

## **BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES**

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on February 21, 2008 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall

**PRESENT:** L. Saunders, P. Farris, C. Shore, T. Bandyke, T. Rockwood, L. Belkin

**ABSENT:** M. Lore

**VISITORS:** Micheal Kitts, Peggy Duvall, Beau Bassler, Ron Mislowsky

**MINUTES:** The Minutes of February 7, 2008 were reviewed. Mrs. Shore, seconded by Mr. Bandyke motioned for approval of the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously with Mr. Belkin and Mr. Rockwood abstaining.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Belkin suggested moving the first three cases under New Business to the Consent Agenda because all information presented falls within the guidelines and does not require discussion. The Board agreed.

**BAR-08-09** Request of Beau Bassler for approval of a projection sign at 30 N. Cameron Street.

**BAR-08-10** Request of Thai Winchester Restaurant for approval of a patio enclosure at 24 S. Loudoun St.

**BAR-08-11** Request of Melinda Kramer for approval of awnings at 139-141 S. Loudoun St.

*Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Rockwood motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to BAR – 08-09; 08-10; and 08-11.*

*The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Saunders abstaining.*

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**BAR-08-13** Request of Chris Mohn of Oakcrest Properties for approval of renovation to include demolition and rebuild at 163-165 N. Loudoun St.

Ms. Peggy Duvall representing the applicant explained that she plans on refurbishing the building to something more compatible with what's already on the mall. The only change being steel doors on the front and side of the building. She explained that the addition in the back is falling down, so she plans to replace it with something very similar to what's there and add a metal staircase. (She provided a picture of the type of staircase that would be installed) She included that the transoms are frail and the condition of the glass is poor so they will be replaced also.

There was some discussion among the board as to color and material choices.

Mr. Rockwood asked why she has chosen steel doors.

Ms. Duvall explained that it was mainly for maintenance reasons. The owners have another building in the downtown area with the steel doors and they have served them well so they planned on using the same ones on this building.

Mr. Rockwood suggested that the doors should be wood since they are protected from the elements.

Ms. Duvall stated that there has been talk about the doors being wood so there will be no problem if that's what the Board is recommending.

Mr. Bandyke agreed that the doors should be wood.

Mr. Belkin asked what the floor surface would consist of.

Ms. Duvall presented a stone sample for the Board to review. She explained that there would be a slope instead of stairs to get into the front of the building. The side entrance however, would be a step and only the top would consist of the stone.

Mr. Belkin asked what the bulkhead would be made of

Ms. Duvall stated that it would be made of wood.

Mr. Saunders asked if the side and rear of the building would remain stucco.

Ms. Duvall stated that it would but that would need to be replaced.

Mr. Belkin asked about trash removal.

Ms. Duvall stated that there is no room in the back of the building for a dumpster so they are working with the City on when and where the pick-ups would occur.

***Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Bandyke to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to BAR-08-13 on the following conditions:***

1. The mall side of the building will have wood framing on the doors.
2. The floor will match the stone sample that was provided.
3. The rear elevations will remain stucco in a tone close to Brixment sample provided.
4. The staircase will be industrial steel, modeled as on picture of Kent St location provided.
5. Windows will be Colby & Colby.

***The motion passed unanimously.***

**BAR-08-12** Request of Ron Mislowsky for PHR&A for a pre-application review of a plan to build a pharmacy at 326 Amherst St.

Mr. Mislowsky explained that he is requesting comments and suggestions about the proposed construction of a Walgreens at the now used car lot. He stated that there are no formal plans in place at this time, this is strictly an area that Walgreens is interested in at this point. He simply wanted to hear what the Board had to say on the subject and he will take it back to the Walgreens Committee so they can make a decision. Mr. Mislowsky brought 2 pictures of different types of Walgreens stores; one with a flat roof (the one they want to build) and the other with a faux second story. He showed a plan that would have the parking in the front and the building set back to make the drive-thru accessible.

Mr. Saunders felt signage would be an issue with it being within the Historical District.

Mr. Mislowsky explained that he has had previous discussions with the Zoning Administrator and understands that they would have to follow the Ordinance.

Mr. Diem stated that to put up a sign they would have to come back in front of the Board.

