

**Montpelier Development Review Board**  
**September 7, 2010**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Jack Lindley, Acting Chair; Ali Sarafzadeh, Daniel Richardson, Roger Cranse, Sabina Haskell and Alan Blakeman.  
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning and Zoning Administrator

**Call to Order:**

The September 7, 2010 meeting of the Montpelier Development Review Board was called to order by Jack Lindley, Acting Chair, at 7:00 P.M.

**Review of June 21, 2010 and August 2 and 17, 2010 Minutes:**

Upon motion by Mr. Blakeman and Mr. Richardson the minutes of the June 21, 2010 meeting of the DRB were adopted unanimously.

Upon motion by Mr. Cranse and Mr. Richardson the minutes of August 2, 2010 DRB meeting were adopted unanimously.

Upon motion by Mr. Richardson and Ms. Haskell the minutes of the August 17, 2010 DRB meeting were adopted unanimously.

**Comments by the Chair:**

Mr. Lindley explained the Development Review Board doesn't take rigorous testimony on items placed on the Consent Agenda because they have been before the Design Review Committee.

**I. 8 Bailey Avenue - CB-II/DCD:**

Owner/Applicant: Vermont Land Trust

Design Review for door and window replacement

Interested Party: Kris Hammer

Mr. Lindley said this seems to be a straight forward permit for the replacement of a rear door and basement window.

Mr. Blakeman said there is a staff recommendation for the window to be an awning style window composed of fiberglass with wooden sash and a carriage house door is Model # 7117. He asked Mr. Hammer if that was okay with him.

Mr. Hammer replied that was what the DRC recommended at the meeting. The door was the original door they presented. They looked into trying to find an awning for that opening. It is actually a cutout in concrete and a very small opening and they don't make an awning window that small. They are going to use the original design which is a sliding window. They don't make awning windows that small.

Mr. Richardson said the two adjustments of scope that the DRC recommended are that the window be an awning style. He is saying he can't comply with that because they don't make an awning window that small. Secondly, they have no problem with complying with their selection of Model # 7117 for a door.

Mr. Hammer said they presented the DRC two options with the doors and they liked this model.

Mr. Richardson moved for design review approval for 8 Bailey Avenue with the adjustment to the scope that the carriage house door be the selected model # 7117 fir fiberglass door and the other recommendation by the DRC not be carried in the motion. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous vote.

## **II. 5 High School Drive – GB/DCD**

Owner: City of Montpelier

Applicant: Friends of Central Vermont Tennis

Design Review for a pergola.

This application is for a sitting area for the tennis court. Mr. DeSmet said it is for a pergola within the seating area that was already approved previously. They are in the Design Review District which is a gateway to the city.

Mr. Richardson said one of the recommendations is that the staff has concerns about anchoring of the pergola. What proposed anchoring do they have to secure the pergola to the cement path?

Dana McCarthy said it actually outside the cement path. The wooden posts are going to sunk about five feet down into the ground. They will be sunk below the frost level.

Mr. Blakeman moved approval of the pergola for the High School tennis court at 5 High School Drive. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion.

Mr. Cranse asked if they saw the staff comments. The staff comments say that the minimum National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations require that all new development shall be reasonably safe from flooding as well as meet the following requirements:

- ✓ Designed and adequately anchored to prevent flotation, collapse or lateral movement of the structure during the occurrence of the base flood.
- ✓ Constructed with materials resistant to flood damage (see FEMA technical bulleting 2-93: Flood Resistant Materials Requirements); and constructed by methods and practices that minimize flood damage.

Will the footing they describe meet those two requirements?

Ms. McCarthy said she couldn't answer that because she isn't technically versed in that area. She would assume so unless it was the 100-year flood because they will be so deep in the ground that she can't imagine that just a surface amount of water would dislodge them at all. They are supposed to be not only down in the ground but packing some type of soil around it as well so everything is at a level and slope.

