

Montpelier Development Review Board
July 18, 2011
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Approved

Present: Philip Zalinger; Chair; Alan Blakeman, Daniel Richardson, Jack Lindley, Roger Cranse and Ali Sarafzadeh.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Philip Zalinger, Chair, at 7:00 P.M.

Review & Approval of July 5, 2011 Minutes:

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Blakeman and Mr. Lindley the Minutes of July 5, 2011 were adopted on a vote of 5 to 0.

Comments from the Chair:

Mr. Zalinger said tonight he would like to acknowledge Alan Blakeman. It is his last night as a member of the DRB. He has been a member of the DRB since its inception in 2002. He has been ever faithful and always present. Alan is very trustworthy and reads the minutes, makes motions when they are necessary and asks tough questions. He has always been a very supportive member of the DRB. He would like to acknowledge Alan and Alan's service but would also like to introduce Mayor Mary Hooper who is going to address the DRB.

Comments from Mayor Hooper:

Mayor Hooper read a proclamation outlining Alan Blakeman's service, a copy of which is attached and made a permanent part of the record. Mayor Hooper presented a gift of the picture of City Hall to Mr. Blakeman on behalf of the City of Montpelier.

I. 21 Main Street – CB-1/DCD

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

Mr. DeSmet said The American Legion Post #3 seeks design review approval for a wall sign at 21 Main Street. They have existing signage, but it is below the threshold for the allowable signage. The Design Review Committee reviewed this application on July 12, 2011 and approved it with the recommendation that the sign be centered adjacent to the space at the left side window. There is a picture in the packet showing the sign but it is going to be a little bit different.

Mr. Zalinger asked if the Legion had any objection to the recommendation of the Design Review Committee as far as the location.

Mr. Harlow said they would like to keep it the way it is like it is in the picture. It is on the left hand side of the front door.

Mr. Richardson inquired how that was different from what the Design Review Committee recommended.

Mr. DeSmet replied they just wanted an equal distance between the top of the window and the bottom of the window.

Mr. Harlow said they want the sign to come even with the window and they were going to do that anyway.

Mr. Zalinger said in matters like this he would ask the Development Review Board members if they have any questions or observations.

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Blakeman for design approval for the sign at 21 Main Street for the American Legion, the application passed unanimously on a vote of 6 to 0.

II. **1 Terrace Street – MDR/DCD**

Owner/Applicant: John Kords and Allison Parish
Design Review for a Fence and Landscaping

It appears the Design Review Committee reviewed this application on July 12th and recommended approval as proposed with an optional change to be pursued at the discretion of the applicant to put lighting around the patio.

Mr. Kords said the DRC recommended putting lights around the patio or a singular light mounted on the rear corner. They would like to put lights around the patio.

Mr. Blakeman asked if he had checked with his neighbors.

Mr. Kords replied they spoke to their abutting neighbor about the fence and they are fine with it.

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Blakeman for 1 Terrace Street for design review approval and seconded by Mr. Richardson, the application was approved unanimously on a vote of 6 to 0.

III. **23 Harrison Avenue - MDR**

Owner/Applicant: Carol Kendrick
Variance Request form Side Yard Setback for Carport

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to the applicant, Carol Kendrick.

Mr. DeSmet said the applicant requests a variance from the side yard setback to construct a 14' x 20' carport along the eastern side of single family dwelling at 23 Harrison Avenue. The setbacks in that area are 10' from the front and 10' from the side and 30' from the rear. The existing structure is approximately 16 feet from the same eastern line and the existing structure is conforming. The setbacks are 10', 10' and 30'; the proposed carport will be approximately 2' from the line, or an 8' incursion. The applicant purchased the property in 2010. The main structure was constructed in 1936. It is not known when the current use or lot was established.

Ms. Kendrick said the garage is a detached garage located on the other side of the house and quite a distance from the house. Her main motivation was to create another entry into the house because the only way to get in is either through the front door or around the back of the house into the kitchen. There is a very steep bank that goes up right back of the house and it is very difficult to get up from the garage. You have to go around the corner of the house through a very narrow walkway. Her idea was to create another entrance on the east side of the house, which she has done. She had a new door installed. Hopefully, a carport and a driveway which would allow her to drive her car up to the side of the house and go into a new mudroom/laundry area.

