

Montpelier Development Review Board
November 16, 2009
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Philip Zalinger, Chair; Kevin O'Connell, Vice Chair; Alan Blakeman, Daniel Richardson, Jack Lindley and Roger Cranse.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning and Zoning Administrator.

Call to Order:

Philip Zalinger, Chair, called the Montpelier Development Review Board to order at 7:00 P.M.

Review of November 2, 2009 Minutes:

Upon motion by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Blakeman the November 2, 2009 minutes of the Montpelier Development Review Board were approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

I. 108 Main Street – CB-I/DCD

Applicant: Hyzer Industries, Inc.
Owner: David Miller
Design Review for a Sign.
Interested Party: Scott Kerner

Mr. Zalinger said it appears that the Design Review Committee reviewed this application on November 10th and recommended approval with an optional change, which is the applicant may install up to three black gooseneck lamps with a 60 watt or equivalent bulb. The applicant may pursue this option at their discretion. Mr. Kerner said he was in agreement with that.

What the DRB usually does with Design Review matters is since they have been before the Design Review Committee if the applicant is in agreement with their recommendations the DRB doesn't usually take additional evidence unless there is someone present to be heard on the matter. They understand it is optional as to whether they use the gooseneck lamps.

Upon motion by Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Richardson, the application for 108 Main Street with the optional criteria by the Design Review Committee, the application was approved on a vote of 6 to 0.

II. 150 Main Street – CB-II/DCD

Applicant/Owner: Carol Vassar
Design Review for Replacing Garage Doors.

The Design Review Committee reviewed this application at its November 10th meeting and recommended approval with an optional change.

Mr. Lindley said there is nothing in the original application for the 60 watt bulbs to be installed. Did the applicant ask for that?

Ms. Vassar replied no.

Mr. Zalinger said the application is to replace three garage doors and the Design Review Committee recommended approval with an option that the applicant may pursue at her discretion the installation of three wall mounted shielded fixtures with 60 watt bulbs.

Ms. Vassar said the issue was that both the lights for the sign and the lights above the garage door might be fairly likely to be anticipated, and to spare us from having to come back when they realized it would have been a good idea to ask for it.

Mr. Lindley said if she wants a sign there should be an application for a sign.

Mr. Vassar said in her case it was the thought that it might be nice to have better lighting. They asked about the lighting in the area, and lighting could be better. It was an offer to keep her from having to come back again with another request if she decided she wanted lighting.

Mr. Richardson said from the minutes in the packet it looks like Mr. Everett raised the issue after they reviewed the criteria as an additional subject.

Mr. Zalinger said it says at the applicant's discretion.

Mr. Blakeman moved approval of Dr. Vassar's application for 150 Main Street, including the optional change recommended by the Design Review Committee. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion.

Mr. Lindley said he would vote in the negative only because he doesn't think the wall mounted light fixtures were a part of the original application. He would support the changing of the doors. If we put 60 watt bulbs all around town we are going to look like a Christmas tree before we are done. He is appalled at the fact that if somebody doesn't ask for it that it is automatically thought we should have 60 watt bulbs put up. He supports the doors but not the light fixtures.

The motion to approve the motion was in the affirmative 5 to 1 with Mr. Lindley voting no.

III. 22 State Street – CB-II/DCD
Applicant/Owner: Carlo Rovetto
Design Review for a Display Case.

The Design Review Committee reviewed this application at its November 10th meeting and recommended approval as proposed.

Mr. O'Connell moved the application for 22 State Street as proposed, with Mr. Blakeman seconding the motion. The application was approved on a vote of 6 to 0.

IV. Final Plan Review for Two Lot Subdivision
304 Berlin Street – MDR
Applicant: McKee, Giuliani & Cleveland
Owner: Norman and Virginia Kelley

Mr. Zalinger said the DRB had some expectations about additional items being included in the site plan, including the demonstration of where the setbacks would be.

Attorney Elizabeth MaGill said the DRB asked to see all utilities, which have been added to the plan, and the rights-of-way which have also been added. They also wanted a designation of where the spring rights would be, which have also been added to the plan.

Mr. Zalinger asked if there was a legend that identifies these on the map.