Mr. DeSmet said he talked to Don Marsh about it so he knows that is part of the design. They just didn't indicate it as such in the materials. He is satisfied they will meet those requirements.

Mr. Richardson said this is a solid wood structure. All pieces are solid wood that are put together.

Ms. McCarthy said it is either pressure treated lumber or white cedar. They are substantial pieces of wood.

Mr. DeSmet replied they are 6 x 6 posts.

Mr. Richardson said he is satisfied that the material is solid wood as opposed to plywood or light metal.

The application received unanimous approval.

### **III. 62-64 Main Street – CB-I/DCD**

Applicant: Leslie Rabins – One More Time

Owner: Stephen LewinStein

Design Review for a Sign

Permit #5777

Mr. Lindley administered the oath to Leslie Rabins.

This is for the sign band that has nothing in it except for the lights. He asked what the change in the application was.

Stephen Miller said it is a change in the size of the lettering.

Mr. Lindley said the DRC has some findings which are listed in the staff report.

Mr. Cranse said the DRC basically said that the size and scale of the lettering and graphics are incompatible with other signage in the downtown area. They noted that the capital

letters are approximately 3 ½ feet high. They said 31 ½ inches is incompatible with the downtown area.

Mr. Miller said the recommendation the DRC made was to take the original sketch down to 75 percent of its linear dimension, which is 9/16ths in area. They resisted but now that is what the sketch is. The difference from 31 ½ inches to 30 inches represents quite a change in the area. He put the square footage down because they originally thought they were entitled to 208 square feet and the design is now 47 square feet.

Mr. Richardson said what they are proposing to the DRB today is the smallest sign of which the capital letters are 30 inches tall. How tall are the lower case letters?

Mr. Miller said they are about 15 ¾ inches. The icons are all to scale.

Mr. Richardson asked what was the height on the dress and chair and ring.

Mr. Miller said the dress would be about 39 inches high and the chair is about 32 inches high. The ring is about 30 inches.

Ms. Haskell asked if the chair and ring were about the same size.

Mr. Miller said they are pretty close. The ring might be a little smaller than the chair. The rectangle here is the actual sign band inside all of the trim. The capital letters are generally 4 ¾ inches away from the edge. When they were before the Design Review Committee they worked out the size of the different pieces but solely concentrated on the size of the letters. The icons are resin castings and molded. They will be high relief castings.

Mr. DeSmet said they are similar to Cool Jewels.

Mr. Miller said these will be sculptures. The letters will be mounted the same way.

Mr. Sarafzadeh said on the typical lettering how many screw mounts do they anticipate each single letter to have.

Mr. Miller said because of the script there will be at least two or three per letter. They are just screw eyes on the letter and background and link together. It is a very sturdy connection.

Mr. Richardson said they are proposing a white background. Is that going to go on the blue area or blue and yellow?

Mr. Miller said it isn't going to be exactly white. It's a dusty rose color.

Mr. Richardson asked where the dusty rose is going to go on the existing sign band. Is that going to be just the blue area or the blue area and yellow border?

Mr. Miller said it will be just on the blue area.

Mr. Richardson said essentially what is the yellow will be outside of the dusty rose area.

Ms. Rabins said they thought they would use the regular border.

Mr. Lindley said they have to be careful about the border because that is an architectural detail. They have to leave that alone.

Mr. Miller said it will be light blue.

Ms. Haskell asked if the rose color was meant to match the color of the brick.

Mr. Miller replied no.

Mr. Richardson said he sees three surfaces on the sign front.

Ms. Rabins said they just want to do a regular border. It's like a curved piece.

Mr. Richardson said what is the blue surface right now they are proposing to paint that the dusty rose. What is the yellow border, which he recalls as being a different surface and slightly raised, that will be blue.

Ms. Rabins said there won't be two colored borders. There is just going to be one border.

Mr. Richardson said he sees a very thin yellow border. His recollection is that is not the same surface as the blue but slightly raised. Then, there is a sort of reddish final border which is a curved raised surface. Are those two surfaces going to stay yellow and red?