Mr. Zalinger asked her to tell the Board about the topography.

Ms. Kendrick said the whole back of the property backs up to Capital City Housing land. It is a very steep bank that goes up right from the base. There is a deck in the back, and from that deck it just goes straight up. When you are coming in from the garage, which is quite a distance away from the house, you walk up and then go around a sharp corner to a walkway that is probably more than two feet wide. It's just not very convenient.

Mr. Zalinger said he sees the exterior door on the west side.

Ms. Kendrick replied no, there is no door there. That might be on the east side which would be her new door. The proposed carport is on the east side. The plot map with just the house sitting is very confusing because you can get very turned around.

Mr. Zalinger said the site plan she submitted shows the house as a rectangle but it is a one-story L.

Ms. Kendrick replied it is a rectangle because they added a wing on to one side. The original house was just the left hand side of the house. The people who owned it before added a second story over the original part of the house and then another wing off to the right which goes down to the garage side.

Mr. Zalinger said the variance criteria are challenging because they are very strict, and if they are read very strictly it makes it very difficult to grant a variance. The law was written that way, but often times in a city like Montpelier where many buildings were constructed before zoning was adopted and lots were created they often times had the ability to find exceptions to the strict application of the ordinance. He is going to go through the criteria and they Board will assess the project from those criteria

Variance Criteria: §1006.B (1)(a)-(f)

- a) *That there are unique physical circumstances or conditions, including irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of lots size or shape, or exceptional topography or other physical conditions peculiar to the particular property, and that unnecessary hardship is due to such conditions, and not the circumstances or conditions generally created by the provisions of the zoning regulation in the neighborhood or district in which the property is located.*

If the rest of her lot was so steep that the only place that was level enough to accommodate a carport was the area she suggested that would represent an exception. It seems that the location of the carport in the incursion in the side yard setback really derives from her decision to put the new entry door at that location.

- b) *That because of such physical circumstances or conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the provisions of the zoning regulation and that the authorization of a variance is, therefore, necessary to enable the reasonable use of property.*

Unfortunately, this is a situation which there is already a garage on the site. Secondly, there are no conditions that are no physical conditions contributing to the need to put the carport where she is proposing it. Another exception they often run into the city of Montpelier is where you want to put a deck on your home or a front porch on their home and the house will have been built into the setback already so the house is already encroaching into the setback. If they are going to square off an L or continue a line at the property they grant a variance because it is not increasing the already existing encroachment. In this instance, however, there is no encroachment so the encroachment would be initiated by the carport.

- c) *That the unnecessary hardship has not been created by the appellant, and the hardship relates to the applicant's land, rather than personal circumstance.*

She might have changed her plans for the door if she realized she needed a variance to put the carport there.

Ms. Kendrick replied no.

Mr. Zalinger said the fact is that the unnecessary hardship has to derive from the land and its special conditions, not from personal circumstances.

- d) *That the variance, if authorized, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or district in which the property is located, substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use of development of adjacent property, reduce access to renewable energy resources, nor be detrimental to the public welfare.*

This is a criterion that is generally easy to meet. He doesn't think she is going to alter the essential character of the neighborhood by adding a carport. It doesn't appear that she will substantially impair the appropriate use of the development of her neighbor's property with a carport nor does he think it would be detrimental to the public welfare.

- e) *That the variance, if authorized, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and will represent the least deviation possible from the zoning regulation and from the Montpelier Municipal Plan.*

Mr. Zalinger asked what the width of the proposed carport was.

Mr. DeSmet replied 14 feet.

Mr. Zalinger added you really can't build a carport much smaller than that and be able to open the door without being outside the carport.

- f) *The variance will not result in the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.*

This variance proposal will not change the use to which she uses the property so it would remain a residential use.

Mr. Blakeman said she is fairly close to the neighbor to the east of the carport. Are there any problems with her neighbor?

