

MINUTES
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
OCTOBER 21, 1997

Members Present

Kurt Wassenaar, Chairman
Brent Nelson
James Oschrin
Ken Schwartz
Dawn Thompson
Linda Winner
Joan Fenton

Staff Present

Marcia Joseph

Meeting convened at 5:00 PM.

Kurt Wassenaar began the meeting by explaining the review process. He suggested that the approval of the minutes be moved to the end of the meeting. The rest of the board agreed.

The veteran and new members then introduced themselves.

BAR 97-10-26 118 West Main Street

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Mr. Wassenaar asked questions about the materials and the signage.

Ms. Julia Williams, architect representing the project, said that she didn't know if she could reuse all of the materials. She said that what they replaced would match the existing, and that they have not selected the door yet.

Mr. Oschrin asked what would be happening on the left hand side.

Ms. Williams said that it would stay the same.

Mr. Oschrin asked if you could still get the black glass.

Ms. Williams said that she is not sure that it is all glass now, that some had been replaced with black painted Plexiglas.

Brent Nelson asked what would happen to the doors on the other side.

Ms. Fenton said that they would stay the same.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the current accessibility code would require some modifications to the entrance.

Mr. Oschrein said that he would like to look at the building as a whole.

Ms. Joseph unfolded the drawing illustrating the side of the building.

Mr. Oschrein asked if the windows had muntins.

Ms. Williams explained that only the lower windows were proposed, the upper windows were existing.

Mr. Wassenaar asked what material the new door system was.

Ms. Williams said that she thought it would be aluminum, and that the existing door was wood painted black.

There was discussion concerning the fact that wooden doors would be desirable.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there was any comment from the public.

Mr. Oschrein said that he felt the doors were a very important component.

Mary Bess Johnson said that she agreed that wooden doors should be used.

Andrew Neveles, tenant for the proposed improved area, said that the texture of the wood was not apparent, and that the metal door would not take away from the texture of the building.

Oliver Kuttner, owner, said that the Advanced Auto doors looked good and that he would like to use old wooden doors.

Mr. Wassenaar then closed the meeting to the public.

Ms. Fenton said that she would abstain from voting, because she was moving her business into the other side of the building.

Ms. Thompson said that the proposal seemed OK but was missing a few details, and wondered if there would be administrative approval of the materials.

Mr. Schwartz said that he was unsure of the history of the site elevation, and that he was not sure where that stood in the approval process.

Ms. Joseph then explained the history of the review of the side street elevation.

Mr. Oschrin said that he thought the proposal looked good.

Mr. Nelson said that it was good to see the center middle door back, and explained that it had been there when the building was used as a grocery store. He said that he would like to see wood doors.

Mr. Wassenaar said that there was a problem with wood doors. He said that there was a lack of detail on how the door fits into the glass wall, and that the details were fairly significant. He said he was prepared to see this proposal move forward, and supports it conceptually, and suggested administrative approval. He asked if there would be signs on the building.

Ms. Williams answered that there would be a neon sign in the window.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if there was any exterior lighting planned.

Ms. Williams answered that there was not.

Mr. Wassenaar moved to approve the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1) **Administrative approval of the final details including but not limited to:
materials proposed
colors proposed**

- 2) **Administrative review committee consisting of the following members:
Jay Oschrin
Dawn Thompson
Brent Nelson**

The motion was seconded by Linda Winner. The motion was approved unanimously, with Joan Fenton abstaining.

BAR 97-10-27 106 & 108 South Street

Ms. Joseph presented the staff report.

Jim Grigg, architect, spoke representing the H & R Block proposal. He said that they needed two entrances, and that he was working with Grover Smiley to discuss the access required. He said that he was not committed to the light fixtures proposed or the anodized aluminum. He was more concerned to determine if the concept was acceptable. He said that he would work with H & R Block concerning the signs.

Kurt Wassenaar said that conceptual approval of the signs could be discussed.

Mr. Grigg stated that the electric service could not be moved, and that the awnings had been added to mitigate the effects of the awning.

Mr. Oschrein asked why the electric service could not be moved.

Mr. Grigg said that moving the electric was not seen as part of the work proposed. He said that the building and the electric service would be painted white.

Mr. Oschrein asked if there were two apartments upstairs.

Mr. Grigg said that there was an office and apartments and storage upstairs.

Mr. Oschrein asked about the air conditioner units and whether or not they could be removed.

Mr. Nelson said he would like to see a sample of the cobalt blue awning material.

Mr. Grigg said that the awning would not be a shiny canvass.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if any member of the public would like to address the topic.

Martha Gleason said that her only objection was to the cobalt blue awning.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the BAR in the past had approved pieces of the building. He suggested that the record should contain a recommendation that if any successive improvements were made to the facade of the building that the electric service be moved.

Mr. Oschrein suggested that Mr. Wassenaar was the institutional memory of the BAR.

Mr. Wassenaar said that Ms. Joseph did research the projects and brought information about the project to the BAR. He said that he had a problem with the sign proposed, and a problem with relocating the light fixture, and thought it should be replaced with a new fixture. He said that he had no problem with the door and no problem with the cobalt blue color.

Ms. Fenton said that she agrees with Mr. Wassenaar regarding the sign, and that the lights should match and that the doors should all match or compliment each other. She said that she would like to see the colors and the materials.

Ms. Winner said that the proposal would be a big improvement and that she likes the cobalt blue color.

Ms. Thompson said that the sign proposed would be an eyesore and that the awning and building color must be coordinating colors. The sign shown on the drawing looked more appropriate than the cabinet sign proposed.

Ms. Fenton suggested that they decide what to do with the signs before they chose the colors for the awning.

Mr. Swartz asked about the plane of the doors.

Mr. Grigg said that the doors would be pushed back.

Mr. Swartz said that both bays should be pushed back the same distance, because matching all doors was important. He said he thought that painting out the facade and painting out the conduit would be a big improvement.

Mr. Grigg stated that one of the lines would be eliminated and pulled off the building.

Mr. Oschrin asked if they had the ability to change the electric.

Mr./ Wassenaar answered only if the service changes.

Mr. Oschrin asked if this was the only light fixture they were considering.

Mr. Wassenaar said that this was a good fixture.

Mr. Nelson said that he objected to the internally lit sign. He said that the facade treatment was a big improvement, but he objected to the aluminum store front, because it is inappropriate in context. He wondered if the electrical could be boxed in. He also questioned the lights. He said he was opposed to the cobalt blue awning.

Mr. Nelson also wondered if the side of the building was going to be painted.

Mr. Francolini said that Mr. Marshall, owner of the building, would be painting the side.

Mr. Grigg stated that the entrance was workable and that Grover Smiley had seen it.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he would like to see a wood system installed that would keep the storefront in character. He said that all the doors should match, the colors and systems should match and that he was not concerned about the light fixtures proposed.

Mr. Swartz asked if the project pushed back if the board would have jurisdiction over it.

Mr. Wassenaar talked about encroachment.

Ms. Fenton asked if the intent of the BAR was to give as much information to the applicant to begin work on the project.

Mr. Wassenaar said that it was the intent to give the project a general OK and that is to grant a certificate with conditions.

Ms. Fenton asked if the time frame was important.

Mr. Wassenaar said that it has been the inclination to approve the project, but put it in pieces.

Ms. Fenton moved to approve the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1) Approval of the three doors, this includes:
material
color
- 2) Matching the three doors
- 3) Approval of the light fixtures proposed
- 4) Using matching light fixtures across the face of the building
- 5) Approval of awning color
- 6) Approval of building paint color
- 7) painting electrical apparatus on the front to match the building paint color
- 8) Wood as an alternative facade was encouraged
- 9) Signage is considered a separate issue, the cabinet signs were not approved

The motion was seconded by Dawn Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

BAR 97-10-28 205 Fifth Street SW

Mr. Cotton, contractor representing the owner, explained the request to place an addition onto the side rear of the building.

Ms. Joseph stated that staff could support the request.

Ms. Fenton asked if there were any windows on the addition.

Mr. Wassenaar asked what form the roof took.

Mr. Cotton answered that there were no windows proposed, and that the roof would be shed with asphalt shingles.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the slope of the existing porch roof should be followed.

Mr. Oschrein asked if the porch would remain.

Mr. Cotton said that the porch would remain.

There was general discussion concerning the windows.

Mr. Oschrein asked why the item was being reviewed.

Staff explained that the property was individually designated as a historic structure in the City Code.

Mr. Swartz asked what the base material was.

Mr. Cotton said that the addition would be placed on piers.

Mr. Swartz then asked how far to ground was the finished floor.

Mr. Cotton said that grade was 5' below the finished floor.

Mr. Swartz said that he felt it was important to continue the same system existing on the other parts of the building.

Mr. Wassenaar asked how the new roof worked.

Mr. Cotton said that the new roof would butt onto the old 5'x5' roof.

Mr. Wassenaar said that they might want to continue with a hip roof.

Mr. Oschrein said that he would like to see more drawings.

Ms. Winner said that she was most concerned about the wood siding and the roof.

Ms. Fenton said that she thought the roof was important.

Mr. Wassenaar said that he felt the window should match the style and type of the porch. He said that the detail of the foundation should match. The siding should be a vertical board joint and corner boards. He said that 2 elevations should show a window detail. He also said that the proposed roof should be integrated into the existing porch roof.

