

PLANNING SERVICES

***Architectural Review Board***

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**May 16, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Derek Salter, Anna Fogarty, Nina Campbell, George Mead, Susan Campbell-Hatler

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Leslie Statler, Planner, Ross Pristera, Advisor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Bob & Bonnie Robertson, Ron Martin, Robert Montgomery, Bob Zimmerman, Blanding Fowler, Bob Greene, Frederike Mittner, Mark Essert, Tonua Harris-Branch, Valerie Aune, Koby Achane, Jerry Sparkman, Mary M. Tackett, Robert Prime, Ken Mitchell, Dennis Tackett, Tim Milstead, Philip Napier, Phil Christensen

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairman Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Mr. Mead made a motion to approve the April 18, 2019 minutes, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** – Chairman Quina explained the Board procedures to the audience and asked for speakers, and there were none.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Item 1**

**110 W. Strong Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review on doors, windows, lighting.**

(Chairman Quina recused himself from the first item.) Carter Quina, Quina Grundhoefer Architects, is requesting FINAL approval for an addition and modifications to the exterior stairwell as well as modifications to the parking area.

Mr. Guarisco presented to the Board and advised that the accessory structure would largely match the existing structure. The Board had recommended revisiting the design of the staircase. Modifications now have a more residential feel and match the design of the neighborhood. Mr. Mead advised they had addressed the screening of the driveway making it much more suitable and simple, and it would not overshadow the main structure. Ms. Campbell advised North Hill had no problems with the project. Mr. Guarisco explained the horizontal lap siding would be the same color; they were not intending to re-side the

lower half but would match the existing lower half of the accessory structure. Mr. Salter asked about the windows, and Mr. Quina explained with a solid wood window, there is no concern with who the manufacturer is. Mr. Mead stated he had no problem with the Jeld-Wen product painted to match the house. Mr. Guarisco stated the doors would be fiberglass with a wood finish. Mr. Napier clarified the door would be a fiberglass clad door which accepts stain and would look like a wood door. Mr. Mead stated he would be comfortable with Jeld-Wen approved to match the existing house and fiberglass doors to match the existing structure with the elements confirmed on record through an abbreviated review. Mr. Salter pointed out the clear requirements of submittals and agreed the design was fitting and the modifications were acceptable, but with what the Board was tasked with, it did not have adequate information. Mr. Mead agreed that if they were proposing anything different from the existing structure or to match the main house, he would not be comfortable. After conceptual approval, he was comfortable with the products and the representations which could be put into record with an abbreviated review. Mr. Salter explained the package for final approval should be that record.

**Ms. Campbell made a motion to accept as presented, requesting an abbreviated review on the specifications of the doors, windows and lighting for the record. Mr. Mead amended the motion to consistent with the representations of the windows to match the house, with doors to match the existing structure. The amendment was accepted; the motion was seconded by Ms. Fogarty and carried 5 to 2 with Mr. Salter dissenting, and Mr. Quina recusing.**

**Item 2** **SW Corner E. Romana Street & S. PHD**  
**New Construction** **9<sup>th</sup> Avenue** **HC-1 / Brick Structures**  
**Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.**

Jerry Sparkman, Sweet Sparkman Architects, is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a three-story residence with a detached garage.

Mr. Sparkman presented to the Board and pointed out the lot was long and narrow which leaned to the shotgun approach but they re-interpreted the design to a contemporary feel. The intent was to do something contemporary but protect the historical vernacular. He explained the arches would consist of precast concrete, and the overall design would complement the neighborhood. Mr. Crawford indicated the main entrance off Aragon did not fall under Aragon guidelines and did not go through the Aragon design board but was still a high level of importance on how it blends. He emphasized there was a specific design code in Aragon which allowed an "out-of-the-box" project but also elevated the discussion about how this design contributed to the neighborhood.

Mr. Sparkman explained the ground plan becomes a garden and opens up the view to pedestrians. He pointed out the height was the same as the homes to the south. He indicated this project was a completely different strategy even though they had built elevated homes. They considered this home the "whale bone house" where the whale floated into the space and these were his bones. There will be a water reflecting pond, and pedestrians will see through the arches into the garden; he advised the owner would not mind if people walked into the garden space. The project model was then passed around to the Board members. Ms. Campbell-Hatler asked for an explanation on the green building sustainability concept. Mr. Sparkman indicated historic preservation was the best form of sustainability. They created a smart envelope with high quality windows to resist UV, a smart wall system, and a roof system with passive solar design techniques for shading. Adding smart systems such as LED lighting, control systems and solar place the buildings into a different level of performance.

Mr. Mead advised with regard to the Code, he thought this design (A-03) did a lot to meet the intent of the Code regarding infill and new construction (12-2-10(A)(7)(8)). Mr. Sparkman pointed out the massing of three levels, with the middle level being more solid. The height is the same as those buildings to the south and north, and the color in the area is predominantly white. He explained the precast was not white/white, and they used basalt fibers which produced a speck effect. They also used a very smooth STO stucco system with the horizontal siding between the two elements for contrast. Chairman Quina pointed out there was nothing

in the Code preventing a modern or contemporary approach in Aragon. In giving Board approval for the conceptual design, it meant the Board likes what it sees, and the applicants will go the next step toward completion.

Ms. Campbell-Hatler questioned had they considered a future owner not wanting people walking through underneath since other homes had a brick wall or gate, and Mr. Sparkman stated it depended on the water feature being part of the street experience or internally which would decide on the placement of a wall. He also advised they would use shade tolerant plants in this area. The Board then discussed the height of 44.5' and being consistent. Mr. Mead also stated the Board needed to address the streetscape elements (12-2.2) for ornamental and roof details. Mr. Salter stated if this was considered Privateer's Alley, the Board should consider requirements under 12-2-12 (B)(5)(J)(3). He was concerned with eave height at around 35' for most of the approved structures; this flat roof structure eave height would be considerably higher. The Board then discussed the Aragon requirements. Mr. Sparkman pointed out they were allowed to get to 45' because of the flood requirement.

Mr. Pristera stated being on the corner of this location in a preservation district in a totally new area did not bother him as much; the structure felt more commercial and the scale a little large, but the architecture was very consistent and he did not want to require additional pieces just to fit the Code. Mr. Salter indicated it was less about the flat roof and more about the scale.

Mr. Montgomery, Chairman of the Gateway Review Board, stated this structure was in Aragon Phase II, and their review committee loved this structure and thought it was an exceptional piece of art that was going to get attention.

Mr. Mead commented that building entrances should be visible from the street, and that did not speak very well for this design. Mr. Sparkman stated the intent of the entry was described in the A.0.3 diagrams and was centered between the columns. Mr. Mead then referenced GRD Section 12.2.A.2 with the design to encourage human activity on the street. He emphasized this structure was definitely unique, and they had taken a minimalist view of basic structures and forms. Mr. Crawford wanted clarification of the building height, and staff verified that it did conform to the requirements. Ms. Campbell referred to an email placing the height at 55'. Mr. Crawford noted the garage needed more attention in possibly relating to its neighbor and could be a transition as a formal change from this design to the structures to the west. Chairman Quina suggested having a parapet. Ms. Campbell-Hatler agreed the garage needed more attention. Mr. Mead was still concerned with the roof form not relating to 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue structures. Ms. Campbell felt since it was right in the gateway on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, we could be a little edgy and unexpected, and softening it would lose its design. Ms. Fogarty appreciated the design, and the location made the massing more acceptable. Chairman Quina explained Mr. Sparkman was taking notes from the meeting and understanding the Board's comments. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve with the return of the handling of the garage, seconded by Ms. Fogarty. Mr. Crawford amended to say a study of the eave height needed to be looked at, and it was accepted by Ms. Campbell-Hatler.** Mr. Mead addressed the overhang eave height relating to the predominate streetscapes, and Mr. Pristera was concerned with the visible ground plan for underneath the house. **The motion for conceptual approval then carried unanimously.** (Photos of the model were taken for the record.)

**Item 3**

**917 N. Palafox Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Valerie Aune is requesting FINAL approval to construct an 8-foot by 10-foot storage shed behind the main residence. Ms. Aune presented to the Board. Chairman Quina noted the pitch on the roof was low and requested that it be raised, and Ms. Aune was agreeable. It was noted North Hill had no issues with the proposal. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Crawford. Mr. Salter amended the motion to change the roof at 6: 12 which was accepted. The motion carried unanimously.**

(The Board proceeded to Item 5)

**Item 4** **905 N. Reus Street** **NHPD**  
**New Construction** **PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Carolyn and Robert Prime are requesting FINAL approval for the replacement of all windows on the main residence. Mr. Prime indicated the windows were nailed shut and didn't fit property. Mr. Pristera stated even though he did not like windows being replaced, he understood the concerns of the property owner. He advised if the Board approved replacements, they should match in all the characteristics of the original windows. Chairman Quina advised North Hill had no objections to the AuraLast® Pine-clad double hung windows being proposed. Mr. Mead thought they had done a good job in matching the windows. Mr. Prime advised the mutttons on the outside would be white. **Mr. Mead made a motion for final approval, seconded by Ms. Campbell. With no speakers, it carried unanimously.**

**Item 5** **113 S. Alcaniz Street** **PHD**  
**Contributing Structure** **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Phil Christensen and Toni Dixon are requesting FINAL approval for exterior modifications and an addition to the main residence. Mr. Christensen presented to the Board and advised they wanted to demolish the handicap ramp and rear bathroom addition. He was opened to Board suggestions for replacement windows. He advised the house had not had attention in 50 years, and they proposed simple cedar shutters painted black. The trim at the bottom was incorrect and would be replaced with better materials. Mr. Pristera furnished a photo of the home from the master site file. Mr. Christensen was open to suggestions from the Board for siding, and Chairman Quina recommended cypress milled. Ms. Campbell indicated the house has needed some care. Mr. Crawford stated the plan layout was good. Mr. Christensen was not planning to replace the doors but was replacing certain windows. Chairman Quina stated the problem with clad was that they would be stuck with their color palette. **Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve as presented.** It was noted the fence would be wood, was adjacent to commercial property and could be 8.5' in height. Mr. Salter clarified no trees would be removed for fence installation. **The motion failed for lack of a second.** Mr. Harding made the Board aware that the fence on the south side of the property was shadow box, and he would be limited to an 8' height and 6.5' on all other sides. **With no speakers, Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Salter amended to clarify the front door and two existing windows under the front porch were to be restored and not replaced, and it was accepted. Mr. Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.** (The Board returned to Item 4.)

**Item 6** **402 E. LaRua St – 406 E. LaRua St** **OEHPD**  
**New Construction** **OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

Ken Mitchell is requesting *conceptual* approval to construct two single-family residences resembling historic brick warehouses. The original request for this project was denied by the Board in March 2019. Mr. Mitchell presented to the Board. Chairman Quina indicated the plan was approved by Old East Hill. Mr. Mitchell stated a variance would be needed between Units A and B which would be addressed at a later date. He explained the idea was to have them match. **Mr. Crawford made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 7** **211 N. Palafox Street** **PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C2-A**

**Action taken: Approval of soccer field – return with landscaping.**

Blanding Fowler is requesting FINAL approval for the construction of a soccer field and the installation of a soccer backstop net. Mr. Fowler presented to the Board and stated the poles would be galvanized aluminum. Landscaping would be attached to the soccer field with the netting on the Palafox side. Mr. Mead suggested using Italian cypress to cover the poles, and Mr. Fowler was acceptable to this. Ms. Campbell suggested discussing with the contractor the intent to cover and disguise the poles. Mr. Fowler explained this proposal did not cancel out the future master plan but would be a welcomed addition. Chairman Quina pointed out this would become more of a landscape feature instead of a streetscape. It was determined the mesh would be 8' from the sidewalk edge. Mr. Fowler advised they would sacrifice the length of the field for necessary landscaping. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve the soccer field with a return on a landscape plan for details, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler, and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 8**

**60 S. Alcaniz Street**

**PHD**

**Non-Contributing Structure**

**HC-1 / Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Robert Zimmerman, Zimmerman Properties, is requesting *FINAL* approval for exterior modifications including a new storefront entrance, rear entrance and awnings. This project received conceptual approval in February 2019 with comments regarding the alignment of the new storefront to the existing storefront.

Mr. Zimmerman presented to the Board and stated they had aligned the awnings as the Board requested. Mr. Salter asked how they planned to address the exterior finish. Mr. Zimmerman stated some type of EFIS treatment would be added. Chairman Quina explained the applicant had made the requested modifications. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell. Mr. Salter amended the motion to include the detail of the EFIS. Mr. Mead restated the motion to approve with the addition of the details to provide the EFIS or other treatment of the coverage of the beam for the storefront and for the storefront detail. Ms. Campbell accepted the restated motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 9**

**129 E. Government Street**

**PHD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-2A / Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Good Foundations, Inc. is requesting FINAL approval for an addition and modifications to the rear of a commercial structure.

Ms. Harris-Branch presented to the Board and explained the exterior wall was structural, and the height would be increased to match the existing overhang, replacing the roof with a standing seam with a profile similar to the structure across the street. The courtyard wall would be increased as well. Chairman Quina indicated this would result in a 9' brick wall; Ms. Statler clarified it was within the buildable area and would be allowed. Ms. Harris-Branch stated they were going to re-use the exterior door if it met the load ratings. She also stated they preferred high windows because of vandalism in their area. Mr. Salter addressed the horizontal windows, possibly breaking them up into two or three square windows; Ms. Harris-Branch stated they were not opposed to that suggestion. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve with the modification to horizontal windows being made square, paired or triptych and otherwise approved as noted. Mr. Mead seconded the motion. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** – None.

**DISCUSSION** – Ms. Statler informed the Board that during this meeting, a Quasi-Judicial meeting of the Council was conducted to hear an appeal of an ARB decision, and the Board’s decision was upheld. The appeal was concerning the placement of the wrong roof on a structure in Old East Hill heard by the Board in the previous month.

The Board extended its appreciation and goodbye to Ms. Deese and welcomed Mr. Harding as the Board Secretary.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregg Harding", written in a cursive style.

Gregg Harding  
Secretary to the Board