

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1978 AT 2:00 P. M.

PRESENT: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Lay, Mr. Farmer and Mr. Van Groll.

Absent: Mr. Martin, Mr. Keller.

City Officials Present: Mr. Huja, Mr. Davis, Mr. Higgins, and Mrs. Drumheller.

Case No. 78-74. Action deferred pending clarification of the Ordinance relative to free-standing signs.

Case No. 78-75. Queen Charlotte Square. Mr. Norris, the Architect, presented the Project and explained the changes and refinements to the design that have taken place since it was last presented. His comments included the following items:

1. Solar bronze glazing will be used throughout the building.
2. The side of the building along 3rd Street has been "broken" in response to earlier comments.
3. Brick balcony railings have been introduced, along with brick wing walls to separate the balconies. The wing walls will add a measure of privacy to the balconies.
4. There will be a two-level foyer at the main entrance to the building.
5. Cast stone will be used for the facia, for the penthouse, balcony railings, and on the plaza.
6. The East Jefferson Street shops have been indented into the plaza structure.
7. The High Street projections have been reduced to two stories.
8. An all-weather pool will be installed at the upper level of the High Street wing.
9. Individual HVAC units will be used in each apartment. There will be no noise pollution.
10. The alternate solution for the HVAC system would be to install an 80 Ton heat pump on the roof. It would be visible and noisy.

Mrs. Smith asked to see the earlier High Street Elevation showing the three-story projections.

Mr. Lay made a statement that included the following items:

1. The model that has been presented will help to understand the building in its context.
2. The plaza with its relationship to Lee Park is a plus. It sets off the Library and the Jones House.
3. The intersection of the building blocks at the interior corner of the structure has been improved, but needs further study.
4. The all-weather swimming pool is a plus. It will help to sell the apartments.
5. The penthouse suites should be a great selling point for the project.
6. The concept of new housing downtown is supported by the Board.
7. Brick balconies are an improvement. Perhaps the parapet could also be brick.
8. The detailing of the brick will make or break the building.
9. Brick plaza is appreciated. Perhaps brick can be taken into the Lobby area.

Mr. Norris said that the use of oversized brick will reduce the scale of the building. The brick will be the same color and tone as was used in the County Courthouse.

Mr. Lay expressed the following concerns:

1. The facade should be modulated in some way to respond to the other buildings in the neighborhood. Not sure that resolution is complete.
2. The High Street units, in particular, should respond to the community by utilizing different roof shapes or something. An example of roof shapes that do respond to the neighborhood can be found at the Park Lane Apartments on Park Street.
3. The relationship to the synagogue and the Catholic Church is a real problem because the 3rd Street and Jefferson Street corner is so overpowering.
4. It is assumed that the intentions and modulations made in the building line for the purpose of saving trees are realistic. The root systems of the trees should not be subjected to undue trauma.

Mr. Lay concluded his comments by saying that the strength of the project lies in the basic concept. The weakness, he said, lies in scaler problems. Mr. Lay said that he had hoped for a more architecturally stimulating building rather than a reserved building. But, since it is reserved maybe it should be more so. Mr. Lay stated that he appreciated the model display and the project will be an asset to downtown.

Mrs. Smith commented on the various aspects of the design as follows:

1. High Street side: preferred the previous design with 3-story projections.
2. 3rd Street side: beginning to like it more, but still needs work - maybe with use of diagonal lines; really feels the need for diagonals - maybe as surface treatment.
3. Jefferson Street side: Likes new treatment of large "blank" wall; likes recessed balconies; perhaps diagonal brick walls could be used inside the recessed balconies; feels the need an "in between" size wall.
4. Plaza and sides of building facing the plaza: likes the use of diagonals in the landscape design; the many balconies give a feeling of monotony; she looks for empty areas - "resting spaces for the eye."
5. Second Street side: a reasonable and interesting break-up.

Mr. Farmer agreed with Mrs. Smith in saying that the 3-story elements on the High Street side were better than all 2-story projections. He felt that 2-story projections were too small. Mrs. Ramsey agreed also, but felt that they shouldn't all be three stories.

Mr. Van Groll thought that the building was weak. He felt that design responses to Committee suggestions will result in a weak design. He said that too much brick could be bad. He didn't understand what generates the plaza design. It will be too hot in the summer, he said. Also, he does not like the balconies and the project has the appearance of a hospital or office building. He had a question about the Drive-In-Bank, which bank it would be and the location.

Mr. Norris stated that the plaza planting will be as large as possible. Mr. Lay asked if larger planting "boxes" could be detailed into the structure, Mr. Norris said, no.

Mr. Lay expressed concern with the symmetry that has been introduced in the 3rd Street elevation. He noted that we have an asymmetrical building with registration on the 3rd Street side. He suggested making some arbitrary design decisions to "break up" the facade.

Mr. Van Groll commented on the Jefferson Street "drop off" area. A general discussion followed.