Ms. Kendrick replied no. She spoke with him and he has no objection to her putting a carport that close to his property line. The way the houses are set is her house is set on the most northeastern part of her lot and his house is the same way so he has a lot of land between his house and her house. It wouldn't be an infringement on his house at all.

Mr. Richardson said the one story addition that was put on her house is on the west side. When was that addition put on?

Ms. Kendrick said her understanding they did the upstairs addition and the wing addition about 25 years ago.

Mr. Richardson asked what the use of the one story addition was.

Ms. Kendrick replied they are two bedrooms. There is a laundry area and a closet and two bedrooms in the new wing and a bathroom.

Mr. Richardson asked if it would be possible to put a door on this side.

Ms. Kendrick said she had thought about it, but actually the way it sits now is that it is more like an open suite. There is a front bedroom and a back bedroom with a very large opening between the two not even closed off. To put a door in you would have to have a hallway so you would lose a lot of space in one of the bedrooms. The reason she put the door on that side is because that room the door opens into now was just a very small space and not very usable. Her idea was to make it into a laundry/mudroom with an exterior entrance.

Mr. Richardson said he thinks the Chair acknowledged that the first three variance criteria are the ones she has the most trouble with as far as meeting the physical circumstances and the possibility of developing the property in strict conformity.

Mr. Zalinger asked if she could describe the construction she wants to do.

Ms. Kendrick said she included a picture of it. It is just a very simple structure with a sloping roof going down to the back of the house.

Mr. Zalinger inquired if the corners were going to be 6 x 6 or 4 x 4. Are they going to enclose it?

Ms. Kendrick replied it wouldn't be enclosed. She might do some lattice around one side and maybe the back for storage.

Mr. Zalinger asked if the corners would be on sonotubes. Has she gotten that far in the design?

Ms. Kendrick said she believes so. Nothing has been definitely set.

Mr. Zalinger said there is precedent for this. At the corner of College Street and Liberty Street they granted a variance for a carport on the side of the house. It was pre-existing small lot. One of the reasons they granted the variance for it was because it wasn't going to be a solid mass because there was an open side. He asked if she would be agreeable if the side was open.

Ms. Kendrick replied absolutely.

Mr. Zalinger said she could use lattice at the rear of the property because then the mass that exists at the property line is decreased. You really only have the roof line and the two corner posts to that side.

Ms. Kendrick mentioned she would prefer that. If it is more agreeable to the Board she doesn't have to have it 14' either. She just wants something she can drive her car in.

Mr. Zalinger asked if she would be agreeable to amend the application to provide for there being no enclosing material on the east side of the carport.

Ms. Kendrick replied yes.

Mr. Blakeman said he walks around town a fair amount. He noticed she is using a cane.

Ms. Kendrick replied she is hoping to get over that. It's not something she anticipates using the rest of her life.

Mr. Zalinger said she indicated she had plans to build a step or landing outside the door.

Ms. Kendrick said if she can't get the variance granted then she would probably put some kind of porch where the door is.

Mr. Zalinger asked how much space is there for a porch.

Mr. DeSmet said 6 feet.

Mr. Cranse moved approval of the variance application at 23 Harrison Avenue with the condition that the carport not be enclosed on its east side. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously on a vote of 6 to 0.

IV. 152 Main Street – CB-II/DCD

Owner/Applicant: Cassandra Lansky

Variance Request from Side Yard Setback for ADA Ramp
and Design Review for Multiple Exterior Renovations

Mr. Zalinger recused himself from participating in the vote because Dr. Lansky happens to be her dentist and he lives a couple of doors down the street but he will stay on the Board to facilitate the discussion.

Mr. Richardson said Dr. Lansky is his dentist as well but he doesn't believe this would imperil his objectivity in reviewing this application or vote.

Mr. Cranse said he also goes to Dr. Lansky and he can judge this impartially.

Mr. DeSmet said the applicant seeks design review approval for exterior renovations and variance for the placement for an ADA accessible ramp within the side yard setback at 152 Main Street. The Design Review Committee reviewed the proposal and recommended approval on their July 12th meeting. The minimum setbacks in the area are 10' in the front, 10' in the side and 20' in the rear. It appears that the main structure is approximately 9' so therefore nonconforming as it is.

