

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, January 3, 2024
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present:

James Spencer
Michael Lyons
Andrew Scott
Bud Adams
Theresa del Ninno

Members Absent: Margaret Miller, Nastaran Zandian

Secretary: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principal Planner

Staff Present: Brendan Harris, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Zandian and Ms. Miller were absent. All other members were present.

II. MINUTES

Consideration of minutes from the December 20, 2023 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review approved the December 20, 2023 Meeting minutes, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

New Business

3 BAR#2023-00380 OHAD

Request for signage at 725 N Washington Street
Applicant: Adams Environmental Engineering Group

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00380 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

REASON

The Board supported the application as submitted.

SPEAKERS

Dylan Hamme, applicant, was available for questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board approved the application without discussion.

4 BAR#2023-00112 OHAD

Request for alterations at 1021, 1023, and 1025 King Street
Applicant: Donna Giaimo/ Daughters of St Paul

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Adams, the Board of Architectural Review voted to deny BAR#2023-00112 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 3-2.

REASON

The Board decided to uphold the design guidelines for the replacement of existing windows.

SPEAKERS

Karlen Murray, Renewal by Andersen, presented the project.

Gail Rothrock, HAF, encouraged the Board to uphold the existing guidelines and deny the application. She noted that these are early, important buildings. She suggested that the applicant phase the project to retain some windows and replace others.

DISCUSSION

Ms. del Ninno asked the applicant about color options for the product in order to match the existing windows. The applicant noted that a variety of options are available and could use different colors on different portions of the building.

Mr. Scott asked about the extent of window replacement, including the decorative windows. The applicant clarified that the decorative windows will not be replaced. He further asked for clarification on the proposed one over one configuration. The applicant noted that the replacement windows would be similar to the existing window configurations except for the arched third floor window which would be a single window.

Mr. Lyons asked about repairing the existing windows. The applicant explained that the existing windows are not in good condition.

Ms. del Ninno stated that 1021 and 1023 King Street are directly adjacent to King Street and should have wood windows. The 1025 King Street building is closer to Henry Street which is more vehicular and the windows are above eye level. Would support the replacement of windows at 1025 King Street with composite windows with divisions similar to existing.

Mr. Lyons appreciated the practicality of the proposed windows but could not support the use of windows that are contrary to the existing guidelines.

Mr. Adams stated that the King Street windows should be repaired. The arched window at the 1025 King Street elevation should be divided similar to the existing. He could support the use of composite windows on the rear of the property.

Mr. Spencer asked staff to review the existing policy regarding replacement windows in OHAD. Mr. Scott stated that 1021 and 1023 King Street should be restored or repaired where possible. He further noted that the guidelines require single pane windows on the front elevation. For 1025 King Street, he could support the use of composite windows. He suggested that the arched third floor window retain the existing configuration and include a wood frame. He could support the proposal because the application had been changed to a sash kit rather than an insert type of installation.

Mr. Spencer supported staff recommendations based on a concern for setting a precedent for the use of composite windows.

Mr. Scott noted that non-wood windows have previously been approved for a commercial multi-unit building on King Street and that the guidelines indicate that every building should be weighed on its own merit.

Mr. Scott moved to approve, with staff recommendations for 1012 and 1023 King Street. For 1025 King Street, the application would be approved with the condition that the applicant work with staff on the design and construction of the third floor arched window. The motion was seconded by Ms. del Ninno. The motion failed 3-2.

Mr. Lyons moved to deny the application per staff recommendations, the motion was seconded by Mr. Adams.

5 BAR#2023-00113 OHAD
Request for alterations at 111 S Columbus Street
Applicant: Karlen Murray/ Renewal by Andersen

The Applicant withdrew BAR#2023-00113.

BOARD ACTION: Withdrawn

REASON

The proposed window replacements are not visible from a public right of way.

SPEAKERS

Karlen Murray, renewal by Andersen, Based on the previous discussion would only move forward with windows that are not visible from a public right of way.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Spencer noted that the applicant does not need approval for windows that are not visible from a public right of way.

6&7 BAR#2023-00518 OHAD
Request partial demolition/encapsulation at 112 Princess Street
Applicant: The Federal City Group

BAR#2023-00519 OHAD

Request for alterations at 112 Princess Street
Applicant: The Federal City Group

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, and seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00518 and BAR#2023-00519 as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. The applicant was instructed to work with staff on a material other than acrylic for the garage door.

REASON

The Board found the proposed alterations appropriate but had concerns about garage door acrylic.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant. He gave a brief introduction and description of the project and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams stated that the design looks handsome, and he supports it.

Mr. Lyons noted that other houses nearby have modern updates, and he therefore supports the application.

Ms. del Ninno asked if the garage panels were 1/8 inch acrylic and Mr. Kulinski replied in the affirmative. Ms. del Ninno asked if Mr. Kulinski had considered frosted glass instead.

Mr. Scott asked if the garage door acrylic would resemble the front door frosted glass. Mr. Kulinski replied yes, that the acrylic would have a frosted look and the door would be frosted. Mr. Scott said he supported the project in general but had cautions about acrylic and glass next to each other on the elevation, noting that it may look off.

Ms. del Ninno asked staff what the *Design Guidelines* say about acrylic. Staff replied that acrylic is not specifically mentioned in the *Design Guidelines*.

Mr. Kulinski expressed concern about the potential of glass on the garage door breaking and asked if he could possibly work with staff on a different material.

Ms. del Ninno suggested laminated tempered frosted glass.

8&9 BAR#2023-00520 OHAD

Request partial demolition/encapsulation at 320 N Alfred Street
Applicant: The Federal City Group

BAR#2023-00521 OHAD

Request for alterations at 320 N Alfred Street
Applicant: The Federal City Group

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Mr. Scott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00520 and BAR#2023-00521 as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

REASON

The Board supported the application with staff recommendations.

SPEAKERS

Steve Kilinski, architect, presented project and answered any questions.

DISCUSSION

The Board approved the application without discussion.

Other Business

10 Proposed updates to the Parker Gray Residential Reference Guide and to the BAR Policies for Administrative Approvals in both Historic Districts.

Staff presented the proposed changes to the Board for Discussion. The Board adopted the change to routine maintenance in Section II, Item 3 of the Administrative Approval Policies.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 8:20 pm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

BAR#2023-00537 OHAD

Request for front stoop replacement at 304 N Pitt Street

Applicant: Grace & Liam O’Grady

BAR#2023-00536 OHAD

Request for door sill replacement at 216 S Alfred Street

Applicant: Kelly Meyers