The Board agreed to meet again for a work session on Wednesday night, November 15, 1978, at 8:00 P. M.

Case: 532 Park Street. Mr. and Mrs. Walton discussed with the Board the problems of the porch at 532 Park Street. They wish to remove the upper and lower level porches, and build a smaller one-story porch. Mrs. Walton presented preliminary sketches. The Board decided to visit the house before offering any advice. They agreed to go to the house immediately following the meeting.

There was no further business to come before the Board.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

Chairman

Meeting : Nov. 9, 1978

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: Basement Conference Room
City Hall

Board Members Present: Mrs. Wadlington,
Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsay, Mr. Lay,
Mr. Farmer, Mr. van Groll.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Martin, Mr. Keller

City Officials Present: Mr. Hujar, Mr. Davis,
Mr. Higgins, Mrs. Drumkeller.

Case No. 78-74: Action ~~deferred~~ deferred
pending clarification of the Ordinance
relative to free-standing signs.

Case No. 78-75: Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Morris, the architect, presented the project and explained the changes and refinements to the design ~~since~~ ~~it was last presented~~ that have taken place since it was last presented. His comments included the following items:

1. Salar bronze glazing will be used throughout the building.
2. The side of the building along 3rd street has been "broken" in

response to earlier comments.

3. Brick balcony railings have been introduced, along with brick wing walls to separate the balconies. The wing walls will add a measure of privacy to the balconies.
4. There will be a two-level Foyer at the main entrance to the building.
5. Cast stone will be used for the facia, for the penthouse balcony railings, and on the plaza.
6. The East Jefferson Street ~~shops~~ shops have been indented into the plaza structure.
7. The High Street projections have been reduced to two stories.
8. An all-weather pool will be installed at the upper level of the High Street wing.
9. Individual HVAC units will be used in each apartment. There will be no noise pollution.
10. The alternate solution for the HVAC system would be to install an 80 ton heat pump on the roof. It would be visible and noisy.

Mrs. Smith asked to see the ~~the~~ earlier High Street Elevation showing the three-story projections. *also to see the diagonal appearance in the sills, the depth of the balconies & the landscaping.*

Mr. Lay made a statement that included the following items:

1. The model that has been presented will help to understand the building in its context.
2. The plaza with its relationship to Lee Park is a plus. It sets off the Library and the Jones House.
3. The intersection of the building blocks at the interior corner of the structure has been improved, but needs further study.
4. The all-weather swimming pool is a plus. It will help to sell the apartments.
5. The penthouse suites should be a great selling point for the project.
6. The concept of new housing downtown is supported by the Board.
7. Brick balconies are an improvement. Perhaps the parapet could also be brick.
8. The detailing of the brick will

make ~~it~~ or break the building.
 9. Brick plaza is ~~the~~ appreciated.
 Perhaps brick can be taken into
 the Lobby area.

Mr. Norris said that the use of oversized brick will reduce the scale of the building. The brick will be ~~the~~ the same color and tone as was used in the County Courthouse.

Mr. Lay expressed the following concerns:

1. The facade should be modulated in some way to respond to the other buildings in the neighborhood. Not sure that resolution is complete.
2. The High Street units, in particular, should respond to the community by utilizing different roof shapes or something. An example of roof shapes that do respond to the neighborhood can be found at the Park Lane Apartments on Park Street.
3. The relationship to the Synagogue and the Catholic Church is a real problem because the 3rd Street and Jefferson Street corner is so overpowering.

4. It is assumed that the indentions and modulations made in the building line for the purpose of saving trees ~~are~~ ^{are} realistic. The root systems of the trees should not be subjected to undue trauma.

Mr. Lay ~~was~~ ~~concluded~~ concluded his comments by saying that the strength of the project lies in the basic concept. The weakness, he said, lies in scalar ~~problems~~ ^{problems}. Mr. Lay ~~the~~ said that he had hoped for a more architecturally stimulating building rather than a reserved building. But, since it is reserved maybe it should be more so. Mr. Lay stated that he appreciated the model ~~display~~ & the project will be an asset to downtown.

~~Mrs. Smith, in commenting on the High Street elevation, said that she preferred the previous design showing 3-story projections. She said that the 3rd street side was beginning to show improvements. However, she would like to see more diagonal lines - maybe as surface treatment, if nothing else. She commented favorably on changes shown on the Jefferson Street side.~~

6

Mrs. Smith commented on the various aspects of the design as follows:

1. High Street side: preferred the previous design with 3-story projections.

2. 3rd street side: beginning to like it more, but still needs work — maybe with use of diagonal lines; really feels the need for diagonals — maybe as surface treatment.

3. Jefferson street side: likes ~~the~~ new treatment of large "blank" wall; likes recessed balconies; perhaps diagonal brick walls could be used inside the recessed balconies; feels the need an "in between" size wall.

4. Plaza ~~and~~ and sides of building facing the plaza: likes the use of diagonals in the landscape design; ~~the~~ the many balconies give a feeling of monotony; she looks for empty areas — "resting spaces for the eye."

