

**BAR MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
March 19, 2024 – 5:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In person at City Space & virtual via Zoom)**



Welcome to this Regular Monthly Meeting of the Charlottesville Board of Architectural Review (BAR). Due to the current public health emergency, this meeting is being held online via Zoom and in person at City Space. The meeting process will be as follows: For each item, staff will make a brief presentation followed by the applicant's presentation, after which members of the public will be allowed to speak. Speakers shall identify themselves and give their current address. Members of the public will have, for each case, up to three minutes to speak. Public comments should be limited to the BAR's jurisdiction; that is, regarding the exterior design of the building and site. Following the BAR's discussion, and before the vote, the applicant shall be allowed up to three minutes to respond, for the purpose of clarification. Thank you for participating.

Members Present: Cheri Lewis, Tyler Whitney, Ron Bailey, Carl Schwarz, Roger Birle, Breck Gastinger, James Zehmer, David Timmerman

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Jeff Werner

Pre-Meeting:

Mr. Gastinger had questions about the window replacement on Ridge Street. Staff did go over the application with the members of the BAR. In the ordinance, Mr. Schwarz brought up the financial cost of the project. Mr. Timmerman had concerns about the front door of the Ridge Street application. There was a discussion regarding the Ridge Street application. Mr. Zehmer referred to a website from the National Park Service recommendations for rehabilitation.

Staff also went over the 747 Park Street application.

Mr. Zehmer called the BAR meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

A. Matters from the public not on the agenda.

No Public Comments

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

1. Meeting Minutes – February 21, 2024

Ms. Lewis – Moved to Approve – Mr. Bailey with the Second – Motion passes 6-0 with one abstention (Mr. Gastinger).

C. Deferred Items

NA

D. New Items

2. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 24-03-04

807 Rugby Road, TMP 050013000

Rugby Road HC District

Owner/Applicant: Cat Jensen, George Ragsdale

Project: Modify front porch (change portico to flat roof)

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA to remove the portico roof segment of the front porch roof and replace with either a flat roof (membrane) or one with a low pitch (metal). No changes will be made below the current entablature, the existing trim, and columns will all remain.

Mr. Schwarz did provide some advice to the applicant. It was determined that Mr. Schwarz did not need to recuse himself from participating in the vote of this Certificate of Appropriateness.

Cat Jensen, Applicant – I believe in this process and this board existing. It is why we love our neighborhood and our house as much as we do with that charm and historical character. From the moment we saw the house, that portico was this bad ‘nose on a pretty face.’ We have been thinking about what we could do. We recently learned that the roof needed to be replaced. We’re being ‘strong-armed’ by our insurance company. A roof replacement is coming up. We thought we don’t want to put money towards this bad portico, and maybe we should try to fix this now. I like the flat style. That is not a sophisticated argument. We went around the neighborhood and found one that is similar. I guess it is more in the federalist style on our colonial revival leaning home. The change would be at home in the neighborhood. I think we are doing the neighborhood a visual service. However, we are deconstructing something that somebody built. It is part of the history. At the very least, we would like to edit that asphalt ‘eyebrow.’ Hopefully, we can do more and make it good as it is facing Rugby Road. It is a public property.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Ms. Lewis – Would you prefer a flat roof or a low-pitched roof? Is there a preference?

Ms. Jensen – I prefer the flat roof. The low-pitched roof was another one that we found examples of around the neighborhood. It would reduce the volume of that pediment enough to make it more in proportion with the façade of the home. I personally lean towards the flat roof.

Ms. Lewis – I didn’t know whether the drawing that was submitted was perfectly flat. I didn’t know what category it fell into. Is that perfectly flat? Was there a little pitch to it?

Mr. Birle – Are you thinking of a membrane rubber roof or a standing seam, very low slope metal roof?

Ms. Jensen – I would love to do the standing seam everywhere. If allowed, it would be membrane. The angle from which you see it, the membrane wouldn’t jump out at you. You’re not looking down at it. That could be a more economical solution.

Ms. Lewis – Is the street below the house?

Ms. Jensen – Yes. It is slightly slopes down the front yard.

Mr. Whitney – Are you replacing the overall roof of the main house?

Ms. Jensen – Yes. That is ‘on the table.’ We are getting mixed answers. We got feedback from our insurance company that they won’t insure this roof. We have talked to 4 roofers. Two roofers have said to replace it. One roofer has said to repair it. Another roofer said that we have 2 to 5 years left on it.

Mr. Whitney – Are you looking at asphalt shingle for replacing?

Ms. Jensen – Yes. We are looking at designer asphalt shingles to emulate slate to varying degrees of success and 3 tabs that are what is on it now.

Mr. Zehmer – If it is replaced in kind, it doesn’t need to come to us. If it was to change material, it might need to come to us.

Mr. Werner – The evidence from the Sanborn maps is that it has been a shingle roof. I don’t mind. The materials that she has shared with me is not a fake slate asphalt. It is a darker color.

Mr. Timmerman – Do you have an idea of what is behind the pediment? Is it pediment on brick? I am curious. Sometimes when you take some of that stuff off, you don’t quite know what you are going to get behind it.

Ms. Jensen – It is brick. I assume that it is brick behind it. That is behind the originality question. It looks like, from the sides, where it meets the brick, the way that it is treated, it appears as though it is brick behind.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – I don’t think there is anything in our guidelines that would allow us to even prohibit this. The guidelines, for this neighborhood, say it is important to have a porch. They don’t specify porches for porticos or porches with any sort of style. It still fits the massing of the house.

Ms. Lewis – I think the issue is removing an element that we believe is not original. We are not 100 percent certain that it was added later.

Mr. Schwarz – We need to decide what constitutes an actual demolition. In a Conservation District, my understanding is you could rip all the trim off the house. You could take every decorative element off, and it wouldn’t matter. I guess that is more than decorative trim. This seems perfectly fitting within the guidelines.

Ms. Lewis – Are you replacing the roof on the side porch to match?

Ms. Jensen – Yes. That is the plan. There are architectural drawings in the packet that were made in 2010 that document that portico precisely. In addition to photos, if somebody did later want to restore to its former version, they would have that as well.

Mr. Zehmer – Documentation is important. I would look to the National Park Services Standards for historic preservation. There are some good resources there on how to properly document it both photographically and through measured drawings. Looking at our standards for review for historic conservation districts, there are a few things to check off. Whether the form, height, mass, and placement of the proposed construction are

visually and architecturally compatible with the site and applicable conservations district. The harmony of the proposed changes in terms of overall proportion in the size and placement of entrances and windows. The impact of the proposed changes on the essential architectural form and integrity of the existing building. The effect of the proposed change on the adjacent building or structures and any applicable provisions of the city's design guidelines. I am not a fan of taking away original elements. I also tend to agree with Mr. Schwarz. I don't think there is something that prohibits us from saying 'no.'

Mr. Gastinger – I agree because this is in a conservation district. It should and could be allowed. I don't think that if this was in a historic district, that we would approve it. I am in favor of the application. I will note that I believe that Rugby Road starts at the top of the hill and comes down. Even with a flat roof, the material will be visible from the street.

Mr. Zehmer – If that is the case, do we want to talk about if it is a membrane roof and the color of that membrane roof. Typically, they are black or white.