Kurt Wassenaar moved to approve the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1) Approval of the detail of the foundation**
- 2) approval of two elevations**

- 3) Approval of window detail
- 4) Integrating the existing porch roof into the proposed porch roof
- 5) Approval of roof material and color
- 6) Approval of natural siding material and color
- 7) Approval committee consists of;
Ken Swartz
Dawn Thompson
Jay Oschrin

The motion was seconded by Jay Oschrin, and approved unanimously.

Ms. Thompson suggested that staff inform the applicant of the revolving loan fund.

BAR 97-10- 29 222 & 224 Court Square

Ms. Joseph explained that the front wall of the building was deteriorating, and that this item was before the board to expedite the process to ensure that the building would receive the maintenance that is required.

Mary Bess Johnson, owner, stated that they would like to use the old brick but she didn't think it was feasible. She said that they would like to use new brick, reuse the old windows. She said that she would replace the door on the right with a smaller 1800's door. She also said that there would be wooden shutters on the windows.

Mr. Oschrin asked if they will repair the original windows and trim.

Ms. Johnson said that they would.

Mr. Wassenaar asked why it was falling.

Ms. Johnson said that it was because the joists were parallel to the outside wall.

Mr. Wassenaar asked what the depth of the wall was.

Ms. Johnson said that it was three bricks./

Mr. Wassenaar said that he was concerned with building walls and that the brick would not match.

Ms. Johnson said that it was trouble and expense to clean the brick.

Ms. Winner asked how close the sample brick was to the existing brick in color.

Ms. Johnson said that this was the closest they could find.

Mr. Swartz said that he agreed with Mr. Wassenaar concerning the brick. He wondered if there were shutters on the buildings surrounding this building.

The discussion revealed that buildings in the area did have shutters.

Mr. Swartz left at 6:30 PM.

Ms. Johnson said that the two adjacent buildings had used new brick to rebuilt walls.

Mr. Wassenaar urged Ms. Johnson to get a 2nd opinion on the bricks. He said that the National guidelines call for bricks and mortar to match the side wall exactly.

Mr. Wassenaar then stated that he applauded the applicant for repairing the building but stressed that a schedule would be necessary to repair the entire building.

Ms. Johnson then explained that they have been entangled in a legal process because part of the building encroached onto their neighbor's property.

Mr. Wassenaar explained that the back porch must be repaired. He said that he was concerned about the building and that he wanted to help the applicant move forward to stabilize the building, and recommended that the entire building needed attention. He said that he was respectful of the concern over the cost of repair, and that if it was not possible to reuse the brick that they must find a match to the brick as close as humanly possible.

Mr. Nelson said that he was glad to see the something done and he would like to see it done with old brick.

Ms. Fenton asked if anyone on the board knew of a mason that cleaned and reused old brick.

Mr. Tabackman said that Gabe Silverman had used old brick.

Mr. Wassenaar said that they had a lot of valuable brick and that they should look into reusing the brick as most cost effective. He also said that the applicant should construct a sample panel on site.

Ms. Johnson asked why the other two renovations had used brick that didn't match.

Mr. Wassenaar said that the board had required this in the past.

Ms. Winner asked what color the shutters were. The answer was green.

Mr. Oschrin moved to approve the certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

- 1) Approval of reuse of the old brick to rebuild the wall or use of new brick matching exactly the brick on the side walls of the building. In either case, the proposed mortar should match exactly the existing mortar in color and strike detail.
- 2) It is highly recommended that the entire building is repaired in conjunction with the reconstruction of the front wall.

The motion was seconded by Brent Nelson, and approved unanimously.

BAR 97-10-30 Foods of All Nations - Appeal

Ms Joseph explained the appeal from administrative approval to use a green color on the standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Wassenaar explained that the property was on an entrance corridor, and that the director of planning and community development had the ability to approve designs administratively. The director had determined that the roof should be painted a brown or gray, not green.

The board voted unanimously to allow the green standing seam metal roof.

BAR 97-08-21 Wyn Owens - Demolition

The board discussed the letter received from Mr. Owens stating that moving the building located at 110 10 1/2 Street was not cost effective.

Mr. Wassenaar moved to deny the demolition request.

Mr. Oschrin seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously to deny the demolition request.

West Main Street Guidelines

Mr. Oschrin stated that he did not think that the walk through was informational. He handed out a discussion of the process.

Mr. Wassenaar agreed that there were a lot of pieces to the project and that it was important enough not to sandwich it in between items. He said that they should make another time to discuss the issue.

The board determined that they would meet on Tuesday November 4, 1997 at 5 PM. They asked if snacks could be provided.

Mr. Wassenaar asked if approval of the minutes could be postponed until November 4, 1997 meeting.

Mr. Wassenaar then discussed the fact that he would be leaving the board and that the board should vote for a new chair and vice chair.

Mr. Oschrein indicated that he would be interested in serving as Vice Chair.

Mr. Wassenaar nominated Joan Fenton for Chair, and Jay Oschrein for Vice Chair.

Brent Nelson seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30PM.