

**Montpelier Development Review Board
December 5, 2005
City Council Chambers, City Hall**

Subject to Review and Approval

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

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Zalinger.

Comments

Mr. Zalinger noted that five members of the DRB were present. He said that there must be a majority of four affirmative votes to approve an application. He said that the applicant could request that the application be continued to another meeting if they preferred to be heard by a more full complement of Board members.

Minutes of November 21, 2005 Meeting

Mr. Blakeman made a motion to accept the minutes of the November 21, 2005 meeting. Mr. Bresette seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 with Mr. Zalinger and Mr. Lindley abstaining.

I. Public Hearing - Minor amendment to a Planned Residential Development & Conditional Use Review

Property Address: 61 College Street
Applicant: Robert Falker
Property Owner: Robert Falker
Zone: HDR/MDR
• Addition to existing 5 unit multi-family dwelling
Interested Parties: Don Marsh, Robert Falker

Mr. Marsh said that the application was for a 10' x 20' addition to the rear of the existing building. He said that the roof of the garage would be raised. He explained that the building is a pre-existing non-conforming use as it does not meet setback requirements, but the proposed addition would meet setbacks. Mr. Marsh said that the addition would result in a total lot coverage of 30.1% which is less than the 33% limit. He said that the addition will provide additional family space with no additional bedrooms, occupancy or parking. Ms. Smith asked whether there was a plan showing the fire escape. Mr. Marsh provided an amended plan that eliminated the exterior fire escape. Mr. Falker said that he had discovered an internal stairway that would be used as an emergency exit. Mr. Bresette asked whether there were criteria for the inside fire escape. Ms. Smith said that it would really be a second means of egress and that it would be reviewed by Labor and Industry.

Mr. Falker said that the contractor says that the addition will be 10' x 22'. Ms. Smith said that the increase in the size would increase the lot coverage, but it would still be less than 33%.

The Board reviewed the conditional use criteria.

1. *Capacity of existing or planned community facilities.* The addition of living space within the existing unit will not increase the demand on existing or planned facilities.
2. *Character of the area affected.*
 - a. *Performance standards in 814*
 - i. *No use shall emit noise at the property line in excess of the standards set in the*

Montpelier code of Ordinances, Chapter 11, Article 10 [814].

- ii. *Emit odor which is offensive at property line [814]*
- iii. *Emit dust or dirt at the property line [814]*
- iv. *Emit smoke in excess of Ringmann Chart no.2 [814]*
- v. *Emit noxious gasses which endanger the health, comfort, safety, or welfare of any person, or which have a tendency to injure or damage property, business or vegetation*
- vi. *Emit lighting or signs which cause undue glare, which could impair the vision of a driver of any motor vehicle or are offensive to the neighborhood [814]*
- vii. *Cause fire, explosion, or safety hazard, or create electrical interference[814]*
- b. *Site plan review standards in 506.C.*
- c. *Hours of operation.*
- d. *Cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood.*
- e. *The noise generated per unit [504]*
- f. *Any factors judged to have an adverse impact on the area [504]*
- g. *The cumulative impact of the proposed conditional use taken together with other conditional uses in the neighborhood [504].*

The building has been a multi-unit rental dwelling since before 1973. The character of the area will not be affected by the continued use of the building.

3. *Traffic on roads and highways in the vicinity.* No impact on traffic is expected.
4. *The zoning and Subdivision Regulations in effect [504].* The proposal will comply with dimensional requirements.
5. *Provisions to protect the utilization of renewable energy resources [504].* Not applicable.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion that the Board grant conditional use approval and approval of development within an approved planned residential development. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

II. Public Hearing-Minor Amendment to a Planned Residential Development

Property Address: 191-221 Barre Street
Applicant: Central Vermont Community Land Trust
Property Owner: River Station Planned Community
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Site plan review for minor site alterations
- Design review for changes to previously approved exterior finishes, windows and colors
- DRC recommended approval as submitted

Interested Parties: Kathy Beyer, Housing Vermont

Ms. Smith explained that this application was for site plan and design review for proposed alterations to a previously approved planned residential development consisting of 36 apartments and 18 condominiums. She described the changes as follows:

- consolidation of the carports into one building
- alterations to the grading of the interior park
- other minor walkway surface and curb alterations

She said that the modifications requiring design review were:

- reduction of the size of the windows from 7' to 5'-6"

- elimination of windows on the carports
- replacement of the majority of the previously approved fiber cement siding material to vinyl siding
- change to the color scheme
- elimination of previously approved awnings over the doorways.

Ms. Beyer said that the changes were intended to reduce costs. She said that construction costs had increased since the recent hurricanes. Mr. Blakeman asked which sidewalk material would last the longest, concrete or asphalt. Ms. Beyer said that the concrete would last longer, but that the asphalt walks should last at least ten years. She said that the asphalt would be used only for the internal walks within the condominium portion of the project.

Mr. Bresette asked about the runoff from the slope where the retaining wall was to be eliminated. Ms. Beyer said that there should not be too much runoff as the area will be grass covered.

Ms. Smith said that the Board members had been provided with a memo on the water meter. She said that it was not an issue as long as the location was coordinated with the Department of Public Works.

The Board discussed the changes to the siding, windows and color scheme. Mr. Lindley asked whether the savings in the change of siding would be significant. Ms. Beyer explained that the savings in materials and labor costs would be significant. She said that, in addition to cost savings, the change in the window size addresses a safety issue as the bottom of the previously proposed 7' windows would only be about one foot above the floor. Mr. Lindley asked whether the vinyl siding will last as long. Ms. Beyer said that the vinyl siding would probably be better for the condominium association since it would not have to be painted. Mr. Zalinger noted that the DRC had recommended approval of the changes, including the changes to the color scheme.

Mr. Cranse made a motion that the Board approve the proposed alterations to the development within an approved planned residential development and grant design review approval. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

III. Design Review and Variance Request - Sign Permit Application

Property Address: 101 Northfield Street
Applicant: Kuldeep Sharma, Capitol Inn
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Replacement of an existing 32.5 square foot ground sign with a 37 square foot ground sign

Ms. Smith said that this application had been tabled at the DRC meeting as the applicant is considering changes to the sign.

Other

Ms. Smith provided a schedule of future meetings. The Board discussed the possibility of rescheduling the July 3, 2006 meeting to July 5, 2006. Ms. Smith said that she would check on the availability of a meeting room.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Smith
Administrative Officer

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.