

**Montpelier Development Review Board**  
**October 17, 2011**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Approved*

**Present:** Philip Zalinger, Chair; Daniel Richardson, Jack Lindley, Roger Cranse, Elizabeth Koenig, and Brian Lane-Karnas.  
Staff: Audra Brown, Planning & Zoning Assistant

**Call to Order:**

Philip Zalinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

**Review and Approval of October 3, 2011 Minutes:**

There was no quorum of members present so they will postpone approving the minutes until November 7<sup>th</sup>.

**I. 63 Barre Street – CB-II/DCD**

Owner: Leslie Sabo  
Applicant: VT Network  
Design Review for a Sign  
Chani Waterhouse, VT Network

The Design Review Committee reviewed this application on October 11<sup>th</sup> and recommended approval as proposed. The DRC also offered the opinion that the applicant may also choose to plan the sign between the entry door and the adjacent window, or where originally proposed. It offers a menu of alternative locations. The applicant said she was in agreement with the recommendations.

The Design Review Committee conducts a much more in-depth investigation into design review matters and it is advisory to the DRB. The Board doesn't take any more testimony unless it is necessary.

Mr. Richardson asked if there was an existing sign already.

Ms. Waterhouse replied there is an existing sign they are going to alter. They just moved to 63 Barre Street from 5 School Avenue so the existing sign was in place at 5 School Avenue for many years. They are working with the sign design company to cover over the arrow.

Mr. Richardson inquired if it was a hanging sign before.

Ms. Waterhouse replied it was hanging at 5 School Avenue but at the new location it will just be on the building so it will be less obtrusive than it was in the previous location.

Mr. Richardson asked if she had a preference for the location whether it is between the door and the window or between the two windows.

Ms. Waterhouse said at one point they decided it would be preferable to have it between the two windows. They said they would also give us the option of putting it between the door and window because then it would be under the existing light. The final decision will be made by her co-workers. It's a nice option.

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Lindley for design review at 63 Barre Street with the two options recommended by the Design Review Committee, seconded by Mr. Richardson, the application was approved on a vote of 6 to 0.

II. **107 State Street – CB-I/DCD**

Owner: John Russell

Applicant: Athene Cua and Jay White

Design Review for an Exhaust Vent

The Design Review Committee reviewed the proposal at its October 11<sup>th</sup> meeting and recommended approval with a recommendation to the DRB. It has to do with exhaust hoods, door placement and painting.

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to the parties.

Ms. Cua said the project is constructing a new kitchen in the Thrush Tavern space consisting of stoves and hoods of which the exhaust wood is going to vent to the outdoors.

Mr. Zalinger explained the DRB's jurisdiction starts on the outside of the wall.

Ms. Cua said it will be a drum type exhaust fan similar to that at the Coffee Corner. It will be a slightly different placement from where the previous one was. The previous one was taken out and the hole bricked over so the new one will be slightly more aligned between two windows from above and be painted when the exterior of the building will be painted. It will be painted the same color.

Mr. Zalinger said the Design Review Committee recommended that the exhaust hood is to be painted to match the building color and make-up air is to be supplied through horizontal wood louvers connected to the triangular exterior of the projection over the rear door.

Ms. Cua said the little roof over the back door is basically another duct that can be hidden in that space and the intake would be from the louvered doors.

Mr. Zalinger added it provides an ancillary source of fresh air. He asked if the applicant was in agreement with the recommendation.

Ms. Cua replied yes.

Mr. Zalinger said the Design Review Committee also states that a previously approved rear door replacement may be modified to have a six panel wooden door with no glass. Is the applicant in agreement with that.

Ms. Cua replied yes.

Mr. Zalinger said the Board doesn't revisit a lot of the decisions the Design Review Committee makes. Are there other questions or comments that Board Members may have?

Mr. Richardson said he thinks it is a clever way of hiding the second duct so it doesn't create another box outside or messy metal extension so he is in favor of that feature that maintains some of the historic integrity of this building because it is such an important building.

Mr. Lindley said the seating space in the site plan for all of the parking that exists with this building, are they seeing an expansion that requires other parking to go with the restaurant?

Mr. Zalinger told Mr. Lindley he didn't think the applicant knows.

Mr. Lindley inquired if staff had looked at the site plan.

Ms. Brown replied there is no change to the site plan.

Ms. Cua said the landlord states there are 13 spaces for the building and there are tenants on the second and third floor.

Ms. Brown said CB-I parking doesn't apply.

Mr. Zalinger reminded members the application is here before the DRB for design review. He told Jack he was interested in his comments but he thinks it is unfair to ask Audra who is sitting in for Clancy, or the applicant, whether other site plan considerations have been considered.

Ms. Brown said there aren't any changes to the site plan.

Mr. Lindley said they had this building before the Board for the school part of it.

Mr. White added that project was withdrawn. The school is no longer there because the cost of making the interior changes to satisfy the fire separation required and the amount of lease time that was available to the owner for renting that space did not make economic sense so the school moved out of the building. It wasn't a school but actually a business that was in the business of training adult students. It wasn't really a school. Either way it's not there and has been vacant since and that project was never completed.

Mr. Lane-Karnas asked when the building was scheduled to be painted. Is that going to occur at the same time as the rest of the improvements?

Ms. Cua said he would have to ask the landlord.

Mr. White said he was the architect on the project when it was going to be a business in the education and is also a member of the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Zalinger said he finds it hard to believe that he sat on the Design Review Committee and reviewed an application by his own client.

Mr. White said he recused himself from participating in the application. The vote was 4 to 0 in favor of the application and it wasn't because he didn't agree with it but because he did not participate in the review of the application. The painting was approved in the previous permit to paint the exterior of the building and open up some of the windows again. The painting is scheduled to occur when it is financially feasible. When the painting is done they want to paint the new exhaust hood to match and not before. They want the original brick color when it is painted.

Mr. Cranse asked if there was going to be a restaurant there now.

Ms. Cua replied yes, a restaurant and gifts.

Mr. Richardson moved for design review approval at 107 State Street with the conditions as recommended by the Design Review Committee that the exhaust hood be painted to match the building color, that it include the provision for make-up air to be supplied through wood horizontal louvers connecting in the triangular exterior of the projection over the rear door, and that the previously approved rear door replacement may be modified to a six panel wooden door with no glass. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lane-Karnas and approved unanimously on a vote of 6 to 0.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Cranse the Development Review Board adjourned on a vote of 6 to 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Audra Brown, Planning Assistant

Transcribed by: Joan Clack