

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes
June 16, 1998

Present:

Joan Fenton (Chair)
Joe Celentano
Jessie Hook
Brent Nelson
Jay Oschrin
Ken Schwartz
Linda Winner

Also Present
Tarpley Vest

~~Miss Fenton Clerk~~

At 5:05 Ms. Fenton convened the meeting. She indicated that staff presents a report for each application and that the applicants, public and board members will each be given the opportunity to comment and ask questions. She indicated that some issues may be resolved fairly quickly and that long comments may not be necessary.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the first formal application on the agenda might be resolved quickly. She asked the board if they would like to review and vote on that application first.

Townhouses of Second Street

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the copper roof is an improved material. Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the new copper roof.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. The motion was approved with Ms. Fenton, Ms. Hook, and Mr. Celentano voting in favor and with Ms. Winner abstaining.

Union Station Restaurant

Mr. Joe Phillips of Osteen Phillips Architects introduced himself. He indicated that he was not on the agenda but that he would like to present a preliminary concept to the board for comment. He indicated that he had a schematic design and that he wanted to get the board's comments and input from the beginning.

He indicated that he was working on a design for a restaurant in Union Station. He indicated that there were a couple of proposed exterior elements. He indicated a proposed additional exit stair. He indicated that the stair is a code requirement and that they intend upstairs dining. He indicated a proposed wooden fence and a walk in cooler be placed behind the building. He indicated that this would be a ground level walk in cooler. He indicated that they proposed this as an exterior element because they did not want to punch into the interior space. He indicated that the stair addition would be brick with a pitched roof. He indicated that it was possible for the stair enclosure to have vertical siding. He indicated that he is trying to build a discreet separate element that responds to what is there. Mr. Phillips asked the board for preliminary comments and questions.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it is hard to orient the drawing without having the opportunity to visit the site.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is hard to orient the drawing without seeing the adjacent building.

Mr. Celentano indicated that it would be useful in the drawings to see the baggage building and to see how it works all the way through.

Ms. Fenton asked if the stair was required by code.

Mr. Phillips answered yes. He indicated that the public would need quick egress from the second floor and the rooftop patio.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the problem of introducing the cooler into the interior space creates the same type of problem on the exterior. He asked about the roof pitch.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the roof is a pitched shed roof that comes back to the low sloped roof.

Ms. Fenton asked if the project was receiving rehabilitation tax credits.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he was not sure. He indicated that he is working with the tenant rather than the building owner.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the gable element is new.

Mr. Phillips indicated that it is a balancing act. He indicated that he wants to develop something that is distinctly different and something that reads as three different parts.

At this point Mr. Clark arrived.

Mr. Celentano indicated that he wonders about the brick next to the main brick building mass.

Mr. Schwarz indicated that he has preliminary comments. He indicated that the three elements look uncomfortable. He indicated that they don't look like they relate to each other and that they compete with the existing building. He indicated that he understands that it is a tough problem and that the backside is not as loaded as if it were facing main street.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he does not want to minimize the back of the building.

Mr. Celentano asked if the whole building would be used as a restaurant.

Mr. Phillips answered yes.

Mr. Celentano asked if the refrigerator courtyard could be looked down into from the road.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the issue had not been addressed yet.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the issue is critical.

Red Roof Inn Cafe

Mr. Mark Aston of the Red Roof Inn introduced himself and indicated that they are interested in

having an outdoor café for the Chesapeake Bagel Bakery and the Hard Times Café. He indicated that he would use black wrought iron furniture to be consistent with the other furniture in the area.

Ms. Fenton indicated that he would need council permission for the location of the café space. She indicated that the board only reviews the appearance of the café furniture.

Mr. Aston indicated that they want to keep the furniture secure by securing it under the brick. He indicated that they intended to use a unit all in one piece.

Ms. Hook asked if all the furniture would be attached as a single unit.

Mr. Aston indicated that it is easier if it is all attached as a single unit. He indicated that it would actually be attached to the ground.

Ms. Fenton asked if the furniture would be on city property or the Red Roof Inn property.

Mr. Aston indicated that it would be on the Red Rood Inn property.

