



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

July 21, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Courtney, Board Member McCorvey, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee, Advisor Pristera

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Fogarty

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Digital Media Specialist Johnston

STAFF VIRTUAL: Development Services Director Morris, Assistant Planning and Zoning Manager Cannon, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Urban Design Specialist Parker

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael and Anita Williams, Tim Daniel, Tosh Belsinger, Aaron Ebent Chad Henderson, Randy Maygarden, Jeff Griffey, Todd Alford, Stacy Phillips, Charles Kunze, Harry Levin, Dan Girardin, Philip Partington

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the June 16, 2022, minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried 6-0.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2 **1203 N. Barcelona Street** **NHPD / PR-1AAA**
Replacement Windows and Doors at
Noncontributing Property
Action Taken: Approved.

Eric Todd Alford is requesting approval to renovate the exterior of a noncontributing structure. The scope of work will include replacing all aluminum windows with wood clad windows,

replacing the damaged vinyl rear door with a wood clad door, and replacing the front door with a wood clad door. This work will upgrade the windows and doors with impact units for insurance purposes and many of the existing windows are either broken or inoperable. This packet includes site photographs, a site plan showing where the windows and doors will be replaced, and details on the proposed products.

Mr. Alford presented to the Board. Chairperson Salter read North Hill's comments which stated no opposition to the request. Board Member Ramos commended the applicant on the good improvements to the property. Chairperson Salter confirmed that the window products were as shown in the packet.

With no further questions Board Member Ramos moved to approve the application as submitted. Board Member Mead seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 3 **226 N. Spring Street** **PHBD / C-2A**
Rear Addition to a Contributing Property.

Action taken: Approved.

Tim Daniels is requesting *final* review for a proposed rear addition to a contributing structure. This project received conceptual approval at the June 2022 meeting. The addition has been designed to communicate with existing shed roofs on the rear and front, and in a way that does not detract from the elevation on West Wright Street. The project will have Hardi-board siding to match the existing texture, profile, and size of the existing wood siding, a brick veneer base with recessed sections, single hung 2/2 wood windows and shutters, and a matching shingle roof. The proposed paint will also match the existing elements.

Mr. Daniels presented to the board. Chairperson Salter stated that not a whole lot has changed since the project came before the board as a conceptual packet and that the applicant had gone through a lot of effort to tie the addition into the existing structure well. Board Member Mead echoed the comments and complimented Mr. Daniels. The addition is clearly keeping with the existing architecture.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 4 **322 E. Intendencia Street** **PHD / HR-2**
Rear Addition to a Noncontributing Structure.

Action Taken: Approved.

Chuck Kunze, Artisan's Architecture LLC, is requesting approval for a rear sunroom addition to a noncontributing structure. The addition will be approximately 280 square feet and will leave portions of the existing brick patio. The roof will match the shingles on the existing house materials. The soffits and fascia details will also match along with the siding which will match the existing Hardie ship lap. The patio French doors and windows will be white Kolbe aluminum clad. Since this is a noncontributing property and since the addition will be completely hidden from street view, the homeowner is requesting that the new windows and doors have no mullions. Matching exterior paint colors will include Sherwin Williams "Roycroft Suede" and "Creamy".

Mr. Kunze presented to the board. Chairperson Salter ask about the Hardie vented soffit panels and asked for confirmation that it was existing on the structure. Mr. Kunze confirmed that it was and referenced a photograph in the packet. Mr. Kunze stated that all proposed materials would match the existing except for the windows with no muntins. The homeowner was requesting this to provide an unobstructed view to the back yard garden area. The area is not visible from the

street and is completely in the rear. Chairperson Salter thought the intentional change in the aesthetic would allow for the windows to have no muntins. Chairperson Salter asked about the lap siding between the windows and doors and if the applicant had considered a plain piece of infill. Mr. Kunze stated that the intention was that any infill would be matched with the existing siding on the house and mother-in-law suite.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 5 **606 E. Gadsden Street** **OEHPD / OEHC-1**
Exterior Renovations to a Contributing Structure.

Action taken: Approved with comments for consideration.

