

**Montpelier Design Review Committee**  
**January 11, 2011**  
**Memorial Room, Montpelier City Hall**

*Approved*

**Present:** Stephen Everett, Chair; James Duggan, Vice Chair; Eric Gilbertson, Kate Coffey, Jay White, Muffie Conlon and Zachary Brock.  
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

**Call to Order by Chair:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Stephen Everett at 5:30 P.M.

**Comments from the Chair:**

Mr. Everett explained the advisory role of the Design Review Committee to the Development Review Board. The Committee will make decisions based on a set of criteria they are mandated to judge the projects by.

**I. 106 East State Street – HDR/DCD**

Owner/Applicant: Gary Schy  
Design Review for Multiple Exterior Renovations.

Mr. Schy said the DRC wanted them to just clapboard over the door on the west side. It is very busy on that side and he would be happy to do that. He didn't want that door there. He would be inclined to remove the door. The Committee also suggested creating a vestibule on the front of the building and having the entry doors going off the vestibule. The vestibule would be 10 feet deep. There would be a door on the north side of the vestibule. It would be a shiplap walnut stain so when the barn door is left open it looks like it is a barn. The Committee said they would approve three little windows. There would be no door on the front, just the vestibule 10 feet deep with a walnut stain shiplap and grey slate for the floor. There would be one door on the west side going in on the side. That is the front of the building.

Mr. Everett asked if he was proposing any lighting for the interior either on the outside or inside.

Mr. Schy replied he did have some lighting. On the inside they could do recessed lighting with a soft light. They were talking about the west side where he has the existing window and two smaller windows. With the busyness of this side they proposed eliminating that door which he is happy to clapboard across. It was proposed he do one larger window. It would be a 48 x 42 foot window. For the exterior those were the changes they came down to. He would also propose on the east side of the building the same window, the 48 x 42 double hung windows for the east side of the building. Someone suggested they could just match those on both ends of the building.

Then they talked about gutters. He brought in some cut sheets on gutters. It is a heavy gauge galvanized barn gutter so it would fit the building.

Mr. Duggan asked how they would be attached.

Mr. Schy replied they could feed them under the shingles. They would be attached under the roof.

Mr. White asked if he had considered copper gutters. Copper gutters will last a lot longer. Galvanized gutters will get rusty after two years. The copper gutters would hold up much better and it would be worth it putting them into a new building.

Ms. Coffey said on the double window for the gable end is he planning to put any muntin bars or dividers in there.

Mr. Schy said the window he was proposing does have those

Mr. Gilbertson said with new windows rather than having any of the applied stuff he would do the one over one.

Ms. Coffey said she would rather see them plain.

Mr. Gilbertson said they new windows and they aren't trying to replicate anything.

Mr. Schy said the last issue they talked about was lighting. His favorite is the burnished aged bronze.

Mr. White said he would prefer more of an industrial hood type of fixture with an opaque metal top to it. That would give more brightness for the amount of wattage and it wouldn't throw the lighting towards the Green.

Mr. Schy said he would like a light on the side.

Mr. Everett said the option for the double windows under the eaves on the third floor on both ends, what makes is that window?

Mr. Schy said they are Marvin Integrity windows.

Mr. Everett said the option would be to do a one over one or to do dividers.

Mr. Schy said he is happy with the one over ones.

Mr. Gilbertson said he isn't too worried about the dimensions of the windows are on this building.

Mr. Everett asked if there were any other details that needed to be clarified. He asked what the dimensions of the deck were.

Mr. Schy replied the deck is 40 feet long and 10 feet wide. He would do a 3 foot high rail with a top rail to meet code.

Mr. Brock said he has a comment about the vestibule. He sees this 10 feet deep and he thinks there is a danger of people throwing their trash barrel and skis and bikes in the vestibule and not close the door. All of that stuff would be visible from the Green.

Mr. Schy said the one thing that will make that not happen is just behind the garage is going to be storage. This is a common area and there is going to be a door into a heated really big storage space. The garage will remain a garage. People cannot put anything in common areas. The vestibule will be like a front porch.

Mr. White asked if they could restrict it that it not becomes a storage space.

Mr. DeSmet said they could barely even regulate it.

