



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

August 18, 2022

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Digital Media Specialist Russo, Cultural Affairs Coordinator Robinson

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Cynthia Miller, Pete Southerland, Aaron Ebent, Tosh Belsinger, Donald Lindsey, Jessica Tolbert, Dio Perera, Michelle Burch, Steve Dana

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 July 21, 2022, minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2 **315 W. Blount Street** **NHPD / PR-1AAA**
Addition of Rolldown Shutters at a Noncontributing Structure
Action Taken: Denied.

Mr. Robertson is requesting approval to install electric rolldown shutters on two garage door openings at the rear of a noncontributing structure. The clearance of both openings are too low to install conventional garage doors with ceiling-mounted equipment. The shutters are an aluminum Town & Country model for hurricane protection and will be painted to match the body

color of the house. The 10"-wide shutter head, or box, will be mounted flush with the tops of the openings with 3" wide side rails. The shutters themselves will measure 114" x 95".

Mr. Southerland, the applicant's contractor, presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification that there was not enough clearance for a conventional garage door and Mr. Southerland stated that was correct. The home never had garage doors and the owner was not aware of this when it was bought. The items in the garage needed to be secured and the roll down shutters would be a good solution. A nice feature of the roll down shutter was that the bottom track included a rubber seal which would stop water from coming in. Carriage doors were looked at, but they were not feasible. Chairperson Salter read comments from the North Hill Preservation Association. He stated that there are options such as bifold, out swinging doors that do not need any clearance. Something like this would be more architecturally appropriate for the house. Mr. Southerland replied that the homeowner was looking at locally available products. Board Member Ramos clarified that the doors would be installed on the rear and Mr. Southerland stated that the rear garage doors would be visibly screened by landscaping. Board Member Mead clarified that the proposed doors would be mounted to the outside. Mr. Southerland also stated that the roll down doors are hurricane rated. He also stated that the garage had a 4" clearance from the opening to the ceiling and that floor joists were directly above the ceiling paneling. Board Member Mead provided an example of a decorative garage door that opened to the side, and which would be more architecturally appropriate. Board Member Courtney wished to not lose the aesthetic of the soldier brick work at the tops of the garage openings. Board Member Mead asked staff if ARB had ever approved roll down shutters in North Hill and Historic Preservation Planner Harding was not aware of any. Board Member Mead understood that this was a noncontributing structure, but it was also built in a French provincial style which added to the neighborhood. And although the doors were in the rear, they were still visible, and landscaping could not be relied upon as permanent screening. He wished to see a more aesthetic product and would at least like to see some exploration of an alternative product. Chairperson Salter also stated that this was a noncontributing structure, but it did have architectural merit and that its style was very well done. He was concerned with mounting an aluminum, industrial type element, and that it would impair the architectural integrity of the building. He also agreed that there are other possible options that may not have been explored to their most possible extent. The proposed shutters could only be acceptable as a last resort. He read from Sec. 12-3-10(2)d.ii.(a), that "in the case of a proposed alteration or addition to an existing building, that such alteration or addition will not impair the architectural or historic value of the building." **With no further questions Chairperson Salter moved to deny the application based on Sec. 12-3-10(2)d.ii.(a) and that the application of this element would indeed impair the architectural value of the building. Board Member Mead seconded the motion and it carried unanimously. Chairperson Salter added that applicant could research other options and if there truly is nothing else available and that if the owner can bring that back to show that there are not any other reasonable options, the board could certainly look at this again.** Staff added that based the conversation, Sec. 12-3-10(2)g.2. was applicable regarding noncontributing buildings which states, "in review of these structures the board may make recommendations as to the use of particular building elements that will improve both the appearance of the individual structure, its relationship with surrounding structures and the overall district character."

Item 3

1415 N. Barcelona Street

NHPD / PR-1AAA

Replacement Metal Pergola System

Action taken: Approved.

McNeill Palm Contracting LLC is seeking approval to replace a storm damaged pergola structure at the rear of a noncontributing structure. The new structure will be white aluminum with an acrylite panel and will be custom engineered to meet drainage and wind load requirements. Product rendering, details, and a site plan have been provided along with images of the old pergola system.

Ms. Miller presented to the board. Board Member Fogarty asked if a rafter detail or flourish detail would be included in the design. Ms. Miller stated that it could be added if the board required it, but the homeowners preferred the clean lines since it matched with the 1950's theme.

Chairperson Salter asked for clarification on the engineered drawings and the column placement on the renderings. Ms. Miller stated that the columns would be placed according to the engineered drawings. North Hill's comments were read. Board Member Mead pointed out that part of the pergola would probably be seen, but that it matched with the style of the house and with the style of the courtyard and that it would be a nice addition. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as presented. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.**

Item 4

422 E. Zarragoza Street

PHD / HC-1

New Accessory Dwelling Unit at a Contributing Structure.

Action Taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Diosdado Perera, Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects, is requesting review and final approval of a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at a contributing structure. The new building has been designed to reflect the existing structure with horizontal lap siding, six-over-six windows, and a metal roof. The structure will be pushed back to the center of the lot and connected to the primary building with an open-air breezeway. A front driveway is also proposed with colored concrete edged with brick and contained within metal fencing set between brick piers. For the ADU, materials include Hardie lap siding, aluminum clad windows and doors with simulated divided lites, a 5v-crimp metal roof, steel garage doors, tongue and groove wood porch floors, and wood rails with custom pickets cut from Hardie panels. Elements such as columns and corbel details have also been designed to match the primary.

Mr. Perera presented to the board. Board Member Courtney asked about the Hardie siding and Mr. Perera stated that it would be a 5" exposure and is made to match what is on the main residence. Chairperson Salter commended the applicant and liked that there were so many elements that matched the main house. He had some concerns about the balcony columns, but thought that they worked with the primarily structure. His only comments were in regards to the site elements. The proposed fence and brick piers were not common in this section of the historic district and the metal fence infill would be a new material element at this property. His concern was that the metal fence would also not screen the parking area appropriately and recommended the fence infill be wood. Chairperson Salter also did not think that the use of artificial turf was appropriate in the historic district. Based on the ordinance, artificial turf is not an acceptable material. The use of grass, ground cover, or shrubs is included in the ordinance and that those elements be living is implied. Board Member Mead echoed the Chairman's comments on site elements. He also was concerned with the roof profile and how the accessory structure communicated with the primary structure. He thought a simple hip would be less dominant and more appropriate. Typically, an ADU would be more simple and less prominent. It was a very

nice structure, but it needed to fit. Mr. Perera responded that the choice for the roof was based on other nearby homes of a similar massing. Board Member Ramos agreed with all of the previous comments. Regarding scale, the site plan reflected an appropriate scale, but the front elevation showed the dominance of the ADU. Perhaps lowering the second floor would help.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with the following changes to be submitted for abbreviated review: lower the roof slope and simplify the roof line with either a comprehensive hip or combination of hip elements, provide a perspective view to assist the review and address the prominence of the ADU, address the railing consistent with Board Member Ramos' comments, and address the site features consistent with the Chairmans comments, specifically that the grass materials be nature and for wood infill vs metal to be used for the fence. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Item 5

150 S. Baylen Street

PHBD / C-2A

Conceptual Review of New Construction.

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Michelle Burch, Caldwell Associates Architects, is seeking *conceptual review*, of a new townhouse development located on an existing parking lot. This project received conceptual approval with consideration of the board's comments in February 2021. The proposed development will have eleven (11) single family attached dwelling units consisting of three (3) different three-story unit types. Changes have been made to the exterior design which now shows a brick façade with horizontal siding infill. Additional materials and accents have been incorporated and the February 2021 elevations have been included for comparison.

Ms. Burch presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked if the brick was proposed to be whitewashed and Ms. Burch stated that was correct. He also asked if the LTU approval allowed for front fencing and Historic Preservation Planner stated that his understanding was only for the front porch and balcony overhangs. Ms. Burch stated that the fencing may not have been part of the original application, but her understanding was so long as it was removable for utility access that it would be acceptable. Both Ms. Burch and staff agreed to look into it further. Board Member Mead asked how far the barrier would go beyond the property line and Ms. Burch referred the board to the application site plan. Chairperson Salter stated that when this project came to the board for the first time, there was a discussion on the brick façade and a suggestion from the board to incorporate materials from buildings B and C into A more. However, the current plans seemed to reduce the brick to the point where it was a secondary material. He thought that brick should be a primary element so that the building could be more identifiable as a masonry building. The main facades in buildings B and C certainly created its own architecture, and the main elevations worked well. The smaller end elevations are where he started to get lost. He liked how the site was being developed. With building A, it could either be more like buildings B and C or more like an old brick building with accents. Board Member Mead echoed comments regarding building A. The effort to mix materials between structures rather than within the same structures would work well and would break up the development in a positive way. There can be variety, but the corner element should be stronger and more traditional. Ms. Burch stated that reducing the amount of brick was primarily driven by cost. Board Member Yee asked how the overall height compared with the neighboring parking garage and Ms. Burch replied that the development would be a story or two shorter. He also had concerns for building A on Baylen Street regarding materials. There was something missing on the front. The porch and eyebrow looked like it was applied. For final review, it would be good to have a landscaping plan and how

the building would interact with the sidewalks. Board Member Yee asked about the LTU and that a removable planter may be a softer look than fencing. The Hardie paneling bothered him less than the other board members. If the building was designed to be more historic-looking, a more applied-looking balcony would be appropriate. He was excited about the development. Board Member Ramos suggested that bringing a base ground floor to building A, similar to buildings B and C, might anchor the building more. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the conceptual application with addressing the comments made by the board in the final application. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.**

Item 6

39 E. Chase Street

PHBD / C-2A

Final Review for a New Hotel.

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Chad Henderson and Tosh Belsinger are requesting *final* review of a new hotel. This project received conceptual review in June 2022 and a variance to increase the height in July 2022. The proposed Hilton Tapestry and will consist of nine stories with a lobby, restaurant, and kitchen on the first floor, meeting space on the second, guest rooms on floors three through eight, and restaurant and bar on floor nine. Façade materials were chosen to complement the historic commercial district with precast stone and brick being the primary elements. The applicants are also requesting final review for the urban plaza corridor along the south side of the building which will be heavily landscaped.

Mr. Ebent, Mr. Belsinger, and Mr. Dana presented to the board. Board Member Mead greatly appreciated the revisions and incorporating the comments from the board during the conceptual review. However, the use of artificial turf was not appropriate. It worked at the SCI building because it's a modern structure, everything is supposed to read as man-made. However, here, the goal appears to be a New Orleans style courtyard where people are brought into a natural landscaped space. Also, if the purpose of the landscaped infill is to direct pedestrian traffic away from the center, some other center defining element might be better than a fountain. A slightly raised planter bed might better serve the purpose of the alleyway. Mr. Belsinger stated that the urban plaza was meant to invite people to sit down and use the space. His team will certainly look more into it. Board Member Mead asked what was being reviewed for final review. The urban plaza space was so important, and he thought it may need a little more work. Mr. Belsinger stated that they would like to proceed with final review for the hotel and with conceptual review for the urban plaza and the board was agreeable. Board Member Ramos suggested that tables and chairs rather than faux grass might be a nice substitute. He also agreed that artificial turf was not appropriate but thought that everything else looked great. Board Member Courtney thought the urban plaza was beautiful and agreed that artificial turf was not appropriate in the historic districts. She loved the fountain. Chairperson Salter echoed the comments of the board members. About the building, he thought there were very nice improvements and that revisions to the west elevation were excellent. Regarding materials, he asked the applicants to elaborate on the use of tinted mortar. Mr. Ebent stated that they would not try to match the brick and that the standard gray mortar was too strong. They hadn't found a perfect tint yet, but the goal was that someone would be able to read the individual bricks. A tinted mortar could work and would be appropriate so long as it didn't match the brick. Mr. Belsinger stated that the brick façade of the Saenger was a good example of where they would like to go. Chairperson Salter stated that the chosen brick was a good choice and went along with the presented architecture. While Chairperson Salter appreciated the changes, he was still concerned with metal panel 2 and that it was such an industrial panel. He was concerned with

the panel's proximity to the pedestrian level. He didn't have an issue with it being on the roof, but along Chase Street it would be very visible. He asked the applicants to consider another panel; something more in line with panel 1. Increasing the height of the brick parapet might also help along with a change in panel type. The main canopy also looked like it had the same corrugated look to it. Mr. Ebent stated that a textured rib panel was desired, but the panel 2 was not the right one. They were still looking for the specific profile and would be willing to investigate a better alternative.

Mr. Lindsey addressed the board and was representing the church across the street. He had interest in the development and was not here to object to the design of the building. He did want clarification on any changes to the service entrance area along Chase Street. How would loading and unloading of service vehicles be handled? Mr. Ebent spoke to the façade facing the church and Mr. Belsinger spoke to the layout of the master development plan.

With no further questions, **Board Member Mead made the motion to remove the urban plaza from final review but to conceptually approve it in consideration of the board's comments, and that the hotel be approved with the following items to follow in an abbreviated review: the brick mortar tinting and color, and the metal panel treatment of the lower levels (specifically the Chase Street elevation and front). Chairperson Salter asked if the motion could also include the notion that signage would not be included as part of this motion. Board Member Mead agreed. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.**

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

 9.14.2022

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board