

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
July 18, 2017

Location: City Council Chambers

BAR Members Present: Melanie Miller, Chair; Whit Graves, Stephen Balut, Justin Sarafin, Carl Schwarz, Breck Gastinger, Corey Clayborne (arrived at 6:45).

BAR Members Absent: Tim Mohr, Vice-Chair; Emma Earnst

Staff Present: Scala, Mess, Saunders, and McCray

Call to Order: Chair – Melanie Miller calls meeting to order at 5:30

5:30 A. Matters from the public not on the agenda (please limit to 3 minutes)

Mark Kavit: Last month one of you affirmed an application because you felt like it would be a good update. Update is not a word we should be using for a property in an ADC district, preservation should be the word used. In making decisions, preservation should be the first concern, not making something look like the suburbs of America. The idea of an ADC district is to preserve the past, not convey current ideas of design. If you ignore your own outlines, you open the door to someone ignoring you. I have recently visited DC, Alexandria, and Baltimore. These places have a lot of tourism traffic because of their historic character. Thank you.

Bob Fenwick: Thank you for your work. The Dinsmore House has changed that part of the city, it is incredible. There were questions last night about what the BAR does, and the BAR helps. The work that you do is being reflected in the city and I want to say thank you

B. Consent Agenda (Note: Any consent agenda item may be pulled and moved to the regular agenda if a BAR member wishes to discuss it, or if any member of the public is present to comment on it. Pulled applications will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.)

1. Minutes June 20, 2017 Regular Meeting

Motion: Balut moved to approve the June 20, 2017 minutes. Schwarz seconded. Approved 4-0-2, with Gastinger and Graves abstained.

C. Deferred Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-06-09
416-418 West Main Street
Tax Parcel 290012000
Main Street West, LLC, Owner/ Greg Jackson, Applicant
Roof Addition

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Greg Jackson: We honed in on the third option, with a Dutch shed roof form. We modified it per the comments we heard, streamlining it, giving it more fenestrations giving it a horizontal element, lowering the roof. The North side does benefit from that additional shade element because it gets a lot of morning sun.

Questions by the Public
No questions from the public.

Questions by the Board:

Schwarz: What is the purpose of the verticals on the outside, they seem to overlap the underside of the gutter?

Jackson: They're part of articulating the façade in a sense. To shade it and break it up a little bit. It also helps to support the horizontal shade element as well.

Balut: The medium grey will be the column covers?

Jackson: The windows will be a bronze, similar to the roof. But the rest are basically in medium to light grey family.

Gastinger: Could you explain a little bit the treatment of the cornice or the wall cap of the existing structure? It seems to be rendered in white like the new structure.

Jackson: There is an existing metal cap that we will replace with the same material language as the addition. The lights are currently off, but we would move them to a pattern that fits better. We looked at the existing steel windows, the division of the clearstory and the monitorare thinner elements than before as well as more frequent, we followed the same nine square pattern in a sense, to work with that type of reference.

Schwaz: What was the inspiration for the medium grey?

Jackson: To keep it simple and neutral and let the building be the color; a grey works in the family of the existing colors. We want the addition to stay in simple colors.

Balut: There windows look like a 3 over 3 pattern, not a nine square.

Jackson: That is correct. You can see a reference there in the side elevation.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: You have worked really hard on this, and you've been working a lot with us. But I still feel like it's the basic massing that is a problem. I don't think it fits within our massing guidelines and I think the addition is foreign to everything that's there. You are adding a whole set of features that aren't already there. Maybe there is a different form that can do the job simply. A lot of this seems to be decorating away that original form.

Gastinger: I have some concerns; I don't have an issue with the roof or detailing but the relationship of the proposed structure to the existing façade. It almost neuters it as a historic structure. There are several guidelines that speak exactly to this situation, both in additions and rehabilitations. There are specific recommendations related to how to add a new story to a building. Because the addition stretches the volume of the building, that is what I find problematic.

Balut: I feel that the proposed design is compatible with the guidelines. The original volume of the building is not being touched and it is still identifiable. The addition on top is different enough to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. It is utilitarian in aesthetic and use, the vaults lend to the utilitarian logic. The fact that the building is being preserved, the cap is intact, and the details are utilitarian (like the mullions on the windows) addresses all of the concerns we have raised as a board. I feel like it is appropriate, it's funky and utilitarian and overall compatible with the site.