5. Second Street side: a reasonable and interesting break-up.

Mr. Farmer agreed with Mrs. Smith ~~the~~ in saying that the 3-story elements on the High Street side were better than all 2-story ~~the~~ projections. He felt that 2-story projections were too small. Mrs. Ramsay agreed also, but felt that they shouldn't all be ~~the~~ three ~~story~~ stories.

He doesn't like the balcony. Also, the project has the appearance of a hospital office building. He had a question about the brick in bank, which one & location.

Mr. Van Groll thought that the building was weak. He felt that design responses to committee suggestions will result in a weak design. He said that too much brick could be bad. He didn't understand what generates the plaza design. It will be too hot in the summer, he said.

Mr. Norris stated that the plaza planting will be as large as possible. Mr. Lay asked if larger planting "boxes" could be detailed into the structure. Mr. Norris said, no.

spelling (?)

Mr. Lay expressed concern with the symmetry that has been introduced ~~in~~ in the 3rd street elevation. He noted that we have an ~~an~~ asymmetrical ^(spelling-?)

8

building with vegetation on the 3rd Street side. He suggested making some ~~the~~ arbitrary design decisions to "break up" the facade.

Mr. van Groll commented on ~~the~~ the Jefferson Street "drop off" area. A general discussion followed.

The Board agreed to meet again for a work session on Wednesday night, November 15, 1978, at 8:00 p.m.

Case: 532 Park Street

Mr. and Mrs. Walton discussed with the Board the problems of the porch at 532 Park Street. They wish to remove the upper and lower level porches, and ~~to~~ build a smaller one-story porch.

Mrs. Walton presented preliminary sketches. The Board decided to visit the house before offering any advice. They agreed to go to the house immediately ~~the~~ following the meeting.

There was no further business to come before the Board.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN B. FARMER, JR.
Secretary.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1978 AT 8:00 P. M. (Work Session)

PRESENT: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

ABSENT: Mr. Keller

City Officials Present: Mr. Higgins.

Case No. 78-74. (Continued): This Case was deferred on November 9, 1978, pending clarification of the Ordinance relative to free-standing signs. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had spoken with the City Attorney, but was unable to get a clear clarification. Ms. Anne Memory presented her sign again, and asked that it be approved with the condition that the location and the supporting device be worked out later with City approval.

The sign was approved unanimously following a motion by Mr. Lay that was seconded by Mr. Martin. The sign board itself was the only thing approved. The location will have to be approved at a later date. It was suggested to Ms. Memory that an appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals would be necessary if she wishes to place a free-standing sign on the property. The Board of Architectural Review agreed to support such an appeal, if it is made. Mrs. Wadlington said that the BAR would write a letter to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Van Groll said this sign (at 307 East Market Street) would be more appropriately located on a free-standing post just like the other two signs on the property. He pointed out that it would look rather odd to have one sign mounted on the brick surface of the building, and two signs (existing) mounted on free-standing posts.

A general discussion about the Sign Ordinance followed. Mr. Lay was concerned that the final determination of this case should not set a precedent for other properties. Mr. Martin said that the problem of free-standing signs (limited to one per property) has come before the Planning Commission on several occasions. Mr. Lay said that a City Official should clarify the Sign Ordinance for the BAR. Mrs. Ramsey suggested asking the City Attorney for a Memo on the subject. Mr. Lay preferred asking the City Attorney to appear before the BAR so that Board Members could talk with him about the problem. Mr. Lay said that we should know the answers to "sign problems" so that applicants are not subjected to undue delay in getting decisions on designs for signs.

The Minutes of the October 12, 1978, meeting of the BAR were approved unanimously following a correction made in the address given for Case No. BAR 78-71. The address should read: 609 E. High Street.

The minutes of the October 27, 1978, meeting of the BAR were approved following a correction made in the address given for Case No. BAR 78-71. The address should read: 609 E. High Street. Mr. Martin abstained from voting on this set of minutes.

Case No. 78-75. Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Higgins presented a request from Mr. Huja that the Board's Comments on this case be made available to the Office of Community Development, no later than November

21, 1978. In the absence of Mr. Norris, the Architect, Mr. Higgins pointed out the new prospective drawing that has been added to the presentation.

Mrs. Ramsey asked what changes had been since the last meeting. Mr. Farmer noted that the High Street projections (2 out of 3) had been raised to three stories. Mr. Lay asked about the purpose of the BAR meeting. He noted that adjacent buildings are shown in the perspective drawing.

The enhances on 3rd Street were discussed. It was pointed out that two vehicular entrances are shown on this block - one for the garage and one for a drive-in bank window. Mr. Van Groll spoke about the lack of "stacking space." Mr. Higgins said that a curb-cut cannot be located as close to the corner as is shown.