Scott Amberson is seeking approval for exterior renovations to a contributing structure. All work will be done to Unit B which includes the north (rear) half of the building which is hidden from street view. An overview of all work has been provided, as well as details per work area. These include replacing elements such as lighting, doors, windows, decking, and handrails, while new elements such as siding infill, a second rear awning, a tankless water heater and new skirting will be added. The two rear doors will be replaced with matching wood doors, and the windows will be double hung 2/2 wood. The hallway between the main house and the attached accessory space will be partially closed in with matching wood siding and turned into a stacked washer and dryer closet. The rear decking will be replaced with Trex decking and all repairs to the handrails and balusters will be done with in-kind materials and design.

Lucy McLendon presented to the board. Chairperson Salter read comments from Old East Hill POA and asked if the shutters were functional. Ms. McLendon stated that they would be fixed and will be painted to match the trim of the house. Board Member Courtney stated that the 2' awning window was odd and that a typical transom window should be around 1'. Ms. McLendon stated that based on the interior space, they wanted some natural lighting. Board Member Courtney questioned if fixed shutters were appropriate and questioned the extra rear awning. Advisor Pristera answered that he hasn't seen many awnings of that style on a residential property. Board Member Courtney thought a cantilevered gable or shed awning would be more appropriate. Ms. McLendon stated that the intent was to match what was there now and to try not to change as much as possible. Board Member Courtney asked if the section to be filled in could be recessed a bit to retain the structures history since the accessory unit was likely a detached kitchen at one point. Board Member Ramos agreed with leaving the evidence of the historic section. He did not have an issue with the awning but questioned the use of the faux shutters. Advisor Pristera stated that faux shutters have been used in the historic districts but that the proportion of the window should be decreased to reflect Board Member Courtney's comments. Faux shutters also tell a story of what used to be in that area and a window could more easily be added in the future. Board Member Ramos agreed with reducing the height of the transom window and adding a dividing lite so that it's not a single piece of glass and to match the other windows. Board Member Mead asked for clarifications on the closet area which would be accessed from the porch.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the application with the condition that enclosing of the washer/dryer area be slight recessed to clear the trim/corner board and that the window with the faux shutter have a vertical divided lite and be reduced to 1.5' in height instead of the proposed 2'. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 5-1 with Board Member Courtney dissenting.

Item 6

422 N. 7th Avenue

OEHPD / OEHR-2

Conceptual Review for A New Accessory Dwelling Unit.

Action taken: Conceptual approval with comments.

Jeff Griffey is requesting conceptual approval for a new accessory dwelling unit in the rear yard. The 20' x 30' structure will have smooth Hardie lap siding with an exposure to match the main house, false decorative louvered shutters also to match the main house, fiberglass French doors, and fiber cement stucco panels skirting the building. Paint will match the main building with a white body and trim, green shutters, and a grey stucco foundation.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated that he had received a written notice requesting that the review be changed from final review to conceptual review. Mr. Williams confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Griffey presented to the board. Chairperson Salter read Old East Hill POA's comments. Chairperson Salter asked if the intent was for the siding to be the same profile as what is on the main house. Mr. Griffey stated that it was. Chairperson Salter also asked if porch rails were required, and Mr. Griffey stated that he did not want railings if it was not required. It was clarified that railings would probably not be required except for on the stairs. Mr. Griffey stated that the structure was in the rear yard and not visible from the street, and that adding a window to the north side would be difficult due to the interior space restraints. Chairperson Salter addressed the faux shutter on the front and thought that it was too large for a typical entranceway. Mr. Griffey stated that the drawing did not represent the faux opening well and that the shutters would match what was on the main house. He offered to leave the shutters off completely. Board Member Courtney offered that the left door could be made into a window with working shutters to provide some clearer symmetry. Chairperson Salter stated that the proportion of the shutters was an issue – solutions would be to remove the shutters or that a false window of an appropriate proportion be added instead. Board Member Mead stated that the form was so simple that if the applicant did not want to maintain symmetry, he could reduce the left most door to a single door and have a door with shutters on the right. The symmetry would be retained, but the central entrance would be more dominant. Board Member Ramos thought removing the faux shutters altogether and infilling the area with siding would also be appropriate. Adding a swing or art to the right area could be used as balance. The foundation infill was then discussed. Advisor Pristera asked about a pathway leading from the main house to the accessory structure or any kind of landscaping. Mr. Griffey stated that there would be a courtyard between the two and that the accessory structure would be lined up with the main residence. The infill between the piers will be covered with the stucco panels, so the piers will not be seen to match the main house. Board Member Yee asked about Old East Hill POA's comment about adding a window to the north elevation and whether the applicant would consider it. Mr. Griffey stated that he could if it were required, but he would prefer not to add one. The brackets would also match with those on the main house.

