

**Montpelier Development Review Board**  
**April 4, 2005**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Philip Zalinger, Chair; Alan Blakeman; Roger Cranse; Douglas Bresette; Jack Lindley; Guy Teschmacher; Ylian Snyder  
Staff: Stephanie Smith, Administrative Officer

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Zalinger

**Approval of March 21, 2005 Minutes**

The minutes were not available.

**I. Design Review for Sign Permit**

Property Address:	7 Main Street
Applicant:	Hazel Wood Hopkins
Property Owner:	Pomerleau Family Partnership
Zone:	RIV/DCD

Installation of three signs and assorted information signs; a 10 s.f. ground sign, a 10 s.f. wall sign and an ATM surround  
DRC recommended approval with adjustments

Interested Parties: Ray Denault of Twin State Signs

Mr. Zalinger asked about the additional materials that were mentioned in the agenda summary. Ms. Smith said that there were no additional materials. Mr. Denault explained that the DRC had asked that the sign colors be reversed from the originally proposed green background with white lettering to a white background with green lettering. He said that the bank would like to go back to the originally proposed color scheme of a green background with white lettering as that is the corporate color scheme. Ms. Smith explained that the DRC had expressed a preference for white posts rather than green because it was felt that the green would be overwhelming. She said that, in the course of the DRC discussions, it was represented that the applicant was willing to reverse the colors to a white background. She said that the DRC then reviewed the proposal based upon the change in the color scheme.

Mr. Zalinger asked whether the applicant would accept the white background with green lettering. Mr. Denault said that they would, but that the original color scheme was preferred in order to keep with the corporate color logo. Mr. Bresette noted that the only objection that the DRC had was with the color of the posts. Mr. Zalinger clarified that it had been represented to the DRC that applicant was willing to change the sign colors, so the DRC did not consider the sign with the green background. He said that presented a quandary for the DRB because the DRC did not take any evidence regarding the green sign. Mr. Zalinger said that he thought that the matter might have to go back before the DRC. Ms. Snyder noted that the DRC did refer to the change as optional. Ms. Smith clarified that the reference related to the wall sign, where it was understood that there was a preference to maintain the green background.

Mr. Denault said that the bank is anxious to proceed. He said that, if the green sign would result in the project being returned to the DRC, he would request that the DRB consider the white sign instead. Mr. Cranse said that, in his opinion, the green sign would be more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Blakeman noted that people seeking the bank would be looking for a green sign that is consistent with the corporate logo.

Ms. Smith said that the DRC comments are advisory and, if it wished to, the Board could apply the design review criteria itself. Ms. Smith passed a sample of the sign material to the Board members.

Mr. Denault said that the sign dimensions would be the same as the existing sign (40" x 36").

Mr. Lindley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Cranse, for the Board to review the design review criteria. **The motion carried by a vote of 6-1 with Mr. Zalinger voting in opposition.**

Mr. Zalinger said that the pertinent design review criteria to consider for the proposed green sign with white lettering was the compatibility of the colors with other buildings, designs and color schemes in the neighborhood. Mr. Lindley said that there is a sign with green backgrounds at Sarducci's. He added that green is a prominent color at other establishments in the area. Mr. Zalinger said that all of the signs on Memorial Drive use a green field with white letters. Mr. Cranse said that he believed that the proposed sign with the green field and white lettering would be compatible.

Vicki Lane, a member of the DRC, arrived at the meeting and Mr. Zalinger asked Ms. Lane whether she wanted to speak. Ms. Lane said that the application proposed to use a great deal of a very intense shade of green. She said that the DRC's sense was that there would be too much green. She said that the DRC was trying to soften the impact of the green color while allowing for the use of the corporate colors. Ms. Lane said that she would have voted against the application if the DRC had voted on the original proposal. She said that, while she could only speak for herself, her sense was that the majority of the DRC would have agreed with her. Mr. Zalinger said that it sounded as though the issue was the shade of green and the amount of green presented by the signs. Ms. Lane confirmed that was the case. Mr. Bresette asked whether the use of white posts while maintaining the green sign would be an acceptable compromise. Ms. Lane said that she felt that suggestion would still result in too much of the green. Mr. Bresette asked whether another shade of green would have been acceptable. Ms. Lane responded that the proposed shade of green is the trademark color for the bank.

Mr. Blakeman asked whether the ATM sign was to be illuminated. Ms. Smith said that internally illuminated signs are not permitted in the Design Control District. She said that the ATM itself would be lighted.