Ms. MaGill said the surveyor put notes with arrows.

Mr. Zalinger asked if the sewer line was going to serve Lot 1 only. Mr. Kelley's ownership of 484 Sherwood Drive essentially renders it the conduit. Ms. MaGill replied that is correct.

Mr. Zalinger said for the Board's purposes the sewer lines on 484 Sherwood Drive will serve only Lot 1.

Mr. Chamber replied that is correct.

Doug Chamber, son-in-law of Norman Kelley, said they have done several projects together on Sherwood Drive.

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Doug Chamber.

Mr. Zalinger said there is a site plan here and he wants to confirm that the sewer line for Lot 1 is going to be over 484 Sherwood Drive. Also, the electric, TV and telephone lines are going to come from Sherwood Drive over to serve only Lot 1, but then it takes a dog leg and continue up to serve Lot 2.

Mr. Chamber said the power to the original home that Norm owned is serviced from Sherwood Drive just to that house. The house he has now on Sherwood Drive, 484 Sherwood, also comes off Sherwood Drive, but they are totally separate services.

Mr. Zalinger asked what interests will Lot 2 receive over 484 Sherwood Drive.

Mr. Chamber replied it is just a right-of-way across the lot to service the second lot, the lot they are trying to sell to the Jones family.

Ms. MaGill said it appears the water line for Lot 2 will come across the Hickory easement off Sherwood Drive.

Mr. Chamber said they got that easement from the city.

Mr. Zalinger said Lot 2's water service is going to come from Sherwood Drive over the Hickory right-of-way. Its telephone, electric and whatever other services will come from Sherwood Drive over 484 Sherwood Drive and then over Lot 1 as well.

Mr. Chamber said it will service Lot 1.

Mr. Zalinger inquired how Lot 2 would receive its power.

Mr. Chamber said for Lot 2 he has an arrangement with the new buyers to come off of his easement he has. He has talked to Green Mountain Power. He comes down the existing driveway off Sherwood Drive to Lot 2 where the garage is.

Ms. MaGill said that is actually delineated on the plan as well. Lot 2 will receive those easements across 484 Sherwood Drive over Lot 1.

Mr. Zalinger said ingress and egress to Lot 2 is going to be from Sherwood Drive over the Hickory right-of-way.

Mr. DeSmet said the DRB did ask for the setbacks and he doesn't have that.

Mr. O'Connell asked if the Technical Review Committee review this.

Mr. DeSmet said he looked at it with the Director of Public Works.

Mr. Zalinger asked if the house on Lot 1 was in compliance with the setbacks.

Mr. DeSmet said he didn't know specifically.

Ms. MaGill said it appears that item #4 on the decision from the last meeting indicates that it is in compliance.

Mr. O'Connell said it is Medium Density Residential rather than LDR.

Mr. Zalinger said he couldn't be sure that any of the easements and rights-of-way are depicted to scale. The DRB would ask again that the setbacks be depicted on the final Mylar. They don't need to do that for Lot 2 because there

aren't any development plans. He wants to be crystal clear that the improvements on Lot 1 do meet the setback requirements and the only way to do that is to delineate it on the Mylar.

Mr. Chamber said in order to get the building permit all the items were addressed so the city should have records of the setbacks.

Mr. Zalinger said when the house on Lot 1 was built there was no Lot 2.

Mr. Chamber said in order to go through the subdivision with the State of Vermont there were some criteria they had to follow. They also received the information from the city so they could follow that in conjunction with the state's approval. He feels very confident that all of those requirements were met. It was 30 feet for a rear setback, 55 feet from the center of the street.

Mr. Zalinger said there is plenty of that information in here.

Mr. Cranse said he finds it difficult to vote for this without the setback information. Shouldn't that be part of the application?

Mr. Zalinger said Clancy's preliminary use of the scale indicates it is at least 60 feet from the rear of the house to the new proposed rear property line.

Mr. O'Connell said they will have as a condition in the motion that the final Mylar reflect what the setbacks are. Does that satisfy your concern, Roger?

Mr. Cranse replied no.