Board Member Ramos motioned to conceptually approved the application and that the applicant take the board's comments into consideration. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 7

209 S. Alcaniz Street

PHD / HC-1

New Construction.

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Mr. and Mrs. Williams are seeking final review and approval for a new single-family residence. A conceptual review of this project was approved with comments in June 2022, and the new plans

reflect the board's overall discussion. The previous turret has been changed to a large bay window and clarifications have been made to windows, doors, and the car port. Materials remain consistent and include a brick veneer base, fiber cement lap and shake siding, vinyl double hung windows, wood handrails with turned spindles, and a paver ribbon drive.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Sherling presented to the board and Mr. Williams discussed his preferred sample of brick veneer for the foundation. Board Member Courtney thought the revised plans looked much more appropriate with the historic district and Chairperson Salter agreed that much of the board's earlier comments appear to have been addressed. Board Member Ramos thought the plans looked good but wished that elevations of the street frontage to show the scale of the home with surrounding buildings were provided. Mr. Sherling stated that the house on the left was very small and sat very far away from the sidewalk. This project was set as far away from the shared property line as possible. Chairperson Salter asked if there was any consideration to changing the box at the bottom left, front gable corner. Mr. Sherling stated that was where it was tied into the other roof coming down, it may look a little strange – having a roof ridge coming down into that. Board Member Mead offered that the main house and porch gables should be treated the same and without boxes. Board Member Yee also thought the box should be deleted. One example of how it might look was the blue house across the street and at 212 S. Alcaniz Street. This was a similar design with no corner boxes in the gables. Mr. Shurling stated that was an easy enough adjustment.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve with the comment that there be a lower skirt / eyebrow on the main roof gable be similar to the house at 212 S. Alcaniz Street. Board Member McCorvey seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 8

501 N. Alcaniz Street

OEHPD / OEHC-1

New Construction.

Action taken: Denied.

Randy Maygarden is seeking final approval of a new two-story garage cottage. The building's small footprint is due to compliance with district's zoning requirements, specifically a 50% lot coverage maximum and a 15' required visibility triangle at the corner of Alcaniz and La Rua. The front of the building is situated along La Rua where there is no front yard setback requirement, and the design of the building is meant to replicate a two-story accessory carriage house. Materials include smooth profile Hardie siding, wood-clad double hung 2/2 windows with exterior muntins, wood-clad doors, and Trex composite decking, posts, rails, and spindles. Paint colors includes a "Blanched Pine" body and "Very Black" trim. The HVAC units will be screened with a flat-topped wood privacy fence and landscape information has been provided.

Mr. Maygarden presented to the board. Chairperson Salter read comments from the Old East Hill POA and the relationship between the street-facing garage doors on the proposed project and other projects at the intersection of Alcaniz and La Rua Streets were discussed. The project at the northeast corner was a call back to the brick warehouses style, with faux loading bays and carriage style doors, whereas this project appeared as a conventional modern front-loading garage. Board Member Mead thought that if the house was pushed farther towards Alcaniz, a side-load garage might be possible. The site is made more difficult to build on due to the required visibility triangle which has been administratively reduced from 30' to 15'. Board Member Yee agreed that the garage should be placed along La Rua and towards the rear and pulling the structure as close to Alcaniz as possible. One of the main problems was the lack of a perceived frontage and that more prominence should be given to the Alcaniz side – it should look like a true frontage. Board Member Courtney asked if the stairs could be put on the rear or on an interior side. The stairs on the Alcaniz side detracted from it being seen as a building frontage. Mr. Maygarden asked if stairs could be placed in a setback yard, and staff confirmed that open

stairways and landings could encroach into a required yard, but no more than 3.5'. Chairperson Salter agreed in that the building was lacking a true front and that the suggestions heard by the board offered good options to possibly achieve that. Board Member Mead asked if the house or a portion of the house could encroach into the visibility triangle and staff confirmed that posts, columns, or similar structure which is no greater than 12" in diameter could exist with the triangle, but generally lateral vision must be maintained between a height of 3' and 8' above the existing surface. Advisor Pristera stated that this was a difficult lot to work with and might be a good candidate for a variance. Board Member Yee added that the designer may want to discuss with staff and revisit the lot coverage if the open stairway can be deleted from the total.

Board Member Mead moved to deny the application based on its inconsistency with the surrounding structures and the formative years referenced for the Old East Hill district and since the style of front-loading garage in a residential structure is not consistent with other structures. Based on Board Member Mead's comments, staff referenced Sec. 12-3-10(3)e.3.ii.(b) which speaks to rules governing decisions of proposed new buildings and Sec. 12-3-10(3)i. which speaks to regulations for new construction in Old East Hill. Chairperson Salter clarified that the motion was to deny the application based on its incompatibility with the visual standards of the neighborhood. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 9**39 E. Chase Street****PHBD / C-2A****Variance.****Action taken: Approved.**

Chad Henderson and Tosh Belsinger are requesting a Variance to increase the allowed height from 100' to 109'-4" to accommodate a 9-story hotel as part of the East Garden District development. Since the zoning district is commercial-2A, three feet may be added to the height of the building for each foot the building elevation is stair-stepped back from the property line, up to a height of 150'. The applicant has provided a diagram and elevations which identify those areas outside the zoning envelope, and which would otherwise not be permitted. The applicants have also provided a letter which speak to the seven required variance criteria as well as the two ARB-specific criteria. Since the paneling at the very top of the building is meant to screen mechanical equipment, it is exempt from typical height restrictions.

Mr. Belsinger presented to the board and provided their vision and the master planning for the East Garden District. Mr. Ebent also presented to the board and discussed the hotel building and variance request. Board Member Mead asked if the city had a de minimis standard for variances since the relative volume of the request was very minimal and fell into a commonsense notion of a de minimis definition. Staff confirmed that there is not a de minimis standard. Board Member Mead thought that the zoning envelope illustrated the function of a de minimis function as well as the intent of the variance request. This was a design requirement for nipping and tucking here and there and that granting the variance would not provide additional usable space. Board Member Mead thought that the board ought to proceed with the variance request as a de minimis issue and that the variance ought to be approved because the design changes that would be necessary to accommodate the de minimis impact on the code would be vastly disproportionate and therefore could become a hardship. Board Member Ramos agreed that that the request was very minimal and commended the application. Chairperson Salter stated that it appeared that every effort had been made to design this building so that it would conform and that the request is for very minor elements.

Board Member Mead moved to approve and found that the variance application met the 7

variance criteria listed in Sec. 12-11-2(a)(2) and the 2 additional criteria listed in Sec. 12-12-3(5)b.1. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 10

40 S. Palafox Street

PHBD / C-2A

New Construction.

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review required.

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple | Sallis Architecture, is requesting *final* review to modify the first-floor front elevation of the Thiesen Building. This request was partly denied in May 2022. Since then, the plans have been revised to keep the street front side alcoves, thought the existing planters will be removed. Work to the central entrance area is still proposed which will convert the area into an open lobby. Details on a decorative gate which reflect ARB's previous comments have been included and the new lobby will be redesigned with marble tile and a granite border. All glazing at the wood-framed bay windows will be replaced and the side lobby doors will be replaced with new frameless glazing systems. A new overhead coiling system will also be installed, but only to be used during extreme weather conditions. Mr. Sallis presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked if the storm shutter would be recessed in the soffit and Mr. Sallis stated that was correct. Board Member Mead asked if there was precedent for roll-down doors on Palafox Street and Historic Preservation Planner Harding responded that there were roll-down door in the district, but that he was not aware of any along Palafox Street. Board Member Mead respected the initial thought but had concerns about creating a precedent for allowing roll-down doors. Mr. Sallis stated that the main reason for the roll-down shutter was to accommodate the frameless storefront doors and that he would be more than happy to be party to an agreement that stated the shutter would not be used regularly. Mr. Sallis mentioned the roll-down doors at the outdoor bar at Graffiti Pizza and that they are only rolled down late at night. Board Member Ramos thought that the shutter was appropriate and would help to protect the historic architecture. It's not a security type door, but instead a storm protection mechanism. Advisor Pristera advised that the decorative gates were the security measures and that there would be egress issues if the doors were closed. The shutters would only be activated if the building were to be evacuated. Overall, Board Member Mead commended the applicant and the revised design. Board Member Yuri asked for clarification on the existing wood window frames and Mr. Sallis stated that the wood frames would be kept, but that the storefronts would be reglazed. **Board Member Mead moved to approve so long as a statement from the Building Official be provided confirming that the roll-up door can only be used during a state of emergency (a storm event), and that letter be provided to the Chair as notification. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.**

Item 11

200 S. Palafox Street

PHBD / C-2A

New Construction.

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review required.

Scott Sallis is requesting final approval for a new steel framed canopy covering the space between 200 S. Palafox and 210 S. Palafox. The proposed structure will become the new entry to an outdoor event plaza. New back-lit signage will be mounted to the front, powder coated aluminum entry archway; however, specific details for the signage will follow in an abbreviated review. The canopy will have a decorative powder-coated aluminum entry gate, a wood tongue and groove ceiling, a flat standing seam metal roof, recessed and mounted down lighting, and will be flanked by metal planters. Ms. Garret presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked if the four circles in the archway were

representing future signs or if they were built-in elements in the decorative metal. Ms. Garret answered that they represented future signage. Chairperson Salter asked what the intent of the ceiling sconce lighting were – if they were to illuminate the right of way or if they were to light the future signage. Ms. Garret answered that the intent was to light the signage. Chairperson Salter was concerned that the fixtures in that location would shine directly on the right of way. His understanding of the code was that lighting was intended to not be visible beyond the property line of the lot on which the signs are located. He wondered if a directional sconce would be more useful. Board Member Ramos stated that the listed level of lumen output seemed high (around 4,000). Chairperson Salter agreed and added that the canopy was a nice addition to the streetscape. Board Member Mead also thought it was a good improvement to the space. Board Member Courtney suggested that the lumens be more in the warm range.

Board Member Mead moved to approve with lighting details showing the projection of the canopy/signage fixtures to address the Chair's comments on not impacting the right of way be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Mead also suggested that the decorative metal work be worked to incorporate the framed circles. Chairperson Salter added the amendment that the application did not include any signage and it was accepted. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 12**410 and 412 S. Palafox Street****PHBD / C-2A****New Construction.****Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review required.**

Philip Partington is seeking approval to renovate the exterior of a contributing structure. The scope of work includes the following: replace the existing metal canopy with a new retractable fabric awning, remove the existing right door and replace it with a new window to match the existing windows, painting the existing brick façade to match the color of the neighboring street front façade to the south.

Mr. Partington presented to the board. Chairperson Salter stated that the proposed awning was similar to what was placed on Jackson's restaurant but needed clarification on where the track / box would be mounted. Mr. Partington answered that it would be mounted about 30" from the parapet which is probably right at the deck. Chairperson Salter stated that this building has been through a couple of changes and at one point had a stucco façade. Someone went through a lot of work to refurbish the brick, through the parapet was repaired. Mr. Partington stated that the front façade of the building was original when it was renovated in 2015. Some brick was reused to rebuild the parapet. Chairperson Salter stated that where the brick changes are at a horizontal element on the Jackson's building. Everything in the scope of work was appropriate except for the painting of unpainted brick. The reason is that the brick was restored or at least there was an effort to restore the street front elevation to how it was before it was stucco'd over. The unpainted brick is an important feature that is associated with the history of this building. Also, paint cannot be easily removed, and sandblasting will destroy it. The point being is that there was considerable effort to restore the building back to its historic character and that painting it would be taking a step backwards and that it would be a serious detriment to the building. Although there are two different types of brick, the canopy will bridge that joint so that the transition will not be so obvious. Overall, painting the brick will detract from the historic presence of the contributing structure. Board Member Ramos agreed with Chairperson Salter's comments on the brick. It has good historical character and questioned the color of the awning frame requesting that it match the color of the existing cream elements.

Mr. Simpson then presented to the board. Board Member Ramos asked what kind of paint was used on the Artisan, but staff did not recall. The board discussed the painting of brick buildings and Chairperson Salter read from ordinance sec. 12-3-27(f)(4)b., "*Building fronts, rears, and sides abutting streets and public areas*. All structural and decorative elements of building fronts, rears, and sides abutting streets or public improvement areas shall be repaired or replaced to match as closely as possible the original materials and construction of that building." By painting

historically unpainted brick buildings, we are losing the historic and architectural character which the board is tasked with protecting. Some buildings have always been painted, but the ones that weren't are worth protecting. And although there is precedence for painting unpainted brick buildings, the board is not destined to repeat decisions that were later determined to be mistakes. The role of ARB is to protect the architectural and historic character of the Palafox Historic Business District. That includes protecting buildings in their original appearance. Board Member Mead echoed the comments of the Chair. This building was not painted when it was building, and, although covered with stucco at one point, remained unpainted throughout its life. It should not be painted now. He also wanted to be clear that the brick arches should not be covered with the awning.

Board Member Mead moved to approve with the following modifications:

- That painting of the non-painted brick is not approved,
- That the awning be raised or a depicted shown as it is mounted that the drop edge of the awning does not obscure the arches from across the street be submitted for abbreviated review.

Board Member Courtney seconded the motion. Board Member Ramos provided the amendment that the color of the awning frame also to be submitted for abbreviated review. The amendment was accepted, and it carried 6-0.

Item 13

11 E. Chase Street

PHBD / C-2A

New Construction.

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review required.

SMP Architecture is seeking approval for a new outdoor entertainment and event venue where a noncontributing structure was recently demolished. The proposed space will be surrounded by a 10' high painted wood panel fence painted brick piers. The brick piers will be painted to match the adjacent "Vinyl" building. The entranceway will be a painted stucco structure with a standing seam metal roof and a decorative iron gate. All new roof structures and shade structures will be kept below the finished height of the wall.

Mr. Girardin presented to the board and provided hardcopies showing design revisions. Chairperson Salter asked staff to verify if there were any fence restrictions in this area and staff clarified there is no maximum height for fences in the commercial district relative to this lot. Chairperson Salter also clarified that the green wall option is now gone and will be strictly wood fencing between brick piers and with a stucco entrance system which reflects elements on the neighboring Masonic Temple building. Mr. Girardin agreed and stated that any kind of vegetation would only be placed on the interior. Chairperson Salter also added that the fence had been included on the south side and that all other elements will be below the top fence line and hidden but the architectural details of the roof wasn't provided. Mr. Girardin stated that the hard structure roof has since been worked out and described the components. Board Member Ramos asked if the roof structure would need to come back for abbreviated review and Chairperson Salter stated that it would be dependent on the motion. Board Member Ramos asked if the interior of the courtyard was subject to ARB review or if they were just looking at the fence. Chairperson Salter read from Sec. 12-3-27(f)1., which required the board to consider exterior design. The code also defined "exterior" and stated, "The term "exterior" shall be deemed to include all of the outer surfaces of the building and is not restricted to those exteriors visible from a public street or place." Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated that staff's position is that the application was creating an interior space and that the board would not have review jurisdiction on the interior. However, the board can certainly have a different interpretation of the code. The packets

provided to the board had been revised and added to with anticipation that the board would interpret it as such. Additionally, the project was located on a separate parcel and is being looked at as a structure and would require engineering due to the fence height. Mr. Partington asked if it would be possible for the board to review the exterior and to come back for elements interior to the fence. Chairperson Salter stated that based on the revised packet and based on the discussions, the application had evolved significantly to where he saw very little issues of potential concern. His only concern is the profile of the roof structure of the actual building portion. He thought it could be approved with an abbreviated review, specifically the structure of it and what the fascia material will be and how it will be visible. Chairperson Salter liked where the project has gone. The earlier version was concerning. But those concerns have been addressed and it would be a nice street front addition. His only concern was the hard roof of the structure since it will be visible from the public right of way including the public parking garage. For the record and in case of the fence being damaged, he thought it was important for the board to see the design of that specific detail. Board Member Yee also thought the design had evolved nicely and pointed out the structure along the south side of the project area. In regard to the roof, there will need to be some kind of slope on it. A general profile or section of the roof and how it will tie into the existing and how it comes out, how high it will be, where the fascia is, and how the roof will play with the existing surroundings. **Board Member Ramos moved to approve with the details of the bar and restroom roof to be submitted for abbreviated review. Chairperson Salter clarified that the detail or section of the juncture to the adjacent building as well as the profile of the roof edge be provided. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.**

ADJOURNMENT – Historic Preservation Planner Harding provided an overview of the 313 W. Jackson Street appeal to City Council on June 22. City Council affirmed ARB’s decision to deny the roof but will allow the roof to remain until the property ceases to be used as Ms. Chandler’s residence or is sold. The board also discussed the city’s inspection processes and enforcement actions for nonapproved work in the historic districts.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board