, and he is. All of the other companies are 4 to 6 weeks. The other nice thing about the jam pack replacements is he can do them from the inside so this time of the year it really helps. When a lot of the space has tenants it really helps.

Mr. White said it seems to be very similar to the back of the Aubuchon building which also has arch windows.

Mr. Duggan inquired when the building was built.

Mr. Goldman said in the early 1900's. There is an elderly woman who lives across the street who has been very helpful. There used to be porches that ran along the whole side. Right now they are just trying to get the windows done. He has a good client who wants the third floor and he can't justify insulating it correctly, sheet rocking, doing all the wiring over and leaving the crummy windows in.

Mr. White said none of the windows are original on the building.

Mr. Goldman said they are all from the 1970's.

Mr. Duggan said with an arch this low it would tend to be a square window and not originally a round top.

Mr. Goldman said he is proposing one over ones. He is proposing a clad exterior with a wood interior. For the Marvin window the colors are on page 47. He will probably leave the interior natural. He would like to leave the wood natural and then urethane it.

Mr. White said his feeling would be to go darker color clad with the windows like an evergreen. They stay cleaner.

Mr. Everett said he could have his option of any of the darker colors.

Mr. Gilbertson said he would stay away from the bronze because they wouldn't have used a bronze color in that period.

Mr. Duggan said he thinks it would be important to match the surrounding molding and woodwork to match the clad color. What will he be doing with the square windows in the rear at the very top just below the cornice?

Mr. Goldman said he isn't going to do anything other than to paint it to match whatever color that goes in. There is no lead in the roof but right around the change of the season to frost he is getting dew that is collecting on the inside of the membrane and dripping and making a wet spot. He has had every roofer come and the only thing they could do was to take that window out right around the change of the season to let the moisture out and put it back in when it gets cold.

Mr. Gilbertson said he could put a screened louver in there and maybe some kind of fan. He should look at the moisture sources in his building. He should put some cross ventilation in there.

Mr. Goldman said they are going to super insulate the ceiling on the third floor and hopefully that would slow down some of the moisture.

Mr. Everett asked if he wanted to specify the Marvin Integrity tilt pack windows.

Mr. Goldman said he would like to leave it open until he gets his pricing. He can certainly specify the colors.

Mr. Everett said it could be Marvin or equivalent company windows.

The application was approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

**Adjournment:**

The Design Review Committee adjourned on a vote of 5 to 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet  
Planning and Zoning Administrator