

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

Board of Architectural Review
Thursday, September 16, 2021
7:30 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
James Spencer, Vice Chair
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Christine Sennott

Members Absent: Robert Adams
John Sprinkle

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Amirah Lane, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:31 p.m. Mr. Adams and Mr. Sprinkle were 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 4-0.

II. MINUTES

3. Consideration of minutes from the January 21, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2021 meeting, as submitted. Ms. Sennott abstained.

4. Consideration of minutes from the July 21, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the July 21, 2021 meeting, as submitted.

5. Consideration of minutes from the September 1, 2021 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: Approved

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2021 meeting, as submitted. Ms. Roberts abstained.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. BAR #2021-00437 OHAD

Request for alterations and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening requirement at 310 Commerce Street.

Applicants: Timothy Foley and Lori Crandall

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 #2021-00437, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

IV. ITEMS PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED

7. BAR #2021-00355 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 214 and 216 South Payne Street.

Applicant: 214 and 216 S Payne St LLC

8. BAR #2021-00134 OHAD

Request for alterations at 214 and 216 South Payne Street.

Applicant: 214 and 216 S Payne St LLC

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 #2021-00134 and BAR #2021-00355, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The applicant must work with staff to: determine an appropriate material for the cladding of the small addition at the east side of the notch on the south elevation; minimize impact of the connections between the proposed exterior stair on the rear/east elevation on the existing historic masonry wall; refine the rear/east doors; refine the material and detailing on the addition; review the side porch balustrade; and review the cornice molding.

REASON

The Board agreed with staff that the indicated design elements needed refinement to better suit the building.

SPEAKERS

Mark Yoo, project architect, gave a presentation and was available to answer questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, noted that she supported the revisions from the previous submission, supported staff on refining the material for the addition, was unclear about the proposed front door glass, questioned the balustrade on the side porch, and liked the address plates. Mr. Yoo responded to Ms. Rothrock's questions/concerns.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Irwin asked Mr. Yoo what material was proposed for the roof deck, and he advised her it would be painted wood. She also asked if the rear/east door was original, and he responded it is not. Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Yoo to explain the demolition at the front porch. Mr. Yoo advised that

a knee wall on the porch separates the two addresses.

Ms. Irwin recommended that the applicant work with staff on a different design for the rear doors. She also felt that stone on the addition was too different, that the applicant should use modern brick, possibly painted, instead.

Mr. Spencer felt that stone for the addition would be too much and asked if a reveal could be added between bricks. He thought the balusters made the porch look too heavy and that the cornice trim should be simplified. The applicant should work with staff on these elements.

V. NEW BUSINESS

9. BAR #2021-00444 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 610 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Caley Tullman

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Spencer and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00444, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

None

REASON

The Board did not have any questions about the proposal.

SPEAKERS

Mr. William Cromley, the project developer, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts inquired about the current demolition policy and asked Mr. Conkey to revisit the Guidelines/Ordinance to allow demolition applications on non-historic portions of the building that are not visible from a public way and less than X square feet to be approved administratively.

10. BAR #2021-00468 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 105 Queen Street.
Applicant: Bilgehan Yalcin

11. BAR #2021-00457 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 105 Queen Street.
Applicant: Bilgehan Yalcin

BOARD ACTION: Partially Approved, Partially Deferred

On a motion by Ms. Irwin and seconded by Mr. Spencer, the Board of Architectural Review voted to partially approve and partially defer BAR #2021-00457 and BAR #2021-00468. The motion carried on a vote of 4-0.

REASON

The Board would like to see changes to the proposed front elevation.

SPEAKERS

Karen Conkey, project architect, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Michael Treptow, 111 Queen Street, expressed opposition to the rooftop stair enclosure because it would block views. He supported the rest of the project.

Charles Allegrone, 103 Queen Street, opposed the project, saying that the changes did not fit in with the block and noting that the owner is an out-of-town developer.

Edward D'Alessio, 120 Queen Street, objected to the stair structure and agreed with Mr. Allegrone.

Robert Walker, 112 Queen Street, gave a presentation opposing the project.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 South Lee Street, representing OTCA, opposed the project.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked if a roof hatch could be an alternative to the stair enclosure and asked that the applicant consider this option. Ms. Conkey noted that roof hatches leak and can be difficult to use.