Ms. Rabins replied no because they aren't using yellow. That will just be the background color. It's too confusing to have too many colors. It is going to be a light blue color.

Mr. Richardson said they have the height of the letters, but what is the overall height of the sign band itself?

Mr. Miller said the actual sign band is 39.5 inches high.

Mr. Richardson said he is trying to figure out what the border is going to look like. They are going to paint blue on the border and everything into the height of this sign which is going to be 39.5 inches from this line to this line.

Mr. Lindley said as presented tonight they are working with the third size.

Mr. Sarafzadeh said the eye screws hook into each other.

Mr. Miller said one has to be opened up and pried open, and then they hook over and pried shut.

Mr. Sarafzadeh asked if it means they are literally hanging on the hooks. Mr. Miller replied yes.

Mr. Sarafzadeh said on a windy day would there be clanking around.

Mr. Miller said this is a real old method. It is not something he came up with. He learned it from an old-timer who did signs in Burlington for 50 years. It is very strong.

Mr. Richardson said he would like to make a statement of where he is at on this proposal. He appreciates them reducing down the letter size. It makes a lot of sense, but the various sculptures have to come down a little bit too. The dress is 39 inches and it is something that is coming out. He is fearful that it is going to obscure.

Mr. Miller replied the dress is going to be the flattest one of all.

Mr. Richardson said he isn't talking about a substantial reduction. He would be more comfortable with what they are proposing with the ring and the chair between 30 and 32 inches if the dress were closer to that number. That would alleviate the concern he has in obscuring the sign band, especially made as proposed with the letters this would still be one of the dominant signs on Main Street. It is going to be substantially larger than its neighbors, and he thinks in part because that whole sign band is much larger than its neighbors. It is going to be a big sign and he would be more comfortable with a dress that was closer to 30 to 33 inches. That way there would be a gap of hopefully 3 inches on either side that would avoid obscuring the architectural detail.

Mr. Miller said the original concept was to have it hanging from the trim on a coat hanger but the Design Review Committee had them shrink it down away from it and it has lost that element.

Mr. Richardson said Cityscape suggests a sign band that is 2 feet 6 inches total and this is going beyond. The icons have to be smaller so they don't run the risk of obscuring the details with the dress.

Mr. Cranse said he appreciates all the work they have done and actually likes the idea of a hanger. He doesn't feel comfortable voting on this because it seems to him that the changes they are proposing in the third version he would be comfortable if it went back to the

Design Review Committee because that is their job. He doesn't feel comfortable leaping into what they spent quite a lot of time doing. That is a comment for fellow board members.

Mr. DeSmet said one of the concerns the Design Review Committee had was they wanted to reduce it by 25 percent which is what the third version is. They didn't propose the 25 percent reduction at either of those meetings. That was the largest concern the Design Review Committee had.

Mr. Richardson said he would disagree with Roger in that he doesn't know the DRC taking another look at it will help. They have worked with the applicants and made their decision. His experience with the Design Review Committee is they go through a process and come back and they vote on it and the applicant moves on if they choose to. Those recommendations go forward and he feels they have been heard both by staff and the applicant. The DRB is faced with a very different proposal which happens a lot. Since the DRC is an advisory board and not a binding board if it makes a lot of sense. They have chosen to go in this direction. They have taken the DRC's comments and incorporated them into the third version so he feels comfortable voting on it.

Mr. Richardson moved for design review approval for 64 Main Street sign with the condition that it be for the current proposal of 30 inch capital letters, 15 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch lower case letters and icons that are no more than 33 inches tall. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. There is a 4 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> inch spacing between the letters. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 4 to 2.

Mr. DeSmet said they will issue a written decision and they will get the permit.

**Adjournment:**

Upon motion by Mr. Blakeman and Ms. Haskell the Development Review Board adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet  
Planning and Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack