DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Wednesday, December 18, 2019 - 8:00 AM
111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center
Hearing Room (Second Floor)

I. Attendance
Present: Steve Wittman (Chair), Otto Beatty, Jr. (Vice-Chair); Robert Loversidge, Danni Palmore, Jana Maniace, Tedd Hardesty

Absent: Tony Slanec

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Luis Teba, Dan Morehead, Zach McCandlish

II. Approval of the November 21, 2019 Downtown Commission Meeting Results
Motion to approve BL, DP (6-0)

III. Request for Alteration (Certificate of Appropriateness) of Previously Approved Project

Case #1 19-12-1
Address: 554 E. Main Street
Applicant and Design Professional: Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design
Property Owner: JDS Companies / Brian Wilmers

Request:
Alter floor plan to eliminate ground level parking and replace with more apartments. Certificate of Appropriateness for a 4-story apartment with ground level parking. Also a material change in the mesh.

Discussion:
Presenters: Jonathan Barnes

Motion by: Loversidge / Palmore

Motion: To approve the proposal as submitted.

Vote: 6-0
IV. Conceptual Review

Case #2 19-12-2C
Address: 123 E. Spring Street
Applicant and Architect: Bruce Culver / Red Architects
Property Owner: Spring Street LLC

Request:
Conceptual review for the renovation of building. CC3359.05(C)1

Discussion:
Presenters: N/A

- Whittman stated that they need to come in with a set idea of what they want to do, including any plans for a mural.

Motion by: N/A

Motion: N/A

Vote: N/A

Case #2b 19-12-2bC
Address: 260 E. Naghten St.
Applicant and Architect: Ford & Associates / Ben Punturi
Property Owners: Hackman Capital Partners

Request:
Conceptual Review for renovation and addition

Discussion:
Presenters: Ben Punturi

- Whittman stated that he wasn’t sure seating was needed along the south side of the building along the sidewalk. He liked the glass portion of the structure. The brick does not have to match the existing structure exactly, a slight variation may create interest.
- Hardesty suggested they speak to DPS to clarify any ROW issues.
- Maniace asked if the windows will have clear glazing.
- Punturi stated that the building along Mt. Vernon needs to be demolished because the floor plates do not line up. It will also help them stabilize the main building. The parking lot to the west will be improved and used to provide parking for the proposal. The glass addition will have clear glazing.

Motion by: N/A

Motion: N/A

Vote: N/A
Case #3 19-12-3C
Address: 366 E. Broad St.
Applicant and Architect: ArchAll / Brad Parish
Property Owners: 366 E. Broad, LLC

Request:
Conceptual Review for renovation as well as new construction of residences and structured parking

Discussion:
Presenters: Brad Parish, Jeff Boreman

- Maniace stated that the Grant Street façade needs to be pedestrian friendly at the street level.
- Boreman replied that they may do a large installation of art panels.
- Loversidge added that the treatment of the Grant Street façade was critical to the project. It should look like a building all the way to the ground. A flat plate garage would be ideal, but overall they should make the building simpler.
- Whittman stated that they could drop the façade design all the way to the ground. The space between the buildings could be a neat space if designed properly with landscaping and lighting. Will the brick tie the two buildings together?
- Parish replied that a flat plate garage would cause them to lose too much parking, but the brick would tie the two buildings together.

Motion by: N/A
Motion: N/A
Vote: N/A

Case #4 19-12-4C
Address: 155 E. Broad St. Grant Ave. – PNC Bank
Applicant and Property Owner: Edwards Companies
Design Professionals: Stantec (Architecture) MKSK (Landscape Architecture)

Request:
Conceptual Review for Partial Conversion of Bank / Office Building into Residences
Demolition (Removal) of front Portion of Building and Installation of Sunken Court and Plaza

Discussion:
Presenters: Cynthia Harvey, Jeff Edwards

- Harvey stated that the travertine carried down to the ground and the window openings on the ground floor are existing.
- Edwards stated that the space will be open to the public. The stairwell from the sidewalk will go down to the garden.
- Maniace suggested that perhaps the canopies could be raised. The entryway should be more monumental.
- Loversidge agreed that finding the front door could be more dramatic. He was concerned about the street edge, and the hole left in the streetscape. This is a significant building, and while this
is an appropriate modification, there should be thorough documentation of any portion removed.

- Edwards replied that the poured concrete terraces and trees will help create the edge.
- Beatty stated that he was concerned about controlling access and preventing unintended consequences. It is a beautiful design, but he wants to make sure it is safe.
- Edwards replied that they will control access to the garden.