Mr. Lay, Mr. Farmer, and Mr. Van Groll all said that the perspective drawing appeared to be inaccurate, in part. The synagogue seems too large. Either this, or a combination of factors, may be giving a distorted view along 3rd Street.

Mr. Lay noted that the 3rd Street "curtain wall" is still in place. He said that he had hoped for an alternative design for this facade.

Mr. Higgins announced that Mr. Norris has applied for a Special Permit.

Mr. Van Groll stated that Queen Charlotte Square, as presented, is not a good building. He said that it is an institutional building, in appearance, and has nothing to do with housing. He said that a few "neighborhood" people, who have seen the design, also called it institutional. Mr. Van Groll circulated copies of late 50's and early 60's designs that, he said, were the prototypes of Queen Charlotte Square. He noted that the image of an institutional building is apparent. A design showing how the building might be "approached" was also circulated. Mr. Van Groll, while looking at the current design, said that there are other ways of doing it.

Mrs. Smith said that the building does not fit the neighborhood visually, and that she is not satisfied. She said, "We have made many suggestions but the architect has failed to meet the needs of the project." The basic design of the building does not relate to the neighborhood - the surrounding buildings are not reflected in this building in any way except through the use of brick. She said that the need for excellence has become especially apparent since the old buildings were torn down. Mrs. Smith said that the basic layout is O. K., and the basic materials - brick and stone - are O. K. She still would like to see more diagonal lines used in the design, however.

Mr. Van Groll Questioned the use of dark, reflective glass in a "curtain" wall. Where is it coming from? He asked.

Mr. Farmer agreed with the general comments made by others. He worried about Mrs. Smith's repeated requests for diagonal lines, however. Suddenly I begin to see a mansard facia wrapped around everything, he said, and that could be awful.

Mrs. Ramsey questioned the use of oversize brick. I don't know how to react to it, she said.

We are in a dilemma, said Mr. Lay. "Our suggestions have had the effect of putting bandaids on the building. This is no good. How are the problems going to be resolved? What shall we say? All we can do is pass along our thoughts."

Mrs. Ramsey said the Planning Commission will make some changes.

Mrs. Wadlington and Mrs. Smith both asked, "What should the Board of Architectural Review say"?

Mr. Martin said that the Planning Commission would like for the BAR to review and comment on the concept of the project. The Commission would like a "concise set of feelings."

Mrs. Smith asked, "What is the feeling of the Board about building in the neighborhood"?

Mr. Van Groll said that the basic concept is fine, but the building, as an expression of the concept, does not respond to the Historic District. He said that there are high standards for this kind of project - economically, sociologically and visually. He stressed that "The eye" should be satisfied as well as the other senses.

Mr. Martin said that aesthetics is a very personal thing. Mr. Van Groll said that while this may be true, there are people who are trained in the field of aesthetics, and there are basic principles. He noted that the BAR devotes it's entire time to this field. "If people are sick", he said, "they go to a doctor. This Board is well equipped to advise on aesthetics, just as a doctor is well equipped to advise on health care."

Mr. Martin: If the building could cover more area, it might be better.

Mr. Van Groll: A higher building might be better. The 75 feet height limitation is arbitrary.

Mr. Higgins reminded the BAR that a Special Permit is a privilege. He asked two questions for consideration: 1. Can this site be developed in such a way as to deserve the privilege of a Special Permit? 2. Can this building meet the Board's standards?

Mr. Martin: Will a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted when the building comes back to the Board?

Mr. Lay: The 3rd Street facade, the High Street facade and the brick patterning all need much more study. Is the architect willing to work on these things?

Mr. Van Groll: Do we want to patch it up or not? It is an inappropriate building.

Mrs. Smith: We should prepare a simple statement indicating whether or not we are heading toward approval or disapproval.

Mr. Martin: We must comment on the basic layout as it occurs on the property. Are the masses well distributed? Do the setbacks work? The Planning Commission needs our thoughts.

Mrs. Ramsey: We should prepare one statement for the Commission. It must be a consensus of our feelings.

Mr. Martin: The basic concept is not unappealing. I could live in the building without feeling badly. There is room for considerable improvement - a lot more could be done. Nevertheless, I could still live with it even if nothing more were done. I am not trained in art or architecture. I am a builder and thus would tend to take a practical approach. Certain enhancements will increase the cost of the project. I am not willing to reject the building at the present time. Its strengths lie in the mixed use, siting, orientation and open space. There is a problem with scale at the corner of 3rd and Jefferson, however.

Mr. Van Groll said that Queen Charlotte Square will have a major impact on the downtown area.

Mr. Lay noted that other architects have prepared "super" presentations, and worked very hard to present their ideas to the Board. The Queen Charlotte Square presentation is poor by comparison, he said.

Mrs. Ramsey said that the project should not be judged by the quality of the presentation.

However, said Mr. Martin, he is trying to "sell" an idea.

Mr. Lay said that the purpose of a presentation is to present and clarify ideas. Mr. Van Groll agreed.