Mr. Blakeman moved final plan approval for 304 Berlin Street subdivision and that the final Mylar depicts the setbacks on Lot 1 and that the setbacks be consistent with the regulations. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed favorably on a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Cranse voting no.

**V. Site Plan and Design Review
42 Main Street – CB-I/DCD**

Applicant/Owner: Aubuchon Co., Inc.

Front and Rear Entry Alterations and Signage.

Interested Party: Jay White

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Jay White, Architect with Robert Carl Williams & Associates, and the representative for Aubuchon Realty in the application.

Mr. DeSmet said Somers has gone out of business and Aubuchon has proposed to take over the remaining space of that building. Their proposal is design review for extensive exterior renovations, including signage, as well as a change in the entrance to the rear with the sidewalk.

Mr. White said they would start with the front door which is on Main Street. The proposal is to remove both existing signs, the one that says Somers and the one that says Aubuchon Hardware and replace with new signs. These would be white background signs with the word Aubuchon in the corporate color orange and the word Hardware on the 40 Main Street sign and the words Paint Center on the 42 Main Street sign in the dark green. On the 40 Main Street side there would be a sign to the left that says Electrical and one to the right that says Plumbing. That would be the extent of the signage change on Main Street.

On the Somers side, or 42 Main Street, they would also be replacing the existing chrome window store frontage with a dark bronze anodized store frontage that would match the existing Aubuchon Hardware metal store frontage. The solid transom above the doors would be replaced with glass. There would be a pair of doors instead of a single door on the frontage of the Main Street sign. Those doors would be natural fir wood doors, multi glass with wood styles and rails that would also match the Aubuchon Hardware door.

There is also the original granite base of the 42 Main Street which will remain in place. It will be straightened. The photographs show that it was crooked and in the process of trying to straighten it they broke the store front which was why it was plywooded over before they had the permit to do the rest of the work. There is also a slight ramp going into that side of the building. Right now it is a deteriorated ceramic tile between the sidewalk and the store entrance. They are proposing that be replaced with the same type of stamped colored concrete the city has used in all of their recently done handicapped triangle side pieces. It gives a little bit of a texture and color to that spot.

There is no lighting on the sign or on the building. There is a proposal to replace both awnings with a new canvass awning in a solid dark green color. That is scheduled to occur in the spring of 2010. For the winter it will remain as it is for both awnings.

Mr. Zalinger said what they see very often with retail uses is an expansion of signage into the windows. For instance, Glidden prevailed upon Aubuchon to have its name prominently shown over the door. Is that going to continue?

Mr. White said he is not aware of any desire on Aubuchon's part to add any signage to the windows. Their current trend throughout the project is not to advertise in the windows. They aren't proposing to move what is there at this point, but they are not proposing to add any new signage in the windows.

Mr. Zalinger inquired about the banner on top of the windows. The existing 40 Main Street location where Glidden appears... Mr. White said that is actually in the windows above that space and it will not be there either. The intent is not to remove that at this point but they aren't proposing to add anything to the Somers side.

Mr. Lindley inquired if that was on the awning or on the window.

Mr. White replied there are two different issues. On the awning there is a sign that says 40 Main Street and since 1908. That will remain. The new awning will be completely blank with no signage on it on the Somers side. On the Aubuchon side it will basically be a duplication of what is there. They would be changing it so that both canvasses would match without one being more faded than the other, and instead of a scalloped edge on the bottom it would be a straight edge because it holds up better in long term weather. What Phil is referring to is that in the current hardware store they have signs applied to the inside of the glass which says Glidden, tools, etc. and they are planning to discontinue that process. He hasn't been told they are planning to remove it from the existing store, but there is no intent to do such a thing on the new space. It would be completely clear glass.

There are two 10 foot wide openings inside between the two stores that connect the two store spaces together so you can transfer between one and the other. Those have been set to be handicapped accessible so they aren't relying on a wider door at the entrance of the 42 Main Street side for handicapped access on Main Street. They are also are going to be putting in a new handicapped public bathroom in the existing Aubuchon store.

Mr. Lindley asked why they wouldn't have a sign of Aubuchon Hardware centered on both locations so they only see Aubuchon once instead of twice.