Mr. Everett said they have detailed that the gutters will be a galvanized round shaped gutters with downward spouts on the eastern most corner boards. The proposed exterior wall mount light fixtures are aged bronze

and mounted in two locations on the northwest corner board and on the south façade of the building upon the recessed entryway. The windows on the third floor are Marvin Integrity double hung windows on the west and east gable ends of the third floor will be one over one design. The front entry door located in the recessed entry way will be a wood door with lower raised panels and upper glass area. Regarding the deck located on the north side of the building, the deck railings will be wooden material and achieve a 42 inch height with either a single or double horizontal upper railing and the balusters will be 2 x 2 straight wooden materials.

The DRC reviewed the evaluation criteria and found the application acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0.

## II. 58 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner: City of Montpelier

Applicant: 58 Barre Street Housing Limited Partnership

Exterior Renovations

Interested Parties: Greg Gossens/JoAnne Troiano/Jeff Kantor

Greg Gossens, Project Architect for 58 Barre Street, said he assumes they are familiar with the building. They are renovating it, doing a total gut renovation of it to become the permanent headquarters for the Montpelier Senior Activity Center to bring them back in on the lower level and part of the second level. The remainder of the second level and the entire third level will be apartments. Basically, the building remains unchanged other than they are just restoring it. They are taking off the 1970's era vestibule and bring it back to the way it was.

They are doing a window replacement, which is one of the most controversial things, but they have reviewed this with the Division of Historic Preservation and have gotten them to sign off on that. They are going to renovate the building to lead platinum standards. It will be a deep energy retrofit. You have to give credit to the city, Jeff and JoAnne for going out and getting the money to do it right. It's a great effort.

Mr. Everett asked if the windows were clad ultimate double hung.

Mr. Gossens replied they are clad single hung. They have to meet the lift requirement for elderly. They are big windows. You can see they are using some awnings in a few places.

Mr. Gilbertson said the windows were in pretty tough shape.

Mr. Gossens said they talked a lot about it with Historic Preservation and Liz Pritchett and did some heat loss and determined it really needed to be done. They are going to be triple glazed.

Mr. White asked if they were simulated divided light.

Mr. Gossens replied yes.

Jeff Kantor said he wanted to mention they are using historic tax credits as well for rehabilitation.

Mr. Gossens said they are going to introduce a little bit of a front plaza to make an actual urban place out of it. They had a good landscape architectural firm who did an excellent job of coming up with a very nice simple plaza. Hopefully, it will create an actual place for people to be.

Mr. Duggan said they will gain all of that room by removing the vestibule, correct?

Mr. Gossens said they will pick up some. There is some grade change they need to make up. They are in the floodplain so there is a fair amount of Don Marsh's landscape sketch that looks pretty simple but there is a lot of really weird finesse they had to do to get this thing where it would work within the flood limits. They were able to raise the thresholds all above the flood limits, and that is where the finesse came in. There was a lot of grading finesse to get it to that point.

Mr. Everett asked where the sign was going to be located that is proposed.

Mr. Gossens said it goes in a planting bed. It is going to line up with a panel line and go 6 feet over. It is a ground mounted sign with no lighting. There is a street light across the street which provides more than enough light, and at the entry there is a historic light which is there right now. It is the same LED light fixture that just went in at Turntable Park. He brought some pictures of the parking lot lighting. Hopefully, the fixture will just sort of blend into the background.

Mr. Everett said the sign will be a brushed bronzed background.

Mr. Gossens replied it will be a black background with brushed bronzed lettering.

Mr. White said it is a nice job and a very good project.

The DRC reviewed the criteria for the building and found it acceptable. The building and sign criteria were approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

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

Mr. White said the color temperature of the LED lights for the building should be a warm white.

**III. 37 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD**

Owner: CVCLT

Applicant: LaJeunesse Construction Co./Mike LaJeunesse

Design Review for Replacing Windows and Roof Top Solar Collectors

Mike LaJeunesse said they have done an illustration on the location of the panels on 37 Barre Street. There are four panels going across on the back side of the building facing the railroad tracks. They are all done.

Mr. Duggan asked if there were going to be parallel with the edge of the cornice and edge of the roof.

Mr. White replied they are.

Mr. LaJeunesse said they have Chris Temple reviewing the structure of the building and they would like to propose the solar panels going in this location, but there might be a second place they might have to put them based on the construction of the building because that

porch right now is not designed to receive the additional weight of both the unit and the snow load. It would be either up on another flat roof on top. It might depend on costs as far as reinforcing the roofs.

Mr. Gilbertson said this is a visible façade from Stone Cutters Way. Usually the solar collectors that go on the back of the buildings are fine, but this is really two facades. He would rather see them go on the flat roof.

Mr. LaJeunesse said they all would. For efficiency that would be the primary place to install them.

Mr. Duggan said it would look a little awkward from coming up or down the street either way with the panels behind the cupola.

Mr. Everett asked if it would be easier to beef up the porch to hold them.

Mr. LaJeunesse said that is what they are working on.

Mr. Everett said most of the load would be down on the eave which is over the post anyway.

Mr. White said aesthetically it would be far better if they were pushed back further and not right on the façade of the porch. They really don't look compatible there. He thinks there is an opportunity to put them back further.

Alison Friedkin from the Central Vermont Community Land Trust said there would be additional expenses if they moved it back in terms of piping down to the basement and the tanks. If you are familiar with 47 Barre Street, which they just completed, these solar panels are the same orientation on the shed roof on the back.

Mr. Duggan asked if that was an option with this building.

Ms. Friedkin said their first choice is the way it has been represented here. They wanted to be open and say they are still waiting for a report from their construction engineer. They wanted to say there is a chance they would have to shift it back. They are weighing the expense of shifting it back versus reinforcing the roof.

Mr. Duggan said his inclination would be to rather than consider it if it becomes an option to consider it at that point in the application.

Mr. Everett said the location if they shifted it back would be on the gable roof.

Mr. White said he thinks it would be better. He realizes there is some expense for piping but there is also some expense for reinforcing the roof of the porch. It is such a prominent

façade from Stone Cutters Way which is becoming a more prominent avenue for people to be on that it seems like it is a solution if it was the back of the house it would be okay but if you look at the whole house as architecturally important, which it is, then if you put them parallel with the roof plane further back it would be better.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if Mr. White if he thought that would be as noticeable from Barre Street.

Mr. White said he didn't know if it would be noticeable or not. If it was noticeable it would look like solar panels being added to an existing roof without it trying to become its own competing architectural statement which it does when it is on this façade. It is clearly the first thing you see is the solar panel. It reminds him of something he could see in 20 years. There is a better way to do it, and the applicant has admitted there is a better way to do it.

Mr. Duggan said to consider this location he would want to see another drawing or take a closer look at it at that location. What they have in front of them is what he would like to consider.

Ms. Coffey said she would want to make sure you couldn't see them in the second location when she was going up and down Barre Street.

Mr. DeSmet said there are several installations of solar panels on Barre Street.

Ms. Coffey said the front Italian form seems so important.

Mr. LaJeunesse said they should make a firm commitment on which way they are going to go both structurally and mechanically.

Mr. White said his recommendation would be to encourage them to go with the second option and not spend a lot of time trying to get the porch reinforced.

Mr. Everett asked if it was the consensus of the Committee that they would be willing to vote for approval of that now or would they rather see more.

Mr. Gilbertson said he would like to look closer at the building and see some mock up and see what it would do. It should be as flat as they can be with reasonable efficiency. Obviously, the pitch of that roof isn't enough to mount them flat.

Mr. White said he attended a seminar at Vermont Technical College on solar panel installation and the speaker said it really doesn't matter what angle it is as far as the overall efficiency.

Mr. Everett asked what was the technical recommendation as far as the angle of the panels.

Mr. LaJeunesse said the ideal orientation and pitch is facing due south and at an angle is 45 degrees, but it is only a few percentages different if you face it 45 degrees one way or the other.

Mr. Everett asked what was the pitch on the front section they are looking at.

Mr. LaJeunesse said it is a very low pitch. His second pitch would be one of the gable roofs which are facing southeast.

Mr. Duggan and Ms. Coffey said they could support that option as a second location if need be. He would prefer that himself. One of the features of the Italian house is the cupola and its isolation up there and putting more services on top of that particular block will pull away from the cupola. He would be comfortable with that as an alternate location.

Mr. Everett asked if with the money they saved by not reinforcing the porch could they add an extra panel on the gable roof.

Mr. LaJeunesse replied quite possibly.

Mr. Everett said the recommendation now is for the southeast side of the gable roof and the rear addition. The second part of the application was replacing the windows.

Mr. LaJeunesse said it is an insert window. As indicated on the picture for 37 Barre Street all windows are 2 over 2 and they will match the existing windows. It is an aluminum clad exterior with a pine interior finish. It will have a simulated divided light with a spacer bar as shown in the cut sheet.

Mr. Gilbertson asked what kind of condition the existing windows were in. Is it the window itself that is bad? Are they rotten or is it the weather stripping and fitting the issue? Are the windows actually physically rotten or broken?

Ms. Friedkin replied there are no broken windows but broken panes. There is definitely some rot.

Mr. LaJeunesse said he didn't think there is any weather stripping on them. The only thing there is a storm window. The way the sash fits into the frame everything is very loose.

Ms. Friedkin said she would like to give a little background on this project. This is an energy savings project where all of the activities are directly related to energy savings. They have gone through a process where they have screened the building for things like window replacements and installation of solar panels. The things they have decided to do have all shown significant energy savings on the building.

Mr. Gilbertson asked if they worked with Efficiency Vermont.

Ms. Fiedkin replied yes. This project has been funded by VHCV, CDCA and Efficiency Vermont.

Mr. Gilbertson said Efficiency Vermont usually says the replacement of windows is the least cost effective thing you can do. You should only be replacing windows that need replacing for other reasons because they can be weather stripped and repaired if they aren't badly rotten.

Mr. Everett asked what the occupancy of this building is.

Ms. Friedkin said there are five residential family units. She said the window they have chosen has already been approved by the Historic Preservation because of the federal funding on this project. What VEHCB did was go ahead and preapproved with the assistance of the folks at Historic Preservation the various products because they didn't want the individual Land Trust or Housing Authority to be bogged down by these decisions, and some of the entities don't have the expertise. They already preapproved the windows for the application.

Mr. Gilbertson said the DRC's approval is separate and independent from them. Is the amount of glass in the window being reduced?

Mr. LaJeunesse replied it is.

Mr. Everett said the display unit doesn't replicate the actual insert.

Mr. LaJeunesse said you take the existing stock off the window and the new jam goes into that place with the insert.

Mr. White said the reason on this Committee he is often pushing for replacement windows versus restoring them, if the applicant wants to replace the windows, is the advantage to not having the storm window and having it function better for the people who are living there. He would like to see a different replacement window that would not change the proportion of the windows.

Mr. Duggan said he would prefer to see these windows repaired and retained, and he would rather see him put money into a higher quality storm window that be more aesthetically pleasing. In this particular building there is a different situation with these being original windows. He believes they should continue to be there. There is plenty of research that shows that they won't get the payback in expense on these windows in energy savings. There is a lot much cheaper cost in retrofitting air sealing, weather stripping and he would spend less if he had a high quality storm window that is more aesthetically in keeping with

the character of the windows than the triple track aluminum ones that are currently there. His interest would be to retain the windows and repair them at 37 Barre Street. There are 31 windows and that is a lot of old growth wood that still has plenty of good service left in it if it is repaired and refurbished in the proper way.

Mr. Gilbertson said that is his first choice. Somebody would have to prove to him that the existing windows could not be rehabilitated in some way or another because a few windows that have a little rot in them can be taken apart and that piece be replaced.

Mr. Duggan said these windows are meant to be taken apart and repaired in perpetuity; that's the way they are designed. There are a large volume of windows here and probably considering the rest of the architectural detailing they are probably very well made to begin with. On this particular building his first choice would be to repair rather than replace. In order to vote for a replacement he would need to have some more information, whether it is an inventory that says there are 31 windows and so many are in good condition and some can't be fixed. They look pretty good on this building. If possible he would like to see some sort of inventory.

Mr. Gilbertson said since he is coming back with the application on the solar design he would like to see some explanation of why these actually need to be replaced and why they can't be repaired.

Mr. Everett asked how old are the storm windows on the building? When were they put up? what condition are they in?

Mr. Duggan said there are a couple of wood ones toward the back.

Mr. Everett asked if the tenants actually closed the windows during the winter.

Ms. Friedkin said part of the reason for window replacement is two-fold. One is ongoing maintenance for CVLC and the other is in terms of upgrading. Those windows are great when operating correctly. People tend to operate newer windows better because old ones get stuck.

Mr. Everett said the other advantage is the ongoing maintenance of the existing windows you don't have to deal with lead paint issues either. Every time you tear apart an older window you have to go through the entire EPA procedure. Mr. Everett asked if they wanted to table this application to come back with more detail on the proposed windows in terms of size, glass size, etc.

Mr. White said it might make sense to get through this Committee and good to have some proposal for cost to repair the windows, how much it would cost to replace them with a replacement window that is not an insert, and the cost of the replacement period. They don't usually base the decision on cost so much but they sometimes have had applicants surprised that the repair of the windows was a lot less expensive than the product was going to be.

Ms. Coffey said she would like to see some pictures of the windows.

Mr. Gilbertson moved to table the application until they get more information on the windows.

Mr. Everett said they would table until the next meeting so they can get more details on the proposed window replacement. Ms. Coffey seconded the motion. The motion to table the application for 37 Barre Street was tabled on a vote of 5 to 0

#### **IV. 11 Bailey Avenue – CIV/DCD**

Owner: CVCLT

Applicant: Lajeunesse Construction Co.

Design Review for Replacing Windows and Roof Top Solar Collectors

Mr. Everett inquired how many solar panels are on this building.

Mr. LaJeunesse replied four.

Mr. Everett asked if in the application if it says how the solar panels are configured.

Mr. Duggan asked if they had a predetermined location of how to route the pipes, etc.

Mr. LaJeunesse said they are on the south side of the building so from east to west they will be centered in that direction.

Mr. White said he doesn't have a problem with the solar on this building at all. Ms. Coffey replied she didn't, either.

Mr. Duggan said from what he could tell from the street he doesn't believe these are original windows. They have a very narrow sash, one over one, and in this case he is okay with the replacement.

Mr. DeSmet said it says all of the windows were altered in 1977.

Mr. Duggan said in this case they are putting in a better window so he personally doesn't have any issue with the replacement of the windows here as long as they match.

Mr. White said it is telling that you are looking at a window that was replaced in 1977, 30 years ago, and now we are saying it needs to be replaced again whereas we have historic

wood windows that are still good after 100 years. That is an argument towards what Jamie is saying that if you repair the windows long term and maintain this as affordable housing it is probably a good investment to repair. He would still encourage them to look at a full replacement window instead of the insert windows, especially if they are going to be inserting the windows in windows that aren't all that good to begin with.

Mr. Everett asked if they wanted specifications to come back with that or just approve it as an option.

Mr. LaJeunesse said the Land Trust has already done the research.

Mr. White said he did hear from someone at Allen Lumber who was telling him about housing projects that had been approved with insert windows. He thinks it is worth looking at replacing the window with a full replacement window and not the insert approach which makes the glass narrower.

Mr. Gilbertson said in 1977 if you can say it was replaced with an insert window go ahead with the insert. He would be concerned about any significant change in the glass area.

Mr. White said the advantage of replacement windows on this building is they don't get into storms and screens and one product does it all.

Mr. Everett asked if the applicant would like the DRC to vote on the proposal for this one or come back as he is with the other one.

Mr. White said he would encourage him to come back with information.

Mr. DeSmet said not every single person is saying what Jay is saying.

Mr. Everett asked if he would like to come back or have us vote on this proposal.

Ms. Friedkin said there is consensus in moving forward with this window then they would like to have this proposal wrapped up and be able to move ahead. If there isn't consensus and they are going to vote it down and they will have to come back anyway...

Mr. Brock said he didn't have enough personal experience between the two types to have an opinion on that issue.

Ms. Coffey said she is fine with the application as is for 11 Bailey.

Mr. Gilbertson said he is fine with it. He would prefer to know if there is any significant change in the glass area but they don't know what the original glass area was.

Mr. Everett said he is fine with the proposal also.

Mr. Duggan said he is okay with the application as proposed.

Mr. White said he could agree with it.

Mr. LaJeunesse said it is their choice but now they can proceed with the project.

The DRC reviewed the criteria for 11 Bailey Avenue and found it acceptable on a vote of 5 to 0. The solar panels are fine and the 1977 windows are being replaced by 2011 windows. They gave the applicant the option of either the tilt back with the full window sash or insert.

**Review and Approval of December 14, 2010 Minutes:**

Upon motion by Mr. Duggan and Ms. Coffey the Minutes of the December 14, 2010 DRC meeting were approved on a vote of 5 to 0.

**Adjournment:**

Upon motion by Mr. Duggan and Mr. Gilbertson, the DRC meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet  
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack