

\*\*\*\*\***DRAFT MINUTES**\*\*\*\*\*

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, October 6, 2021**  
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing  
Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair  
James Spencer, Vice Chair  
Purvi Irwin  
John Sprinkle  
Robert Adams  
Laurie Ossman

Members Absent: Christine Sennott

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Sennott was absent. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

**2. Resolution Finding Need to Conduct the Board of Architectural Review Electronically.**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the resolution. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**II. MINUTES**

3. Consideration of minutes from the September 16, 2021 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION: Approved**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the September 16, 2021 meeting, as submitted. Mr. Sprinkle abstained.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**4. BAR #2021-00487 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 806 Green Street.

Applicants: John and Karen Becker

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Mr. Sprinkle and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00487, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

**5. BAR #2021-00490 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 601, 607 South Washington Street and 710 Gibbon Street.

Applicants: Kristin Carpenter

**BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted**

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00490, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

**IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED**

6. **BAR #2021-00341 OHAD** (Translation services from English to Amharic will be provided.)  
Request for new construction at 431 South Columbus Street, 416 South Alfred Street, 900 Wolfe Street and 450 South Patrick Street.  
Applicant: Heritage at Old Town PropCo LLC

**BOARD ACTION: Postponed to a date certain, October 20, 2021**

**SPEAKERS**

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project

Ryan Kautz, architect with Hord Coplan Macht, presented the changes to the design since the previous hearing.

Jim Beattie, 718 Wolfe, liked the changes to the design of Block 2 and would like to see further revisions to the design of the seventh floor.

Chris Morell, 421 South Columbus, stated that the height, mass, and density do not meet the small area plan and that the City Council should not have approved the DSUP. For those reasons, the BAR should not be reviewing the project.

Danny Smith, representing HARC, noted that they submitted a letter to the BAR stating their opposition to the project. He noted that their opposition is not based on the inclusion of affordable housing but instead they feel that the height, mass, and scale are not appropriate for the historic district.

Ellen Mosher, 324 St. Asaph, shared a presentation stating that the proposed design is not compatible with the historic district and demonstrated other projects from the architect located in other areas that are similar in design to the proposed project. She stated that the building does not comply with the small area plan.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke, representing HAF, felt that the proposed design is a departure from compatible design for the historic district. She was concerned that this project will be a precedent for larger developments to come and felt that the design does not comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Yvonne Callahan, representing OTCA, agreed with some of the design changes that were made since the last submission but felt that many of the comments from the Board have not been addressed. She stated that she would prefer the removal of the bridge to create separate buildings.

Barbara Hayes, 802 Duke Street, was concerned about the precedent that this project will create for

development in the historic district.

Cathy Puskar, attorney representing the applicant, reminded the Board that comments regarding the proposed project's compliance with the small area plan are not relevant to the Board review. She directed the Board to the memo included with the submission that lists how the applicant has responded to comments from staff and the Board. The applicant has focused their design changes on Block 2 which is fully within the historic district.

At this time the public hearing was closed

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts thanked the applicant for the revisions that were made to the design in response to comments.

Mr. Adams liked the advancement of the design but felt that these changes could go further. He wondered if the massing could be modified such that the tallest part of the building is pushed to the center of the block. He stated that there are very few buildings in excess of six stories within the historic district. He could support a tall building with a unique design facing South Patrick Street but the proposed building is too tall.

Ms. Irwin stated that she does not like the changes to the design which make the building too historicist and not of its time. She would prefer that the building use proportions and alignments to make the modern building compatible with the historic district.

Mr. Sprinkle noted that it is difficult to apply the Design Guidelines to buildings of this size. He appreciated the introduction of historic precedent photos to the submission but would like to see more examples. He appreciated the submission of a study of the solid to void ratio in the submission but asked how this ratio compared to the provided historic precedents. He noted that the proposed width of the townhouse elements does not comply with the widths indicated in the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Ossman noted that the architects are caught between the guidance of the small area plan and the size of typical projects within the historic district. She felt that the applicant has been responsive to the comments from the Board and would like to see further design evolution on the south east corner of both blocks.

Mr. Spencer noted that many of the modern design elements have been removed. He likes the changes to the townhouse elements on South Columbus. He would like to see the project include historic building forms that are rendered in modern detailing. He was concerned that since the townhouse elements are not really vertical units, they will not read as townhouses. He thought that the flower design on the canopy was an attempt to tie the building to the site but would like to see additional steps taken to do the same. His concerns about the proposed height, mass, and scale remain.

Ms. Roberts felt that the design revisions have made the project more closely aligned with the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Spencer thought that the dormers on the east side of Block 2 were out of scale. He thought that the building entry elements felt applied and too large. He wondered if the current design includes too much variety to allow for a cohesive building.

Ms. Irwin stated that after reviewing the project material board, she felt that there were too many brick colors proposed and that the materials should be simplified. She felt that some improved design elements include the revised canopy on Block 1 and the inset panels at the south east corner of Block 1. She stated that the design for a building in the historic district should be of the highest quality possible.

Ms. Roberts noted that some buildings should be background buildings and some should stand out, this building has sections that do both. With the exception of the height, she liked the direction of the proposed design.

Mr. Adams moved to approve the proposed design with the conditions that the applicant work with staff to continue to refine the design and that the height of the building be limited to fifty feet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ossman. Mr. Sprinkle amended the motion to add that the width of the townhouses should be brought into compliance with the Design Guidelines. This motion failed.

Ms. Irwin stated that she does not have a problem with the proposed height but would like to see the design revised to be less historicist.

Mr. Adams moved to approve the design as submitted with the condition that the building be limited to fifty feet tall. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ossman. The motion failed by a vote of 4-2.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if the applicant would accept a deferral to make further design changes with comments from the Board. The applicant responded that they would not accept a deferral.

Mr. Sprinkle made a motion to deny the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams. The motion failed 4-2.

Ms. Roberts noted that only three of the Board members would be willing to approve the project at the current height. She felt that while the tallest part of the proposed building is located in the right part of the site, the overall height is too tall.

Mr. Spencer moved to postpone the meeting to a time certain, October 20, 2021, the next regularly scheduled meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Irwin. The motion passed by a vote of 5-1.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

### 7. **BAR #2021-00496 OHAD**

Request for complete demolition at 101 Duke Street.  
Applicant: Eleventh Street Development, LLC

### 8. **BAR #2021-00495 OHAD**

Request for new construction at 101 Duke Street.  
Applicant: Eleventh Street Development, LLC

### **BOARD ACTION: Deferred**

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2021-00495 and BAR #2021-00496.

## **REASON**

The Board provided feedback on the proposed design and asked the applicant to make revisions to the south elevation of the main building and the garage to make it more compatible with the existing buildings on Duke Street. The board also asked the applicant to study the introduction of metal stoops on the north building to reflect those used elsewhere in the historic district.

## **SPEAKERS**

Ken Wire, attorney representing the applicant, introduced the project

Shawn Glerum, architect with Odell, presented the changes that have been made to the design since the last concept review hearing.

The Board asked questions of the applicant, regarding the proposed design. Answers were provided by Shawn Glerum and Ken Wire.

Ms. Irwin asked if there would be a site drain in the area under the stoop to relieve and water accumulation. The applicant responded that the details for drainage in this area would be resolved during the final grading of the site.

Ms. Ossman asked if the renderings of the project reflect the selected materials for the fourth floor portion of the building, she pointed out that the renderings seem to indicate a greater level of contrast between the metal panels. Mr. Glerum indicated that the provided materials are correct.

Mr. Sprinkle asked for the width of the proposed townhouses. The applicant responded that they will be twenty two feet wide.

Ms. Roberts asked the applicant to review the supplemental materials provided to the Board by the applicant prior to the hearing. The applicant described the exhibit which compared the height of the proposed building to neighboring structures.

At this time, comments from the public were made.

Barbara Saperstone, 100 ½ Duke Street, appreciated the changes to the design and thinks that the revised south elevation is an improvement. She feels that the corner of South Union and Duke Street is not compatible with the neighboring residential buildings. She preferred the original design based on historic townhouses to the warehouse motif of the current design.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, was concerned about the view of the project from Duke Street, specifically the appearance of the garages and the lack of open space at the corner. She disagrees with the use of the warehouse motif for the project and feels that the proposed building will loom over the neighboring gardens. This corner is an important gateway into the city from the south and the design should reflect this and that the Board should deny this application. She recommended that the fourth floor be eliminated from each of the townhouses.

Ana Gomez Acebo, 100 Duke Street, was concerned about the relationship of the building to Duke Street and felt that the proposed design relates more to the hotel than to the houses on Duke Street. She asked for clarification regarding the proposed height of the building relative to its neighbors.

Mr. Wire described the different height measurements provided, indicating that zoning measures from average finish grade which can be different than the perceived heights.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roberts asked how the height of the proposed building compares to the height of the neighbors. The applicant responded that the proposed building will be approximately five feet taller than the building across Duke Street.

Mr. Adams asked if the southern townhouse could be turned to face Duke Street and have a more residential motif. He also asked if the garages could be different material.

Ms. Ossman stated that she has no issue with the proposed height of the building but expressed concern about the windows and detailing on the garage.

Mr. Sprinkle asked if the building could face Duke Street and felt that the current design for the south elevation is not compatible with the neighboring structures. He asked if the architect has explored options for the roof of the garages.