Mr. White said the nature of the building is such that there are two separate storefronts. There is actually a brick pier between the two storefronts so from an architectural viewpoint it certainly makes more sense to have a sign for each side. In effect, inside there are two separate functions. They do connect together, but the paint center is actually all about paint and the hardware side all about hardware. It makes sense to have both signs saying Aubuchon Paint Center on one side and Aubuchon Hardware on the other. What is worth noting is that the size of the sign has been reduced. The sizes of the letters on the new Aubuchon Hardware sign are going to be less. When they discussed that the first intent was to make them read the same. As they looked at it further they discovered the Aubuchon Hardware letters are plywood and fairly worn so rather than to replace those, which was one option, and they considered the background which they considered repainting he told them since it is a plastic background and it is better to replace it. As long as they are replacing it that instead of having the big orange stripe he thought it would look better if they went with their modern corporate logo which is the orange and green letters on a white background as opposed to green letters on an orange background. It would look fresher and the letters are smaller.

Mr. O'Connell asked what color are the letters on the background.

Mr. White said they are green. In the final analysis there would be much less orange than the current background has. It would say Aubuchon Hardware on one side and Aubuchon Paints on the other. Since there is a very distinct storefront difference and one has a granite base and the other doesn't it really is a separate function it is fair to have it say Aubuchon Paint Center.

Mr. O'Connell said he would agree. It would like odd to try to put a sign across both storefronts. There are two distinct storefronts. Essentially, they are working with the existing situation.

Mr. White said they are upgrading the existing to improve it so both signs would be brand new and comparable. It is also worth noting that normally Aubuchon has purchased their signs from a manufacturer in Massachusetts and he asked them to bid the signs locally. They chose to do that and are accepting local suppliers for that. He thinks they will be doing the same with some of the construction on the rear. Also, the awnings are costing significantly more to buy them in Vermont but they are choosing to do that in order to support the local economy and should be commended for that.

Mr. Blakeman said from he hears is the Somers side will have two new doors and they will be opened at the same time as 40 Main Street as well. Is that right?

Mr. White replied they may be. Based on how crowded they may choose to leave those doors closed and only have the customers use the main 40 Main Street doors, but those doors will be operable and will open. The operator may choose to just have those doors closed and let people use the other doors.

Mr. Blakeman said he is curious about the security of it.

Mr. White said security just means how many people they have on staff. It is also worth noting in taking over the Somers space they also took over some of the Somers employees so that those people are now working for Aubuchon. There is always enough staff in the Aubuchon Hardware Store that he doesn't think security is going to be an issue whether there is one door or two doors for people to come and go. There is actually going to be a new rear entrance which will also be convenient for people, and there is also an existing rear entrance that will be made. There will be four ways to come in and buy hardware at Aubuchon in Montpelier.

Mr. Blakeman asked if California Paints will still be there or are they being sold out.

Mr. White replied they are currently selling California Paints and also selling Glidden Paints. He went out of his way to match a California color instead of a Sherman Williams color to match their corporate signs. They purchased the Blouin Paint Company and all of their stock and they are planning to sell California Paint.

Mr. Lindley inquired whether there was any proposal for 60 watt gooseneck lighting for the signs.

Mr. White said there is no proposal for signage being lit on the front side and no internal lights, either. There is a street light between the two stores that seems to be lighting their storefront adequately and they are not typically opened after dark.

Mr. White said he has very much enjoyed working with Aubuchon on this project and the one in Barre. He finds them an extremely good corporate company and very concerned about the local economy where their stores and very focused on service.

Mr. Zalinger said he noticed at the 40 Main Street location there are banner signs along the top of each window. All of them are set back from the line of the sidewalk.

Mr. White said the entrance there recesses back in and all of that is inside their own window.

Mr. Zalinger said he wanted to distinguish how the 42 Main Street where the four of the six windows in that storefront are directly on the sidewalk. He wonders if he has the authority to make a representation on behalf of Aubuchon that there will be no permanent signage affixed to those windows. If they are presented with the need for Aubuchon Hardware Electronics and Plumbing at 40 Main Street, and the Aubuchon Paint Center at 42 Main Street as proposed if it is married with more signage in the windows it may impact upon his view of the need for the signage that has been presented.

