

MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
JANUARY 26, 1988
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT

Robert Moje, Chairman
Larry Herbert
Rob Freer
Margaret VanYahres
Jean Hiatt

ABSENT

Don Sours
Douglas Gilpin

STAFF PRESENT

Fred Boger

Mr. Moje called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

A. MINUTES

Mr. Freer moved to approve the minutes of the December 22, 1987 meeting with the following corrections: Page 1, second paragraph of item 1 - change Mr. Booker to Mrs. Booker. The motion was seconded by Mr. Herbert and unanimously approved by all members present:

B. APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 88-1-296

804 East Jefferson Street
Relocation, Demolition, New Construction
Bosworth Parks Development Corp.

Mr. Boger stated that Bosworth Parks Development Corporation has submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following exterior work:

- Relocate the original Carter-Gilmer outbuilding as shown on the site plan.
- Demolish the remaining accessory buildings on the site (does not include the Carter-Gilmer House).
- Construction of 19 new residential condominiums with underground parking.

Staff has reviewed the plans and has no major objections to the concept as presented pending submission of final details. However, we have the following comments:

- a) The Landmarks Commission has discussed the proposed relocation of the out-building and it is our understanding they have no major objections to the relocation. However, the Commission did have some concerns about the historic significance of the remaining buildings

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Two

to be demolished. The Commission decided to visit the property and research the history of the buildings to be demolished. The information available to us at the present time indicates that there were two buildings at the rear of the property in 1896, however we do not know if the current structures are the original buildings.

- b) We would like to see more landscaping incorporated into the site. The final landscaping plan must be approved by the Board.
- c) Outdoor lighting fixtures should not be mounted in the trees.
- d) Details on the proposed carport must be submitted for review and approval.
- e) Since the project abuts the Downtown Architectural Design Control District, we have submitted the plans to the DBAR for comment.
- f) Based on the data submitted, the Architects have tried to be sensitive to the historic character of the Carter-Gilmer House in developing the plans for this project. We would like to thank them for this effort.

Mr. Boger further stated that the basic criteria for use in evaluating this project or any project are: Harmony of scale; harmony of materials, textures, colors and motifs; impact on the surrounding environment; and historic or architectural significance of the proposed action. It should be noted that few projects, whether minor additions and alterations or new construction, can expect to fully satisfy all of these specific criteria. However, if you keep these concepts in mind when developing a particular project, then it should result in a more appropriate development for the City. Although these criteria appears to stress harmony and unity, the intent is not to prevent variety which is as important to the character of the ADC District as any other element.

Mr. Boger stated that staff is very concerned about the Board referring Certificate of Appropriateness to the Landmarks Commission for review and approval. The purpose of the Landmarks Commission is to recommend to City Council, structures, landmarks, sites, etc., which should be designated historic and made subject to the ADC regulations. It is the responsibility of the BAR to consider demolition and/or relocation of structures, and the structural integrity of the buildings, new construction, etc., not the Landmarks Commission. Each time an application is referred to the Landmarks Commission, the review process is significantly increased. The Board has a specified time period in which to act on an application and the Board should act on the application as quickly as possible.

Mr. Freer asked what is the time time? Mr. Boger responded, sixty days.

Mr. Moje said he disagreed and felt that the Board could request for additional information from the Landmarks Commission.

Mrs. Frances Walton, member of the Landmarks Commission, asked that the Commission discuss the relocation of the cottage and the demolition of the other structures but has not taken a formal position on this request as of this date. This matter will be discussed at the Commission's next meeting and it is anticipated that the Commission will make a recommendation then.

Miss Eugenia Bibb, surveyor for the Landmarks Commission, spoke briefly about the age of the various buildings on the site. The age of the two buildings at the left rear of the property has not been determined as of this date.

Mr. James Grigg and William Daggett, applicants, were present and presented to the Board a revised concept for the project. The revised plan eliminated the proposed building on the Eighth Street side, and lowered the heights of the proposed building to 30 feet (from grade to cornice line) which is lower than the Carter-Gilmer House. These will be 12,000 square feet of office space and 30,000 square feet of residential space. The Carter-Gilmer House will be renovated on the inside for offices.

Mrs. Frances Walton stated that she was opposed to moving the out-building and was very concerned about the mass of the building overshadowing the Carter-Gilmer House. Mrs. Walton also expressed concern about the removal of the trees.

Mrs. Genevieve Keller, representing the Downtown Board of Architectural Review stated that the DBAR has discussed the proposed plans and is concerned about the impact this project will have on this unique historic site. Mrs. Keller read the following statement:

"In the opinion of the Downtown Board of Architectural Review, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be denied for this project. We collectively feel that its scale and intensity of use, and the elimination of the tree coverage on the site is inappropriate. To be more specific, we believe that the historic relationship between the Carter-Gilmer House and the curtilage is of special significance to the downtown and is important to the architectural design control district."