Mr. Spencer felt that the Duke Street elevation has been treated as a secondary design and should have a similar level of detail as the Union Street elevation. He did not think that the building should be turned to face Duke Street, just that this elevation needs further development. He did not have any problem with the proposed building height. He asked if the proposed reveal on the Union Street elevation of the south building could extend to the ground.

Ms. Irwin stated that she has no problem with the proposed height of the building. Because of the slope of Duke Street, the proposed building is a similar height to those buildings further west on the block. She felt that the south elevation needs further development and asked the architect to look at including something that appears to be an entrance on this elevation. She appreciated the change in material at the fourth floor to metal panels. She indicated that a change in material for the garage could be an improvement and asked for greater refinement of the garage windows.

Ms. Ossman supported the use of the warehouse motif for the building and asked for greater refinement of the Duke Street elevation.

Mr. Spencer considered the idea that changing the materials of the garages could make them more prominent.

In response to this comment, Ms. Irwin suggested that the architect consider extending some of the masonry detailing from the main building to the garage.

Mr. Sprinkle suggested that the garages have a different architectural expression. He considered that the use of a mansard could help to obscure the proposed fourth floor.

Mr. Spencer questioned the use of mansard roofs on warehouse building and was concerned that a mansard roof in this location could make the building appear taller.

Ms. Irwin suggested that the architect consider using metal stoops and stairs at the north building only to further differentiate the two buildings.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

The following projects were administratively approved since the last BAR meeting:

BAR #2021-00368 PG

Request for window replacement at 310 North Columbus Street.

Applicant: Melissa Newman

BAR #2021-00425 OHAD

Request for alterations at 726 Franklin Street.

Applicant: Joel Bernard

BAR #2021-00443 OHAD

Request for fence replacement at 519 South Lee Street.

Applicant: Lee Dunn

BAR #2021-00465 OHAD

Request for signage at 607 Prince Street.

Applicant: Hannah Williams

BAR #2021-00472 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 619 South Royal Street.

Applicants: Susan Alexander and Christopher Durr

BAR #2021-00477 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 310 South Alfred Street.

Applicant: Curtis Road Investments LLC

BAR #2021-00479 OHAD

Request for roof replacement at 314 Prince Street.

Applicant: Dennis Hensley

BAR #2021-00481 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1101 King Street.

Applicant: 1101 King Street Condominium

BAR #2021-00484 OHAD

Request for new fence at 1110 King Street.

Applicant: Marzieh Mohammadi

BAR #2021-00488 OHAD

Request for re-pointing at 109 Cameron Mews.

Applicant: Karen Boyd

BAR #2021-00489 OHAD  
Request for re-pointing at 117 South Fairfax Street.  
Applicant: Scott Flick

BAR #2021-00497 PG  
Request for fence replacement at 323 North Henry Street.  
Applicants: Azizul and Sanjida Choudhury

BAR #2021-00503 OHAD  
Request for door replacement at 635 First Street, Unit 301.  
Applicants: George and Patricia Day

BAR #2021-00504 OHAD  
Request for signage at 831 South Washington Street.  
Applicant: Penny Simons

BAR #2021-00505 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 910 Prince Street.  
Applicant: Bethany Hoff

BAR #2021-00512 OHAD  
Request for trim replacement at 603 South Lee Street.  
Applicant: Ellen McCallie

BAR #2021-00514 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 304 North Saint Asaph Street.  
Applicant: Audra Parker

BAR #2021-00515 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 328 Commerce Street.  
Applicant: Karen Griffin

BAR #2021-00516 OHAD  
Request for window replacement at 103 Queen Street.  
Applicant: Kathy and Charlie Allegrone

BAR #2021-00517 OHAD  
Request for driveway replacement at 1212 King Street.  
Applicant: Sandra Kyer

BAR #2021-00518 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 608 Cameron Street.  
Applicant: Daniel C York Revoc Trust

BAR #2021-00519 PG  
Request for roof replacement at 1022 Oronoco Street.  
Applicants: Heidi and Michael Ford

BAR #2021-00520 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 727 South Alfred Street.  
Applicant: Barney Ales

BAR #2021-00523 PG  
Request for roof replacement at 316 North Henry Street.  
Applicant: Elizabeth Mendel

BAR #2021-00530 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 404 South Lee Street.  
Applicant: Chloe Daley

BAR #2021-00531 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 1130 Prince Street.  
Applicant: Sean Lambe

BAR #2021-00532 OHAD  
Request for window and door replacement at 112 Quay Street.  
Applicant: Ellen Lord

BAR #2021-00535 OHAD  
Request for roof replacement at 800 Franklin Street.  
Applicant: Jennifer D'Arezzo

BAR #2021-00536 OHAD  
Request for alterations at 1108 Duke Street.  
Applicant: Aaron Shepard