

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
December 20, 2016

Location: City Council Chambers

Members Present: Chair Melanie Miller; Vice-Chair Tim Mohr; Carl Schwarz; Stephen Balut; Justin Sarafin; Whit Graves; Emma Earnst; Laura Knott

Members Absent: Corey Clayborne

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner, Camie Mess, Assistant Preservation Planner, and Carolyn McCray, Clerk

Call to Order: [Vice-Chair – Tim Mohr] calls meeting to order at 5:30

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

William Adams, architect, with Train Architects, asked BAR if he could get administrative approval of certain revisions to 1509 University Avenue renovation that was approved by the BAR in October 2016. The BAR had no objections to deal with it administratively.

Rebecca Quinn, 104 4th Street NE, asked for clarification that the BAR was not approving the revisions, but were allowing it to be approved administratively.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes
November 15, 2016 Regular Meeting
November 7, 2016 Work Session (William Taylor Plaza Phase 2)

Sarafin moved to approve both sets of minutes, Balut seconded. Motion passed (6-0-1) with Graves abstaining because he was not present at the meetings.

C. Previously Considered Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-01-04
512-514, 600 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 290007000, 290006000, and 290008000
Heirloom West Main Development LLC, Owner/Heirloom West Main Development LLC,
Applicant
New Construction- Landscape Plan

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Whiney Glick and Ann Pray of Bushman Dreyfus spoke. They asked for feedback on the streetscape, and will return to the BAR with the courtyard detail.

Questions from the Public:
No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:
Graves: where is the tree that is being removed? Is that part of the public right of way?

Pray: more in the corner, we are trying to build off what is there now in terms of street scape improvement, this plan is working with what's there and lining up those trees. We are here for a more in depth conversation

Graves: are you looking for a decision on the courtyard or just the streetscape?

Pray: Just opinions on the plaza and streetscape

Knott: what is the relationship between the bench and the proposed zelcova

Pray: it matches what is existing, it is 4.5 feet

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Knott: the plaza on the east side looks fine, like there is a lot of space. But I am very worried about distance between the trees with the bench/planter, there is not enough room. Right now there is a bench, which serves to protect the door, but it is just too close. The structure should go away until a street scape plan for West Main and there should be another solution for the door opening.

Bault: There is a pinch point here too, not just in front of the specialty pavers. It would be preferable for there to not be a pinch point even though we would like seating and greenery

Pray: In front of the Blue Moon we were trying to improve existing conditions and give people what they are used to, that space is actually a little larger than what it is now. There is a need for benches, maybe well get rid of the planter

Mohr: the bench could be next to the planter and be a little shallower

Pray: what dimension do we want to get to?

Bault: there may be a design minimum in the West Main plan

Miller: you might put the tree on the property, there should be something green

Knott: the street tree decisions appropriate but the planter should be pulled back and make the bench shorter and narrower, make it the same width as the one on the eastern end

Schwarz: what if the bench isn't as long and there are more openings? If you are putting a tree in make it all right. The West Main plan is not fully figured out and this could lead that plan as a special space within it.

Miller: does everyone like the bike racks and bench in general?

yes

Pray: with the planer, we are still figuring out materiality and something that is movable.

Miller: it would be great to have the planter though.

Bault: offer a minimum width to the West Main plan. It is just the clearance that is the issue.

Mohr: maybe have the door and sidelight set differently and swing differently so that it swings into the planter versus people.

Miller: is that paving permeable

Pray: we will look into that

Motion: The applicant requested feedback on the streetscape plan. No action was taken.

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-12-01
310 4th Street NE
Tax Parcel 330205L00
Court Square LLC, owner/ Richard Shank, Shank & Gray Architects, applicant
Exterior Modifications

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Robert Gray, of Shank & Gray architects spoke.

Questions from the Public:

Rebecca Quinn, 104 4th Street NE wants to know how the balcony structure will affect the sidewalk on 4th Street.

Mr. Gray: The setbacks are such that the balconies will not infringe on the sidewalk in any way.

Catherine Moyer, representing Congregation beth Irrael, 301 East Jefferson St., asked are these balconies cantilevered? And if so how much do they extend into the alleyway.

Mr. Gray: They extend into the alleyway, but there is very little projection past the front corner of the parking garage and therefore, the existing face of the building.

Ms. Mpoyen: But it does create a covered space and protection, the Beth Israel Congregation has had difficulty with undesirable activity and I think this would only increase this because it is sheltered and hard to see.

Miller: Is the alley a closed alley?

Mr. Gray: Yes.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: Will there be any effect on the landscaping?

Mr. Gray: Yes, it will have an impact on the 4th Street side, 4 to 5 feet of the landscaped area.

Schwarz: Will there be any effect on the Gingko trees on the west side?

Mr. Gray: I do not believe so.

Miller: Are you proposing a clear glass? In the elevations it seems to be tinted.

Mr. Gray: It is a clear glass.

Schwarz: What is the plan for the balcony edge?

Mr. Gray: It will be a stone surface and a stone face, we have not selected a stone yet. It will be concrete plank construction that is fully faced and the underside would be plastered.

Schwarz: And is your intention to bring down the columns on the side walls? So you will be rebuilding those?

Mr. Gray: Yes, we would be rebuilding them.

Mohr: Are you then talking those wing walls and tooting them into the corner or are they offset?

Mr. Gray: No, they are offset by 12 inches.

Comments from the Public:

No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:

Schwarz: I think the idea of putting residential in this building is a great idea, and the scheme you are presenting looks acceptable, but I am still confused about the final outcome. It would be nice to see what you plan to do on the ground floor as far as paving underneath the balconies, taking up the landscaping, I would like to see an enlarged view of one of these balconies, because I am having trouble discerning details from the line drawings. I think an axon drawing will help clear some of the details up such as how the steel column and the brick wall interact with one another.

Balut: I agree with Schwarz. In concept, what you are proposing looks appropriate, but I too agree we are lacking substantial information to understand fully what this will look like. This can be resolved by showing more detail, specifically materiality.

Mohr: I have reservations about the wing walls in the front area.

Graves: Agrees that it is a good concept, but he needs to see more details, such as materials.

Sarafin: Agree the overall picture and materiality of the structure needs to be included. He is also concerned with how the wing walls affect the overall visual length of the building.

Knott: Agrees that more details and development are needed.

Motion: The BAR liked the proposal for residential use, but requested more detail: enlarged view of one of the balconies, show how columns and brick walls work together, site plan, 3D perspectives in its setting, materiality. Schwarz moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Balut seconded. Motion passed (8-0)

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-12-02
1880 University Circle
Tax Parcel 060089000
Scott and Beth Stephenson, owner/ Mary Wolf, Wolf Josey Landscape Architects, applicant
Landscape Plan

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report

Mary Wolf represented the applicant.

Questions from the Public:
No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Miller: I stopped by and the exiting trees seem like they are in bad shape and overgrown with ivy?

Applicant: The one is dead and the other is on the neighbor's property

Miller: in the back yard it shows evergreen and shrubs, what are you thinking for those?

Applicant: there are camellias already on the property so we will put more of those in

Comments from the Public:

Rebecca Quinn, 4th street: Can everyone speak into the microphone and say your name.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: I am excited that they are redoing the plan and it looks great. It would be good to replace the ivy ground cover now while it's all torn up. I agree with staff that the tree should be replaced by another of a similar size.

Mohr: the street trees are not very substantial correct?

Knott: I think it's a beautiful plan, but I am sad about the old tree, it could have been older than the house. I do not like the dogwood as a choice, the Japanese maple is okay, but that replacement could be worked on. Do we just want the final to come back to us as administrative review?

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Site Design and Elements, Knott moved to find that the proposed landscape changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road- University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted, with additional details provided for administrative review, including the choice of replacement tree and its location. Earnst seconded. The motion passed (8-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-12-03
1600 Grady Avenue
Tax Parcel 050110000
Neighborhood Investments-PC, LP, owner/ Henningsen Kestner Architects, Inc, applicant
Apartment Renovation, fire escape removal and patio addition

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Statement from Richard Spurzem, the property owner:
Update on their other properties that have gone through the BAR

Mark Kestner, the architect: two small changes to make the building more livable and safe
1) Removal of rear fire escapes that are more of a hazard, add porches where escapes were
2) Create sunken patios in the front of the building to get more light into basement units, all you could see from Grady is the railings

Questions from the Public:
Rebecca Quinn from 4th Street: along Grady there would be 4 breaks for egress ladders in the railing?

Mr. Kestner: no because the ladders can run up over the railing

Questions from the BAR:
No questions from the BAR.

Comments from the Public:
No comments from the public.

Comments from the BAR:
Mohr: Great old building, good to not here arguing about the trees and doing something good

Miller: the tree were denied because there was a refusal to replace them

Mr. Spurzem: We'll come back to the landscape plan at some point—the porticos on this property are copied from a building on Cabell. Want to get light and access to rear and basement units.

Mohr: I think that looks nice and improves the courtyard.

Miller: application indicates that you're unsure if you'll go for tax credits.

Mr. Spurzem: We will probably go for state credits.

Schwarz: because this has been so heavily documented, I am not as worried about the standard of steering away from details that mimic.

Sarafin: I do question the design intent of the little gables and porticos which are classically detailed but are nowhere else on the building. I wonder if a hipped gable would be more appropriate

Earnst: I agree, but the way the railings are set back is appropriate. Otherwise I am happy to see that you have taken this on.

Sarafin: It is really nice to see the building in good hands.

Earnst: with the addition of the portico, you will be taking out perforations into the building—would those windows be replaced with like materials?

Miller: you have enthusiastic support but we would like to see more details before giving approval.

Graves: Everything looks really good, I'd like more details but I think it all looks good.

Miller: are there any lighting changes being proposed.

Schwarz: I am with Stephen [Balut] on administrative approval .

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation and for Demolition, Mohr moved to find that the proposed replacement of four fire escapes with entry porticos and other associated renovations, and the addition of eight patios satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road-University Circle-Venable Neighborhood ADC District, and that the BAR approves the application with the proviso that the following are submitted for administrative approval when done: details for railings, window selection, and options on porticos. Sarafin seconded. The motion passed (8-0).

E. New Construction

6. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 16-08-05
NW Corner of Ridge Street and Cherry Ave (William Taylor Plaza Phase 2)
Tax Parcel 290147000, 290146000, 290145000
Cherry Ave Investments LLC, Owner/ Management Services Corp., Applicant
New Construction of Residential Building

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Comments from the Applicant:

Steve Von Storch, Architect: We have a few options for the gable pieces, lightening the color scheme to go with the lighter stucco colors. Painted wood shingles with a slight green hue, Pray shingles, or leave the stucco gables. We do prefer the first option

Questions from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Questions from the BAR:

Graves: For option 3, with the continued cream stucco would that extend, or just on the gable?

Knott: on the front page it looks like you have vertical boards?

Schwarz: did you investigate using vertical gables?

Graves: on the south east corner is that vertical siding

Comments from the Public:

Rebecca Quinn, 4th street: There are a lot of surfaces and color and things going on, I am worried about the number of surfaces when these things don't tend to turn out the way we think. The lighting on Ridge Street is a little bright for a residential area—though that could be because of the window option.

Comments from the BAR:

Mohr: I am not buying the pergolas; maybe they should have bracket language instead of column language like the shed. The gable might work better if they projected more and connected to the wood column.

Sarafin: I think that is a great suggestion and gives some dimensionality

Graves: I am a fan of the stucco because it keeps it more simple, option 3 helps that

Schwarz: the piece on the far south end is the most successful to me

Sarafin: The enclosing of the connectors really helps, but they could be a little darker. Wood shakes or shingles I think helps with the wood columns as well

Miller: I agree with the preference towards the shingles, and that the connectors could be a little darker

Knott: my preference is the green shingles and I talked with the landscape architect, and the landscape plan should help a lot.

Miller: will we get a mockup of the materials?

Schwarz: the one thing you changes in the back is breaking the cornice?

Miller: what do we recommend at the top?

Mohr: a darker stucco related to your other materials

Motion: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, Mr. Schwarz moved to find that the elevations and materials of the proposed new residential building satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Ridge Street ADC district, and that the BAR approves the elevations and materials with the following modifications: Dark color in the attic story of the rear of the building; for the gables we prefer the green shingles but want you to investigate the detail on bottom of those; pergolas come back with the landscaping; find windows with internal spacer bar, landscape plan and lighting plan to come back. Mr. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (6-2 with Balut and Miller opposed).

F. Other Business

7. PLACE Report - No report. Mohr missed the PLACE meeting.

G. Adjournment **7:45pm**