Mrs. Smith spoke about the Board's comments to the Planning Commission. She asked, "how do we judge the building if part of it is good and part of it is bad"? It is like a piece of sculpture, she said, if one side is bad, then the entire piece is bad. We must make a general statement summarizing our feelings.

Mr. Van Groll spoke about the details of a building, any building, that is to be built in the Historic District. He said the details should reflect something about the Historic District. There are features that can be distilled from the neighborhood buildings, he said. As far as we can tell, this building does not respond appropriately to the neighborhood.

Mr. Martin disagreed. Mr. Norris, he said, is probably taking a wider view of the picture. He is looking at the business aspects of the project.

Mr. Van Groll said that the design is "out of the air." It has nothing to do with the Historic District.

Mr. Lay said that the Board should list the pros and cons of the project, and then write a summary statement. Mr. Martin agreed.

Mrs. Ramsey said that she liked Mr. Lay's comments about the project. She said that a compromise may be necessary. There may be some trade-offs that are possible.

Mrs. Wadlington appointed Mr. Van Groll and Mr. Farmer to prepare a rough draft of the Board's position in this matter.

The Board of Architectural Review will meet in the Basement Conference Room on Monday night, November 20, 1978, at 8:00 P. M. to review the rough draft, and to prepare a statement for the Planning Commission.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

Chairman

Board of Architectural Review
Minutes

Meeting: Nov. 15, 1978 (Work Session)

Time: 8:00 p.m.

Location: Basement Conference Room -
City Hall

Board Members present: Mrs. Wadlington,
Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsay, Mr. Farmer,
Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin, Mr. Van Groll.

Board Members absent: Mr. Keller

City Officials present: Mr. Higgins

Case No. 78-74 (Continued): This case was ~~deferred~~ deferred on Nov. 9, 1978, pending clarification of the Ordinance relative to free-standing signs. Mrs. Wadlington announced that she had spoken with the City Attorney, but was unable to get a clear clarification. Ms. Anne Memory presented her sign again, and asked that it be approved with the condition that the location and the supporting devices be worked out later with City approval.

BAR: 11-15-78

(2)

The sign was approved unanimously following a motion by Mr. Lay that was seconded by Mr. Martin. The sign board itself was the only thing approved. The location will have to be approved at a later date. It was suggested to Mrs. Memory that an appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals ~~would~~ would be necessary if she wishes to place a free-standing sign on the property. The Board of Architectural Review agreed to support such an appeal, if it is made. Mrs. Wadlington said that the BAR would write a letter to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. van Groll said this sign (at 307 East Market Street) would be more appropriately located on a free-standing post just like the other two signs on the property. He pointed out that it would look rather odd to have one sign mounted on the brick surface of the building, and two signs (existing) mounted on free-standing posts.

A general discussion about the sign Ordinance

BAR: 11-15-78

(3)

followed. Mr. Lay was concerned that the final determination of this case should not set a precedent for other properties. ~~Mr.~~ Mr. Martin said that the problem of free-standing signs (limited to one per property) has come before the Planning Commission on several ~~occasions~~ occasions. Mr. Lay said that a City official should clarify the sign ordinance for the B.A.R. Mrs. Ramsay suggested asking the City Attorney for a memo on the subject. Mr. Lay ~~preferred~~ preferred asking the City Attorney to appear before the BAR so that Board members could talk with him about the problem. Mr. Lay ~~said~~ said that we should know the answers to "sign problems" so that applicants are not subjected to undue delay in getting ~~the~~ decisions on designs for signs.

~~The minutes for October 12, 1978, were approved by a unanimous vote of the Board. after making a correction in the address~~

BAR: 11-15-78

④

The minutes of the Oct. 12, 1978, meeting of the B.A.R. were approved unanimously following a correction made in the address given for Case No. BAR 78-71. The address should read: 609 E. High Street.

The minutes of the Oct. 27, 1978, meeting of the B.A.R. were approved following a correction made in the address given for Case No. BAR 78-71. The address should read: 609 E. High Street. Mr. Martin abstained from voting on ~~these minutes~~ this set of minutes.

Case No. 78-75: Queen Charlotte Square.

Mr. Higgins presented a request ^{from} Mr. Huija that the Board's comments on this case ~~should~~ be made available to the Office of Community Development, ~~no~~ no later than Nov. 21, 1978. In the absence of Mr. Norris, the Architect, Mr. Higgins pointed out the new perspective drawing that has been added to the presentation.

BAR: 11-15-74

Mr. Ramsay asked what changes had been made since ~~the~~ the last meeting. Mr. Farmer noted that the High Street projections ~~is~~ (2 out of 3) had been raised to three stories.

Mr. Lay asked about the purpose of the BAR meeting. He noted that adjacent buildings ~~are~~ ^{are} shown in the perspective drawing.

The entrances on 3rd Street were discussed.