Mr. Cranse made a motion that the application for design review of the originally proposed sign with a green background and white lettering be approved. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. Mr. Zalinger asked whether the motion was for the entire sign structure to be green. Mr. Cranse said that was correct. Mr. Bresette asked whether the Board could entertain a friendly amendment to the motion to require white posts. Mr. Teschmacher said that the sign would attract less attention if the entire sign structure was only one color. Mr. Cranse agreed.

**The Board voted 7-0 to approve the application for design review.** Ms. Smith said that the application included other signs and she wanted to be clear that the Board approved the entire application. The Board confirmed that was the case.

## **II. Design Review and Sign Permit**

Property Address: 41 Elm Street  
Applicant: Lisa Rutherford  
Property Owner: Peter Hood  
Zone: CB-I/DCD

Installation of a 4' x 4'6" fixed pane window in the facade of an existing building.

Installation of a 3.48 s.f. projecting sign

DRC recommended approval with adjustments

Interested Parties: Lisa Rutherford

Mr. Zalinger noted that the DRC recommended approval of the application with the adjustment that the applicant use a 60 watt lamp to light the sign. He asked whether the applicant had any issues with the recommendation. Ms. Rutherford said that the recommendation was acceptable

Ms. Smith said that the application also involved the proposed installation of a window. She said that the DRC recommended some changes to the window and that the Board had additional information in response to those recommendations. Mr. Teschmacher asked whether the applicant had considered using a double-hung window instead of the proposed fixed window. Ms. Rutherford said that she proposed the fixed window because it will be installed in a proposed storefront. She said that she also felt that the fixed window would better match the existing windows on the door and doorway recess. She said that window will be a display window for a gift shop offering items from local artisans. Ms. Rutherford said that the DRC asked for adjustments to the window dimensions so that it would match the height of the trim on the recess. She said the adjustments were acceptable to her.

Mr. Lindley made a motion that the Board approve the application for design review and a sign permit with the changes to the window and with the staff and advisory comments. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. **The Board voted 7-0 to approve the motion.**

### **III. Public Hearing - Conditional and Final Review - Subdivision**

Property Address: Towne Hill Road  
Applicant: Norman Rice  
Owner: Hugh, Susan and Dennis Hawkins  
Zone: MDR  
Two lot subdivision of a 14.3 acre parcel  
Lot 3a is proposed to be 6.5 acres, Lot 3b is proposed to be 7.8 acres  
Access to lots is through East Montpelier

Interested Parties: Norman Rice and Hugh Hawkins

Mr. Zalinger noted for the record that he has known Mr. Rice for more than 20 years and did legal work for him in the past. Mr. Zalinger said that he does not now represent Mr. Rice and has had no contact with him concerning the application. Mr. Zalinger noted that the application is actually for the Hawkins property although the staff report referred to Mr. Rice as the applicant. Mr. Rice said that he is acting as the surveyor for the project. Mr. Zalinger said that he would participate in the review of the application unless there were any objections. There were no objections.

Ms. Smith described the application for conditional and final review of the proposed two-lot subdivision of a 14.3 acre parcel. She said that the property is divided by the municipal boundary between Montpelier and East Montpelier. She noted that the proposed lot sizes of 6.5 acres for lot 3a and 7.8 acres for lot 3b reflect only the land that is in Montpelier. Ms. Smith said that the proposed subdivision would meet the minimum lot size requirements for Montpelier.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion that the Board grant conditional and final subdivision approval with the staff and advisory comments. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. **The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.**

### **IV. Continued Public Hearing - Conditional Use and Design Review**

Property Address: 623 Stone Cutters way  
Applicant: Hunger Mountain Co-op.  
Property Owner: Hunger Mountain Co-op.  
Zone: RIV/DCD  
• Temporary 28' x 9' refrigerated trailer

Ms. Smith said that the applicant requested that the application be continued to the Board's next meeting. Mr. Lindley made a motion that the public hearing be continued to April 18, 2005. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. **The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0.**

**Other**

Ms. Smith advised the Board that revised zoning maps had been placed on their desks. She said that a couple of the private roads are incorrectly identified as public roads on the maps and that she would advise the Board if any applications were proposed on those roads.

Mr. Zalinger asked for an update on the status of the Master Plan. Ms. Smith said that it has gone back to the Planning Commission for review.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Bresette made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Smith  
Administrative Officer

*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.*