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to Cassandra Lansky.

Dr. Lansky said she has wanted to do this for a while because they have a lot of elderly patients and a few wheelchair bound patients. There are some folks who could use a ramp even though they just have a couple of steps getting into the building. She has been studying locations and where it wouldn't be as obtrusive and the back is the only place to put it. It would have to be closer to the property line than where the existing structure is. It would pretty much mirror the neighbor's ramp. He did the same things a few years back.

Mr. Zalinger inquired if the ramp would protrude any further than the porch that is on the side. Isn't there a bay window?

Dr. Lansky replied yes, it is facing the parking lot. It would go away from the bay window. The only reason she wouldn't follow along the back of the building is because there is a bulkhead. Because of the bulkhead she needs to have it go out about 9 feet past the existing building for the property line.

Mr. Zalinger asked if this was to the rear of the new landscaping.

Dr. Lansky replied yes.

Mr. Cranse asked if the variance was actually for the rear and not the side. In the proposed findings it says side yard.

Mr. DeSmet said it is for the side.

Dr. Lansky said the ramp is part of the project. The other part is the siding.

Mr. DeSmet said he mentioned exterior renovations. She is taking out the aluminum and restoring the wooden clapboard and restoring some windows.

Mr. Zalinger asked if the Board had design review jurisdiction over that.

Mr. DeSmet replied yes, absolutely.

The Board reviewed the variance criteria.

Variance Criteria: §1006.B (1) (a)-(f)

- a) *That there are unique physical circumstances or conditions, including irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of lots size or shape, or exceptional topographical or other physical conditions peculiar to the particular property, and that unnecessary hardship is due to such conditions, and not the circumstances or conditions generally created by the provisions of the zoning regulation in the neighborhood or district in which the property is located.*

He would point out that the building is already in the side yard setback and when the building was constructed it predated ADA requirements. The design of the ramp is predicated by ADA regulations and it requires a minimum slope.

Mr. Richardson added that the foundation with the bulkhead was prior to zoning and ADA as well which is affecting this application. It is a physical condition.

- b) *That because of such physical circumstances or conditions, there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the provisions of the zoning regulation and that the authorization of a variance is, therefore, necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property.*

Given the configuration of the practice, is there any other location where construction of the ramp would work?

Dr. Lansky replied there is nowhere else. It is the only location.

Mr. Richardson added the front which seems to have an original porch with detail would work but would not be the best site for this ramp because that would interfere with the appearance.

Mr. Zalinger said the front would require a variance as well because it is in the front yard setback.

- c) *That the unnecessary hardship has not been created by the appellant, and the hardship relates to the applicant's land, rather than personal circumstances.*

They can conclude it is the location of the building in the existing setback which has created the unnecessary hardship.

- d) *That the variance, if authorized, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or district in which the property is located, substantially impair the appropriate of development of adjacent property, reduce access to renewable energy resources, nor be detrimental to the public welfare.*

Notice went out to the adjoining landowner. Mr. Zalinger asked Dr. Lansky if she had any feedback from her neighbor.

Dr. Lansky replied she had talked to him about it for years and there is no problem with the project.

- e) *That the variance, if authorized, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and will represent the least deviation possible from the zoning regulation and from the Montpelier Municipal Plan.*

Mr. Zalinger asked if it was fair to say that the location of the door creates a situation where the ramp is going to begin.

Dr. Lansky replied yes.

Mr. Zalinger added that dictates where she starts the pitch and the only way the ramp can work is to access the back door. He asked if she was going to increase the width of the door.

Dr. Lansky added if she had. She would like to keep it the same as it is but it might be too tight because it is right at 32 inches.

Mr. Lindley added there probably is an ADA width recommended. As long as she meets all of the ADA requirements the Board has no problem with that.

- f) *The variance will not result in the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.*

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Lindley and Mr. Blakeman the DRB granted a variance for 152 Main Street for an ADA ramp on a vote of 5-0-1 with Mr. Zalinger recusing himself.

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Lindley and Mr. Blakeman the DRB granted approval for design review for 152 Main Street for exterior renovations on a vote of 5-0-1 with Mr. Zalinger recusing himself.

V. 660 Elm Street

Owner/Applicant: Vermont State Colleges d/b/a CCV
Site Plan Amendment and Design Review for an Addition and
Parking Improvements

Interested Parties: David Frothingham, DeWolfe Engineering
Roger Jones, Northern Architects
Barbara Martin, Dean of Administration, CCV

Mr. Zalinger administered the oath to the interested parties.

Mr. Cranse recused himself from participating in the application since he works for CCV.

Mr. DeSmet said the applicant requests design review and site plan review approval for a minor amendment to an existing AIPUD (Academic Institution Planned Unit Development) at CCV's campus located at 660 Elm Street. It is in the Medium Density Residential District as well as the Design Control District. The Master Plan for CCV is current and in good standing. The DRB approved reinstatement of their Master

Plan in 2009. The proposal is consistent with option 1 of the current Master Plan. The project involves the construction of a 6,000 square foot 2-story addition with associated parking.

Mr. Frothingham said the project is located at 660 Elm Street. The surrounding landmark is Trillium Hill Road which is on the south side directly across from Ball Field Drive. Turtle Island Daycare is across the street. It's an 8.3 acre lot zoned AIPUD. The lighter brown area on the map is the existing building and the existing parking is out in an area with a fire lane around the back. The project proposes to build a 6,000 square foot addition to the east side of the existing building directly towards Elm Street. It is two stories and then they will be reconfiguring and reconstructing the parking lots as now recently the frost heaves are about 18 inches tall. They will expand the parking from 100 spaces to 159 spaces. This is in excess of the zoning requirements but is what CCV feels they need to accommodate the students on site. Being a community college with no boarding all of the students drive for the most part. The fire lane around the back is removed. The new Fire Department connections are up front and they are proposing to relocate the drive slightly to the north of its existing location to better line up with the parking on site. There is existing sewer and water on the site. They are proposing connections to the existing service lines and connecting to the Montpelier storm water system for their storm water discharge which is presently also connected to the system. It slopes up steeply on all sides. The lowest point of the site is a drain down in the corner which goes under Elm Street and down through a channel into the North Branch.

That is a brief overview of the site changes.

Roger Jones from Northern Architects said he isn't sure how familiar people are with the buildings that are there currently. It was formerly Woodbury College. Basically, there are two buildings existing there already that are joined together by a connector that was erected. The first is a barn that was converted to use as a school building, and then there was an addition that was built in 1999. They are rather different, so part of the problem in terms of design architecture is just simply trying to find something that is going to blend comfortably with buildings that are already so disparate so they have elected to keep the building fairly simple and quiet and not doing anything radical to call attention to it. In a sense they are trying to make it a good neighbor for the buildings there already.

Mr. Blakeman asked if the neighbors had been approached about this.

Barbara Martin said they actually had a "Meet the Neighbors" evening and there were 25 interested parties attended and the project was very well received.

Mr. Zalinger asked if there was an existing site plan.

Mr. Jones replied it is in their packet. C-101 is the existing conditions plan.

Mr. Lindley asked how far their entry building was being moved.

Mr. Jones replied it is very close to what it is. They are pushing it about 20 feet.

Mr. Lindley said somehow the site on Elm Street has always had the issue of the site distance to the entry way. Have they had luck with no accidents in front of the school?

Barbara Martin said in the two years they have been there they have not had any incidents.

Mr. Zalinger said as they push out from the existing parking just to the south of the proposed new building that is where the parking is being expanded to. What kind of screening do they propose between the eastern end of the building and Elm Street?

Mr. Jones replied there is a lot of existing hedge. The existing hedge is currently proposed to be removed and replaced with new oak trees across the entire front and additional plantings screening the building. There is an existing island in the middle with crab apple trees and they are proposed to be replaced in different areas.

Mr. Richardson said this is going to create a different type of screening.

Mr. Jones said there are also considerable interior trees to provide an additional buffer in the gap between the oak trees out front.

Mr. Richardson said the landscape buffer they are proposing between the parking area and Elm Street right now that is a cedar hedge. What is the thought between taking out the cedar hedge that is a 12-month screen that at this point is fairly filled in and replacing it with the oaks that are deciduous and also aren't going to make a continuous line even when they are in full leaf?

Mr. Jones said he asked the landscape architect that same question. Their explanation was they felt it was a more continuous view of the site and presentation of the front of the site. The trees are the same all the way across.

Mr. Richardson said taking the interior tree planting red maples is proposed and those will grow much taller than the existing crab apples.

Mr. Zalinger asked if there was a change in the circulation of traffic. With that many trees in each of the islands he is wondering whether there will be site difficulties for circulation.

Mr. Jones said the reason they moved the drive was so it lined up directly on the center aisle. That was in order to get all of the spaces they wanted on the site. Zoning says it has to be x distance for a parking space so that was the width they had to have. Otherwise the drive might end up on an island which creates a lot of conflicts with people coming from both directions trying to get out. This provides for much better circulation on site. The only dead end parking lot is the one up at the end.

Mr. Richardson asked if there would be any circulation lines indicated.

Mr. Jones replied it will be paved. Everything is designed for two-way traffic. His recommendation to the school was to have this painted in one direction. They can add an arrow that makes the circulation one-way to eliminate the conflict at the site. There could be signage that says one way and an arrow on the asphalt to indicate that.

Mr. Blakeman asked where the students will have their classes once the new building is put in. Will they still have the same CCV offices there, or will they be in a separate area?

Ms. Martin said the classes will almost exclusively be in the addition. That is essentially just classroom space in the new two-story addition. Yes, their goal when they bought the 660 Elm Street property was to combine their administrative offices, which used to be in Waterbury, with our teaching and learning site that has always been here in Montpelier.

Mr. Blakeman asked roughly how many students maximum will be there.

Ms. Martin said using their current statistics about 150 students. That is the maximum that would be there at one time.

Mr. Sarafzadeh asked if this addition was part of a documented master plan of any kind.

Mr. Frothingham replied it is. The Board has a copy of the Master Plan which was submitted with the application.

Mr. Zalinger said the AIPUD that was created years ago lapsed in 2009. It was renewed.

Mr. Sarafzadeh asked if there was other development anticipated on this lot. After this is done what is phase two as part of the Master Plan for development of this lot, if any?

Mr. Frothingham replied there is room for a future addition to the addition. The way the utilities have been configured there is space. On the site plan there is a dotted line pointing out a future addition if they need the additional space and the utilities have been designed to go around that.

Mr. Zalinger said in their narrative you say the second building shown on the Master Plan is not proposed to be constructed at this time.

Mr. Frothingham replied that is correct.

Mr. Sarafzadeh asked if that would mean the future addition would no longer require them to come back before the Board in terms of doing it as an addition.

Mr. DeSmet replied he is sure they would have to come back for that.

Mr. Zalinger replied for any minor amendment to an AIPUD requires DRB approval. He asked about the lighting.

Mr. Frothingham said there is a lighting plan in the packet. The lighting plan is proposed to be LED on 20 foot poles with greater than 9 percent cutoffs.

Mr. Zalinger asked if they knew what the existing poles are now.

Mr. Frothingham replied he didn't but he would guess at least 20 feet. They are planning on taking out all of the existing poles and replacing all of the lighting on site.

Mr. Lindley asked how they came up with 20 feet.

Mr. Frothingham replied that is the maximum height under the zoning which allows them to put in the fewest number of poles. Presently, there are four in the island and then there are bollard lights by the building and lights at the sign. That is all there is for lighting out there now.

Mr. Lindley said they are increasing the lighting substantially.

Mr. Zalinger said he counted 18 new lights on the plan.

Mr. Frothingham said there is considerable expansion of the parking.

Mr. Zalinger asked if CCV conducted a lot of their classes at night.