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Four

Mrs. Keller then spoke as a concerned citizen. First, Mrs. Keller stated her credential as an architectural historian and informed the board that normally she refrains from speaking on local historical matters. However this site and the building are too important to the architectural heritage of the City and should be protected. Mrs. Keller said that by moving the building, the character of the site will be destroyed. The outbuilding is on its original site, which is one of the few, and possibly the only dependency in the City with this relationship to the main structure. Although some buildings may have been added to the site, nonetheless, it is the last remaining example of a residential complex. The siting of the buildings all relate to the environment and the scale of the Carter-Gilmer House. This is a unique site for the urban area and should be protected.

Mr. Grigg then compared the density and mass of Queen Charlotte Square to this site which is considerably less.

Mr. Daggett stated that they are bending over backwards to protect the historic significance of the Carter-Gilmer House and the site.

Mrs. Walton spoke again, referring to the Peyton property behind K-Mart and expressed concern about the two lots and the issue of BAR's jurisdiction if the structure is moved.

Mrs. Keller asked about the Federal Tax credit and the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior. Mrs. Keller stated that she feels the proposal may not meet these guidelines.

Mrs. VanYahres expressed concern about the trees. First the trees were not properly labeled and the questions the applicants ability to save the large trees as presented. The root system of the Hickory and Linden trees are sensitive and they will not do well as a result of construction activity. The trees may not die outright, but their life span will be significantly shortened.

Mr. Daggett and Mr. Grigg expressed their frustration over their ability to develop this site. The property is zoned B-1 and they are proposing to develop it at half the permitted density.

Mrs. VanYahres said this is just saying that the proposed plans will not save the trees. The applicants should seek the advice from a qualified tree expert on the best possible methods to use in protecting the large trees from damage.

MINUTES OF BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Five

Mr. Moje and Mr. Herbert expressed concern that the developers are being frustrated by the Board. The property owners has a right to develop this site and they they ought to be able to develop it balancing the concerns of all (preservationists, environmentalists , etc.).

Mr. Daggett sated that the property is appraised at \$700,000 and what the Board is apparently saying to the owner is that he cannot develop it. Maybe the City should consider joining with the property owner and developing the site or part of it as a "park". Mr. Daggett asked for a reading from the Board on the massing of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Freer expressed concern about the trees and his reservations about the mass. Mrs. VanYahres expressed concern about the trees as as for the mass, it would be dealt with architecturally. Mrs. Hiatt indicated that she liked the way it looked, but is concerned about the trees. Mr. Moje and Mr. Herbert indicated that they had no problem with relocating the building and support the development of the site in the best possible manner. This is a delimna for the aplicants to balance all concerns expressed.

After further discussion, Mr. Herbert moved to defer the application until the next meeting for the following reasons:

- a) To hear from the Landmarks Commission on the relocation of the outbuilding and the age of the remaining buildings.
- b) To allow time for the applicants to formalize which trees will be removed and; the reasons for their removal and how the remaining trees will be protected.
- c) To allow the applicant time to rethink the massing of the new building and facade.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Hiatt and unanimously passed by all members present:

2. BAR 88-1-297

111 West High Street
401 Altamont Circle
Landscaping and Screening

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report. After a brief discussion, Mr. Freer moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Six

- a) The new down spout recently installed on the High Street side of the building must be painted the same color as the trim.
- b) The PVC pipes from the air conditioner compressor up the left side wall of the building needs to be screened or painted to blend into the brick work.
- c) The proposed trellis or lattice must be painted the same color as the trim.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hiatt and passed by the following vote of the members present: AYES: Moje, Freer, Hiatt, Herbert. NOES: None. ABSENTINS: VanYahres

The Board also identified the following maintenance items which should be corrected before they get worse.

- a) Plastic drain pipes have been installed to direct storm water away from the building. Storm water cannot be directed across city sidewalks.
- b) The Philadelphia gutters appear are in need of repair, especially the gutters on the High Street side of the building.
- c) The brick wall above the rear entrance to downstairs is in need of repointing.
- d) The old tire and air conditioner in the rear yard should be removed.
- e) Several shutters on the building are in need of repair, and the ones removed should be replaced.
- f) The Altamont side porch, and the lattice around the base, is in need of repair.
- g) It is recommended that the screened fence in the rear yard be painted the same color as the house trim or with another approved color.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

Representatives from the Architectural firm of Heyward, Llorens and Boyd were presented and briefly described the preliminary plans for changes to the exterior of the Temple Beth Israel Synagogue located on East Jefferson Street. After a brief discussion, the Board made the following comments on the preliminary plans.

- a) The Synagogue is one of the most significant historical buildings in the Downtown area. Any changes to the exterior will have serious consequences on the architectural features of this building.
- b) The Board expressed concern about changing the design of the front steps and the impact this change will have on the building's facade.
- c) The Board has serious concern about changing the size and design of the front doors.

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were none.

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none.

F. BOARD MEMBERS' REPORT

There were none.

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Two

to be demolished. The Commission decided to visit the property and research the history of the buildings to be demolished. The information available to us at the present time indicates that there were two buildings at the rear of the property in 1896, however we do not know if the current structures are the original buildings.

- b) We would like to see more landscaping incorporated into the site. The final landscaping plan must be approved by the Board.
- c) Outdoor lighting fixtures should not be mounted in the trees.
- d) Details on the proposed carport must be submitted for review and approval.
- e) Since the project abuts the Downtown Architectural Design Control District, we have submitted the plans to the DBAR for comment.
- f) Based on the data submitted, the Architects have tried to be sensitive to the historic character of the Carter-Gilmer House in developing the plans for this project. We would like to thank them for this effort.

Mr. Boger further stated that the basic criteria for use in evaluating this project or any project are: Harmony of scale; harmony of materials, textures, colors and motifs; impact on the surrounding environment; and historic or architectural significance of the proposed action. It should be noted that few projects, whether minor additions and alterations or new construction, can expect to fully satisfy all of these specific criteria. However, if you keep these concepts in mind when developing a particular project, then it should result in a more appropriate development for the City. Although these criteria appears to stress harmony and unity, the intent is not to prevent variety which is as important to the character of the ADC District as any other element.

Mr. Boger stated that staff is very concerned about the Board referring Certificate of Appropriateness to the Landmarks Commission for review and recommendation. The purpose of the Landmarks Commission is to recommend to City Council, structures, landmarks, sites, etc., which should be designated historic and made subject to the ADC regulations. It is the responsibility of the BAR to consider demolition and/or relocation of structures, and the structural integrity of the buildings, new construction, etc., not the Landmarks Commission. Each time an application is referred to the Landmarks Commission, the review process is significantly increased. The Board has a specified time period in which to act on an application and the Board should act on the application as quickly as possible.

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Three

Mr. Freer asked what is the time table? Mr. Boger responded, sixty days.

Mr. Moje said he disagreed and felt that the Board could request for additional information from the Landmarks Commission.

Mrs. Frances Walton, member of the Landmarks Commission, noted that the Commission has discussed the relocation of the cottage and the demolition of the other structures, but has not taken a formal position on this request as of this date. This matter will be discussed at the Commission's next meeting and it is anticipated that the Commission will make a recommendation then.

Miss Eugenia Bibb, surveyor for the Landmarks Commission, spoke briefly about the age of the various buildings on the site. The age of the two buildings at the left rear of the property has not been determined as of this date.

Mr. James Grigg and William Daggett, applicants, were present and presented to the Board a revised concept for the project. The revised plan eliminated the proposed building on the Eighth Street side, and lowered the heights of the proposed building to 30 feet (from grade to cornice line) which is lower than the Carter-Gilmer House. These will be 12,000 square feet of office space and 30,000 square feet of residential space. The Carter-Gilmer House will be renovated on the inside for offices.

Mrs. Frances Walton stated that she was opposed to moving the out-building and was very concerned about the mass of the building overshadowing the Carter-Gilmer House. Mrs. Walton also expressed concern about the removal of the trees.

Mrs. Genevieve Keller, representing the Downtown Board of Architectural Review stated that the DBAR has discussed the proposed plans and is concerned about the impact this project will have on this unique historic site. Mrs. Keller read the following statement:

"In the opinion of the Downtown Board of Architectural Review, a Certificate of Appropriateness should be denied for this project. We collectively feel that its scale and intensity of use, and the elimination of the tree coverage on the site is inappropriate. To be more specific, we believe that the historic relationship between the Carter-Gilmer House and the curtilage is of special significance to the downtown and is important to the architectural design control district."

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Four

Mrs. Keller then spoke as a concerned citizen. First, Mrs. Keller stated her credential as an architectural historian and informed the board that normally she refrains from speaking on local historical matters. However this site and the building are too important to the architectural heritage of the City and should be protected. Mrs. Keller said that by moving the building, the character of the site will be destroyed. The outbuilding is on its original site, which is one of the few, and possibly the only dependency in the City with this relationship to the main structure. Although some buildings may have been added to the site, nonetheless, it is the last remaining example or a residential complex. The siting of the buildings all relate to the environment and the scale of the Carter-Gilmer House. This is a unique site for the urban area and should be protected.