Mr. White said his understanding from Aubuchon was that they are no longer are going with the concept of applying signs to the inside of the windows. He took that to imply they would not be applying signs to the inside of the windows at 42 Main Street. He doesn't think there is a problem for the DRB to condition the approval on that. He thinks the ordinance is typically that a shop keeper can do what they want inside their own windows.

Mr. Zalinger replied yes, it is. As a member of the DRB he can be influenced in his decision about what signage is proposed against upon what is contemplated.

Mr. White replied the intent is not to have any signage in the windows at all.

Mr. Zalinger said it would have a different impact from directly across the street because of their direct frontage on the sidewalk.

Mr. White replied he agrees. He is an architect and cares what it looks like. They care what it looks like and their current trend going forward is they do not advertise with those bands across the top of the windows. Therefore, you come inside to buy what is inside as opposed to seeing everything from the outside.

Mr. Zalinger asked if they could move to what they propose for the rear of the building.

Mr. White said there is a photograph which shows the current condition of the rear of the building which is fairly tacky at this point. The intent is to replace the broken door that is there now. It is basically falling apart. The metal clad has rusted off, the style is broken and it doesn't close properly. The intent is to replace that existing door with a new solid flush metal insulated door that would also be the same dark green color. The windows when they started from the outside had iron bars, some of which were loose, and there was a kind of hardware cloth half inch screen for security. Inside that was an insect screen and inside that was a double hung window, and inside that was sheet rock that years ago the Fire Chief asked them to put on the stairway because there were dumpsters outside and he was afraid if they caught on fire it would catch the building on fire. They chose to remove all of those layers of the exterior, restore the existing windows by simply painting them and cleaning up the windows. There were all of those layers in front of them which were actually in pretty good shape when you got through all of the dust and dirt. They are going to replace the security system with a fixed quarter inch laminated glass storm window that will add insulation value and security into those windows. The exterior side of the existing window would be painted dark gray because the wall inside is insulated and sheet rocked and a bathroom put in through there. The proposal is to paint the inside windows so the new window can be clear glass and gives a natural reflection as far as a nondescript appearance of the two little windows that are there.

Further to the left you can see currently there is a very high triple slider window where there was an office at that level, kind of the loft area. That will be removed. That is not an original window, but they will be keeping the existing height of the support and taking the bricks out underneath it to create an opening for a new double wide storefront entrance which would be a 6' x 4" masonry opening for a pair of 6 foot wide doors. There would be two doors of a total of 6 foot wide. The bricks would be removed and cleaned off and reset to fill in the void. They would use the bricks to fill in the existing louver opening over the existing door at the south side of the building. The new doors would be set back about 3 inches from the face. The metal frames don't wrap around the brick. They actually are recessed back in for the traditional pattern. The new storefront there would be an aluminum door system which is the same dark green. In this case the doors would also be the same material and clear glass where the doors are. Above that would be a clear glass transom, and the transom would have on the inside of the transom vinyl letters that would say Aubuchon in orange and Hardware and Paint Center in white. They are doing white there instead of the green because since it is going to be on the inside the glass it would not show up well if it was green. The colors on the back would be the green frame of the door, the green casings, styles and rails of the door and the Aubuchon

word in orange and Hardware and Paint Center in green. Above that would be a new exterior light that would be inside an opaque canvass awning. At the bottom of the awning would be a black egg crate grill so you can't see the light source unless you look straight up at it. That awning would be fixed to the wall. It is not operable. It would project one foot and it has a slight arch to it to highlight the arches of the other windows that are already on that façade. It gives them a way to shield that exterior light.

Since that is going to be the new fire exit from that side of the building it is required there be a light at that exit by code so they are choosing to do a 4 foot single tube fluorescent light which is an incandescent color. It will be kept up under the awning.