Ms. Sennott asked if the architect had visited the roof deck at 100 Quay. Ms. Conkey replied that she had not, but knows it has a spiral stair and that the 6'8" Code requirement meant that the height is probably similar to that of the proposed. She knows of no complaints about this deck.

Ms. Irwin had no issue with enlarging the second-floor windows, noting that this would add variety and interest. Sightlines indicate that the roof deck and its stair enclosure would not be visible from the street. She recommended Option B or C for the stair enclosure.

Mr. Spencer asked if the proposed dormers would be centered between the windows on the below floors and Ms. Conkey verified that. Mr. Spencer has no issue with the modern look, as these are modern homes. He questioned the entablature over the door, indicating that it should be simplified. Ms. Irwin suggested a metal and glass door canopy instead.

Ms. Irwin asked if the applicant could work with staff on the entablature, but Mr. Spencer said that he wanted to see it again.

Ms. Irwin moved to approve Option B for the roof deck stair enclosure and defer the entablature and front elevation to align the dormers and change the railings by the front door.

12. BAR #2021-00456 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 329 North Washington Street.
Applicants: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

13. BAR #2021-00455 OHAD

Request for addition and alterations at 329 North Washington Street.
Applicants: Hershel Kleinberg and Lisa Cohen

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of

BAR #2021-00455 and BAR #2021-00456.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Applicant return with images of color of elevator siding as compared to the brick, changes to the connection between the elevator and the building, and updated elevations accurately depicting the grade.

REASON

The Board was concerned that the color of the elevator enclosure could make it too visible and that the proposed 8” gap between the elevator and the exterior wall would create future maintenance issues. Also, the submitted elevation from Princess Street did not accurately depict the grade.

SPEAKERS

Tamar King, project architect, gave a brief presentation and was available to answer questions.

Teri MacKeever, project manager, was available to answer questions.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Roberts asked about visibility; Mr. Conkey referenced photos in the staff report. Ms. Roberts also requested clarity regarding the amount of demolition relating to the proposed elevator enclosure.

Ms. Sennott asked if the proposed elevator would touch the wall. Ms. King explained that the applicants wanted to minimize touching the building and therefore set the elevator 8” back from the exterior wall. Mr. Spencer and Ms. Irwin indicated that this would create future maintenance and waterproofing issues.

Mr. Spencer asked about the color of the metal siding proposed for the elevator. Ms. King said that they intend to use a dark shade to match the building trim and roof.

Ms. Irwin discussed potential maintenance problems with an 8” gap and recommended that the elevator enclosure abut the building with waterproofing and flashing. Mr. Spencer echoed Ms. Irwin’s comments.

Ms. Roberts asked if staff could work with the applicant on these issues. Mr. Spencer agreed, then decided he wanted to learn more about the stair enclosure and its color, as he was concerned it would stand out.

Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant return with a materials board, but Ms. Irwin said that photographs of proposed materials’ colors alongside the existing brick would be preferable. Ms. Roberts would also like to see more details on the cable railings.

Mr. Spencer would like for the applicant to provide updated elevations with the correct grade on Princess Street.

The Board agreed that the applicant should return with photos of the proposed stair enclosure materials next to the existing brick, altered connection between the elevator and the exterior wall, railing details, and corrected elevations with proper grade.

Converted to administrative approval.

14. BAR #2021-00434 PG
Request for alterations at 1521 Princess Street.
Applicant: Christopher Wolfe

VI. NEW BUSINESS

15. Review Proposed Administrative Approval Policy for Solar Panels.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

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

BAR #2021-00466 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 404 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Chloe Daley

BAR #2021-00474 OHAD
Request for window replacement at 1218 West Abingdon Drive.
Applicants: Brandon Cochenour and Danelle Kosmal

BAR #2021-00475 PG
Request for window replacement at 421 North Fayette Street.
Applicants: Sondra Stokes and Mark Mahar

BAR #2021-00476 OHAD
Request for signage at 111 North Pitt Street.
Applicant: Cambridge Asset Advisors

BAR #2021-00478 OHAD
Request for door replacement at 203 Wolfe Street.
Applicants: Andrew and Tiffany Pache

BAR #2021-00480 OHAD
Request for alterations at 624 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Barbra Lustig

BAR #2021-00485 OHAD
Request for window and door replacement at 632 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Brenda Doherty

BAR #2021-00486 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 210 South Payne Street.
Applicant: Thomas Rust

BAR #2021-00499 OHAD

Request for shed replacement at 915 South Columbus Street.

Applicant: Robert Voigt