Mr. Nelson asked if there were Design Guidelines for furniture on the corner.

Ms. Vest indicated that the Design Guidelines were written to address all historic properties in the city but that the Design Guidelines for Cafés refer directly to the Downtown Mall.

Ms. Fenton indicated that existing café furniture on the corner is primarily black metal.

Ms. Nelson asked if the furniture would be on city property.

Mr. Aston indicated that the existing brick pavers are on his property.

Ms. Hook indicated that the furniture is unattractive. She indicated that she prefers separate tables and chairs. She indicated that the furniture might also be hard to get in and out of.

A member of the public indicated that there might be an accessibility issue with the tables.

Ms. Winner indicated that the furniture falls within the Design Guidelines and that she has no objections.

Mr. Nelson indicated that the furniture is a problem. He indicated that the general design is not very attractive. He indicated that the detached furniture gives more of a café feel to the Downtown Mall and the Corner. He indicated that the attached units get away from that café feel.

Mr. Celentano, Mr. Clark, Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Fenton each indicated that they agree with Mr. Nelson's comments.

Mr. Celentano made a motion for administrative approval by staff of metal-framed furniture similar to other café furniture on the corner.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Young Men's Shop New Door

Staff presented the report.

Lisa Murphy, applicant, indicated that the doorstep would be a simple U shape. Ms. Murphy indicated the doorstep is a safety issue for them.

Mr. Nelson asked if the idea was to keep the door from swinging out 180 degrees.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the doorstep was intended to keep pedestrians from getting in the path of the door.

A member of the public suggested that planters could be used instead.

Mr. Clark indicated that he wasn't sure if the doorstep would be a problem for vision impaired people.

Ms. Fenton asked if a planter would be used on either side of the door.

Ms. Murphy indicated that there are problems with planters. She indicated that she thought they would be harder to get approved by the city. She indicated that flowerbeds on the mall are vandalized. She indicated that the doorstep simply projects from the building and doesn't actually touch the mall.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there are other doors that open onto the Mall.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that those doors are grandfathered.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he wished that they did not have to do this.

Ms. Murphy indicated that the new door has to be wide enough to meet ADA even though it is a door to a staircase.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that people will run into the doorstep at some point.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he would like to ask, can the BAR exercise some influence that this is a bad thing to do to the Mall and to the building.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that the doorstep will not be very visible.

Mr. Clark indicated that the element is subtle. He indicated that an 18" doorstep is highly visible while a 9" doorstep is hardly visible. He indicated that there is a question of visual intrusion.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he would like to ask the city to consider a 6" intrusion. He indicated that 6 inches is a lot subtler. He indicated that there is a big difference between 6 and 12 inches.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board could ask the city to reconsider.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the doorstep as submitted with a strong recommendation to the city that they consider allowing a six-inch version of the doorstep because it is far less obtrusive and obvious.

Ms. Winner seconded the motion. The motion was approved with Mr. Celentano, Ms. Hook, and Mr. Nelson and Mr. Oschirin voting in favor and with Ms. Fenton abstaining.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the door as submitted.

Mr. Nelson asked about the hardware for the new door.

Ms. Murphy indicated that they would be using original hardware from the original doors of the building.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Clark indicated that he had a comment about the west wall of the Young Men's Shop

building. He indicated that the workmanship is of low quality.

Ms. Vest indicated that Mr. Kuttner was aware of the board's concerns and that he had indicated that he is not finished working on the windows yet.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he would not put any other windows on any other building in the future.

Ms. Fenton asked Mr. Kuttner if the intent is to finish the interior and then to finish the windows.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that they plan to finish the interior and then to do the west windows.

Miller and Rhodes; SNL Securities

Staff presented the report.

Mr. Kuttner indicated that he was also dissatisfied with the mortar color on the west elevation of the Young Men's Shop Building.

Mr. Clark indicated that he had concerns about the masonry, woodwork, joints, and with the poor installation.

Mr. Train, applicant, introduced himself and indicated that Train and Spencer Architects was retained by SNL Securities. He indicated that they intend to remove the tinted and spandrel panel glass. He indicated that the existing window frames would be retained. He indicated that he intends to remove the interior Sheetrock. He indicated that they were suggesting eight large windows on the east elevation centered on one large opening and repeated on the west elevation. He indicated that the windows on the West Side do not meet code.

Mr. Train indicated that SNL Securities will use the 4th street entry as a main entry. He indicated that they intend to establish a corporate identity at the entry. He indicated that they will bring stucco out beyond the existing doorframe. He indicated that the canopy and the stucco are

intended to give some presence to the entrance. Mr. Train indicated that the Charleston Green was chosen because it would help the frame to recede. He indicated that the original building had white frames.

Mr. Train indicated that the budget requires keeping the frames.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the glass sample.

Mr. Train indicated that the idea was to use the sandblasted glass to be compatible with the idea of the clear glass.

Ms. Hook asked Mr. Train about the tinted sidewalk.

Mr. Train indicated that they were proposing a canopy, which meets the city and BOCA codes. He indicated that they would receive approval from the City Manager for the canopy. He indicated that they intend to polish and stain the concrete in order to obtain a doormat effect. He indicated that the idea is to allow the concrete color to slide out from the lobby.

Ms. Winner asked about the color of the tint.

Mr. Train indicated that the interior colors are copper and green. He indicated a weathered copper is the color that SNL is using in their corporate identity.

Ms. Hook indicated that if the concrete tint were to be used a lot in the city it could look like a patchwork.

Ms. Gleason asked if the original outdoor restaurant on the top of the building had been enclosed.

Mr. Train indicated that originally the columns on the upper terrace stood free. He indicated that they are now glassed in. He indicated that SNL plans to use all the interior space.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the proposal looks fine. He indicated that he understands the concern about the concrete. He indicated that he would like to keep the continuity along the 4th Street side. He indicated that the proposal looks great.

Mr. Clark indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz. He indicated that the applicant could modify the texture but that a different color might not work.

Mr. Schwartz indicated the present proposal is fairly subtle and modest. He indicated that it is an improvement and that it will be a much nicer building as a result. He indicated that he is thrilled by the retail use on the mall and he is very enthusiastic.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the color of the canopy.

Mr. Train indicated that it would be white.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the use of retail at the main entrance is great. He indicated that he likes the interior piece coming out. He indicated that he does not find the tinted concrete to be as much of an issue in this spot on 4th Street. He indicated that there are not a lot of competing uses on the street and this offers something to break the street up.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Celentano on the sidewalk issue. He indicated that the new window glass and the retail use in the front will give life to the Mall.

Ms. Winner indicated that she approves of the proposal and that she is not opposed to the tinted concrete.

Ms. Hook indicated that she approves of all except the tinted concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Clark indicated that an option is to vary the texture of the walk without varying the color.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she approves of most aspects of the project. She indicated that the

applicant could come back with the sidewalk when he knows the color. She indicated that she likes the fact that there will be retail on that street.

Mr. Train indicated that the present idea is that the concrete would be a consistent material between the interior and exterior of the building. He indicated they would like to mark the doorway.

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the exception of the colored concrete. Mr. Clark indicated that the concrete could be submitted at a later date.

Ms. Hook seconded Mr. Clark's motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Lewis and Clark Square Canopy

Mr. Casero, applicant, introduced himself and indicated that he would like to apologize for the lack of communication over the canopy. He indicated that thought and design went into the canopy. He indicated that there have been continuous problems at the west entrance due to water. He indicated that the top of the canopy is flat for reduced uplift. He indicated that the color scheme is the same as the existing canopy. He indicated that the posts are the brown of the downspouts and the blue is the blue of the tiles.

Ms. Fenton asked about the snow buildup on the canopy.

Mr. Casero indicated that the canopy has a snow bearing weight of 24 inches. He indicated that they have problems of water coming into the building. He indicated that the distance is based on rain coming in. He indicated that the canopy is well designed for snow load.

Mr. Oschrin asked about the material of the platform.

Mr. Casero indicated that the platform is aluminum.

Mr. Nelson asked about the top of the structure.

Mr. Casero indicated that it is white in color.

