

Montpelier Design Review Committee
October 11, 2011
Memorial Room, Montpelier City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Stephen Everett, Chair; Kate Coffey, Jay White, Zachary Brock and Tim Senter
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:

Stephen Everett, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

Comments from the Chair:

Stephen Everett, Chair, explained the Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board and vote on the applications. Their vote is advisory to the Development Review Board.

I. 63 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner: Leslie Sabo

Applicant: VT Network, Chani Waterhouse

Design Review for a Sign

The Vermont Network was just behind Parker's Quick Stop for many years and the sign hung outside their building on School Avenue. Their hope now is to put this sign up with the address on just the front porch of the building. They occupy the whole building. It is a nonprofit and they use the building for offices.

Mr. Everett asked if they had thought about putting the sign next to the door.

Ms. Waterhouse said they decided it would be better between the two windows. They only do business during the day. Because they don't do business after dark it didn't seem important that the sign be lighted.

Mr. Everett explained they could leave that as an option so they can mount a lamp there.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0.

II. 107 State Street – CB-I/DCD

Owner: John Russell

Applicant: Athene Cua

Design Review for an Exhaust Vent

Committee Member Jay White recused himself from participating in the application because he is working on the project as an architect.

Mr. White said he met today with Athene on the fire issues. He submitted some additional drawings as part of the application because they would also like permission to remove the existing fire escape that is on the back of the building. The original permit they had for the building was to restore the façade, including repairing the fire escape, but since the upper floors are used for offices Glenn Moore has agreed to support the removal of the fire escape completely because it is not really meeting code compliance, even to access it let alone to spend the money for the repairs. It looks bad on the building. He has agreed to allow the use of the offices with the installation of a fire alarm system and changing the doors to one-hour rated doors along the corridor. As a result of that they are proposing to remove the fire escape and remove the two

historic doors and reuse them in the restaurant so they are still visible to the public. They would replace those with in-kind appearing one-hour rated doors that would become the main entrance to the restaurant,

Part of the application is to install an exhaust hood blower. You may recall there was originally a grill there for the exhaust hood.

Mr. DeSmet said the newspaper warning for this project was for the exhaust. The DRB might have a problem with the modifications you have made. The fire escape is a non-substantial alteration because it isn't a historic feature.

Mr. White said they also need a supply for the exhaust to work. They are proposing to do that with a louver in the pediment over the door.

Mr. DeSmet said it hasn't been warned in the paper.

Mr. White said the exhaust was warned in the paper and this is related to the exhaust. There already is a permit in hand to replace the existing exterior door with another door. They would like the option to replace it with one of the doors that would be removed from the second floor or to replace it with the door that is already permitted. This is the back door. It would be in the interest of the applicant and John Russell to be able to amend the permit to include a different door than what is already permitted. John has agreed to change the existing door because it is simply worn out and doesn't seal properly.

Mr. Everett asked if the existing door was just a flat solid door.

Mr. White replied it is a flushed solid door. It isn't the original door. The front door of the building will stay the same. This application has nothing to do with the front of the building.

Mr. DeSmet said he doesn't have any of this information and he is going to have to explain to the DRB without anything in writing about what they are proposing. He is taking a risk. You are supposed to notice it in the paper.

Mr. White said he would like to get the approval of the exhaust system as it is proposed and if they can do an optional amendment to allow the applicant to use a different door instead he would save him coming back through the whole process again. The issue that prompted the meeting this morning with Glenn Moore was whether the exhaust fan would interfere with the fire escape and if it did would they need a different fire escape design or would they need to build another fire escape.

The light fixture that was approved in the previous application would just be in the same spot but a little lower on the trim board as he shows on the elevation. The exhaust hood the hood manufacturer proposed it just be painted to match the building when the building is painted so it disappears. The exhaust hood looks significantly better than the fire escape on the back and it makes the building functional.

Mr. Senter inquired how far the hood projects do from the wall.

Mr. White replied it projects about 30 inches from the wall. The previous application was dated October 13, 2010.

Mr. Everett said the application for the exhaust hood includes a provision for make-up air to be supplied through wood horizontal louvers constructed in a triangular exterior at the overhanging projection over the rear door. Subject to approval of the DRB the previously approved two panel 9-light wood rear door

replacement may be modified to a 6 panel wood door with no glass. They also mentioned something about removal of the fire escape.

Mr. DeSmet said he didn't think the fire escape needs to be approved by this committee. It isn't a historic feature. It is a non-substantial alteration.

Mr. Everett said the exhaust hood is to be painted to match the building color when the building is painted.

The DRC reviewed the criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0.

Review of Minutes of September 27, 2011:

Upon a motion duly made by Kate Coffey and Jay White the Minutes of the September 27, 2011 with a minor amendment were approved on a vote of 3 to 0.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion duly made by Kate Coffey and Zachary Brock the DRC adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack