

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**June 28, 2011**  
**Memorial Room, City Hall**

*Approved*

**Present:** Stephen Everett, Chair; James Duggan, Vice Chair; Jay White and Zachary Brock. Eric Gilbertson joined the Committee later.  
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

**Call to Order:**

Stephen Everett, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. Mr. Everett explained that the Design Review Committee is advisory to the Development Review Board.

**I. 21 Main Street – CB-I/DCD**

Owner/Applicant: The American Legion Post #3  
Design Review for a Sign

Nobody was present for the application.

Mr. Gilbertson said he didn't have any problems with the American Legion sign. It is nicer than the one they have now and adds a little character to it.

**II. 24 State Street – CB-I/DCD**

Owner/Applicant: Woodbury Mountain Toys, Karen Williams-Fox  
Design Review for a new awning and repainting store front

Karen Williams-Fox said she wanted to change the awning from the brown to something a little more exciting and also change the paint on the front of the store to match with the awning. Across the awning on the top just like Carlos has for Positive Pie they would like to put wording. "Come Play with Us!" is out and "The Best is Yet" is what it will read.

Mr. Everett said the storefront currently has two colors. There is a red around the windows and the lower panels which is beige.

Ms. Williams-Fox replied that is what she wants to paint. She included paint chips with her application. It is the banana yellow and the California blue for trim.

Mr. Brock asked if they were replacing only the fabric or the whole awning.

Ms. Williams-Fox replied the fabric. The framework is fine. The lettering will be on the lower strip of the awning.

Mr. Duggan said the colors of the awning will be a nice improvement.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0.

**III. 67 Main Street – CB-I/DCD**

Owner: Heney Family Main Street LLC  
Applicant: Athena's Boutique – Kelly Sullivan  
Design Review for a Sign

Kelly Sullivan said she had an older sign at the other space but she wants to fill the space above the new space she is going into which is the old Peach Tree space. She took her logo which is "Athena's Boutique" and her colors to Always on Time Sign who designed it for her. She hopes to place that right above the door and it will fit with Montpelier Pharmacy and Play It Again Sam visually. It is a rectangular sign.

Mr. White asked if she was moving into both storefronts they had or just one.

Ms. Sullivan replied she is only taking the one in the middle. Capitol Stationers is taking the other.

Mr. White said her existing sign is graphically it is attractive but it is very hard to read because the two colors are too close together.

Ms. Sullivan said the sign matches all of her bags and business cards.

Mr. Duggan inquired about a shadow line to pick out the letters a little more.

Mr. Everett said she could highlight the brown in Athenas but just do the highlight around the perimeter of the lettering in a gold that would make it stand out more and give it some dimension as well.

Ms. Sullivan agreed that would be a good idea.

Mr. White said aesthetically it's fine.

Ms. Sullivan said she would have to speak with her partner. They haven't started making the sign yet so it would be an easy switch.

Mr. Duggan said it could be added as an option.

Mr. Everett said there could be an option to use either a lighter brown or gold color or highlighting the brown with just an accent around the lettering. He asked how high the lettering is. This is an optional change she may pursue at her own discretion. The lettering may be changed to a lighter brown or gold color or the proposed brown color may be highlighted with a perimeter of pinstriped with gold or a lighter color.

Mr. White said he would like to leave it to the applicant and her sign designer to not try to change the aesthetics too much. The intent was to give her the option.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application as proposed acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0.

#### **IV. 148 State Street – CB-II/DCD**

Owner: Vermont Association of Realtors

Applicant: Robert Hill

Design Review for a Sign Plan.

Robert Hill said this is a refresh of the current sign as to when they bought the building in 1977. It has been the same sign with a little variation of the content. They now own the entire building so there is tenants upstairs and that will be the additional signage underneath. It is the Vermont Association of Grocers, Vermont Association of Retailers and Vermont Homebuilders.

Mr. DeSmet asked if he anticipated the signs as the tenants change.

Mr. Hill replied their hope is that the tenants won't change for quite a long time.

Mr. DeSmet asked if they did change would they use the same font and the same size panel on the sign.

Mr. Hill replied of course.

Mr. DeSmet said this is a sign plan and they would have to come back.

Mr. Duggan said he mentioned three other tenants. Is that in addition to the doctor?

Mr. Hill replied the doctor is just a place order.

Mr. White said it is the same location and same size sign and they just want to add the three other tenants.

Mr. Duggan inquired if it was a one-sided sign or two-sided sign.

Mr. Hill replied it is just a one-sided sign that will be on the corner of State Street and Bailey Avenue.

Mr. Everett said he made a note to reflect that the smaller rectangular sign panels at the bottom of the Vermont Association of Realtors sign will remain the same sized font and color and additional tenants in the building may be changed accordingly in the future. He asked if this panel was going to be repainted or are they doing a whole new panel.

Mr. Hill replied it would be a new panel with the same shape and size but newer material.

Mr. Everett asked if he would have to raise the height of the sign to make the lower three panels readable.

Mr. Hill replied he has no intention of doing so. The Association of General Contractors is no longer there. They purchased their half of the building. They moved down across the railroad.

The Design Review Committee reviewed the sign criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 4 to 0. Mr. Gilbertson joined the Committee and abstained from voting on the application.

**V. 152 Main Street – CBII/DCD**

Owner/Applicant: Cassandra Lansky

Design Review for construction of an ADA Ramp, Change Siding,  
Replace Side Door and Basement Windows.

Cassandra Lansky said the renovations are long overdue. The place hasn't been painted for awhile. It just seemed to make sense to do it the right way so you could see the trim work that is underneath it. They pulled off the siding on the back side just to see what it looked like and it looked good but they are prepared to replace it. They want the building to look more authentic because it is in the Historical District. They want to pull the siding off, repaint everything and some of the basement windows are in bad shape and need to be redone. A couple of years ago they redid the front door so they want to redo the side doors and back door the same way so everything matches and they will be more durable. The last thing is to put the ADA compliant ramp in the rear to help with patients. They have a lot of elderly patients from the Gary Home come over who have trouble with just a couple of steps.

Mr. Duggan asked if the ramp would go out past the end of the building.

Ms. Lansky replied yes it will have to. She thinks it is about 9 feet. Mr. Hitzig has a ramp that comes their way so they will blend in with each other.

Mr. White said he has a problem with not having an adequate site plan or elevation as to what the railing looks like. The ADA compliant ramp is not really a design description but a function description. He would propose they approve the application without the ramp and have the ramp as a separate application because it is important how the ramp fits with the site plan. In order to be consistent with what they require of other applicants he thinks the committee needs to have a sense of what the railing is and what the material is made of. Is there paneling underneath the ramp or is floating above gravel or landscaping? Even though it is on the back of the building he thinks it is still a visible part of the overall cityscape. He would like to see the ramp portion pulled out and come back as a separate application otherwise he won't be able to vote for it as it is.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if she could describe the railings she plans on installing.

Ms. Lansky said that is up to the builder. She just asked him to make it ADA compliant.

Mr. White said she may find she just needs a handrail and not all of the balusters as if it were a barrier to keep you from falling. There needs to be a little more research done on how it is built and how the handrails are made and what the sides of the ramp looks like.

Mr. Gilbertson said the other way they could look at the application is to table it so she won't have to come back with a whole new application.

Mr. White asked if they could approve the application and just table a piece of it.

Mr. DeSmet replied it is complicated because this application has a variance request for the placement of the ADA ramp in the back.

Ms. Lansky said if there was something specific they wanted to be included then she can make sure it is included. What she was imagining is not so much concern about the costs as she is with the safety issues. She just wants to do it the right way.

Mr. Everett said she could do a simple iron pipe rail around it or balusters.

Mr. White said if it going to be ADA compatible what they mean is that it won't be too steep but they will find that hand rails or 2 x 4's, which are not handicapped accessible might not be safe.

Mr. DeSmet told Jay he didn't think the DRC has jurisdiction over how it complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the building code. It just has to comply with design review standards on the rear of the building. We are getting far afield from what this body regulates.

Mr. White said he thought that was part of the design with the handrails.

Mr. DeSmet said he disagreed.

Mr. Gilbertson said it would be helpful to know exactly what the builder planned to do. There are all kinds of ways to do it.

Mr. Everett asked what her timeframe for doing the work was.

Ms. Lansky replied she would like to get it done this summer.

Mr. Everett said he should do a sketch of what the railing is going to look like. Another thing she may want to think about is the terms of convenience and snow issues. They could extend the roof over which would cover all or part of the ramp. It would make maintenance of the ramp a lot simpler in the winter.

Ms. Lansky asked what if she had it made to match the other porches.

Mr. Brock said it is probably more complicated than that.

Mr. Everett said their next meeting is July 12<sup>th</sup> so she could come back. She might also ask the builder if he thinks it is appropriate to extend the roof line over the ramp.

Mr. Gilbertson said he thinks it is great what she plans on doing with the building.

Mr. Duggan asked if she was doing all of the windows on the basement.

Ms. Lansky replied they are on the side facing the driveway. There is one on the front facing the neighbor and two on the side.

Mr. Duggan said he like her color palate.

Mr. Everett said they would table the application until July 12<sup>th</sup>. The Committee agreed on a vote of 5 to 0.

**Review and Approval of Minutes of June 14, 2011:**

Mr. Gilbertson moved approval of the Minutes of June 14, 2011. Mr. Duggan seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion made by James Duggan and Zachary Brock the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet  
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack