

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

March 23, 2017

Members Present

Sean Davis
Robert Stowe
Robert Weir
Michael Nicholas
Robin Crews

Members Absent

Susan Stilwell
Jeffrey Bond

Staff

Renee Burton
Anna Levi
Tracie Lancaster
Alan Spencer

We have a request to add an item to the agenda that is this packet. Mr. Weir made a motion to add the item to the agenda. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2017000042, filed by Liz Russell to remove the storm doors from the four (4) first floor doors at 132-138 Holbrook Avenue.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Liz Russell. Ms. Russell stated we have four doors in the bottom. They have these metal glass storm doors on them and then upstairs there are two doors that have different screen doors on them. We would like to remove the metal screen glass doors on the bottom four front doors.

Mr. Nicholas stated do you plan to replace them with anything?

Ms. Russell stated no right now. We have a lot of screen doors in our basement but I would probably have to come back and ask for that.

Mr. Weir stated you are just removing them?

Ms. Russell stated yes the metal glass doors.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the application as submitted as it does meet the guidelines. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

2. *Request has been filed by DRHA to replace the retaining wall with a stucco finish at 120 Chestnut Street.*

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Anna Levi. Ms. Levi stated the existing retaining wall collapsed some work was being done to the dirt behind it. The wall collapsed and not enough brick was able to be salvaged.

Mrs. Crews stated so the current status is the demolition?

Mrs. Burton stated yes that's the current status.

Mr. Davis stated I saw that wall when it collapsed.

Mr. Nicholas stated so what is your request?

Ms. Levi stated to go back in and put up a new retaining wall that is either block or concrete that is coded with the stucco finish. The last page of your packet is the architectural review that was done for this specific property and the architect recommended that concrete with stucco in any case that the brick was not able to be salvaged if it were to collapse.

Mr. Nicholas stated you are saying it is not enough brick.

Ms. Levi stated right, to go back as it were.

Mrs. Crews stated is it not salvaged with the brick that is already there. It is aestactically pleasing to have brick because it does match the house. Is that possible?

Ms. Levi stated it is not possible to do with the brick that was there.

Mrs. Crews stated do we not have salvageable that could be used for this purpose?

Ms. Levi stated I would have to check on that.

Mrs. Crews stated it is very continuity of the house it's very nice in the before picture.

Mrs. Burton stated the contractors were unable to locate brick that matches what was there previously. That particular side of the house had a garage at one time and it was removed. So there were four different types of brick on that side of the house as it is. So then you have to determine which one do you match it to? So the decision was made to put a stucco finish to match the front wall.

Mr. Nicholas stated is it this brick right here that we are talking about?

Ms. Levi stated yes correct.

Mr. Davis stated there are a lot of bricks on that side. The first close up photo the one that says 120 Chestnut were the bricks had fallen there are three different types of brick. You can see where the original garage was there. I think it would be nice to have bricks that contain one but there is a mixture of 1930's, 40's and 50's brick that are there. Since the front already has a block wall the continuity to the wall system would work because the stairs are bricks so you have a mixture of cement and bricks.

Mr. Nicholas stated do you have any idea what it would look like after this wall is replaced?

Ms. Levi stated not at this time.

Mr. Davis stated I think it would be similar to the front.

Mr. Nicholas stated let's ask. Would it be a continence of this?

Ms. Levi stated yes it would match that.

Mr. Davis stated the question I have and this would fall under the City not necessarily the CAR but the reason why that collapsed and fell was because the drainage for the gutter system runs right along that wall. Is the City going to address that issue?

Mrs. Burton stated yes this project is the middle of a rehab that has started on the exterior. But it will get a full interior rehab on this project. So that will be part of it as well.

Mr. Davis stated so they will make sure that isn't going to push the wall out again?

Mrs. Burton stated that is the intent.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas stated I am leaning in favor because it seems like the original wall collapsed and this isn't a design choice. I like the fact that there was at least an attempt to use salvageable brick and they were unable to find another bricks that actually match. But for me personally if you have the front wall here and it will match I think that is the most we can ask of the property owner.

Mrs. Crews made a motion to approve the application as submitted as it does meet the guidelines. Mr. Stowe seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the January 26, 2017 minutes. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Davis stated I do have something. Mr. Davis stated the quad-plex that is being built at the upper corner of Green Street Park. We had someone come in and wanted to build a brick sit on their house. He was told because it was going to be below 36 inches then he would have to build an additional 36 inches railing because someone could stand up on the seat and topple over. The railing that is up there aren't 36 inches tall so would they have him add something on top of that? I know approved the blueprints for the house but those walls aren't 36 inches.

Mr. Nicholas stated sounds like a Zoning issue.

Mrs. Burton stated it has been approved it would be an building code issue and I would have to look at the architect elevations drawings to tell you for certain. I have that in my office if you want to look at it.

Mr. Weir stated usually it is 42 inches.

Mr. Davis stated maybe it was 42.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

Approved