Mr. Grigg then compared the density and mass of Queen Charlotte Square to this site which is considerably less.

Mr. Daggett stated that they are bending over backwards to protect the historic significance of the Carter-Gilmer House and the site.

Mrs. Walton spoke again, referring to the Peyton property behind K-Mart and expressed concern about the two lots and the issue of BAR's jurisdiction if the structure is moved.

Mrs. Keller asked about the Federal Tax credit and the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior. Mrs. Keller stated that she feels the proposal may not meet these guidelines.

Mrs. VanYahres expressed concern about the trees. First the trees were not properly labeled and she questioned the applicants' ability to save the large trees as presented. The root system of the Hickory and Linden trees are sensitive and they will not do well as a result of construction activity. The trees may not die outright, but their life span will be significantly shortened.

Mr. Daggett and Mr. Grigg expressed their frustration over their ability to develop this site. The property is zoned B-1 and they are proposing to develop it at half the permitted density.

Mrs. VanYahres said this is just saying that the proposed plans will not save the trees. The applicants should seek the advice from a qualified tree expert on the best possible methods to use in protecting the large trees from damage.

MINUTES OF BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Five

Mr. Moje and Mr. Herbert expressed concern that the developers are being frustrated by the Board. The property owners have a right to develop this site and they ought to be able to develop it balancing the concerns of all (preservationists, environmentalists, etc.).

Mr. Daggett stated that the property is appraised at \$700,000 and what the Board is apparently saying to the owner is that he cannot develop it. Maybe the City should consider joining with the property owner and developing the site or part of it as a "park". Mr. Daggett asked for a reading from the Board on the massing of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Freer expressed concern about the trees and his reservations about the mass. Mrs. VanYahres expressed concern about the trees as for the mass, it would be dealt with architecturally. Mrs. Hiatt indicated that she liked the way it looked, but is concerned about the trees. Mr. Moje and Mr. Herbert indicated that they had no problem with relocating the building and support the development of the site in the best possible manner. This is a problem for the applicants to balance all concerns expressed.

After further discussion, Mr. Herbert moved to defer the application until the next meeting for the following reasons:

- a) To hear from the Landmarks Commission on the relocation of the outbuilding and the age of the remaining buildings.
- b) To allow time for the applicants to formalize which trees will be removed and; the reasons for their removal and how the remaining trees will be protected.
- c) To allow the applicant time to rethink the massing of the new building and facade.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Hiatt and unanimously passed by all members present:

2. BAR 88-1-297

111 West High Street
401 Altamont Circle
Landscaping and Screening

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report. After a brief discussion, Mr. Freer moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

January 26, 1988

Page Six

- a) The new down spout recently installed on the High Street side of the building must be painted the same color as the trim.
- b) The PVC pipes from the air conditioner compressor up the left side wall of the building needs to be screened or painted to blend into the brick work.
- c) The proposed trellis or lattice must be painted the same color as the trim.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Hiatt and passed by the following vote of the members present: AYES: Moje, Freer, Hiatt,. NOES: None. ABSTENTIONS: VanYahres

The Board also identified the following maintenance items which should be corrected before they get worse.

- a) Plastic drain pipes have been installed to direct storm water away from the building. Storm water cannot be directed across city sidewalks.
- b) The Philadelphia gutters appear to be in need of repair, especially the gutters on the High Street side of the building.
- c) The brick wall above the rear entrance to downstairs is in need of repointing.
- d) The old tire and air conditioner in the rear yard should be removed.
- e) Several shutters on the building are in need of repair, and the ones removed should be replaced.
- f) The Altamont side porch, and the lattice around the base, is in need of repair.
- g) It is recommended that the screened fence in the rear yard be painted the same color as the house trim or with another approved color.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

Representatives from the Architectural firm of Heyward, Llorens and Boyd were present and briefly described the preliminary plans for changes to the exterior of the Temple Beth Israel Synagogue located on East Jefferson Street. After a brief discussion, the Board made the following comments on the preliminary plans.

- a) The Synagogue is one of the most significant historical buildings in the Downtown area. Any changes to the exterior will have serious consequences on the architectural features of this building.
- b) The Board expressed concern about changing the design of the front steps and the impact this change will have on the building's facade.
- c) The Board has serious concern about changing the size and design of the front doors.

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were none.

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none.

F. BOARD MEMBERS' REPORT

There were none.

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.