~~The distance of the entrances at the~~
~~end of the block was the first topic discussed.~~

It was pointed out that two vehicular entrances are ~~shown~~ shown on this block — one for the garage and one for a drive-in bank window. Mr. van Groll spoke about the lack of "stacking space." Mr.

Higgins said that a curb-cut ~~and~~ cannot be located as ~~close~~ close to ~~the~~ ^{the} camera as is shown.

Mr. Lay, Mr. Farmer, and Mr. van Groll all said that the perspective drawing appeared to be inaccurate, in part. The ~~synagogue~~ ^{synagogue} seems ~~to be~~ too large.

Either this, or a combination of factors, may be giving a distorted ~~view~~ view along 3rd Street.

VIEW

BAR: 11-15-78

(6)

Mr. Lay noted that the 3rd street "curtain wall" is still in place. He said that he had hoped for an alternative design for this facade.

Mr. Higgins announced that Mr. Norris has applied for a Special Permit.

Mr. van Groll stated that Queen Charlotte Square, as presented, is not a good building. He said that it is an institutional building, in appearance, and has nothing to do with housing. He said that a few "neighborhood" people, who have seen the design, also called it institutional. Mr. van Groll ~~passed around~~ circulated ~~copies~~ copies of late 50's and early 60's designs that, he said, were the prototypes of Queen Charlotte Square. He noted that the image of an institutional building is apparent. A design showing how the building might be "approached" was also circulated. Mr. van Groll, ~~in~~ while looking at the current design, said that there are other ways of doing it.

BAR: 11-15-78

(7)

Mrs. Smith said that the building does not fit the neighborhood ~~visually~~ visually, and that she is not satisfied. She said, "We have made many suggestions but the architect has failed to meet the needs of the project." The basic design of the building does not relate to the neighborhood — the surrounding ~~buildings~~ buildings ~~are~~ are not reflected in this building in any way except through the use of brick. She said that the need for excellence ~~has~~ become especially apparent since the ~~two houses and church~~ old buildings were ~~have been~~ torn ~~to~~ down. Mrs. Smith said that the basic layout is O.K., and the basic materials — brick and stone — are O.K. She still would like to see more diagonal lines used in the design, however.

Mr. van Groll questioned the use of dark, reflective glass in a ~~the~~ "curtain" wall. Where is it coming from? he asked.

BAP: 11-15-78

(8)

Mr. Farmer agreed with the general comments made by others. He worried about Mrs. Smith's repeated requests for diagonal lines, however. Suddenly I begin to see a mansard fascia wrapped around everything, he said, and that could be awful.

Mrs. Ramsay questioned the use of ~~over size~~ ~~brick~~ over size brick. I don't know how to react to it, she said.

~~Mr. Lay~~ We are in a ~~dilemma~~ dilemma, said Mr. Lay. "Our suggestions have had the effect of putting band-aids on the building. This is no good. ~~How~~ How are the problems going to be resolved? What shall we say? All we can do is pass along our thoughts."

Mrs. Ramsay said the Planning Commission will make some changes.

Mrs. Wadlington and Mrs. Smith ~~both~~ both asked, "What ~~do~~ ^{should} the Board of Architectural Review say?"

BAR: 11-15-78

Mr. Martin said that the Planning Commission would like for the BAR to review and comment on the concept of the project. The Commission would like a "concise set of feelings."

Mrs. Smith asked, "What is the feeling of the Board about building in the neighborhood?"

Mr. van Groll said that the basic concept is fine, but the building, ~~is~~ as an ~~is~~ expression of the concept, does not respond to the Historic District. He said that there are high standards for this kind of ~~project~~ project — economically, ~~socially~~ sociologically and visually. He stressed that "the eye" should be satisfied as well as the other senses.

Mr. Martin said that aesthetics ~~are~~ ^{is} a very personal thing. Mr. van Groll said that while this may be true, there are people who are trained in the field of aesthetics, and there are basic

BAR: 11-15-78

(10)

principles. He noted that the BAR devotes its entire time to this field. "If people are sick," he said, "they go to a doctor. This Board is well equipped to advise on aesthetics, just as a doctor is well equipped to advise on ~~medicine~~ health care."

Mr. Martin: If the building could cover more area, it might be better.

Mr. van Groll: A higher ^{building} might be better. ~~A~~. The 75 feet height limitation is arbitrary.

Mr. Higgins reminded the BAR that a Special Permit is a privilege. He asked two questions for consideration: (1) Can this site be developed in such a way as to deserve the privilege of a special permit? (2) Can this building meet the Board's standards?

Mr. Martin: Will a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted when ~~it~~ the building comes back to the Board?

Mr. Lay: The 3rd street facade, the

BAR: 11-15-78

(11)

High Street facade and the brick patterning all need ~~more~~ much more study. Is the architect willing to work on these things?

Mr. van Groll: Do we want to patch it up or not? It is an inappropriate building.

Mrs. Smith: We should prepare a simple statement ~~indicating~~ indicating whether or not we are heading toward approval or disapproval.

