

Montpelier Development Review Board
January 16, 2007
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Philip Zalinger, Chair; Jack Lindley; Alan Blakeman; Roger Cranse, Jeremy Hoff; Ylian Snyder; Guy Teschmacher; and Ken Matzner, alternate.
Staff: Kathy Swigon

Minutes:

The first item on the agenda is a review of the January 2nd minutes. Alan Blakeman moved approval of the minutes of the January 2nd meeting with minor changes, and Guy Teschmacher seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 6-0. Jeremy Hoff abstained.

I. Design Review – CB-I/DCD

32 School Street

Applicant: Dorothy Walka

- Replacement of windows with vinyl windows

Mr. Zalinger noted that the Design Review Committee recommended that the application be approved with an adjustment that the windows will be modified by installing applied muntins to the exteriors.

Mr. Zalinger asked Ms. Walka if she had any objections to the Design Review Committee's recommendations. Ms. Walka said she did. She called the New England Window Company in Rutland, Vermont and they don't make muntins for these windows. She said her builder told her that the windows would not open if she applied muntins to the exterior because there is no additional space for a muntin which protrudes from the glass

Ms. Walka said she has replaced 35 windows at a cost of approximately \$300 apiece, which is a sizeable amount of money. She has been doing this over the course of the last four years. Six to eight weeks ago it was called to her attention that she hadn't gone through the Design Review application process. She hadn't given it any consideration because she didn't change the window sizes. All she did was replace the window panes.

Mr. Zalinger asked if Ms. Walka's further investigation into the manufacturer's restrictions and contractor's recommendations occurred before or after the Design Review Committee meeting. Ms. Walka said she talked to the contractor after her second meeting with the Design Review Committee. Mr. Zalinger noted that the DRC was not aware of this new information.

Ms. Swigon said her understanding of the situation is that the DRC had experience with someone putting these muntins on windows that were purchased from Green Mountain Windows. That company supplied both the window and the applied grid, and she understands from Ms. Walka that the company is not interested in supplying the grid for someone else's window. Ms. Walka said her contractor told her if she put in muntins she wouldn't be able to open and close the windows. If she could put in muntins there isn't enough clearance between the top and bottom window. Mr. Zalinger asked if Ms. Walka's contractor had testified before the Design Review Committee that the muntins couldn't work. She said no.

Ms. Snyder moved to approve the application as submitted without the exterior muntins for 32 School Street. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

II. Design Review – CB-II/DCD

138 Main Street

Applicant: Vincent Illuzzi

- Installation of airlock entryway

Mr. Zalinger said that he is a principal in a partnership that is in an adjoining property to the applicant's so he is not going to participate in the debate or vote but will facilitate and chair the hearing on the matter.

Ms. Swigon said this is an application for the construction of a glass enclosed air lock at the front door of 138 Main Street. This application was initially before the DRB on August 21, 2006. At that time, there was some discussion about the possibility of this air lock being a temporary structure. The applicant's representative was asked to go back and speak to the applicant and either return to the Design Review Committee to discuss the air lock being a temporary structure in an attempt to get a different recommendation from the DRC or to let the DRB know how he wanted to proceed. Neither of those things happened. After the application was rescheduled, she received an e-mail from the applicant stating that he requested that the Development Review Board consider the project as proposed except the air lock would be a seasonal temporary structure installed and used from on or about October 15th to on or about May 1st of each year. That proposal has not been before the Design Review Committee. He stated he wanted to proceed directly through the DRB.

Mr. Zalinger said he would point out that no one would be here to testify for the applicant.

Mr. Cranse said he hasn't changed his mind on this application. He said he believes the DRC's judgment is sound and the application should be denied. Mr. Hoff said he would agree with that. He said there are examples around town where air locks have been installed that are permanent now, and he doesn't see how having it for six months of the year makes any difference. It's a beautiful building, and the door way shouldn't be impaired by an air lock.

Mr. Blakeman said he disagreed. He said that saving energy is important. He said he was disappointed that the applicant is not here to discuss his proposal, but the current proposal is that the air lock would be taken down in May. The spring, summer and fall weather is the time when you notice the architecture of the building. During the winter some things need an air lock.

Ms. Snyder said the building has an inside vestibule that some type of inside weatherization application could be considered rather than outside of the door. It is an important building on the federal register. Mr. Matzner said he would be reluctant to vote on the application without the DRC reviewing it as proposed with the change. He noted that the applicant was not talking about taking the whole thing down, just the front door and a side panel. It would still be screwed to the upper part of the door. He doesn't see that the partial disassembly they are talking about would solve the problem of the appearance.

Mr. Teschmacher said he agrees with Ms. Snyder's comments. He thinks that some weatherization could occur in the vestibule. The DRB made reference to page 4 of the August 21st minutes where Mr. Illuzi said the two contractors said they could redesign the application to actually remove the door and side panels and put it back to normal. They could take it apart and store it in the basement during the summer months. But there was no specific proposal for this.

Mr. Cranse moved approval of the application as submitted. Ms. Snyder seconded the motion. The motion was denied 6-0. Mr. Zalinger abstained. The application was denied.

Minutes

Mr. Cranse moved approval of the December 18, 2006 Development Review Board Minutes, with Mr. Blakeman seconding the motion. The minutes were approved 5-0 by Jeremy Hoff, Kevin Matzner, Roger Cranse, Alan Blakeman, and Jack Lindley.

Other

Mr. Zalinger said the applications for 169 Barre Street and 51 Berlin Street have been continued to February 20, 2007.

Adjournment:

Mr. Blakeman moved adjournment, with Jack Lindley seconding. The Development Review Board adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Swigon,
Administrative Officer

Transcribed and Prepared by:

Joan Clack
City Clerk & Treasurer's Office

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.