The other changes to the rear are the conduit and meter box would be painted to match the brick color. They want to blend that into the brick the best they can. The other change, which is a good change, is they will be taking out the asphalt against the building to a distance of 7 feet 2 inches, which is where the end of the wood stairway is that goes up to the Black Door Restaurant. They would be replacing all of that with a new concrete walk. The concrete walk would be designed to be handicapped accessible. It would pitch slightly to the south until you get to the landing where the existing door is and then pitch a little bit towards the parking area so that it would shed water well and provide handicapped access to that space and also create more of an entrance that is more pedestrian friendly than just the ragged asphalt that is there now. The dumpsters that are there would no longer be used because Aubuchon would use their own dumpsters on the other side of the building.

Mr. Zalinger said the photo provided in the packet shows a wall of dumpsters along 40 Main Street's north wall. Those will be removed.

Mr. White said there will be no dumpsters at that location. It is also worth noting that Mr. Jacobs who owns the property sent a letter regarding this matter which he would like to read for the record. The Somers property extends 9 inches beyond their building and the city leases the whole parking lot from Jeff Jacobs. Mr. white talked with Jesse Jacobs about this project well in advance and his father wrote:

As an adjoining property owner to the above referenced use and site plan for 42 Main Street we are offering our strong support for this project. It is our believe that the proposed changes will help to create a stronger and more dynamic downtown. Please accept this letter with a strong endorsement of their project.

He thinks it is significant that an owner is endorsing these improvements to their property paid for by another adjoining owner. He thinks it helps the whole flow of circulation into that back area instead of people coming into that tight little corner now which was the back entrance to Somers Hardware.

Mr. O'Connell asked if Aubuchon own the existing Aubuchon space.

Mr. White replied they do. They own this building as well. It is Aubuchon Realty Company that owns the building and Aubuchon leases the space from Aubuchon Realty. There are two separate companies.

Mr. Lindley said in the corner of this building shown in the picture is not the lot line.

Mr. White said he was referring to the whole space back there. Jacobs owns up to 9 inches of this space and up to 6 feet of this space. He owns this part of the parking lot as well. This is the entrance to the Black Door.

Mr. Lindley said by virtue of his owning the parking lot the lot line goes into the side of the building.

Mr. White said they are not proposing any changes to the lot line to property ownership. He owns to 9 inches on the outside of the wall.

Mr. Lindley said the creaky door he has gone through for years is going to be replaced with a nice door. Is that so they are maintaining the entrance that goes up to the second floor? In other words, the new store inside will start on the other side. The construction is on the other side of that and they are maintaining the stairwell that goes up and down.

Mr. White said the stairwell that goes up and down will still be there but will no longer be accessible to the public. It will be safer not to have the creaky doors to go through. The doors are going to be maintained for staff use only to go upstairs or downstairs. Gary would prefer not to have the door at all inside and have the display space. Aubuchon has decided they don't always want to have to go outside in order to go upstairs or downstairs so the door will be left for staff only. The exit sign will be moved over to the new public doors and there will not be a public exit through that existing door.

Mr. Lindley said he doesn't see a sign on the outside of where the proposed new metal door is.

Mr. White said they aren't proposing any sign whatsoever. It may not even have any hardware on that side. His experience as an architect is that typically in retail situations people do not go through a door that is solid. If you have want to have retail access you need to have some type of glass in the door. If you have a pair of glass doors and inside you can see the wonderful paint center they are building in there they will likely go there and not try the other door. It shouldn't be confusing and they don't see a need for a sign on that door. He doesn't like to have a sign that says "No Admittance" to a retail sale. It should say to come on in and buy something.

Mr. O'Connell said the upstairs floors, both the second and third floors, on both spaces are vacant.

Mr. White replied it is. They have been talking with Aubuchon Realty about the possibility of finding a use for that. there is a lot of demand for that space. If they could just find some money to conduct a feasibility study to confirm that it would be workable as office space that would be great. There was one done for residential use which didn't seem to be as attractive as it would be for office space. That would be a different matter. They aren't prepared to propose anything for the upper floors at this point.

Mr. Richardson said over the existing door they are removing a louver window.

Mr. White said at some point there was the remains of an exhaust fan which has been disconnected for years and it is just a void there now. It has a metal louver over it that if the fan worked it would push the louver open. It hasn't functioned for years and they don't intend to have it function. They just want to block it up to be brick. Again, all of this has been specified that the brick is too thin so they won't see a vertical joint of mortar there. They have specified that the mortar match the existing color and size and character of the existing mortar.