Mr. Martin: We must comment on the basic layout as it occurs on the property. Are the masses well distributed? Do the setbacks work? The Planning Commission needs our thoughts.

Mrs. Ramsay: We should prepare one statement for the Commission. It must be a consensus of our feelings.

Mr. Martin: The basic concept is not unappealing. I could live in the building

BAR: 11-15-78

(12)

without feeling badly. There is room for considerable improvement — a lot more could be done. Nevertheless, I could still live with it even if nothing more were done. I am not trained in art or architecture. I am a builder and thus would tend to take a practical approach. Certain enhancements will increase the cost of the project. I am not willing to reject the building at the present time. Its strengths lie in the mixed use, siting, ~~and~~ orientation and open space. There is a problem with scale at the corner of 3rd and Jefferson, however.

Mr. van Groll said that Queen Charlotte Square will have a major impact on the downtown area.

Mr. Lay noted that other architects have prepared "super" presentations, and worked very hard to present their ideas to the Board. The Queen Charlotte Square presentation is poor by comparison, he said.

BAR: 11-15-78

Mrs. Ramsay said that the project should not be judged by the quality of the presentation.

However, said Mr. Martin, he is trying to "sell" an idea.

Mr. Lay said that the purpose of a presentation is to present and clarify ideas. Mr. van Groll agreed.

Mrs. Smith spoke about the Board's comments to the Planning Commission. She asked, "how do we judge the building if part of it is good and part of it is bad"? It's like a piece of ~~art~~ sculpture, she said, if one side is bad, then the entire piece is bad. We must make a general statement summarizing our feelings.

Mr. van Groll spoke about the details of a building, any building, that is to be built in the Historic District. He said the details should reflect something about the

BAR: 11-15-78

(14)

Historic District. ~~There~~ There are features that can be distilled from the neighborhood buildings, he said. As far as we can tell, this building does not respond appropriately to the neighborhood.

Mr. Martin disagreed. Mr. Norris, he said, is probably taking a wider view of the picture. He is looking at the business aspects of the project.

Mr. van Groll said that the design is "out of the air." It has nothing to do with the Historic District.

Mr. Lay said that the Board should list the pros and cons of the project, and then ~~write~~ write a summary statement. Mr. Martin agreed.

Mrs. Ramsay said that she liked Mr. Lay's comments about the project. She said ~~that~~ that a compromise may be necessary. There may be some trade-offs that are possible.

BAR: 11-15-78

Mrs. Wadlington appointed Mr. van Grool and Mr. Farmer to prepare a rough draft of the Board's ~~the~~ position in this matter.

The Board of Architectural Review will meet in the Basement Conference Room on Monday night, Nov. 20, 1978, at 8:00 p.m. to review the rough draft, ~~and~~ and to ~~voice the Board~~ prepare a statement for the Planning Commission.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

JOHN B. FARMER, JR.
Secretary.

THE BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW WAS HELD IN THE BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1978 AT 8:00 P. M.

PRESENT: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin and Mr. Van Groll.

ABSENT: Mr. Keller

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mr. Higgins

Case: 532 Park Street. There was a general discussion concerning the Walton's front porch. Mr. Van Groll noted that the porch needed repair, the owners are not happy with the existing porch design and the existing porch is not original. He sympathized with the request for a smaller porch. Mr. Farmer agreed. Mr. Lay discussed the preliminary sketches that were presented at the November 9, 1978, meeting. He was encouraged by the preliminary designs, and preferred the smaller porch that would enhance the Federal doorway. Mr. Lay talked about problems with "rising damp" and repointing the brick. The Board voted to allow the owners to proceed with plans to remove the porch and design a new one. Mrs. Smith will communicate the Board's feelings to the Waltons.

Case No. BAR 78-72. (Continued):

Dr. Samuel D. Caughron, 211 East High Street.

Colors for the building and some other work had been previously approved, but there were still some unresolved matters which Dr. Caughron wished to present. Board members approved the following decisions unanimously: 1. to double the size of the existing chimney cap, which would allow the opening up and use of a second fireplace in the house. 2. Replacement of the light on the porch by either a flat or a short hanging lamp, similar to drawings A and C which Dr. Caughron submitted. Number B., a double light, was not approved. 3. Approval of the sign that had been previously submitted; but, to be a single board rather than composed of two or three sections hung together with chains. The size will not exceed 6 square feet per side, and it will hang on the existing pole, which is topped by a carriage lamp.

Case No. BAR 78-70 (Continued):

C. James Summers, 415 Park Street. Approval was granted to change the wording on the sign which had been approved on October 12, 1978, by raising the "key" design slightly and inserting the words, "Robert M. Huff and" at the top. All other features will remain the same. Mr. Huff has agreed to remove his other hanging signs which are on the porch of the building.

Case No. BAR 78-75: Queen Charlotte Square.

