

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

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

Members Present:

James Spencer
Michael Lyons
Andrew Scott
Bud Adams
Nastaran Zandian
Margaret Miller

Members Absent: Theresa del Ninno

Secretary: Bill Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Susan Hellman, Historic Preservation Principal Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. MINUTES

Consideration of minutes from the January 17, 2024 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Ms. Miller, and seconded by M. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review approved the January 17, 2024 Meeting minutes, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

Items Previously Deferred

3&4 BAR#2023-00527 OHAD

Request for reapproval of a previously approved application for alterations at 115 S Union Street
Applicant: Jeremy Morrison

BAR#2023-00528 OHAD

Request for reapproval of a previously approved application for partial demolition/encapsulation at 115 S Union Street
Applicant: Jeremy Morrison

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, and seconded by Mr. Lyons, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00527 and BAR#2023-00528 with staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board found that both options were appropriate to the building.

SPEAKERS

Laura Escobar represented the applicant and was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Miller asked for an explanation as to the function of the windows, if they would be providing light to interior office space. Ms. Escobar replied in the affirmative, that the interior needed more light on the storefront level.

Mr. Scott asked if the top of Option #2 was lowered to match the top levels on the front elevation. Ms. Escobar replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Miller asked if the tops of the proposed windows would align with the Union Street windows or the sidelights on the alley. Ms. Escobar explained that they would align with whichever were closer.

Ms. Miller noted that alley lighting is important and that she liked the original submission. She felt that Option #1 introduces a new window type/style and Option #2 increases monotony.

Mr. Adams said that both options are good; he prefers Option #2 but is open to other options.

Mr. Lyons did not have an issue with the original proposal as he liked the bigger windows. He could support either option as long as the new windows are aligned with the existing.

Mr. Scott noted that Option #1 is more like a storefront and that Option #2 blends in. He was happy with either, stating that Option #2 is probably cleanest but he is fine with Option #1.

Ms. Zandian did not oppose either option. She liked the verticality of Option #2 but was fine with Option #1. She asked Ms. Escobar if she had a preference and Ms. Escobar stated a preference for Option #1 because it would admit more light and therefore attract more business tenants.

Mr. Spencer found both options okay. Option #2 blends in better and the building isn't big enough for it to be monotonous, but he was fine with Option #1.

Mr. Scott made the motion to approve with staff recommendations, with the additional flexibility for the applicant to select Option #2 instead of Option #1 as recommended by staff.

New Business

5&6 BAR#2023-00538 OHAD

Request for alterations and addition at 820 S Lee Street
Applicant: Marks Woods Construction Services

BAR#2023-00539 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/encapsulation at 820 S Lee Street
Applicant: Marks Woods Construction Services

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Scott, and seconded by Ms. Miller, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR#2023-00538 and BAR#2023-00539 with staff recommendations. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

REASON

The Board found the proposed addition and alterations to be compatible with the community.

SPEAKERS

Erica Rossi, homeowner, gave a summary of the project, introduced her husband John Medici, and noted that they had lived in this house since 2010. They were available to answer questions.

Lucy Adams, project architect, discussed the proposed stain and roof colors.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Scott asked if all of the brick would be stained and was advised that it would be.

Ms. Zandian asked about the size and location of the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment shown on page 18 of the application materials. Ms. Adams advised that it would be located on the shed roof portion.

Mr. Scott asked if the proposal added a full third story to the house. Ms. Adams replied in the affirmative and also explained that at least two courses of brick would be added above the upper floor windows on the primary/west elevation, as currently the roof sits directly on the tops of those windows.

Mr. Lyons supported the project with staff recommendations.

Mr. Adams agreed with Mr. Lyons.

Ms. Zandian agreed with Mr. Lyons and Mr. Adams.

Ms. Miller also supported staff recommendations. She also suggested that the rear/east door have a contemporary configuration, as it is the only remaining traditional component on that elevation.

Mr. Scott said that this was a nice design and that he approved it as submitted.

Mr. Spencer fully supported the application.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 7:26 pm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

BAR2024-00003 OHAD

Request for signage at 108 N Alfred Street

Applicant: Reza Mohammadi

BAR2024-00004 OHAD

Request for rear door installation at 831 S Washington Street

Applicant: Dr. Laviola

BAR2024-00010 OHAD

Request for bike shed at 228 S Alfred Street

Applicant: Daniel A. Munz

BAR2024-00013 OHAD

Request for existing shingles replacement at 1016 Prince Street

Applicant: Satish Joshi

BAR2024-00014 PG Request for siding replacement, trim installation, water barrier installation, rear door replacement, and gutter installation at 409 N Henry Street

Applicant: Alco Products Company, Inc