

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

Board of Architectural Review  
**Wednesday, October 5, 2022**  
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber  
City Hall

Members Present: James Spencer, Chair  
Christine Sennott  
Robert Adams  
Theresa del Ninno  
Margaret Miller  
Andrew Scott

Members Absent:

Secretary: Bill Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Marina Novaes, Historic Preservation Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. MINUTES**

2. Consideration of minutes from the Sep 21, 2022 meeting.

**BOARD ACTION:**

Approved as submitted. On a motion by Ms. Sennott and seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review approved the September 21, 2022 minutes, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6 – 0.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**3 & 4. BAR #2022-00396 OHAD**

Request for alterations at 712 Wilkes Street.

Applicant: John Pontecorvo

**BAR #2022-00416 OHAD**

Request for demolition/ encapsulation at 712 Wilkes Street.

Applicant: John Pontecorvo

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Adams, and seconded by Ms. Del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to **approve** BAR #2022-00396 & BAR #2022-00416, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

**REASON**

The Board agreed with staff's recommendation.

**SPEAKERS**

Rebecca Bostick, the project architect, briefly explained the project and was available to answer questions.

John Pontecorvo, the property owner, was available to answer questions.

**DISCUSSION**

Ms. Del Ninno stated that she found the proposed shed dormer and materials appropriate.

Ms. Sennott asked the architect the reason for the window pattern on the dormer be different from the rest of the windows. Ms. Bostick clarified that there is no specific reason, the owners prefer casement windows.

Mr. Scott asked the architect the reason for the dormer window be not centered aligned with the windows below. Ms. Bostick clarified that they could center the shed windows in relation to the roof or the windows below, it seems a better approach to have it center on the roof. There was no further discussion.

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 5. Review of updated BAR administrative approval policies.

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Scott and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updated BAR administrative approval policies with the edits discussed in the hearing.

**REASON**

The Board found the changes acceptable with their edits.

**SPEAKERS**

None

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott recommended that the first bullet point in the “No BAR approval” section be two separate bullet points to include a sentence indicating what does not require approval for demolition and encapsulation.

Ms. Miller request a clarification of the term “sun sails” in the “Awnings” section of the table.

Mr. Scott recommended that the administrative approval for awnings and sun sails only apply to the rear and side elevations. Awnings on the front elevation must still come to a BAR full hearing.

Mr. Adams felt that outdoor chimneys, included in the “Sheds and accessory structures” section of the table, should not be approved administratively in order to allow neighbors to have input.

- 6. Review of updated BAR administrative approval policy for gas meters.

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Scott and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updated BAR administrative approval policies with the edits discussed in the hearing.

**REASON**

The Board found the changes acceptable with their edits.

**SPEAKERS**

None

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott recommended changing the wording to encompass other situations, such as additions or interior spaces other than basements.

Ms. del Ninno noted that new developments should not be permitted to put gas meters on the front elevation. She suggested adding the phrase “for existing structures” to prevent new construction from putting gas meters on the primary elevation.

- 7. Review of updated BAR administrative approval policy for signs within the historic districts.

**BOARD ACTION:**

On a motion by Mr. Scott and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the updated BAR administrative approval policies with the edits discussed in the hearing.

**REASON**

The Board found the changes acceptable with their edits.

**SPEAKERS**

None

**DISCUSSION**

Mr. Scott asked if the language regarding the difference between murals and signs came from the Supreme Court case. Mr. Conkey explained that this came from the City Attorney’s Office. Mr. Scott felt that “information” was too broad a term to use. Mr. Conkey suggested that staff work with the City Attorney’s Office to fine-tune this sentence. The BAR agreed with his recommendation.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

BAR #2022-00447 OHAD

Request for door trim replacement at 505 South Royal Street.

Applicant Suzanne Lipcaman

BAR #2022-00445 PG  
Request for stoop replacement at 1015 Queen Street.  
Applicant: Andrew Bury

BAR #2022-00433 OHAD  
Request for pedestrian bridge replacement at 1 Cameron Street  
Applicant: Douglas Zang

BAR #2022-00439 PG  
Request for rear and front siding replacement at 1015 Queen Street  
Applicant: Navarro Construction

BAR #2022-00436 PG  
Request for roofing material replacement at 1501 Princess Street  
Applicant: Rebecca Beattie

BAR #2022-00434 OHAD  
Request for relocation of gas meter at 810 Prince Street  
Applicant: 820 Prince Street, LLC