Mrs. Wadlington asked for the Committee report regarding the Board's position in this case. Mr. Van Groll suggested that the rough-draft be read aloud. Mr. Farmer distributed copies of the draft report, and then read it to the Board.

Following the reading of the report, there was a point by point discussion of its contents. A few changes were made in the wording. Mrs. Ramsey commented that the report was excellent, and that the Board's position could not have been

better stated. Mrs. Smith moved for acceptance of the report, as revised, as the expression of the Board's position in this case. Mrs. Ramsey seconded the motion. The motion passed on an unanimous vote of the Board of Architectural Review.

Mr. Lay asked if the minutes of past meetings, during which Queen Charlotte Square was discussed, would be sent to the Planning Commission. Mr. Higgins answered that his office would like to include all minutes, concerning this project, in the background material that would be sent to the Commission. Several Board members said that this was a good idea.

Mr. Farmer announced that the minutes would be written and delivered to Mrs. Drumheller immediately after the Thanksgiving weekend. He instructed Mr. Higgins to ask Mrs. Drumheller for a typed copy of the BAR minutes in time for distribution to the Planning Commission.

A hand-written copy of the BAR report on Queen Charlotte Square (presented as a memo to the Planning Commission) was given to Mr. Higgins for typing and distribution.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Farmer, Jr.
Secretary

Chairman

Board of Architectural Review Minutes

Meeting: Nov. 20, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

Location: Basement Conference Room
City Hall

Board Members present: Mrs. Wadlington, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Ramsay, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Lay, Mr. Martin, Mr. Van Groll.

Board Members absent: Mr. Keller

City Officials present: Mr. Higgins

Case: 532 Park Street.

There was a general discussion concerning the Waltons' front porch. ~~that~~ Mr. Van Groll noted that the porch ~~was~~ needed repair, the owners are not happy with the existing porch design, and the existing porch is not original. He sympathized with the request for a smaller porch. Mr. Farmer agreed. Mr. Lay discussed the preliminary sketches that ~~had been~~ were presented at the Nov. 9, 1978, meeting. He was encouraged by the preliminary designs, ~~and~~ and preferred the smaller porch that would enhance the Federal doorway.

Mr. Lay talked about problems with "rising damp" and repointing the brick. The Board voted to allow the Owners to proceed with plans.

to remove the porch and design a new one. Mrs. Smith will communicate the Board's feelings to the Waltons.

CASE NO. BAR 78-72 (Continued);

(2)

Dr. Samuel D. Caughron, 211 East High Street.

Colors for the building and some other work had been previously approved, but there were still some unresolved ~~decisions~~ ^{matters} which Dr. Caughron wished to present. Board members approved the following decisions unanimously: 1) to double the size of the ^{existing} chimney cap, which would allow the opening up and use of a second fireplace in the house. 2) Replacement of the light on the porch by either a flat or a short hanging lamp, similar to drawings A and C which Dr. Caughron submitted. #B, a double light, was not approved. 3) Approval of the sign that had been previously submitted; but, to be a single board rather than composed of two or three sections hung together with chains. The size will not exceed 6 square feet per side, and it will hang on the existing pole, which ^{is} ~~will be~~ topped by a carriage lamp.

CASE NO. BAR 78-70 (Continued) :

C. James Summers, 5 415 Park Street. Approval was granted to change the wording on the sign which had been approved on ^{Oct. 12, 1978,} by raising the "key" design slightly and inserting the words, "Robert M. Huff and at the top. All other features will remain the same. Mr. Huff has agreed to remove his other hanging signs which are on the porch of the building.

BAR: 11-20-78

Case No. BAR 78-75: Queen Charlotte Square.

Mrs. Wadlington asked for the Committee report regarding the Board's position in this case. Mr. Van Groll suggested that the rough-draft be read aloud. Mr. Farmer distributed copies of the draft report, and then read it to the Board.

Following the reading of the report, there was a point by point discussion of its contents. A few changes were made in the wording. Mrs. Ramsay commented that the report was excellent, and that the Board's position could not have been better stated. Mrs. Smith moved for acceptance of the report, as revised, as the expression of the Board's position in this case. Mrs. Ramsay seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous vote of the Board of Architectural Review.

BAR - 11/20/78

(4)

Mr. Lay asked if the minutes of past meetings, during which Queen Charlotte Square was discussed, would be sent to the Planning Commission. Mr. Higgins answered that his office would like to include all minutes, concerning this project, in the background material that would be sent to the Commission. Several Board members said ~~expressed~~ that this was a good idea.

Mr. Farmer announced that the minutes would be written and delivered to Mrs. Drumheller immediately after the Thanksgiving weekend. He instructed Mr. Higgins to ask Mrs. Drumheller ~~to~~ for a typed copy of the BAR minutes in time for ~~the~~ distribution to the Planning Commission.

A hand-written copy of the BAR report on Queen Charlotte Square (presented as a memo to the Planning Commission) was given to Mr. Higgins for typing and distribution.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned