

Mr. Perez presented to the Board. Staff explained the requirements for this district were different with the main concern in the GCD being that the structures were coordinated with the architectural structures in this district. Chairperson Salter pointed out the project seemed to be in line with the architectural character of the existing building. **Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and with no speakers, it carried unanimously.**

#### Item 8

##### New Construction

150 S. Baylen Street

PHBD

##### Action taken: Conceptual Approval.

C-2A-2

Michelle Burch, Caldwell Associates Architects, is seeking *conceptual review*, of a new townhouse development located on an existing parking lot. The proposed development will have eleven (11) single-family attached dwelling units consisting of three (3) different three-story unit types. Staff advised this project was for conceptual review and would be coming before the Planning Board at their next meeting for division of the land and would return to this Board for final approval.

Mr. Rothfeder presented to the Board and explained this property was within the CRA, with the goals for infill housing. The development group purchased the property. Mr. Crawford confirmed they wanted to develop the property as an infill. The units would range between 2,000 to 3,000 sq. ft. for single-family attached residences. All of the residences would be accessed from an internal drive. They wanted to develop a masonry style appropriate for that location, with A/C units screened and internal hatches for access. He indicated they were applying for an LTU for the balconies and front porches. Chairperson Salter appreciated the effort to maintain the street front. He pointed out Building A was quite different from the other buildings, and Mr. Crawford advised one of the factors was to respect the existing buildings downtown and the combination of trying to create some additional space for B and C with balconies which created a more modern language; the intent was to tie them together but have that differentiation. Chairperson Salter agreed it was a great opportunity going forward. He explained that the massing of the Type A, 3-story rectangular building had the warehouse feeling; brick detailing and bringing in some additional materials and geometry that defined the architecture of Types B and C, and possibly bringing in trims and accents on the windows, would make the mass more ornamental. Board Member Mead indicated there was a lot going on at Baylen Street, and it would be the more significant face, but as you come around the corner, there is a double entablature treatment behind on each face of the units defining each of them as a unit; it would be nice to carry that entablature feature around the corner. It would also be nice to have some of that type of treatment on the Intendencia side as well. Mr. Crawford asked if some of the character of B and C should be brought to the Baylen side of A, and Board Member Mead agreed. Board Member Yee appreciated the internal drive to limit curb cuts and to maintain the sidewalk for pedestrians. In looking at the corner of Unit A, he wondered if they would consider some fenestration at the ground level which would hold the corner a little better. Ms. Burch indicated they could consider that. Mr. Crawford stated they needed to see a conglomerate perspective of Intendencia that shows the full massing treatment. Board Member Yee asked for a description of the access to the north side of Unit B, and Ms. Burch explained adjacent to their site was a parking lot for BLAB, and there would be some sort of sidewalk, landscaping, and a fence along the property line as well.

Board Member Mead asked about the amenity treatment, and Ms. Burch indicated they were looking at a more upscale decorative looking fence and wanted a more pleasing view for the owners, but this was still in the development stage. Board Member Ramos advised conceptually this was a very exciting project, and it was great to see a parking lot develop into an asset for

the city. To be a successful design, involved how it connected from the sidewalk to the building; he was interested in seeing how the exterior wall transitioned to the sidewalk. He also stated on the Baylen side, landscaping should be included to soften the austere entrances. Board Member Villegas explained as we continue to infill the streets downtown, Intendencia was just as important visually and wanted to make sure that it be its own positive addition to the project and not just a side street. Mr. Crawford indicated they would be treating all sides with the same level of attention. Ms. Burch indicated Unit C on the ground level would be for guests, an Air BNB or workout room.

Charles Liberis, representing 21 W. Romana LLC, wanted to place his objection and to convey to the Board why he was objecting. He explained 21 W. Romana had been in this family for some 82 years, and as long as he could remember, access to the rear of the property had been by crossing through the property at the Intendencia Street entrance, going back to the back of his building. All of the fire exits come out and empty into the easement there into the driveway. There is limited employee parking there, and the dumpster pickup has also been there as long as he could remember. Building these townhouses in the configuration presented would completely prevent access to the rear for all property owners that join north of the property and along the west of the property. Rear access for his tenants was mandatory for deliveries, and there was also a fenced in brewery that is not visible; the most important element was the access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Benjamin Alexander, representing Big Top Brewery, stated his client operated the bottom floor of 21 W. Romana Street, and this business was required to maintain dumpsters, with deliveries of alcohol going into the rear of the property. The project as currently planned would prevent this business from using that portion of the property and negate their ability to maintain facilities for trash and refuse and prevent a method of ingress and egress for emergency purposes as well; the current plan would prevent the operation of their business and require them to close their shop. The Big Top Brewery would be negatively affected by the project as planned.

Chairperson Salter advised it was his opinion that the purpose of the ARB was to review the architectural aesthetics regarding preservation, new construction within the district and how it relates visually. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained it was appropriate for someone to voice concerns, but this Board was a design/review Board and prohibited from making decisions which affect the land use of these properties; opportunities for review would be through the Planning Board's next meeting. Board Member Mead explained there were some things within the ARB purview regarding access and egress off the property. Some functions that may have been accomplished architecturally may have to shift and become operational. Some things that were regulatory were not within the Board's purview. This plan currently meets all of the architectural issues the Board identified, but that would be the limit of what the Board could or should do. Since this was a conceptual review, Board Member Ramos stated there were still opportunities for other parties to address their concerns.

Staff advised there had been predevelopment reviews with the architects involved on the project, and those issues would continue to be discussed as the project developed. Minutes from this meeting as well as material supplied from Mr. Liberis would be provided to the Planning Board for consideration. With no other speakers, **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve conceptually in light of the Board's comments. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty and carried unanimously.**