Ms. Martin replied yes.

Mr. Zalinger asked if there was a lighting consultant.

Mr. Frothingham replied there is.

Mr. Zalinger inquired if there was a design for the light fixtures.

Mr. Frothingham replied it was included in their packets.

Mr. Richardson said he knows the DRC made a recommendation that the LED be as warm as possible.

Mr. Frothingham said he doesn't know if that has been addressed by the lighting engineer.

Ms. Martin said she believes that is in keeping with what the recommendation was.

Ms. DeSmet said it was more of a restatement. They wanted to make sure the lighting was as warm as possible.

Mr. Zalinger said his sense about the lighting is they understand the desire is to create an institutional environment but more of a campus orientation rather than a Hannaford's. There are no other institutional uses out at Elm Street aside from the recreation field which is used only three to four months a year, and the pool which is used even less. He is concerned about the impact the lighting would have on the Elm Street corridor. We haven't talked about the hours of lighting. If you don't have resident students then you probably wouldn't need to leave the lights on all night, but you would want a plan that would have some on through some period of time and probably tripped by a cell when it came dark. His concern is if we just accept the lighting consultant's first take on lighting for the site then we do a disservice for the next 20 years to that whole corridor of Elm Street. There are a lot of residences up there, both north and south of the college, and there are a lot of commuters going up and down there. He feels they have done a really nice job addressing all of the other issues that arise under the Master Plan process, but no one asked the lighting consultant to go another step and determine whether 16 foot poles with a different configuration might achieve comparable coverage. Although, the poles at the entrance wouldn't have to be changed. The poles at the front of the new addition would probably not have to be changed. You would still get the same amount of coverage. In other words, lowering the poles from 20 to 16 feet might not result in a significant increase in the number of poles because all of that would have to occur in the exterior area of the lot rather than the interior like at the entrance. He is sure the 16 foot poles would suffice.

Mr. Richardson said the landscape plan they are designing is a shift that is going from instead of what is existing now. It might make sense to have the lights lower given you are going to be putting a lot of money and effort into creating somewhat of a block with a canopy trees.

Mr. Zalinger said they would like to see how the lighting engineer responds to reviewing the landscape plan and the feedback from the DRB about our concern about the height of the poles and the fixtures.

Mr. Richardson said he had a question about the clarification of the proposed building colors. They recommended using a family of earth tone colors. Has that been addressed?

Mr. Jones said it hasn't been pinned down. They had some paint chips from the existing building to present which they haven't had a chance to analyze for exact color match. The most prominent of the two buildings is an asphalt shingled roof that is brown and the walls are a muted gray which when you look at the chip is quite green. The wood siding on the original building is going to require repainting at some point. The other siding material is a fiber cement siding material and seems to be holding up remarkably

well, and there shouldn't be any repainting there. In terms of the general form of the building the intention was not to do anything color wise that would depart from the original building. This building literally connects to the other one and they want to blend it together. He thinks what the Design Review Committee stipulated was that if there was any intent or proposed departure they didn't want it to be changed.

Mr. Zalinger said as a condition it says the color scheme for the new building will be within the earth tone family.

Mr. DeSmet said if you look at the picture showing the gabled end of the red building when the new addition goes on they may want to change that color from red to something that will disappear.

Mr. Jones said on the south elevation there is a small area of siding which they probably would repaint, which is red, and that is the only part of the red building that is still going to be visible. The exposed gabled end of that red building is going to be obscured.

Mr. Zalinger said he would like to continue this proposal to another meeting to discuss lighting again and also see if they can narrow the questions surrounding the coloring so they can have a more specific permit condition so that compliance and his direction is fairly clear. They can continue this to August 1st that their lighting consultant so they will have the submission that will be here for that meeting. The lighting plan is all they would have to discuss on August 1st and then they can approve the application.

Motion to Continue the Application for CCV until August 1, 2011:

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Richardson and Mr. Blakeman to continue the application for CCV until August 1, 2011.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion duly made by Mr. Lindley and Mr. Blakeman the Development Review Board adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator

Transcribed by: Joan Clack