Mr. Belkin felt that there is a fundamental problem with the location according to the guidelines. He stated that the houses up to the proposed site all have a common set back. He read from the guidelines that if buildings on the block have similar set backs, respect that line. He calculated that the proposed set back would fall 177%, way outside the guidelines of 85-115%. He stated that it doesn't meet the criteria. Mr. Belkin again read from the guidelines, "Large paved areas for parking should not be placed in a front yard of any size properties except extremely large lots with deep setbacks." He stated that he would have great difficulty saying yes to a Certificate of Appropriateness for those reasons. He suggested moving the building up closer and finding a way to put the parking elsewhere on the site.

Mr. Mislowsky stated that he has read the guidelines and has discussed this issued with the both the Planning Director and the Zoning Administrator. The issue is that there is currently only one entrance to the site, off the driveway of the Selma site. The only other entrance that Selma will allow is in the back of the property. He stated that if the building is moved to the front of the site it would close of the existing entrance and force everyone to drive all the way around the Walgreens to the back entrance. He continued to say that if it's the feeling of the BAR that this site would not get a COA as presented, then that is the information that he needs to take back to the committee.

Mr. Saunders stated that he disagrees with Mr. Belkin. He would prefer the building to set back rather than be up next to the street. He continued to say that the guidelines are not specific in what would be considered a "large lot" or a "deep setback".

Mr. Belkin said that the guidelines are very clear as to the setback percentage allowed. He would find it very difficult to work around that.

Mr. Saunders stated that the existing building on the lot doesn't meet the criteria and it was approved.

Mr. Bandyke asked why Selma is only allowing one entrance.

Mr. Mislowsky explained that Selma is very busy in the morning and they don't want to impact their patients. He continued to say that they are working with Selma to get an eavesment on the back area because phase II parking wasn't built. Walgreens would like to build that parking lot to count some of that parking toward their use. Rezoning would be required.

Mr. Rockwood asked if a new access could be build directly off of Amherst St.

Mr. Mislowsky stated that the City required it stay closed because it is too close to the lighted intersection.

Mr. Rockwood stated that he felt the lighting that would be required is overwhelming as it is the residential district. He asked if the footprint for the Walgreens could be smaller.

Mr. Mislowsky responded by saying that the 14,000 sq ft store that is being proposed is the smallest they have. He stated that he understood that the light poles would have to be approved by the Board.

Mr. Diem continued by saying that there would also be a site plan review by the Planning Commission that would address the ratio and scale of light.

Mr. Saunders made the point that it is already a lit used car lot.

Mr. Belkin stated that since the side of the building facing Amherst St would be the short end, architecturally something could be done to make that fit in to the district but the setback and the parking are something that can't be overlooked.

Mr. Farris stated the he is going back and forth on this issue. That the site is going to be significantly different unless it becomes an extension of the residential neighborhood. He felt that the issue is the fact that what's being proposed is a 14,000 sq ft Walgreens. He stated he does agree that the setback is a serious issue, so a site plan would have to be presented for a decision to be made. He would hope that if there was a way to fix the setback and parking issues, that Walgreens would be willing to do so.

Mr. Bandyke brought up the issue of greenery and the fact that the information provided didn't show any. He then agreed with Mr. Farris in that it has to have a residential flavor.

Mr. Rockwood would like to see the architect try to minimize the apparent scale of the structure.

Mr. Farris agreed that the green space would also be an issue.

Mr. Bandyke asked if there was a way to get from the front or the back without getting caught in the drive-thru.

Mr. Mislowsky stated that once go around you cant come back the way you came, there isn't any room.

Mr. Belkin pointed out that Rotz Pharmacy is further down Amherst, they have done a cleaver job making that building not look commercial from the street.

Mr. Saunders asked why they couldn't pull the building forward and put the parking and entrance in the back.

Mr. Mislowsky stated that having the building all the way forward would prevent use of the drive-thru. Also, all the dumpsters are in the back, which would force everyone entering the store to walk past them.

Mr. Saunders stated that based on requirements, its going to be difficult to put a large structure there.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the proportions of the footprint could be altered at all.

Mr. Mislowsky answered no. He thanked the Board for their time and suggestions.

There was a short discussion between the members regarding administrative suggestions from Mr. Belkin.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:05pm.