

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
Tuesday March 21, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

Members Present: Melanie Miller- Chair; Tim Mohr- Vice-Chair; Justin Sarafin, Carl Schwarz, Stephan Balut, Emma Earnst, Breck Gastinger

Members Absent: Whit Graves and Corey Clayborne (provided written comments)

Staff Present: Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner, and Camie Mess, Historic Preservation Assistant

Call to Order: Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda

No comments were made.

B. Consent Agenda

1. Minutes

February 22, 2017 Regular Meeting

Motion: Schwarz moved to approve the February 22, 2017 and February 22, 2017 regular meeting minutes. Earnst seconded, and the minutes passed 6-0-1 with Balut abstaining because he was not present at the February meeting.

C. Previously Considered Items

3. **Preliminary Discussion**

BAR 17-03-03

612 Grove Avenue

Tax Parcel 510049100

Heather Carlton, owner/applicant

Screened porch (Conservation District)

This was changed to a preliminary discussion.

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Heather Carlton, the applicant, spoke: she passed out pictures for what she was envisioning for her porch.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Gastinger: How are you planning on using the space under the porch?

Carlton: It is driveway now, and it would be continued to be used as such.

Clayborne (from written comments): Is the slope and pitch of the addition the same as the slope and pitch of the existing roof?

Carlton: Yes

Balut: Is the French door centered on the window?

Carlton: Yes

Schwarz: What are you thinking of for the railings?

Carlton: I would be amenable to whatever you all thought.

Sarafin: Many of the questions I have will be answered when the survey come back. They are dealing with the scale of the porch and the driveway, but they can wait until next month, when the survey is complete.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Mohr: I think you can take some cues from the top porch on page 2, of the photos you passed out.

Gastinger: Shares concerns of the staff about what the side setbacks are as far as limitations for the size of the porch.

Schwarz: Showing us the pictures have been very helpful. The zoning is not very specific and most times you will get things that look like a deck, and the pictures you have shown us have much more carpentry to them. As long as you stick with a design like the pictures you have shown us, it will look nice.

Motion: There is no official motion to be made since it is a preliminary discussion, but the BAR suggested the applicant come back next month with more information about the massing of the porch. If she could include drawings or more pictures to show what the details are going to be, that would be extremely helpful.

D. New Items

4. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**

BAR 17-03-01

225 West Main Street

Tax Parcel 330274000

Mark Brown, owner/ Josh Zanoft and The Bebedero, applicant

Replace 5 windows

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Josh Zanoff, the applicant spoke, he mentioned the before and after pictures had been switched in the PowerPoint.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: Did you say there is a middle mullion in there that stays?

Zanoff: Correct.

Mohr: Is there a reason the semicircular top glass does not have any divisions in it?

Zanoff: Budgetary constraints

Mohr: I mean the top part, even just one straight bar.

Zanoff: That makes sense, and we can look into that.

Sarafin: Is the desire to get that functionality, so you can open them?

Zanoff: Yes.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Mohr: I would like to see the addition of a vertical muntin to the arched window.

Miller: It sounds like the application has support, and it sounds like everyone could go either way and the main request is to add the break at the top and we could give him the option to either two horizontal muntins or one.

Motion: Balut moved to find that the proposed new windows satisfy the BAR's criteria and guidelines and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application with the following modifications: adding a vertical muntins with the stipulation that it is either one or two vertical muntins to add a visual break to the semicircular windows. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-03-02

617 Park Street

Tax Parcel 520186000

Megan and Chris Long, owner/ Clark Gathright, applicant

New Driveway and landscaping

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Clark Gathright is representing the applicant.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: What is the fate of the magnolia tree?

Mohr: The width of the sidewalk cuts are decided by the city, correct?

Gathright: Yes.

Miller: You were not included in the previous packet correct?

Gathright: Correct, I was not included.

Gastinger: Can you explain the difference between the treatment of the east set of walls and the west set of walls?

Gathright: My notion was to make the pilasters the entrance and then swing around the utility pole.

Miller: Is that utility line still overhead?

Gathright: Yes, it is overhead to that pole and then drops underground to go into the house.

Schwarz: Is there any consideration in the screening of the mechanical equipment?

Gathright: That hasn't been discussed. We are not planning to change that fence at all.

Schwarz: Do you have any idea as to how tall those holly bushes are?

Gathright: They are currently very tall.

Clayborne (from written comments): Are there in plans for site lighting?

Gathright: We haven't discussed any lighting plan.

Clayborne: Do you have an elevation of the 18 x 18 pillar at the entrance way? He thought it would be nice to understand more about it since it forms the entryway.

Gathright: It is basically just extending 6" higher than the rest of the wall, and there is no cap on it.

Clayborne: Will there be any further landscaping for the island created (ground cover, etc.) by the driveway?

Gathright: Currently no, there will be the maple tree, the replanted hollies, and grass.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Miller: There have been several things planted behind the fence post review, that were not in the final approved landscape plan.

Schwarz: I understand wanting to keep the privacy screen, but I think moving the hollies back to the line of the tree will look odd. As a note to the board they are taking out a significant portion of the rounded concrete curbing, so we would potentially be breaking the precedent we have set with other COAs.

Mohr: I guess what hit me the most is that most of this is turning into hardscape, did you look at adding only one entrance and then exiting out the alley? Or potentially adding a single entrance so it is more like a court.

Sarafin: This whole application seems to be adding a very suburban driveway and hardscape to a historic street. The proportion of the parking area overwhelms the rest of the site, and makes the house serve a very suburban function in this setting. I do not see it as being appropriate to the district. I also think it runs contrary to what the original landscaping plan was, which was to create privacy.

Miller: I agree. If they wanted to do this and remove the current driveway, and create less hardscape and more landscaping that would maybe work, but as it is, it is just adding too much hardscape. Is the idea of this to get more parking? Or is it to make it easier to get to the house?

Earnst: I agree, and it is also changing the front of the house. The front of this house is on Park Street and needs to remain as such, this addition of this hardscape would make it appear like the front is on Wine Street.

Schwarz: The fact that it is adding a driveway does not bug me, and I think it is going to act more like courtyard because it is going to be made with pavers. However, the landscaping is still treating it more like the side of the house, and if you are going to make another public front to the house, make the landscaping fit that.

Gastinger: I also share the concerns about the amount of paved area on the side of the street and also the number of entrances, and the proximity to the intersection of Wine and Park Street. It is already a dangerous intersection because of the site lines, and to add another two entrances in that close of proximity complicates things. I also worry about the maple tree surviving in the current plan.

Balut: I agree with a lot of what is being said, but I feel less strongly about the amount of hardscape, but I agree it is very car focused. I think it contributes to how the house is connected to the street, and the materiality of the design is very well thought out.

Motion: Sarafin accepted the applicant's request for a deferral. Mohr seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

6. **Certificate of Appropriateness Application**
BAR 17-03-04
159 Madison Lane
Tax Parcel 090145000

Jeffrey Gore, owner/Bobby Craig, Arapahoe Architects PC, applicant
Handicapped ramp

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Evan D. Mayo: the applicant spoke.

Questions from the Public:
No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Schwarz: You said the basement doors will no longer be used, are you just going to cap the entrance?

Applicant: Yes

Schwarz: The ramp appears to have a gap in the middle of the two flights? This is leading to a comment that I would push those two things together.

Applicant: I agree with this comment.

Mohr: It does appear to show a metal deck once it goes past the corner of the house, is that gone?

Applicant: We were very specific that the ramp needed to be made of concrete and brick.

Miller: There is some general upkeep as far as broken windows and things, are these going to be fixed as well?

Applicant: Yes, this has been part of a continuing conversation between the alumni members and the current residence. One of the things that has happened in the past few years is a general contractor has been kept on retainer for the repairs.

Miller: Also, and I struggle to call it landscaping, it looks like this plan takes out the only living things that are around the house.

Applicant:

Mohr: A potential fix is to add a raised planter to add landscaping and minimize the effect of the ramp.

Miller: I don't know what the interior plan is, but I know the parking is at grade. You already have a basement and landing you could always just add a lift up to the main entrance.

Balut: Did you say the metal handrail would be painted black?

Applicant: Yes.

Comments from the Public:
No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Gastinger: I would just make a note about the details drawn, and to make sure they meet ADA requirements.

Miller: It seems overall that people are supportive, the board just needs more details.

Mohr: It would be good to see how the ramp is going to be handled where it is abutting the building.

Applicant: I am just going to run through a list of things to bring back for next month's meeting.

- The addition of planter along the ramp
- The removal of the garbage trap
- Flashing or waterproofing where the ramp meets the building
- Take care of the broken windows
- Develop a plan for the back spots that conflict with the proposed ramp
- Remove metal detailing from the construction drawings

Gastinger: One thing the designer will need to deal with is how the concrete deck is supported against the existing wall in that area.

Miller: Also, look into a handicap accessible entrance from the other side where the parking is already the same height as the basement door.

Clayborne (from written comments): He has asked for some specific details like ramp elevations, door and frame elevations, lighting cut sheet specification, if there are any door surround details, and door hardware style, and color.

Motion: Schwarz accepted the applicant's request for a deferral. Balut seconded. The motion passed (7-0).

E. New Construction

7. **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

Façade revisions

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Jeff Dryfess, the applicant spoke.

Questions from the Public:

No comments made.

Questions from the BAR:

Miller: Holds up material, and asked if there were any different colors.

Applicant: It comes in a range of colors, but this is the closest to what the original zinc coloring that was approved.

Balut: How will the painted aluminum age in retrospect to the zinc?

Applicant: The zinc would age faster than the paint, but they should both lighten over time. But the paint won't have the same variation and color change as the zinc

Miller: Is there a guarantee for how long the paint lasts.

Applicant: Yes, but I don't have the information right now, but I will get back to you about that.

Mohr: What I am reading with the window lines, is that there is a 3 inch projection right? That's why there are continuous vertical lines in the material. The hardy panel has a projection across all the way down. I ask because the horizontal lines read much more strongly.

Applicant: Yes there is a three inch projection all the way across, the horizontal lines are at floor level. That is continuous around the building. The color variation brought back the horizontal shifting in the vertical panels.

Miller: How big do these aluminum panels come? What happens on the east and west ends where you have wide expanses of metal?

Applicant: Those vary in width between 8 and 12 inches, so there's a series of panels. The variation of widths gives a texture that the material does not have.

Miller: How do these panels interlock?

Applicant: They more or less snap together. Detail 6.02 on the far right shows how they interlock, and you get that line where they come together. So they come together as a large metal panel, but they are broken down.

Balut: What was the final result on the window glazing?

Applicant: We will have to come back to you with that, there will be a shading coefficient. When we choose the final metal color we will pick the final glass. It will be a kind of grey, no color.

Miller: Do you think the third revision is better than the second revision?

Applicant: Yes, absolutely. I feel more comfortable with the building having a back to it. Main Street in the most important elevation of the building, and not to slight the neighborhoods, but this did not need the same materials on the back as the front. We thought about changing the side elevations but decided people would see those more than the north. But we felt comfortable with the back being different.

Miller: The second iteration seemed like the east and west elevations were book ends to the building.

Applicant: yes we felt that it was important to wrap the metal around both and end that material in a logical way.

Comments from the Public:

No comments made.

Comments from the BAR:

Clayborne (from written comments)*: ... He would like to see the designs push the envelope a little more and felt that the elevations were underwhelming. Consider

developing a cohesive rhythm with the glazing, zinc panels, and hardy plank that would present opportunities to pull the façade in and out in. The side elevations, particularly the east, appears to be an afterthought.

*did not see the new drawings that were submitted at the meeting

Gastinger: I am appreciated of the changes in the back on the rear façade, I think they make sense, and the color variation helps. The switch from zinc to aluminum, even though the material in person looks good, it is unpredictable in how the material would weather and takes away from the life of the building. I do think that the ones with variation in the pattern gets at that and could be successful. The only other thing to consider with the east and west façade is to use slightly different reflective values to bring in more variation. And I think that the north façade can have more variation to create depth and that shadow line will be really important.

Miller: in the rendering of the back side of the building, it looks like fine bits of red around the windows, which is nice even though it's just a rendering. It gives it interest.

Schwarz: I think it is a beautiful design, and I appreciate the quality of materials that you are using, the change that you made is almost equivalent to what you had. However, I have voted this down before, and I still cannot support it because of the context.

Balut: I think the material changes you have submitted are compatible with the guidelines and the previous design. I do like the more textured aluminum panel, and having more of a matt, because it will be so reflective back there, and the lighter color is more appropriate. So I like these softer one more, but both are good. As far as the south façade, I think going to the contrasting, I think that the newest version is best. It feels less like the back of a building to me, because it is well designed.

Miller: I agree with Steven's choice on the panels. I don't think that exactly matching the panels is that critical. What people liked about the zinc is how it will change over time, and if we won't have that then we can go with something different.

Mohr: I think it is more about finding a contrast than matching the color. I do like the matted finish of the one panel. I do think the rear elevation is good. It wouldn't hurt if the back panels were colored, maybe the mica panels where the colors are quiet.

Gastinger: Thinking about the reflectivity is the biggest change with the material on the east and west side. I would be careful about the light color to not have a big white wall. Images of this will be important in coming to a final decision.

Miller: We don't have the landscape plan, but there is a lot of one color pallet here, so hopefully the savings on the panels can be put into significant planters on the balconies to lighten things up and add some color.

Sarafin: I am sorry to lose the articulation on the south façade and the change of plane, the color change almost does it, but the two colors of hardy plank in the same plane has

the ability to go south very quickly. It will really depend on the quality of the detailing and installation .

Motion: Balut moved to find that the proposed material changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the West Main Street ADC District, and that the BAR approves the changes as submitted. To be clear we are approving the substitution of zinc panels on all facades with the painted aluminum panel (the color and texture to be determined) and on the south façade we are also approving the substitution of the zinc metal panels with the light grey hardi panel as presented tonight. Gastinger seconded. The motion passed (6-1, with Schwarz opposed.)

The applicant must return for approval of the following items before the final COA can be issued: final elevation drawings, remaining building materials, lighting plan, location of mechanical units and signage, and rehabilitation plans for the two historic buildings.

F. Other Business

8. PLACE Report

Tim Mohr reported that PLACE discussed the concept of having someone (Chief Architect is too strong a word) involved in long range urban planning to get forward of the curve. We need a branch of NDS not bogged down with daily issues that can coordinate with other divisions of government such as Parks and Public Works), and having a vision about what the City wants to be.

There will be a meeting to discuss lighting – updates to the lighting code; preparing a good RFP – April 10, 11:30 a.m., at Open Grounds.

Carl Schwarz noted a Tom Tom community picnic may work as a means of BAR outreach.

Melanie Miller suggesting asking the applicant for a final plan compilation.

Tim Mohr suggested asking for a 3D model.

Staff asked for resolution of 310 4th Street NW. Mr. Balut suggested that staff follow up with Mr. Graves and Mr. Clayborne, and he offered to scrutinize the application further.

G. Adjournment: Moved by Miller seconded by Earnst to adjourn at 8:10 p.m.