Ms. Gleason indicated that the awning is very unattractive and looks temporary.

Ms. Toledano asked if the canopy had been torn.

Mr. Casero indicated that the awning was flipped up in the picture. He indicated that they would probably come back to the Board with a lightning rod system soon.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he saw lightning strike the cornice.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he is uncomfortable that the awning is up and that the board is in a tough position.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board's job is to look at the project as if it was not built yet.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he would like to express dismay at being in this position again.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that it is hard to imagine what he would like there and what would look attractive.

Mr. Oschrin asked if there is any contingency plan for awnings.

Mr. Casero indicated that they used good expensive material for the awning. He indicated that the wind in this location will be a big factor.

Ms. Winner indicated that the awning meets the guidelines and that she does not see a conflict.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is a difficult situation. He indicated that the building was not designed with an awning in mind.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that what bothers him is that had an architect been involved he would have understood the need for approval and integration for the awning. He indicated that instead this went to an awning contractor. He indicated that as a process matter this is a design problem. He indicated that water concerns are legitimate and serious concerns. He indicated that it is a design issue to solve the problems rather than just put up a canopy. He indicated that it is a shame that this occurred without an architect involved.

Mr. Casero indicated that the architect for the building should have anticipated this problem. He indicated that an architect in the building was consulted and responded that the awning should be of the same colors. He indicated that he understood that staff was contacted. He indicated that they received a building permit.

Ms. Vest indicated that she understood that the applicant did not receive a building permit or approval prior to installation.

Mr. Clark indicated that it is reasonable to defer the application to do research to determine if they were issued a building permit prior to installation.

Mr. Clark moved to defer the application until the next regular meeting in order to determine if a building permit had been obtained.

Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion. He indicated that he understands the attempt to use several of the elements. He indicated that it looks very temporary, provisional, and not well designed. He indicated that he questions the whole idea of a fabric valance dressing an aluminum awning. He indicated that he is not comfortable and that he is interested in finding out the process issues.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. Clark's motion was unanimously approved.

Monsoon Café

John Rhett, applicant, introduced himself and indicated that Monsoon café was moving to the location on Market Street. He indicated that they would move the entrance from Market Street to 2nd Street to address accessibility issues and for safety reasons. He indicated that the side entrance would include a ramp. He indicated that they would use a fabric fencing for privacy.

Ms. Fenton asked if this material had been used anywhere else.

Mr. Rhett indicated that it has been used in other places and in a residential setting. He indicated that he was not able to obtain a sample of the material before the meeting. He indicated that the material would be an off white material and that it would be a lot more transparent than the samples he had. He indicated that the material would be stretched tight across the frame. He indicated that the iron gates were inspired by the 9 over 1 windows. He indicated that the gates would use the same square pattern. He indicated that the gate would be a simple wrought iron grid.

Ms. Hook asked what would be done in the case of vandalism to the canvas awning.

Mr. Rhett indicated that vandalism is a concern for all buildings.

Ms. Hook asked if vandalism is something that can be coped with on canvas.

Mr. Rhett indicated that the canvas could be replaced.

Ms. Hook indicated that the HVAC is on the outside of the building. She indicated that it will need to be baffled if people are to sit outside and eat and drink.

Mr. Celentano asked about the relationship of the courtyard to the fence screen. He asked if there is a step up to the yard.

Mr. Rhett indicated that they would need to pave the yard with slate. He indicated that there is a

tree that they will make an attempt to save. He indicated that they will have to build a deck for the tree and that the roots are pervasive near the surface. He indicated that the fence was chose because of level of change and line of site issues.

Mr. Clark asked about the decision to separate the dining terrace from the public realm.

Mr. Rhett indicated that the decision is related to traffic and noise on Market Street.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that there are places such as Duval Street in Key West where dining on the street is a delightful thing. He indicated that there is a section change that separates the terrace from the street. He indicated that he is very uncomfortable with the nylon making a strong intrusion into the eyes of the street. He indicated that the proposal is wonderful but that he is very uncomfortable with the screening and the posts. He indicated that he was initially concerned about the canopies on the side elevation but that he understands the reasons for protecting the entrance and for because of the strong western sun.

Ms. Fenton indicated that her concerns are the same as the others. She indicated that it will be wonderful to have this be a restaurant. She indicated in regards to the screening that if you see people dining in a restaurant you will want to go in. She indicated that this is the case at Mono Loco.

Mr. Rhett indicated that Mono Loco has used stucco wall fences.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it is an issue of height.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that on this site there is an issue that there is no parking lane there and no barrier to transition from the street to the patio. He indicated that he supports having the wall there. He indicated that he is happy to see the use of a new material other than brick or wood. He indicated that he would like to know how it will wear over time. He indicated that the lights over the fence posts appear to be floating in space.

Ms. Gleason indicated that she is glad to see the building become a restaurant again.

A member of the public indicated that she recently moved from Texas. She indicated that she supports the canvas fencing. She indicated that this material is used in Texas and that in one example kids painted a mural on an awning. She indicated that it would be exciting to see that happen.

Mr. Rhett indicated that the property owner supports the idea of art and that she recognizes her close proximity to McGuffey.

Ms. Fenton indicated that it is important that the property owner is aware that it may be graffitied and need to be replaced.

The member of the public indicated that in Texas they got the kids involved as a solution to the graffiti problem.

Mr. Nelson indicated that there is a lot of graffiti downtown and that a lot of people do not repaint it. He indicated that canvas is even harder to replace and that if there is graffiti on canvas we may have to look at it even longer.

Mr. Clark indicated that he does not think that the canvas is a good idea. He indicated that the wind on this site is strong and it may give the material trouble. He indicated that the translucent material may be lovely but may also be subject to more abuse. He indicated that it may become ripped and dirty. He indicated that a cotton overhang could define a room without completely separating the space from the street.

Mr. Rhett indicated that they considered a cotton overhang. He indicated that they are not married to the idea of the canvas wall. He indicated that they want to get started with the project.

Ms. Fenton indicated that the board could separate the fencing out and approve the other elements.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he has not seen graffiti on Mono Loco.

Ms. Fenton indicated that this will be a good surface for graffiti.

Ms. Schwartz indicated that this could be wonderful but that he is uncomfortable with this in this location.

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the application as submitted excluding the fence.

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Fenton indicated to Mr. Rhett that he can begin the project, excluding the fence.

100 W South Street

Staff presented the report.

Roulhoc Toledano indicated that she has revised the original design. She indicated that the addition follows the guidelines. She indicated that the issue is that the addition needs to be finished in an attractive way. She indicated that when she built the original addition the BAR told her that warehouses should have utilitarian structures on their roof. She showed a plan of the roof and indicated that the building is not impacting the roof to a great extent. She indicated that the purpose of the building is to make the roof secure. She indicated that an overhang on the Garrett Street side would repeat the overhang on the south. She indicated that the newly proposed overhang brings out the old building. She indicated that the new building sticks out less than 12 inches from the rear. She indicated that the rhythm is improved. She indicated that she is proposing casement openings to match the existing door facing to the west. She indicated that she is proposing three simple clarestory windows. She indicated that the idea of the T1-11 siding is to create the effect of board and batten. She indicated that she will cover over the north and south and the side of the structure. She indicated that she doesn't think that anyone will know the material from the street.

Mr. Clark asked if a building permit had been issued for the addition.

The answer was no.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he is unclear about the specific design proposal he is being asked vote on.

Ms. Toledano pointed out the proposed drawing and indicated the three clerestory windows.

A member of the public asked about the doors.

Ms. Toledano indicated that the doors on the North elevation would be casement with a simple cornice line. She indicated that the south side would have an overhang to match the recessed element of the existing building.

Mr. Nelson indicated that it is ironic that the most awkward elements are where the two buildings come together and yet that it the most visible part from the street. He indicated that the new proposal does not address the main concern about the way that the two additions come together in an awkward fashion. He indicated that the shed like slant is quite noticeable.

Ms. Toledano indicated that the elevation that you see is squared off and that they are raising the elevation considerably. She indicated that the purpose of the addition is to enhance the preservation of her warehouse. She indicated that there are shed roofs in town and that there are horizontal next to vertical buildings. She indicated that the pitched roof is appropriate for a classical building. She indicated that the addition follows the trapezoid of the building and the roofline.

Mr. Nelson indicated that he does not object to the pitched roof. He indicated that the problem is the way the two pitches meet in an awkward fashion.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the design responsibility relies on the applicant. Mr. Schwartz indicated that if he were the applicant he would get drawings, photographs and photographic examples of other rooftop structures. He indicated that he does not see any clearly stated design proposal. He indicated that he does not have a clear picture of what is proposed or how it is justified.

Mr. Clark indicated that the addition is more visible from 2nd Street near the Mall than from

anywhere else. He indicated that he totally agrees with Mr. Nelson's comments. He indicated that the design problem has to do with the awkward collision of two shapes. He indicated that the older addition is relatively comfortable on the roof. He indicated that the sides above the parapet are graceful. He indicated that it is trying to contrast with something more vertical.

Ms. Toledano indicated that the new addition could not pierce the roof. She indicated that the first addition was built from the elevator shaft.

Mr. Nelson asked if the new addition was set on decking, so to speak.

Ms. Toledano answered yes. She indicated that the interior of the room is quite nice. She indicated that the roofline could be lowered but that she did not want less than eight-foot ceilings.

Ms. Toledano indicated that she was following the guidelines by creating an addition that was clearly differentiated from the old.

Mr. Clark asked what guidelines Ms. Toledano was referring to.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that the guidelines are intended to be applied to a historic building with a contemporary addition.

Mr. Clark indicated that painting the addition white may not be the best thing to do for it. He indicated that he had a thought that the building may be metal clad. He indicated that the two forms are troubled at that corner.

Ms. Toledano indicated that if the two buildings were at the same height she is not sure if the addition would meet code. She indicated that she feels strongly that the guidelines require that you need to differentiate between the new and the old.

Ms. Fenton indicated that she has a sense that it is an awkward building that is incompatible and unrelated. She indicated that the building does not relate to the original structure.

Mr. Clark indicated that it is a matter of scale. He indicated that the original penthouse differentiated from the warehouse.

Mr. Celentano indicated that the drawings do not convince him that it is the right thing to do to build an addition here. He indicated that he needs to see a comprehensive proposal for how to deal with the condition.

Ms. Toledano indicated that the building needed to go on the west side of the roof. She indicated that she needed the storage.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he marvels at the brazenness of building this without a permit and that he is frightened by what it looks like. He indicated that this building should not be here. He indicated that he questions building additions on rooftops.

Mr. Oschrin made a motion to deny the application as submitted.

A member of the public indicated that more preparation could go into the idea of extending the roof.

Mr. Oschrin indicated that he thinks the BAR should take a stand.

Mr. Oschrin restated his motion to deny the application as submitted.

Ms. Fenton seconded the motion.

Mr. Nelson indicated that at the last meeting the board moved to not accept the application as presented and to allow time to come back to the board with a revised application. He indicated that he does not want to see a committee formed on this issue. He indicated that he wonders if we want to move to deny the application and ask for a redesign.

Ms. Winner indicated that this isn't a redesign but rather a recipe book with different ideas.

Ms. Toledano indicated that many people have enjoyed the roof. She indicated that the addition was built when she was not in town.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he supports the motion on the floor.

Ms. Toledano indicated that she would like to point out that many people have given input on the project and that she has won an award for infill.

Mr. Schwartz indicated that he thinks it is important to get a complete presentation

Ms. Fenton indicated that if the board denies the design the applicant has another month to submit another design.

Mr. Oschrin's motion was unanimously approved.

March 17 Minutes

Ms. Vest indicated that she had corrected the March 17 minutes. She indicated that on Page 12, after Mr. Clark's motion to approve demolition she added: "Ms. Hook seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved."

Mr. Schwartz moved to approve the March 17 minutes as corrected.

Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

May 19 Minutes

Mr. Schwartz moved to approved the May 19 minutes.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Winner moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Celentano seconded the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

At 7:00 PM the meeting was adjourned.