Ms. Jensen – I would think it would be black or a darker color.

Motion – Mr. Bailey – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including City Design Guidelines for Historic Conservation Districts, I move to find that the front porch alterations at 807 Rugby Road satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the Rugby Road Historic Conservation District, and that the BAR approves the application as submitted. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 8-0.

3. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 24-03-01

712 Ridge Street, TMP 250067000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Chinh Le

Project: Replace doors/windows, remove chimney, construct driveway

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request CoA for:

- Replacement of existing windows with sash/frame inserts. Pella Lifestyle series.
- Removal of a structurally unsound chimney. Hole to be infilled with roof repair.
- Alterations to the front retaining wall to accommodate a driveway. New side walls and repairs to existing will be concrete, painted, to match the existing.
- Possible replacement of the front door.

Chinh Le, Applicant – I am excited to restore this home. I have some plans for both internal improvements and the changes that staff mentioned. I am hoping to be able to restore the home in a way that will improve the neighborhood and help it become a nice property on the street. The condition that it is in right now is one that I don't feel comfortable being there. The one thing that I will say about the windows is that I do have a contractor. I did ask him to try to identify windows that would be as close to maintaining the integrity, style, and look of the property as possible. I think that is what we have come up with. After we talked with staff, we did talk to a couple of different window restoration people. One of the people that we talked to (Charlottesville Glass); my understanding is that they would replace the glass. They won't restore the window itself, the frame, the sash, and the various elements. I don't think that they were the right people. I talked to someone else, who does windows. I sent her some materials. She said that she would come out and look more carefully. It was of a cost that exceeded my own ability to pay, given all the other things that I would like to do to the house. If we need to pursue that further, I am happy to have more conversations with her. I think that she does window restoration around Virginia. She is not in Charlottesville. That is part of the cost. They would have to come

here and either remove the windows or stay here and work on the windows. I know there are other elements. I suspect that windows might be of great issue to the BAR.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – I am guessing that a lot of the conversation will be about windows. I am first going to ask about the driveway. There is no garage, and you are not proposing a garage. Can you explain more about the purpose of the driveway? Is it primarily for parking? How far would it extend into the site?

Mr. Le – I would request permission to go into further detail. I haven't obtained a contractor to develop the details of how far it would go. The primary reason would be for off-street parking. There is significant room there. Looking up and down the street most of the homes have driveways. That would be one reason. An additional benefit would be the opportunity to bury the power line, which is cutting across the property. The plan would be to cut through the concrete wall for the driveway cutout and curve that wall around. The property is sloped. It would probably be a slightly sloping driveway or a relatively flat driveway with the concrete wall coming around the side of the driveway.

Mr. Whitney – Do the windows currently have storms on the outside?

Mr. Le – They do. Many of the storms are either falling apart or just a frame of a storm. Most of them are just the frame of the storm.

Mr. Schwarz – In the packet, there are a bunch of pictures of the windows from the last application.

Mr. Le – There are some pictures from the prior application. I had a home inspection done. A part of that report, if not all that report is included. Some of the windows appear there as well.

Mr. Schwarz – On the sheet for the replacement windows, the specification says 'without HGP.' Do you know what that means?

Mr. Le – I do not know.

Mr. Schwarz – I looked on Pella's website. They do allow for the muttons to be installed on both sides of the glass and an individual bar inside the glass. You can get the lifestyle without that.

Ms. Lewis – I had a question about the chimney. From the staff report, staff said that it was a venting chimney. Is it a venting chimney?

Mr. Le – The house has 2 chimneys. The one that we are requesting to remove is not being used. I don't know what it was for. It is not a fireplace chimney. It is no longer being used. My understanding from the home inspection is that it is compromised all the way down. When I talked to the home inspector, he said to remove it immediately. This chimney could fall.

Mr. Zehmer – Is there any documentation on the front door? It seems 'up in the air' whether it is original.

Mr. Le – I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. Birle – Is there any more documentation on the individual windows? When we look at these pictures, it is hard to tell the actual shape of the individual windows. There is one picture where it looks like there is rot in a corner of a sash. Has anyone done a window-by-window assessment?

Mr. Le – I haven't done a window-by-window assessment. I have looked at all of them. I think that the home inspector's report said that half or more of them don't open or close. That might have been in the original application from several years ago. There are probably a dozen panes that are broken in some way. I don't have a window-by-window assessment.

Mr. Werner – There is not a deterioration rot-wise. They have been so neglected for so long that they are coming apart. They would have to be removed and reassembled. It is more mechanical failure than it is a fungus.

Mr. Whitney – Staff's recommendation on the front door is that it needs to be replaced.

Mr. Werner – You can see the frame here. It has the multiple locks that have been installed on the door itself. It has had a series of things added to it. It is a real interesting piece of art. If this was to go back in at the door, this is something going to a woodshop. They would remove the glass, repair it, and probably reconstruct the frame. It could be done. The reconstruction would be to retain that oval glass.

Ms. Lewis – Are there more locks on the door than just the 2 that are shown?

Mr. Werner – I counted four locks.

Mr. Timmerman – In looking at the new windows sash replacement, have you considered how that would disregard the old storm windows? Has there been any thought about how those replacement windows are going to change the overall outline of the window? Are they going to reduce the glazing by a certain amount? When they go in, are you going to see what you see now minus the bad storms?

Mr. Le – This is from a layperson's perspective. My understanding is that it would be as it appears now minus the storms.

Mr. Werner – These are not sash replacements. They are not removing a sash and getting new sash reconstructed installed. It is a thin frame. It has a spring. It won't be weights. There is an inch reduction overall. When this was reviewed in 2019, the windows that were offered were much smaller than it was a flat piece of trim flashing that was put on and covered up the exterior trim. It filled that void. These are manufactured such that the exterior trim remains. The frame is fit into that framed opening. It retains that existing profile. It will still be slightly smaller.

Mr. Timmerman – It is the same kind of window. It is something where you insert it into the existing frame. It is not a full replacement. What you are saying is that this one has a lesser profile than some of the ones we have seen in the past.

Mr. Werner – They are custom made. They are intended to have a tight fit. With the others, you had a 36-inch frame opening. The thing was 30 inches. You knew it would fit. The original reason these came to us in 2019 is that renters play a game with their landlords. They will call the city and request a building safety inspection. There are a lot of rental units where the windows are screwed shut, they don't open, or they have been painted shut. That is a violation. When I looked at these windows in 2019, the weights were there, the ropes were gone, they were painted shut, and the frame was falling apart. We could have a discussion today. When we get a situation like this, do we want to look. How do we weigh the situation here? In my house, I

was able to remove the windows and strip them. At that time, it was cheaper. That doesn't exist anymore. At my house, I have 4 windows I didn't do. One of the big drawbacks is I know I would have to take the window out, take the sash out. What do I put in there while I am doing this? There is more to it than just someone being able to do it. The appeal of these replacements is the appeal to be able to do it. I feel comfortable, under the circumstances of this house, its age, and its condition that allowing the replacement of the 3 walls, the sides, the back, an effort made. Most of the windows are similar size. The applicant could salvage whatever is the best sash and put in a little work. It is not difficult to replace the sash ropes. That would be a reasonable balance on this one. We are going to have to look at how we treat windows. It is a lot of people like the applicant who acquiring these houses and stuck with what they can do. I don't know how to advise him. It is not an easy solution.

Mr. Timmerman – It seems like a reasonable tack to take from my perspective. Looking at these pictures makes me nervous. I have been dealing with the same thing. Do I replace and try to go higher efficiency? I have stuck with my old single Paine windows and all their deficiencies. I like the looks. They're not as in bad shape. It looked like some of the side trims were rotted out. There is a lot of work here. Prioritizing the front, making deference to the visible portion of the street, and showing authenticity there. With the other 3 sides, most of the windows are higher efficiency and something that is going to work for you. There is the whole maintenance thing. How do you deal with it during construction? I would agree with your perspective on it, knowing how important windows are and how much we want to preserve the original ones as much as possible. They do add character to the house unlike any other element.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Zehmer – I would like to frame our conversation. There are 4 different parts of this application. It makes sense to start with the 'low hanging fruit,' and move to the more in-depth conversation. I would like to start with the structurally unsound chimney removal. I think that is fine.

There was consensus amongst the other members of the BAR regarding the chimney.

Mr. Zehmer – The next 2 items are on par with each other. We will go with the front retaining wall and the driveway.

Mr. Gastinger – I don't feel there is sufficient information to approve a driveway. I don't think it is a driveway. It is a parking space. This property is one of the southernmost in the ADC District. I feel that we need more information about where there is precedent. What I am concerned about is creating a situation where there starts to be parking in the front yards of this district. My quick cursory look is that there are drives and curb-cuts. They are all leading to the rear of property or parking structures. I know that south of here, outside of the district, it looks like there is more parking on the street. Together with the crude information, we don't have enough information.

Ms. Lewis – I was going to ask what the applicant did submit on this. The only thing I saw on the driveway looked to have been prepared by staff.

Mr. Werner – It is just a sketch that I offered in the conversation.

Ms. Lewis – Were we provided any materials. I didn't see any in the packet. What would the drivable surface be? You are cutting through a volume. It is not just a flat surface.

Mr. Zehmer – We have a marked-up photograph. There was a reference to, in terms of a paving surface, what we typically go for with driveways and walkways in the guidelines. Mr. Gastinger's point is well taken. There was no formal site plan submitted, which would show us the driveway potential parking area. It may be acceptable if it was in the rear and details of the retaining wall that would need to be installed.

Mr. Bailey – I would like to bring the Board's attention to the fact where the picture of the driveway is. It is on an abutting piece of land (229 Lankford Avenue) where 2 cars are parked in a driveway right by that house. There is precedence.

Mr. Zehmer – Part of what I am hearing is that whereas we may not be fully opposed. We don't have enough information to make this decision.

Mr. Schwarz – If anybody is doing a straw poll, I am fine with that driveway. It is off to the side. It seemed simple.

Mr. Zehmer – Some of us may not be opposed but may want more information.

Mr. Whitney – Are there site trees that would be removed for the driveway?

Mr. Werner – There is a large dead tree. I did tell the applicant that the tree looks dangerous, and it should be removed ASAP. The last time we had a big front yard driveway discussion was that house on Park Street. By code, you are allowed to use 25 percent of the front yard for parking. You can't turn it into a parking lot. You can constrain things with a no 3-point turn place. If it is paved, someone can put a car there. With the extent that that would maybe go into the front yard, you can look at that. A drawing of some type that you would like to see would be helpful to express to me and the applicant what it is that we would like to see. He can then prepare that. If it is just unacceptable to do it, that would be helpful for him to know before he hired a contractor to develop some drawings.

Mr. Birle – I don't think it is unacceptable. I would like to get more information.

Mr. Zehmer – I would like to see a site plan with details regarding the retaining wall.

Mr. Birle – The retaining wall is pretty character defining.

Mr. Zehmer – The next item is the front door. I was looking in the design guidelines. There was information on the windows.

Mr. Werner – There isn't anything specific about doors. I used what we typically recommend for windows.

Mr. Zehmer – There is a section on rehabilitation on porches, entrances, and doors. It is lacking on doors.

Mr. Birle – There is some question about whether the door is original or not. It has a lot more historic character to me than the suggested replacement doors. It would not be an onus to ask for that to be restored. That is all doable to patch a door lock hole and to patch a jam.

Mr. Schwarz – I imagine that it probably has a lot of holes that have been bored into where the lock set should be. I find the door odd looking and that it doesn't look like it fits with the style of the house. It doesn't seem to stand out to you guys. I find it hard to believe that beveled oval glass survived 100 years.

Mr. Zehmer – It has survived about 40 years with renters. Without seeing the inset in person, it would be hard for me to make a call one way or the other.

Mr. Birle – Maybe it is the replacement that I am getting hung up on. The possible options here seem like an off-the-shelf arts & craft looking detail that feels new to me. The replacement windows would not feel immediately new.

Mr. Zehmer – Perhaps looking for inspiration around the neighborhood and other similar houses for a replacement front door would be advisable.

Mr. Whitney – I like the character of the front door. It looks like it, with patching and restoration, is salvageable.

Mr. Zehmer – You can patch holes where locks have been.

Mr. Werner – One I would say is that you have a door that fits that frame. Getting something new to fit would be money either way. It is worth exploring.

Mr. Schwarz – The odd thing about that door is because with a full light like that on a front door, you must put a lock that has a key on the inside, which is an illegal lock. Otherwise, someone can break through the glass and open the door.

Ms. Lewis – That is why I don't think it is original.

Mr. Schwarz – I imagine that they are going to want to have a thumb turn lock as opposed to having a key sitting somewhere, which is the only way to secure that door.

Mr. Werner – It is an egress issue. In an emergency and someone is in the house, it is a double lock. If they don't have the key, they can't exit. You can have a thumb latch. That gets into somebody couldn't break in. You are not allowed to have a double deadbolt.

Mr. Birle – This is an important element. I would hate to see this off the shelf, arts & craft inspired door.

Mr. Bailey – Would it be possible to ask the applicant to look in the neighborhood for other doors that might be reasonable and would not require the restoration and be more secure?

Mr. Le – I am happy to look around and circle back with staff with additional options. If I were to prioritize the requests, I would say the door is at the bottom for me. There are these other things.

Mr. Timmerman – What is your biggest issue with it? Is it the fact that it doesn't close right, or you don't like the way it looks? Can you give a priority list of the reasons why you want to get rid of it?

Mr. Le – One is security. Once I finish the renovations, I plan to replace the lock. In thinking ahead, the security of both the large glass and what the lock situation will be like. The wood is splitting in different ways. I am sure there are ways to restore it. I just didn't see an easy restoration solution. This is one element.

Mr. Werner – It can be reconstructed using elements that are there. It would be a lot of new stuff. It would be new rails and styles. It is like a plywood material that the glass is set in. It is odd and it is splitting.

Ms. Lewis – Our guidelines do say to avoid substituting the original doors. I am not 100 percent convinced this is original. It doesn't look like it was original. I know it is not part of our guidelines. Having a door that is more than one-half glass is different than Ridge Street. I would allow a replacement door on behalf of the owner for a lot of reasons. What it is replaced with is the issue. I had no problem with the door that was presented.

Mr. Zehmer – I don't necessarily see us approving this entire CoA as it is right now. Is there a way we can approve part of it?

Mr. Schwarz – The driveway wasn't going to get the votes. I was Ok with what was proposed. The chimney is a 'yes.' With the door, I am Ok with what has been proposed. It looks like we are split with the door.

Mr. Werner – With the door, what I had heard from all of you earlier is to look around the neighborhood and maybe a little more exploration. That is helpful in the sense that you are answering the question. It is a replacement door that is suitable to this period and suitable to this district if there is something that can be found. I am Ok with you trusting me on that.

Ms. Lewis – When I came on the BAR, I was told that we can't do that. I know a city attorney has left the city attorney's office.

Mr. Werner – What I am saying is that is an appropriate approach. Allowing this door to be removed and something put in its place. That something that is put in its place will be appropriate to this architectural period, to this style, and to this district. Those are clear instructions to me.

Ms. Lewis – Is there a type of door? I defer to the architects. Would you want it replaced with a solid wood door? Could it be metal? I am thinking of things that could give staff and the applicant some guidance.

Mr. Birle – In some ways, if we are going to replace the door, make it less ornamented in some ways, a simpler door that is wood. I agree with the comments everybody made about the safety issues. I am not against replacing the door.

Mr. Timmerman – I would say more period sensitive.

Mr. Gastinger – It sounds like we have a majority if we add that language. We are going to approve the CoA for the elements that will pass.

Mr. Werner – The separate CoA is very different when we are looking at a project and saying we have a CoA for the height or for the massing. In order to produce a coherent motion, I don't have any problem with breaking them up. Individually addressing each of them allows some clarity. It is not as if you are saying 'we're giving you something broad and you need to come back later for some additional approvals.' There is some finality to the approval. It is discrete and can be expressed. I can understand it later.

Mr. Zehmer – Keep in mind that there is added siding to this house that originally been stucco. The general appearance might have been a little different.

With the windows, we should take a moment. On page 32 of the packet are the guidelines for windows. Window replacement is one of the most contentious issues in historic preservation. We are largely governed by the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Preservation, particularly the rehabilitation standard. To sum it up, you should always take a repair before replacing. That should always be our standard. To replace windows, they need to be proven to be beyond a state of repair. For example, item seven on this list: 'replace

windows only when they are missing or beyond repair.’ The first item on this guideline is a survey of existing window conditions as recommended. I feel that the application from 2019 had a good photographic survey. I would like to see that again with this effort to show where we are seeing this level of failure on which windows. There are some pathways through these guidelines to allow for some replacement, specifically on non-primary facades, sides, and rear of the building. If you have a good sash on a side window that meets the dimensions of a bad sash on a primary façade, you can use that sash on the primary façade. You are using a historic element on the main façade of the building. That is a ‘trick of the trade’ that is often acceptable. There are a lot of details in here about, if we get to replacement, making sure mutton sizing profiles preferably match the historic materiality being wood. We want to err on the side of our guidelines.

Mr. Schwarz – I have been wanting to throw out our window guidelines. It bothers me that there is a difference between historic windows. Just because it is old doesn’t mean it is valuable. There are windows that represent handicraft and customization that can’t be replaced. There are just functional units that wear out over time the same way a roof will wear out over time. At some point, they must be replaced. They are operable parts. They don’t last forever. It is problematic that we are telling people that they can’t have operable windows. They can, but they must have a storm window on the outside that also has to operate. I struggle with this. We have precedent of allowing other people to replace their windows. While I understand the desire to keep the windows on the front façade, I also struggle with that a little bit. That makes sense if you can do internal storm windows and if you are close to a street where someone can appreciate them. It seems to me that this house being set back so far, it would do more for the character of the house to get rid of the storm windows and have functioning windows that can open, close, be air tight, allow them to get fresh air when the weather is right, and allow them to keep the cold and the heat out when the weather is not. One of our purposes on the BAR is to offer exceptions to our guidelines. It would be very easy to use the guidelines as a code and have a picture-book building code for historic districts. I am Ok with replacing the windows. I think they are far gone. The storm windows need to be replaced. I accept the applicant’s description of it being too difficult for them to find someone to do the repairs. We need to take that into consideration.

Mr. Whitney – I have the same opinion as Mr. Schwarz. This house needs a lot of work. I applaud the applicant for taking on the task of looking at restoring this historic home. I am thinking about the overall exterior appearance. It is set back from the road. The number one thing that would improve the appearance of the windows would be removing the storm windows that are detracting from the window. Visually, they have taken some time to look at what the light patterning is, what the mutton pattern is. Visually, I don’t think you are visually going to be able to tell that the windows aren’t historic when you see that it is only going to improve the overall appearance of the house if you replace the windows. The owner would get well functioning windows to go over with the overall improvement on the house. I would vote to approve.

Mr. Birle – As would I, especially after hearing staff’s firsthand description of the windows themselves. It is a little hard to glean that from the photographs. In some of the photographs, it looks like some of the paint is peeling. It sounds like it is much more than that. Maybe they can’t be repaired. We shouldn’t discredit the energy efficiency. That is one of those places where we can make exceptions.

Mr. Gastinger – I agree. We do review these on a case-by-case basis. We have reviewed this one before. The solution for replacing these windows is a much better one than what was previously presented. That should be noted. It will be a huge improvement to remove those storms.

Mr. Bailey – I agree with all these comments. It makes good sense. It won’t detract from the character of the house. It will improve its livability.

Ms. Lewis – The guidelines do require an argument to be made for repairing and restoring. This is a good instance where we don’t follow the guidelines and say that replacement is appropriate. I want to note that the

dark green surround around the windows is a character defining element of this house. On the 2 sets, you have 6 windows (three on each side). They are not regularly sized. I think that it defines the house on both levels. Knowing that will be retained, that is something that is much more noticeable from the public right-of-way where we have some purview.

Mr. Gastinger – There is a transom that was noted in the architectural description. I can't tell if it is boarded up or if it is still there. Is that something that can be replaced when or restored in the context?

Mr. Werner – The hope was to keep the frame/the transom. Everything was fine. Operability is driving a lot of the window questions.

Mr. Le – Is the transom painted? It would be nice to restore that so that it is a window.

Ms. Lewis – The transom is character defining of this era. It would be something that we would want to see preserved if possible.

Mr. Le – If it is possible for me to do it, I would love to do it. My one limitation is that every conversation I have with my contractor ends up being more money.

Mr. Werner – In the application, there were no proposed changes here. By default, the only thing we were discussing was the door. The transom wasn't at risk.

Mr. Zehmer – It sounds like we are leaning towards replacement. I appreciate the diagram that was provided showing the survey of the number of lights per window. That is very important to make sure you have the 8 over 1 for the larger second floor windows. For the primary façade, for the replacement of the attic dormer, you have a 4-light sash, a single light sash, and a 4-light sash. My sense is that all those three would match.

Mr. Werner – If I recall, the owner at that time wasn't going to do anything up there. It wasn't proposed.

Mr. Le – The diagram does show the 414. I believe that when I asked the contractor to go through. Those 3 are in the attic. I don't think that the Pella rep went up there. I do want to replace them if my budget permits. They are not in great shape. They are not included because I didn't realize until too late.

Mr. Zehmer – Is anyone opposed to if the applicant eventually replaces those 3 windows to make them all 4 light windows?

Mr. Gastinger – The description from Eugenia Bibb was that the 3-part window with one-over-one double hung hashes in the dormer.

Mr. Werner – I think they are just sash that are hinge sash. It is not a double hung window. I have seen that description before. There are 4-light casement windows. They not double hung. I would think that you could say in a motion that those windows could also be replaced. I don't know how you are planning to use attic or just get a sash replacement and put it in place. There aren't stairs up to the attic.

Motion – Ms. Lewis – **Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed window replacements, chimney removal, and door replacement at 712 Ridge Street satisfy the BAR's criteria and are compatible with this property and other properties in the ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request with the following conditions:**

- **Proposed window replacements will be simulated divided light windows with internal spacer bars that are set in between the panes as submitted by the applicant.**
- **The replacement door with something that is in kind with a circa 1922 American 4-square drawing inspiration from the district.**
- **The proposed driveway is being omitted.**

The BAR also makes the following recommendation.

- **The driveway should be extended beyond the front plane of the house. It should not have a turnaround or an additional parking space in the front yard.**

Second by Mr. Gastinger. Motion passes 7-1. Mr. Zehmer with the objection.

4. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 24-03-02

0 Park Street, Tax Parcel 520051000

(Parcel at rear of 745 Park Street)

North Downtown ADC District

Owners/Applicants: Karen Vадja and Kevin Riddle

Project: New house

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – Request for CoA to construct a new dwelling. Existing 1957 house will remain and not be altered under this request.

Kevin Riddle, Applicant – Nothing has changed from what I showed you last month. It is a modest structure. It is far from public right of ways. We are not touching another building or a historic structure. The presentation materials make it clear what we are doing.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Schwarz – There is an indication of a future phase for a walkway and a future phase for a parking apron. Are we Ok to say that is all right? Do they need to come back for that?

Mr. Werner – When something says ‘future,’ that is the future. The discussion at the preliminary discussion was that everything was going to stay. There was no new driveway, or anything being added. I am comfortable with you clarifying that those are in the future.

Mr. Schwarz – It would be silly if they had to come back.

Mr. Werner – I would suggest that you use the suggested condition from 712 Ridge Street about paving material.

Mr. Riddle – We would not mind coming back with more information about those 2 things. We haven’t done any design work on them yet.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Board

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Motion – Mr. Birle – Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the ADC District Design Guidelines, I move to find that the new dwelling at 0 Park Street [at the rear of 745 Park Street] satisfies the BAR’s criteria and is compatible with this property and other properties in this ADC District, and that the BAR approves the request. Second by Ms. Lewis. Motion passes 8-0.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness Application

BAR 24-03-03

747 Park Street, TMP 520050000

North Downtown ADC District

Owner/Applicant: Geoff Suttle

Project: Alterations and rear addition

Jeff Werner, Staff Report – CoA request for rear addition and alterations to the house. (Note: The submittal discusses the ongoing and planned rehabilitation work on the 1904 house. While the subject of the formal CoA request—maintenance and repair does not require review—the BAR can certainly discuss what has been done and what is planned, as can the applicant, if it would be helpful.)

Geoff Suttle, Applicant – I tried to pull together a lot of information and provide a thorough application.

Next Slide – Preliminary Discussion

The preliminary discussion was over a year ago. The guidance was that it is going to be complicated. You are going to confuse the old with the new if you try to keep the existing stuff that is in the rear or wasn’t original to the house. I provided a reminder here. It previously showed an all-brick exterior. There were a couple other additional discussions around support for replacement of the roof, for the replacement of the built-in gutters that are problematic, and a strong desire to preserve the original windows and the wraparound porch.

Next Slide – Updated Design

The plan is to remove the existing material, the existing rear addition. We did that. We have updated our design specifically to incorporate that. You all encouraged a more temporary style and maybe a more modern style. We took that to heart. We have come back with something that is very different and distinct, certainly as compared to what we originally proposed. As contemplated with the materials, stucco, or a smooth surface or similar is what is contemplated for most of the dish in the rear. There was similar but maybe different outcome to the discussion earlier tonight. There was a strong desire to preserve the original windows. I have spent many months meticulously restoring the windows, the door casings, and the transoms. We used all the original materials wherever we could. We had to replace some of the bottom rails because they were completely rotted out. We kept the original glass. We steamed the glass, cleaned it up, and made it look nice. We hung the glass with the original sash weights. I am hoping that I have earned some goodwill with that and demonstrated where we are ultimately trying to go with this house. The front porch is messy because it is in such bad shape. As staff indicated, the plan is to stabilize that. That is going to be massive project.

Next Slide – Proposed Rear Addition

Here are a couple shots of the proposed addition. The proposed addition is in blue. The original house is in gray up front. The image on the left is the side of the house facing Park Street. The image on the right is the side facing Park Street. The addition is tucked in behind it. The addition itself is about a 20 percent increase in footprint over the original structure. There is an additional 1-story porch.

Next Slide

These images are more ground level shots. The images might make the addition look larger than it is. You can see the stepdown porch in the rear and the dormer up top.

Next Slide – Compliance with Design Guidelines

These were in our application. I went through the guidelines in detail. We have tried to be thoughtful. We checked a lot of the boxes in the guidelines and tried to be specific and thoughtful about that. The first two are the new construction and additions. I pulled out all the elements where we were checking the box.

Next Slide

This is rehabilitation. This is the stuff that we are doing on the front of the house. The front of the house is going to be repair and restoration. It is being kept as is. The only substantive changes are going to be in the rear.

Next Slide

All that information is laid out in the application along with a bunch of additional detail.

Next Slide – Addition Materials & Details

This is getting into detail that we hadn't gotten very specific on a few of these things. I tried to articulate that this is the intent with the stucco, concrete, or similar material for the exterior of the addition. The intent is to be a smooth finish, not overly rough, not textured. It will not have the tie holes or similar ties sticking out. The expansion joints, if any, will either be aligned and/or incorporated into the design. I picked out a few examples to illustrate the type of surface contemplated. With the exterior walls, we love the concept of being able repurpose, reuse some of the materials that come down in the rear, that existing step-down addition when that comes off. It is not original, but it has some nice brick that is not too much different or dissimilar from the original brick of the house. We were thinking accent wall or similar. We are salvaging that. The intent is not to do a bunch of salvage brick. I don't want to overplay this aspect. The indicative example on the right shows 2 full walls as salvage brick. I suspect that is unlikely because we won't be able to salvage that much material.

Next Slide

With doors and windows, the intention is single-light, recessed into the wall, and the openings with minimal or no exterior trim. We were going for a much different look with the addition than a much more contemporary look than the front of the house. Balcony railings will be simple minimalist. They are going to be wood or metal. They are going to have either cables or glass panels. That is the railings on top of the porch. Above entrance in the back, I would love to have the flexibility to carry that similar railing look over to the covering that goes over that rear back door. It is intended as a detail to provide scale. That is encouraged in the guidelines. Those aren't balconies on top of the porch. There won't be a door accessing those. It is windows. That is probably more detailed than you need to know. The railing is detailing and scaling.

Next Slide – Park Street Neighbor Engagement & Support

I talked with many of the neighbors. They currently are our neighbors. We live about a block down from this property. I shared plans and thoughts with the neighbors. Several of them wrote letters of support, which were included in the packet.

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Questions from the Public

QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Gastinger – The description of the material for the rear addition is stucco, concrete, or similar material. That is very broad. Could we understand hardy panel to be one of those materials? Would plywood be one of those materials? I wondered if there has been more discussion about a little more specificity on what that material might be.

Mr. Suttle – Maybe the appropriate wording is smooth stucco, concrete, or very similar material. Plywood is a ‘no’ and not contemplated. The couple illustrative photos that were in the PowerPoint is my attempt at illustrating where I am trying to go.

Mr. Gastinger – The one on the left looked like a stucco. The one on the lower right could have been a synthetic stucco EIFS product. It means different things to this board. I just wanted to see if we could narrow down the range of what those possibilities might be with more understanding of what you have talked about with your builder/designer.

Mr. Whitney – Some of the example photos look more board like. The left example looked much more monolithic, full stucco, and not broken out.

Mr. Werner – There are different ways to do formed concrete if that was the way he was going to do it. I am trying to illustrate what the range was and not necessarily where he was saying he was going. From the conversations, he wants a smooth surface. The images that were shown are the types of things that could be done with masonry walls or that type of wall. That is my understanding; a smooth surface, whether it is a concrete or a stucco. It will not be formed. It won’t have that brutalist look to it.

Mr. Whitney – If it is concrete, you are going to have 4 more calls. I think stucco is your friend if you are trying to go monolithic and not see some of the breakdowns that you are seeing.

Mr. Schwarz – The concrete is still wet, and you can brush it.

Mr. Timmerman – Mr. Gastinger is asking which one is it.

Mr. Gastinger – I want to know what we are approving. Generally, the project is going to have a lot of support. This is one area that is not very specific. There are good ways of creating that kind of surface. There are cheap ways that are not durable that we would probably want to avoid.

Ms. Lewis – There is a good amount of that surface that is visible from other properties and will be partially visible from the public right-of-way. When I did the site visit, there was a description that said painted concrete. What is that? Is that block concrete you are painting, and this is residential, or you poured in place concrete? What is this looking like? I didn’t get a whole lot further than that. I expressed that block concrete would probably not be approved. A poured concrete or a stucco would be more in line with what our guidelines allow. This is not a preliminary discussion. We should have a final material to vote on. That is why we are asking this question. We usually ask for applicants to bring us something that is their final decision.

Mr. Suttle – The materials that you were looking at during the site visit, those were materials that Mr. Werner prepared. He clarified that was effectively a mislabel. Our intent is to do a smooth surface stucco or poured concrete, something very similar along those lines. There are a lot of moving pieces in this application. We went through and incorporated every recommendation that I got the last time. In terms of the exterior material, I am still working with my contractor to understand the cost implications of one material versus the other. With the images that I shared; staff described as a smooth monolithic surface. We are not trying to use cheap materials on the exterior of a very expensive addition paired with an expensive restoration.

Mr. Birle – I have the sort of question about the use of the reclaimed brick. It seems like that is a little bit in flux. Is this what you are shooting for?

Mr. Suttle – I put a couple of examples in here. There is an indicative A, indicative B, and indicative C. Those are probably somewhat extreme examples. There is not going to be that much salvage brick. For this

one, we are showing two accent walls incorporating the brick. I suspect that we may not get that much. That aspect might 'shake out.' As contemplated, we are not trying to put original brick/salvage brick next to original brick in any scenario. Most of the exterior of the addition is contemplated as effectively as that sort of smooth stucco look.

Mr. Birle – This might be more in line for the comments section. Maybe less is more on that reclaimed brick based on what I am seeing here. It might be nice of literally accents.

Mr. Gastinger – I was going to put it in the form of a question. Would you be Ok if there was no reclaimed brick on the siding? What are you trying to achieve with use of the reclaimed brick?

Mr. Suttle – We are going to have brick on site because that is what is coming down. Some of it is bad brick and some of it is in pretty good shape. I was viewing that as an environmentally friendly way to reincorporate some materials into the exterior surface. It is complicated. It is effectively an accent wall or similar.

Mr. Timmerman – I have a question about the massing. There is this step-back that happens in this picture on the far left. Is there a functional reason for that?

Mr. Suttle – Is that the step-back that you're talking about? There is a bit of a neck on this side. The intent here is that we are putting in an elevator. The antenna is put in that elevator shaft. The stairs are flanked on either side. That will run from the driveway level up to the second floor. We are going to spend years restoring this house, working on this addition. We want to 'bake in' the ability to have an elevator down the road. We also have aging parents.

Mr. Timmerman – It is the result of the interior program.

Mr. Suttle – That is correct. At the top is the kitchen and pantry. You have the stairs and the elevator shaft with basically a 'mud room' there closest to the garage.

Mr. Timmerman – Is the dashed red line the existing footprint?

Mr. Suttle – That is the existing footprint. The existing footprint is the dashed red line. What is the addition is about a 20 percent expansion of that existing footprint. Separately, the 1-story porch is another 600 to 700 square feet.

Mr. Whitney – Did you say that the glass railing around the balcony is not occupiable and there are no doors to it?

Mr. Suttle – There are no doors. We intend to put up a simple railing. We are initially thinking cable. It is not intended as a balcony. You can see the windows but no door onto that space.

Mr. Bailey – Would the material for the porch also be part of the stucco/monolithic material?

Mr. Suttle – That is correct. That is what is contemplated.

Mr. Werner – It is identical form. On the addition, there will be windows and, on the porch, will be screen panels.

Mr. Birle – That is a screen porch.

Mr. Suttle – That is intended as a 3-season space.

Mr. Birle – Is there a way out?

Mr. Suttle – One of the panels does not have the crossbar. It is the middle panel. It lines up with the door into the kitchen.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

No Comments from the Public

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Whitney – I want to commend you for everything you are doing to restore the historic house. It seems like you are taking the time to do it the right way and restore every piece to its former glory. With the addition, I support you doing a contemporary piece that stands different to the existing house. I have issues with the overall shape and massing. There are some details that aren't quite figured out. I understand that is where you are in the process. This project could be great in concrete or stucco. They are different. You can do concrete with metal formwork and get a smooth surface. With that, it is about expressing those former holes and seeing that. You could do other things like board formed concrete, but then it is more about the rough wood. It is not about concrete. With the way you are talking about it, it sounds like stucco might be what you are intending. This project could be great as monolithic stucco. I understand trying to salvage some of the brick and use it. It does feel in contrast to the smooth material. I am not sure what the best way to incorporate it is. I am wondering about the whole dormer being brick and stucco. It seems odd to me. I am wondering if the whole dormer is accent brick and feels like a chimney or if it is just an interior finish on a wall in the 3-season room. One accent wall could work. The rough material of the salvaged brick, in contrast to the smoothness of the new material, seems tough to figure out. There are some small details like the addition returning back to the house. There is concrete intersecting with the metal roof. I think you want to notch that out so that it sits under. The parapet can be at that height for the overall addition. I think you want to notch under the gutter when it gets back to the house. Maybe that is a good spot for a downspout. There are some things that we are not quite seeing yet. In general, I think the project will be a great project. It is figuring out some of those things.

Mr. Timmerman – I agree with what Mr. Whitney just said. I would go one step further. Generally, the massing and the idea of disconnecting the new addition from the old is great. I don't know of anybody here that would not support that. However, there is confusion in the expression. Mainly, it is the materiality but also a little bit on the massing side as well. That extends from what Mr. Whitney was saying. For me, the confusion is not so much these but in the color renderings, the way the different materials are coming together. There is not a design logic to it. There is one accent wall here and there is another one there. That is a little concerning to me, given how wonderful the house is. The design is almost there. There is a deficiency in the expression of the materiality and the way it is intended on conveying the design. I agree that making it more consistent, finding a material that is more consistent, and (coming back into the design guidelines under the New Construction & Additions section), there is a material and textures section that says, 'the selection of materials and textures for new buildings should be compatible with and complimentary with the neighborhood buildings.' The second one says 'in order to strengthen the traditional image of the residential areas of the historic districts, brick, stucco, and wood siding are the most appropriate materials for new building.' We have encouraged a contemporary look to this, there is a great opportunity to marry your contemporary ideas but settle them a little bit with some more basic materials. I think it was the north side where you had your salvaged brick on the other side. There was another one where that was. Instead of being white, it was brick. I could almost see that whole contemporary volume being a brick but a contemporary brick that is the same color. It doesn't contrast quite as much. It is not as jarring of contrast. I want to reiterate Mr. Whitney's sense

of how the whole addition touches the historic house. It could be more sensitive in the way it touches it in a lighter way. Keep going with it and find a design logic that fits. I really appreciate the treatment of the windows. I commend the work you have done. The pictures of these windows are beautiful, especially the before and after. We had a conversation about whether the standards are even necessary. That is a good example of why setting the bar is important. The bar was set. You attained it. We all are better for it. You took a house that could have gone either way. You have brought it back to its glory. I think the world of what you have done to that in the time you have been away.

Mr. Werner – There was some discussion about the details. Construction-wise, I envision some walls come up like a parapet. They would come and continue. The challenge is the same as when we looked at it a year ago in trying to get that height. If you stay below, that is a heavy cornice. If you stay below, it drops everything down. When you mentioned that, that is suggesting changing the height. I just want to make sure that we have some clarity on where people stand.

Mr. Suttle – This is something of an important point. The consideration here is the existing rear of the house. It has this awkward stepdown. You see it in the roof and the exterior but also on the interior. With the original structure, part of the appeal is that it has these amazing, high ceilings. Part of what we are going to be doing with the renovation and the addition is installing air conditioning. There is no air conditioning. The air conditioning units will need room for duct work. It is problematic if we are forced to come in underneath the existing roofline. It is going to feel awkward and closed down when you move from one part of the house to the new part of the house if you must lower the roofline but have room for the duct work and all that that comes with the HVAC. The most practical place for some of those units to go are in the attic and in the crawl space. As contemplated with the crawl space, that will be blowing up into the first floor. The attic will be blowing down into the second floor. The ceiling height and the roofline in the addition accounts for that.

Mr. Whitney – I wasn't trying to suggest dropping the whole parapet line or the whole roofline. As that concrete or stucco return to the metal, it is not going to do that. You need to notch out that corner and it could be all metal flashing or scupper. It could be something.

Mr. Zehmer – The concrete wall goes through and the historic abuts into it.

Mr. Schwarz – It is simpler to cut off the cornice than it would be to try and wrap it through some opening the parapet wall.

Mr. Timmerman – From my perspective, it wasn't so much the height. Even the area where the new hits the old, a simple recess could create a separation there.

Mr. Suttle – To be clear, it does not extend from the corner. The addition is stepped back and recessed. That was some of the feedback the last time. We intentionally incorporated that.

Mr. Schwarz – I feel that what you have done is appropriate. What you have done for the existing house is fantastic. The addition is on the back of the house. It is not going to be seen from the district. You might see it slightly from the street. You are not going to see this connection point. I am not sure that making you go through the 'heartburn' of having two sets of HVAC to drop the hyphen makes sense. I don't think it is going to bias anything for the district and the character of the district. What you have proposed seems to make sense. With the suggestion to put brick on the dormer, don't do that. There would never be brick up there. You're going to have to put steel up there to support it if you do that. That is going to have to be stucco or EIFS. The porch is very open and very light. I highly doubt you are going to be able to do that and pour concrete. Even with stucco, you are going to have joints all over the place. Stucco doesn't flex and doesn't move. The problem that we are running into is that there is some artistry going on here. You want to figure things out as

you go along. You haven't quite got everything figured out yet. I feel that when you figure out the details, whether that is when this is under construction or hopefully beforehand, it may end up looking different than what you have. I don't know how to resolve that. What you are proposing is perfectly compatible with our guidelines and acceptable. It is the back of the house. It is a contemporary addition. It is an elegant one. I think the reuse of the brick is a neat idea. You need to figure out what that is going to look like. If it is a small area, that might look weird versus doing a full wall like you are showing in your renderings. I would be willing to give you some flexibility to work with staff on that. That is something that you are not going to know until you have torn down the addition, cleaned up the brick, and figured out that this is how much you have. I am strongly in support of this. We need to be honest with ourselves. If it is going to look as you have modeled it and presented it, it is probably EIFS. I am not sure how you feel about that. That is acceptable and fine. The materiality of this might end up changing as you detail it out a little more.

Mr. Gasstinger – I love the concept and fully support the massing and the approach. If it wasn't for the brick, I would be ready to approve as is. The thing that concerns me is about the way the brick is deployed. I am not against reusing brick. I would support it. I don't understand necessarily how it is being used. It is more like using a paint bucket tool Photoshop. The walls would be built very different if it is supporting brick versus if it is a concrete wall. These have different thicknesses. I would expect that you would create a volume that might be one part portion. One corner or one element might be made from the brick. I think it would be best to just not try to even commit to using the brick in the façade and find a different way of, whether it be in the flat work or on the interior or some other way of reusing the material. That could yield a better project. The renderings that are not in color are more successful than the ones in color for that reason. I am concerned of not knowing what the material is. I like the way you describe them. I also feel that there are a lot of different things that could fall into those descriptions. I don't know where it is going to end up.

Mr. Suttle – I don't want to get hung up on the salvaged brick piece. I would be very comfortable with a condition that the rear addition will be stucco, concrete, or similar. Any integration of salvaged brick would need to be approved by staff. I don't have a problem with that. I don't want to get everybody hung up on the salvaged brick because it is something that we are partially wanting to do from an environmental perspective of wanting to reuse materials. That is part of the motivator. The other part of the motivator is thinking that it would be nice to have. We are going to have a large stucco type addition having some character, some way to integrate something that has some character to it. I don't want to get hung up on it.

Mr. Birle – What if you just painted the brick?

Mr. Gastinger – I think the whole thing is a painted brick volume.

Ms. Lewis – I think so too.

Mr. Birle – There would be more of a clarity to the addition. It is this color, maybe some texture variation. There is a historic part and a new part. This is a great project. The massing is good. Your presentation is the most thorough presentation that I have seen since I have been here. I commend you for that. With the dormer, have you thought about using the roof material on the sidewalls and making the dormer go away visually? Is it copper or is it standing seam?

Mr. Suttle – It is standing seam. I wasn't sure that would be looked favorably upon mimicking the original roof. Contemplating that as stucco or not brick is something that I am Ok with.

Mr. Timmerman – There is an existing dormer to the left. What is that finished in?

Mr. Suttle – I think that it might be shingles. It is not asphalt shingles. The intent with the new dormer was to make it distinct and a similar style to the new addition so it did not mimic what was there.

Mr. Birle – It is on the back of the wall of the house. It is out of our purview. I don't think that it would be confusing if that was in the material of the roof. It would clearly be a modern monitor.

Ms. Lewis – I am supportive of the project. I like the direction that you took it in. You heard our cues about looking contemporary. It will be a great family space for your family. With the exterior planes with both stucco and brick, I don't think our guidelines are opposed to it. It overcomplicates it. I don't want any of us to be read as discouraging from reusing brick. There is a lot that you will take down. We don't know how much is functionally usable. Maybe on the interior wall inside the porch was a great suggestion. Brick can be used all over landscaping. You must step down from that porch room. The bricks could be utilized there. If you want us to vote on this tonight, it seems like we should have more information about materials, cut sheets, samples, that would be part of this process. We don't have any information about the type of windows and what they look like. We don't have information about the exterior door that is going into that elevator volume. There is no information about downspouts or how water is coming off the roof. In a contemporary design, we have that parapet surround wall on the top. I think you have something going on like trimmed doors. Do these materials go into the Earth? Is there any sort of functional foundation? Those are some of my questions. I feel that we would be getting a little more detailed design right now on a major structure like this. In the history of considering other applications, those are things that would be in front us. I am supportive. Thank you for all the work that you have done. It was incredibly thorough how you went through every design guideline and pick through the ones that obviously supported your application. You had done that before we met on site.

Mr. Timmerman – Having the 3 additions/elevations is paramount. Like you did with the first submission, you can point to all the different sections. If there is a material change, we know where that happens. It is specific. The materials are specific.

Mr. Zehmer – I will echo some of Mr. Timmerman's sentiments from earlier. I feel strongly that this should be more compatible with the historic building. If that is achievable through materiality, that is what I would encourage. In the staff report appendix, there are many examples that show additions to buildings in this district. It seems to me that most of those additions are compatible to the historic building. Personally, I don't find this compatible to the historic building. The flat roof doesn't go with the building. The materiality with the concrete doesn't go with the building. I think that the roofline should be underneath the historic cornice. That would be a well-defined separation. I understand the challenge of the duct work. I appreciate your challenge. For me, it is more of a compatibility issue. We did talk about taking it to a more contemporary design. There is a way to meet in the middle.

Mr. Bailey – I like this design a lot. I think that it makes it quite distinct what the difference is between the 2 buildings. We don't want to necessarily gesture in the direction of the traditional because this is a new addition. That looks very functional to me. With regards to the roofline question, that is part of the way distinguishing the 2 sections, the way the current height that you have it. I don't find any problem with that. I don't think it needs to be below the roofline. I don't think it destroys the historic character of the building itself. That is a part of the building. It makes it distinct what is happening and that the transition is occurring. I understand the concern about the materiality. I have been on this Board for 4 years. I have seen people come in with these wonderful materials and they show them to us. They come back and they cannot afford the materials. The materials become cheaper and cheaper over time. I understand the concern that people have here. You must pay for this stuff. Ms. Lewis' point that we would like to know exactly what material is being contemplated, it would be important for us to approve this application at this point. It would be important to know the material in advance before we could approve it.

Mr. Werner – In the staff report, I do outline some of the questions. You can use that as a checklist. Joints, transitions, and corners cost money. What I am hearing is the use of the brick is a great idea, but maybe it is on the interior wall. Trying to fit it onto this exterior wall, aside from cost and design headaches, might be creating some difficulties. You then get to the material. In my conversations with the applicant, the intent is that this is a masonry material, smooth surface. Does a particular material on this exterior wall, assuming that it is monolithic, and the bricks are incorporated into the interior? When you say that you want to know the material, do you want to know the visibility of the material? Is it a function of the material? I am trying to help a layperson as the applicant, who is producing a visible result that meets the criteria and trying to translate back to them?

Ms. Lewis – We don't have samples, colors, any kind of cut sheets, or any reference to the window from a manufacturer. We are not just missing exterior material, façade material, but also windows, doors, downspouts, system of drainage, trim, foundation. There are a lot of things that we would be seeing. This is not an unsubstantial addition. It is quite a building project. There are details that we have not been given. I don't think that anybody is saying that they are pretty much not supportive of the direction this is moving. What we have been given is nothing.

Mr. Timmerman – There is a lot. There are 3 elevations that clearly spells out what you intend to do in each wall plane. That would sum it up.

Ms. Lewis – Dark windows are discouraged. What exterior lighting would be used? These are not make-or-break items. These are things that we would be seeing at this point.

Mr. Suttle – How far down the path do I need to be?

Ms. Lewis – We are asked to vote tonight on what you have submitted. We have been asked to vote on the application up or down. It is not like an ongoing process. You could defer and work with staff, your architect, and your designer to bring those items that are missing back to us.

Mr. Werner – I am not encouraging you to vote up or down. There is the materiality.

Mr. Schwarz – If they did concrete, I don't think that it is going to look like this. We are going to find that the concrete would be heavier. The porch would not be concrete.

Mr. Gastinger – If it was stucco, it would not look like this. You can't run the stucco down into the ground. It is not a monolith. This is going to start to be horizontal joint or a different material.

Mr. Schwarz – I haven't seen the sections through the building. I can't judge it. It could be perfectly plausible as it is drawn. With the porch roof, I don't think there is enough height there for the drainage and for a ceiling under there. I wonder what this will look like when it has been fully detailed and designed. What you are getting from all this is that there is a lot of support for this. There are a couple of us that have some issues with the hyphen.

Mr. Timmerman – My main issue is with the materiality and the specificity of that. My minor issue would be how it touches the house and being sensitive to how it touches. Thirdly, your point about the porch. If we were to see an elevation and that porch is pointed out as EIFS, I would be skeptical of that. That is a wood or some version of trim materiality that is called out otherwise. It would raise a lot of questions as to how that is going to be and what the results are going to be.

Mr. Schwarz – You have a lot of support and enough support that you could keep rolling with this without changing a lot of it. You need to bring us more specificity. I am not trying to discredit our chair’s comments.

Mr. Zehmer – Part of it for me is ‘choose your own adventure’ in this application where there is option a, option b, and option c. We don’t know what we are going to get. I know that part was driven by the uncertainty of how salvage brick you were hoping to get. There is support of reusing salvage brick in some fashion in your project. How that is to be determined has yet to be seen. I am hearing a little hesitancy to approve this application as submitted. In general, I am hearing support for the project. With some more information, it could be approved. There are 2 steps moving forward from here. Unless you want us to vote on it, there are 2 types of deferrals. We can ask for a deferral, which means you have one month to get all this figured out and turn it back in. You can request a deferral and you have as much time as you would like.

Mr. Suttle – Request for a deferral – Motion to Accept Deferral – Mr. Whitney – Second by Mr. Bailey – Motion passes 8-0.

E. Other Business

6. Staff Questions/Discussion

- Ridge Street Fire Station – storage building
- BAR seat. Owner of a business or commercial property within a district.

7. Design Guidelines – continue discussion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 PM.