Sarafin: I think it has evolved nicely. I think a lot of the issues I had previously have been addressed with the fenestration and the lowered roof. But I do take Brecks point about whether this addition comes from the roof. But as a roof addition element you have addressed our concerns.

Graves: I don't have a problem based on our guidelines, the only issue I have is that the building looks like it's been chopped off and it is hard to add a roof addition. I support the addition but I am struggling with some of the issues my colleagues brought up.

Miller: I wonder is changing the colors would help the addition recede back from the facade. I do think this is much more successful than the first couple iterations.

Sarafin: I wonder if making it really dark would help.

Balut: I agree, right now you have bronze windows. I would make the columns dark bronze as well, and it'll make it recede more and give it a more factory look. I don't know if the new coping would have to be dark as well.

Gastinger: My concerns on the massing still remain. But I do think a different color would help a lot.

Miller: Is this something he could get approved and submit the color change administratively?

Schwarz: Are you planning to keep the utilities on the side of the building? They're kind of a work of art.

Motion: Balut moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for New Construction and Additions, I move to find that the proposed new roof addition satisfies the BAR's criteria and guidelines and is compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application, with the stipulation that the applicant submit color renderings of the proposed design in the most realistic possible fashion, for the BAR to review and approve [to be circulated via e-mail], prior to the COA being issued. [The BAR recommends a darker color for than the light grey.] Graves seconded. Motion approved (4-2, with Gastinger and Schwarz opposed).

D. New Items

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-07-02
120 East Main St., Unit B.
Tax Parcel 280026000
Coran Capshaw, Owner/Sushi Ten, LLC, Applicant
Façade Materials Change

Mary Joy Scala present the staff report.

Coran Capshaw, the owner of Ten, and Johnathan Drolshagr, the General Manager of Ten

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Question from the Board:

Gastinger: The drawing points to the band under the sign, it says it's wood but it's metal correct?

Drolshagr: Yes it is metal. And we will keep that.

Capshaw: Overall we are going for an elegant rustic look.

Gastinger: How will you turn the corner with the tile?

Capshaw: They have a nice finished end piece for the corner.

Schwarz: If your plan to tile directly on that plywood?

Capshaw: We are going to put it right on top. We are working with Ceramico and took a look at it and felt comfortable that this would work.

Gastinger: and your plan for the underside?

Drolshagr: We will tile that as well; everything that is mint green will be tiled.

Comments from the Public:

No questions from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Graves: It seems like an appropriate treatment and better than what's there. I also feel confident in the company they're working with.

Miller: It will also be a cleaner look.

Balut: I like what is there now but I also like what they are proposing.

Motion: Graves moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, I move to find that the proposed façade changes satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Downtown ADC district, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Motion approved (6-0).

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application
BAR 17-07-03
McGuffey Hill North Garage, 2nd Street NW
Tax Parcel 3301741V0
McGuffey Hill Home Owners Association, Owner/Jennifer Linkous, Applicant
Green Roof Replaced with Membrane

Camie Mess present the staff report.

Jennifer Linkous: We have to repair the decking, it is rotten. To repair the roof we have to remove the green roof and we want to replace it with a membrane in an earthy color. We want to add a fence in front to keep pedestrians from walking on. We will take suggestions on the material, although we are looking at aluminum. And the height would be flushed with the parapet wall. The membrane will go up that parapet wall and be capped with metal.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board

Miller: How do you get behind the fence to maintain it?

Linkous: We do not know who maintains it now, it might be the city. Our maintenance staff can remove the trash up there if the city does not. We may have to put a gate there then.

Miller: Why not keep the green roof there?

Linkous: Mostly cost. The green roof doesn't really benefit anyone. The members of the McGuffey Hill Association can't see it and people can't walk on it. Because of the rotting it seemed better to protect it with the membrane.

Gastinger: How will the parapet wall be reconstructed? In terms of material.

Linkous: The membrane would run up the wall and then it would be capped. The other side would remain the same.

Comments from the Public

Kavit: It would be nice to keep the green roof. My biggest concern is the fence or railing. A cast iron would be more appropriate. The city has done a lot to preserve this park, so anything mass produced is not appropriate. There should also be a locked gate so that people cannot get to the other side.

Comments from the Board:

Gastinger: This is unique because it's not part of the plan but still visible to the park. It is sad to step back from the green roof. That being said there's not much we can stipulate here. I am concerned with the visual of the membrane, especially on the wall. I am also concerned with the heat that the membrane might collect.

Miller: our guidelines don't exactly address this situation. Iron might be preferable to the aluminum, but neither relate to the park.

Sarafin: It seemed like the intent from '07 that this was a visual extension to the park. So introducing an industrial flat roof top over this parking feels like it's moving backwards in terms of best practices. It seems like it has been designed as part of the park design and where we fall with that changing, I don't know.

Schwarz: I don't think as proposed it works. It is going to be a trash and leaf collector and it's the people in the park and McGuffey that will be seeing it, not the condo association. Right now it's a nice visual extension of the park and it's nice. It seems to me that it makes sense to move the wall towards McGuffey and make the garage more as a part of the condos than the park. That way if there is trash up there it is the condo association that sees it, not the users of the park.

Sarafin: It does not make sense to put an industrial roof in the park.

Graves: This roof is appropriate for the building. But there is another discussion to be had with the city about the vision for this roof as part of the park.

Balut: I like Carl's suggestion of an opaque wall instead of the fence. I wonder if there is an opportunity for the city to put some planters there. Where is the property line?

Linkous: I am not sure, but I think it is where that fence would be, at the edge of the roof.

Gastinger: Where is the draining handled?

Linkous: Towards the park and off to the side, it appears. I don't know. But everything under the green space is rotting. We are open to changing it to a pitched roof and putting a wall up.

Miller: It would be worth talking to the parks department

Gastinger: Working with the parks department to make sure the treatment is appropriate

Balut: A green roof starts with a membrane anyway, so maybe you do that and parks puts something else down. The ideal situation is to have that replanted again.

Scala: I don't know what happened back when this park was done, but the green roof was done before '07 and they planned improvements but it was never done. The city did install the sedum roofs on the parking garage so they are familiar with that.

Linkous: We are open to working with the parks department to get the green roof back.

Schwarz: If that doesn't work out, the parapet on the driveway needs to go down so that the trash on the roof is visible to the condo association and not the park.

Sarafin: Whatever solution, it will come back to us anyway.

Linkous: Could it be determined if it's required to become a green space again?

Miller: All we can say tonight is that the application as presented does not have support, and then you can meet with the city. If the green roof cannot happen then you can come up with other solutions. We can also help in the next phase before you come back.

The applicant requested a deferral.

Motion: Miller moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral. Sarafin seconded. Motion approved (6-0).

The BAR suggested that the applicant come back with options for the replacement of the roof. Some of the suggestions were:

- replacing the green roof
- moving the parapet wall to make the roof aesthetically part of the carport instead of the park
- having the apartment association replace the membrane then have the city design and maintain the green roof

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-07-04

834 Locust Avenue

Tax Parcel 510088000

Tripp and Lisa Stewart, Owner/Bob Pineo, Applicant

Demolition and Addition

Reid Saunders present the staff report.

Bob Pineo: This is an incredible site, almost two acres. Time has been elegant to it, but there have been some wrongs that we are trying to right. We are trying to bring back the original character. There is a lot of negligible construction and the inside scale and layout does not match the outside grandeur

Tripp Stewart: We have lived across the street since 2008. There was no maintenance and we watch the house slowly decay. The owner approached us and we agreed to take care of it. We want to restore it to its glory.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Gastinger: The discussion of the staff report it says the addition is wider than the house, is that correct?

Scala: The entrance projects, and the addition is slightly wider.

Gastinger: Can you talk about the thinking in changing the roof color?

Stewart: The roof has to be replaced anyway, and the green color on the roof and shutters did not hold up well in time. We thought the darker color would look nice and will tie the whole house together.

Miller: In an ADC district this would be in our purview.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Sarafin: We have seen several projects like this where the applicant wants to restore the historic piece and deal with less high quality additions. This is a conservation district, so without being able to look at all the guidelines, the intent looks good and I think all of the changes seem appropriate. What we are mostly looking at is the massing of the addition which I think is fine

Miller: And from the street we can barely see it at all.

Gastinger: I think it is really elegant.

Balut: The way you presented your intent was admirable and we appreciate what you were doing. If we did have to take the review further, I do think there is a lot that is strong about this design.

Motion: Sarafin moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including Historic Conservation District Guidelines for Additions and New Construction and Demolitions, I move to find that the proposed demolitions and addition satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Martha Jefferson Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Balut seconded. Motion approved (6-0).

Clayborne arrived at 6:45

6. ~~Certificate of Appropriateness Application (deferred by Applicant)~~

~~BAR 17-07-01~~

~~425 2nd Street NE~~

~~Tax Parcel 330085000~~

~~James E. and Lynn K. Garnett, Owner/ James E. Garnett, Applicant~~

~~Construct new front wall, front walk, and install gates~~

Application deferred by applicant

7. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 17-07-05

1509-11 University Avenue

Tax Parcel 090078100

Amorgos, LLC, Owner/ William Adams, Train Architects, Applicant

Façade revisions

Camie Mess present the staff report.

William Adams: It is changing from a stake place to a juice bar, and the changes have to do with aesthetics for that. The tique id contained in the vestibule.

Questions from the Public

No questions from the public.

Questions from the Board:

Schwarz: Unfinished tique will turn grey wont it?

Adams: this is already pretty weathered out so it will ook just like the sample presented.

Balut: how does it turn the corner?

Adams: It will only be painted to where it meets Trinity.

Comments from the Public

No comments from the public.

Comments from the Board:

Balut: I think it seems appropriate.

Graves: I am happy to make a motion.

Motion: Graves moved: Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation, and for Additions and New Construction, I move to find that the proposed façade renovations satisfies the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in The Corner ADC District, and the BAR approves this application as submitted. Sarafin seconded. Motion approved (7-0).

E. Other Business

8. BAR Review of Proposed Text Amendments for Solar Energy Systems

Mary Joy presented the staff report

Schwarz: We review changes to sidewalks, walkways, or landscaping correct? So would a ground mounted solar panel be considered landscaping?

Scala: So I think you would want to review small ground systems too. I would ask Lisa if the BAR would get to approved these small ground mounted systems, under 225 square feet? Because I would think you all would want to.

Susan Elliot: In terms of the background, over the last three years we have been seeing an increased interest in solar pv. A few year ago the city received a smart growth grant, as part of the streets that work project and they noted that we did not have clarity in our zoning code regarding where panels were allowed or any type of solar energy system. They noticed this created a barrier if someone tried to seek us out to figure out what was allowed and what was not. In terms of the city's goals, we do have sustainability goals, specifically reducing the greenhouse gas emissions community wide. We wanted to write this in a way that gave people a more clear direction on how to utilize this alternative energy, it was not in any way supposed to supersede or diminish the review capabilities in any of the overlay districts, both historically protected and entrance corridor. Council wanted this to come before you so that we did not create some sort of loop hole with the change in zoning. We looked for precedents and could not find any in the state. Where these solar systems are placed within the parcel would be very site specific.

Questions from the Board:

Clayborne: You had a very good presentation for the planning commission, with images that were valuable in understanding the text amendments. Are these going to be an appendix so that people can understand this more?

Elliot: There are some documents that would be part of an appendix for reference. The photographs can be online so that people can visualize how they can look. The diagrams and the charts will be online and we can add the photographs if that is requested and seen as helpful, for supplemental purposes.

Comments from the Board:

Schwarz: in 34.11.1 item A2 I think they need to insert the phrase "in aggregate" because that seems like the intention. It seems clear that solar panels do not count towards that 25%, but I am curious what happens with there is a provision that allows solar panels to be 15 feet off the roof surface. Is there some way to prevent someone from creating a shaded space that is 15 feet above the roof? Does that need to be part of the 25%?

Scala: I don't think solar power systems are considered part of the appurtenance.

Miller: Seems like at minimal it needs be reviewed in a district.

Elliot: That did not come up as a point that the planning commission discussed.

Schwarz: In general, I think it should be considered because it adds to the perceived mass of the building. I just want to make sure that the planning commission is thinking about that.

Balut: I think this is great what you're doing and that the city is addressing this issue. I would love it to promote the use of solar energy as much as possible. Generally speaking, yes, we want to review how a building will look, but I would also like to encourage as much solar as possible.

Miller: I would like to be able to review in the conservation district, roof top applications. It definitely can alter the appearance of the house. We want to encourage this, but I think it would be silly not to review it.

Balut: You are saying to change 34-340(b) in the code?

Scala: I think it is perfectly legitimate to ask for review of it, since the addition of solar systems on the front of a building can drastically change the look of it.

Sarafin: That is true, because of this it makes sense to review it on a case by case basis.

Miller: For instance, tonight we reviewed an application from a conservation district, and there wasn't much to review, but it was still nice to see what the design was.

Schwarz: There is so much that we can't review in a Historic Conservation district, a solar panel seems less significant, then some of the other things we can't review in a conservation district.

Balut: I am on the fence with it too. Some examples are egregious, but we also want to encourage the use of it. There is one image in the packet that is a bad example, we would hate to see this on some of the Victorian houses on locust.

Scala: If you don't want certain images to be used in the brochure as examples, you should let Susan know.

Elliot: If this group wants to review this in ADC district and conservation districts from the street, than that is where the code changes and the language used in that code come in. That being said the installers in town do follow a design standard, but that doesn't mean that they can't sometimes be done poorly.

Graves: We are speaking about a blip in time and the technology will keep changing. They don't alter the structure of a house, and they aren't taking away from the historic fabric. It is a personal preference as to if you like the look or not. I think we should definitely review them in an ADC district, but I think we are spinning our wheels reviewing them in a conservation district. I think they will come and go over time, and I think they will be different fifteen years from now, so big picture they won't be an issue.

Gastinger: I do think we should retain as much review capacity as possible, mostly for the egregious circumstances, just because that allows the neighbors a forum to voice their concerns.

Graves: Are we saying that we won't be able to review roof materials but we will review solar panels?

Sarafin: They aren't perfectly flat on the roof, these panels can take multiple forms and my mounted in infinite ways, if some installation that is proposed at some weird angle that contradicts the pitch of the roof, and looks foolish. I would like to retain the ability to review for when things go wrong.

Graves: I agree, but changing from a standing seam metal roof to an asphalt roof is a bigger more permanent change than installing a solar panel.

Miller: To Carl's comment on the panels as shading structures, it works in a small space, but it can make a huge difference on the way a building looks.

Schwarz: I think that if we are going to review them, we should make very clear guidelines about them. We don't know what future BAR members are going to decide. If we crafted guidelines soon enough could they be approved with these changes?

Scala: I think council wants to adopt these changes in August. I think we can change our ordinances for review subsequently. I don't know that we want to change the HCD guidelines again so soon.

Elliot: Based on the planning commission's recommendation, is to move it forward to council with an enactment clause, so that it is paused for the BARs recommendations.

Balut: If we could label them as an addition than that could be under our purview.

Scala: We also want to make sure that the panels small enough to not require a building permit will still require review in an ADC district. I will make sure that that is covered. I will mention in the "in aggregate" comment and the concern with the changing structures. I will relay that the BAR is in support of solar.

Notes:

- In general, the BAR wants to encourage solar energy systems but still wants to review them as they have been doing.
- In historic conservation districts, ordinance changes are needed in order to continue to review solar panels that are visible additions to a building. They are clearly additions to the historic fabric.
- In ADC districts it is unclear whether the BAR can continue to review freestanding solar structures that are too small to require a building permit. Ordinance changes may be necessary for the BAR to continue to be able to review them.

- The BAR wanted to alert the Planning Commission that, everywhere, not only in historic districts, a 15- ft solar structure (for instance on a parking garage) could cover the entire rooftop of a building which would change the massing. They did not know if that would be an issue.
- Under Sec 34-1101 a (2) it was suggested that “in aggregate” be added to the text so it would not be interpreted that each type of item could, by itself, cover 25% of the roof.

9. BAR Recommendation for Court Square Markers

Mary Joy Scala presented the staff report.

Miller: I am proud of these; we have been working on them for a long time.

Sarafin: The signs look very handsome

Schwarz: How would these handle spray paint?

Gastinger: I think they are great. The white text on the captions may be hard to read. Because of the way that the numbers are located in the titles, they are not in the same place

Motion: Schwarz moved that the BAR endorse the [Historic Resource Committee’s proposed] Court Square Markers. Gastinger seconded. Motion approved (7-0).

10. PLACE report

Tim Mohr was not in attendance, so there was no PLACE report update.

The BAR wants to begin the review of ADC guidelines and suggested meeting every other month during the lunch hour for 1.5 hours.

F. Adjournment 7:55p.m.