Mr. Richardson asked if that was the brick they are taking out of the wall for the new door.

Mr. White replied that is correct. That is an advantage of recycling the brick that is there and they know it will match by doing so.

Mr. Richardson asked why they are proposing to have the windows colored as opposed to putting drapes behind them.

Mr. White said they are looking at the inside of a wall. They would be looking at the inside of insulation and the back side of sheetrock because the whole inside has been sheet rocked over. You can't see out the window in the bathroom nor the stairway. It is all sheetrock. In the bathroom you can see evidence of a little bit of a former window sill but the stairway was added since those windows were put in.

Mr. Richardson said the windows are essentially just to preserve the architectural detail on the outside.

Mr. White replied yes.

Mr. Lindley asked if they lost a parking space. It seems he could park right in front of the creaky old door. Is there going to be a parking space taken away in order to protect the entrance?

Mr. White said they aren't proposing any parking changes other than what is there now. Right now they would be moving the dumpsters and putting a concrete walk in. There is enough length there that a car could pull forward and get by the car.

Mr. Lindley said if you backed up you would hit people coming out of the store if the parking space was there.

Mr. Zalinger said there isn't any parking proposed with this project.

Mr. Lindley said the new door is going to create some type of a walk area out there. How far out are they coming with the concrete?

Mr. White said the full width of the building is 27' 9" and they are coming the full width of the building 7' 2" out, so they are going out as far as the wood stairway. There is a piece of the wooden stairway that is broken. They want the concrete to help protect the stairway. If someone pulled all the way up against the building as it is now you can still come out the door and there will be 8 feet of space if the cars pull all the way forward. There will be room to walk behind the cars. He doesn't see any conflict with this change.

Mr. Zalinger noted for the record that the Design Review Committee reviewed the proposed and recommended approval as proposed.

Mr. White said he is a member of the Design Review Committee but did not vote for this project. He did not participate in the discussion.

Mr. O'Connell moved to approve design review of the application as proposed and as recommended by the Design Review Committee. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion.

Mr. Cranse asked if they were voting both on design review and site plan.

Mr. Zalinger said there should be separate motions for each.

Design review approval was granted for the application on a vote of 6 to 0.

Mr. Cranse moved approval of the site plan as presented for 42 Main Street with Mr. Richardson seconding the motion. The vote was approved on a vote of 6 to 0.

Mr. Richardson said he would just note that his vote is influenced by the fact that he is making representations that the interior signs will not be applied. This is noting that they do not have authority over interior signs. However, they do have authority over exterior signs. The representation here they are voting on is they are going to keep it fairly low key frontage without the signs.

Mr. White said that is the agreement he understands from Aubuchon Hardware. The intent is not to do any signage in the windows.

Site plan approval was granted for the application on a vote of 6 to 0.

VI. 5 Memorial Drive – GB/DCD

Applicant: David Simendinger

Owner: WESCO Realty, LLC

Design Review for Signage.

The applicant is not present for the 5 Memorial Drive application for signage.

Mr. O'Connell said he would note that the Design Review Committee had extensive conditions and it is on the consent agenda. He would prefer to table it.

Mr. Zalinger said if they don't have an applicant here to testify whether they are in agreement with the recommendations of the Design Review Committee they can't really develop a record. They would continue it.

Mr. Richardson moved to continue the application for design review for signage at 5 Memorial Drive, with Mr. O'Connell seconding the motion. The vote was in favor on a vote of 6 to 0. Since it is continued it will be scheduled at their next regular meeting which is December 7th.

Other Business:

Bob Sheil said he was here two weeks ago and discussed his application at that time. It was taken under advisement. He hasn't received any decision yet.

Mr. Zalinger said perhaps the Zoning Administrator could advise when the decision will be ready for issuance.

Mr. DeSmet said he hopes to issue it this week. By statute he has 45 days and it should be issued this week.

Adjournment:

Upon motion by Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Blakeman, the Development Review Board adjourned on a vote of 6 to 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning and Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by Joan Clack