Motion by: N/A

Motion: N/A

Vote: N/A

V. Corrective Action – Items Not In Compliance

Case #5 19-12-5V

Address: 275 S. Front Street  Matan Building
Applicant and Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities / Kristin Schmid
Attorney: John Kennedy

Request:
Corrective action. Deviation from Downtown Commission approved plans. CC3359.05(C)1

Discussion:
Presenters: Edward Kennedy / Krystin Schmid

- Loversidge asked why the applicant thought they could make the changes without returning to the Board.
- Kennedy stated that LC is not scared to come downtown, but prices have increased and LC asked staff to value engineer the building and put that money towards the preservation of the historic building. There were staffing changes, and they thought the changes were minor. They have examined the buildings to self-report any changes.
- Whittman stated that part of the problem is that the Board is trying to get a higher level of design and materials. It is very concerning to think that they are approving things that are changed later. What are the materials of the entryway?
- Schmid replied that they are cast stone.
- Whittman asked how far it would stick out.
- Schmid replied that they would stick out 4 inches.
- Loversidge asked if the square stone should be stained to make the arch more prominent.
- Schmid asked if the stain could be a lighter color.
- Loversidge replied that a lighter stain could work.
- Whittman asked if they could return to the Board with more accurate details.
- Schmid replied that they could. She added that they would like to use cementitious paneling instead of the metal panels.
- Loversidge replied that he felt the vertical piece should be different from the panels on the top of the building. It shouldn’t be too subtle. It could be two steps darker.
- Whittman added that it could be darker and a different finish. He then asked the Board if they were ok with the arch proposal, the changes to the brick, the removal of the lintels, and the cementitious panel.
The Board replied in the affirmative.
Schmid added that the Ludlow elevation would be the same, as the metal panels were also supposed to go to the ground.

Motion by: N/A
Motion: N/A
Vote: N/A

Case #6 19-12-6V
Address: 245 S. High Street  Beatty Building
Applicant and Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities / Kristin Schmid
Attorney: John Kennedy

Request:
Corrective action. Addition of columns on upper levels of High Street elevation. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion:
Presenters: Edward Kennedy / Krystin Schmid

- Whittman asked if the columns would be round.
- Schmid replied that they would.
- Whittman asked if they would be eifs.
- Schmid replied that they would.
- Hardesty asked what would happen if they did not fit.
- Whittman asked if they could bring it back with details.
- Schmid replied that they would.

Motion by: N/A
Motion: N/A
Vote: N/A

Case #7 19-12-7V
Address: 217 S. High Street  Trautman Building Pool Courtyard – West Stairs
Applicant and Property Owner: Lifestyle Communities / Kristin Schmid
Attorney: John Kennedy

Request:
Corrective action related to steps to the courtyard. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion:
Presenters: Edward Kennedy / Krystin Schmid

- Whittman asked if the Board had approved both stairways.
- Thomas replied that the stairs were removed and the tree beds and sidewalk need to be completed. Three different drawings were submitted to the Board, so the final approved design is uncertain.
• Whittman stated that he didn’t feel good considering there were three different drawings on file. He asked the applicant to bring some different solutions for the Board to consider, as well as a landscaping and lighting plan.
• Hardesty asked if it was possible the landscaping was already approved.
• Thomas replied that the Beatty Building had the landscaping administratively approved, but not the Trautman.
• Whittman asked for details regarding the courtyard entry and the streetscape.

Motion by: N/A

Motion: N/A

Vote: N/A

VI. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification Nov. 14, 2019

Mural – Bold & Italics

1. A19-11-6M - 43 W Long St - Apple OB
2. A19-11-7M - 56 E Long St - Apple
3. A19-11-8M - 263 N Front - Apple – OB
5. A19-11-10M - 154 N Third N - WMC – Outfront
7. A19-11-12 16-10-3 31 to 55 W Long - Reno Connect Realty
8. A19-11-13M - 80 S Sixth - Facebook – Lamar
9. A19-11-14 255 E Long - Normandy Signage
10. A19-11-15 295 E Long - Normandy Signage
11. A19-11-16 - 194 S High - Hai Poke Signage
12. A19-11-17M - 145 N High - Facebook – OB
15. A19-11-20 518 E Broad - State Auto Air Handling
16. A19-12-1M - 88 W Mound - Facebook Tiny House AM OutfB
17. A19-12-2M - 34 N High S - Facebook – OB
18. A19-12-3M - 55 E Spring - Facebook – Outfront
19. A19-12-4M - 34 N High N - Facebook – OB
20. A19-12-5 245 S High - Code Now Open Banner
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