



DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2021

6:00 P.M.

ZOOM WEBINAR

PRESENT: Tamie Ehinger, Chair; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair; Rob DuBoff; Leslie DiCarlo; Chris Bennett; Ellen Sheehan; Sean Smith

STAFF: Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Vince DeLeonardis, City Attorney, City of Saratoga Springs

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the proceedings of this meeting are being recorded for the benefit of the secretary. Because the minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings, the minutes are not a word-for-word transcript of the recording.

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2021 DRC meeting minutes as submitted. Ellen Sheehan seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair; in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appears to be "approvable" without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wishes to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the "consent agenda" and dealt with individually.

1. **20210043 D'ORAZIO PETERSON SIGNAGE**, 193 Lake Avenue, Architectural Review of a freestanding sign within the Urban Residential-2 District.
2. **20210044 BETHESDA CHURCH SIGNAGE**, 26 Washington Street, Architectural Review of a wall sign within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.
3. **20210045 BENNINGTON MATTRESS SIGNAGE**, 46 Marion Avenue, Architectural Review of wall signs within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.
4. **20210058 T-MOBILE NORTHEAST COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT**, 176 West Avenue, Architectural Review for the installation of new communications equipment within the Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the D'Orazio Peterson Signage, 193 Lake Avenue; Bethesda Church Signage, 26 Washington Street; Bennington Mattress Signage, 46 Marion Avenue; T-Mobile Northeast Communications Equipment, 176 West Avenue that these applications be approved as submitted. Chris Bennett seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

C. PROCEDURAL ITEM

1. **20200927 JUST CATS COMMERCIAL BUILDING**, 1 Driscoll Road, Initiation of coordinated SEQRA Review and consideration of Lead Agency status for Architectural Review of a new Commercial structure within the Tourist Related Business District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated this application was initially before the Commission and the initial feedback in terms of mass, scale and materials presented was positive. Due to the scope of the project, it seems appropriate that the Planning Board would oversee the SEQRA process.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the Just Cats Commercial Building that the Design Review Commission defer Lead Agency Status to the Planning Board should they choose to seek it. Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Vice Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

D. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

1. **20210048 GEICO INSURANCE AGENCY SIGNAGE**, 506 Broadway, Historic Review of wall signage within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

Applicant: Will Schrade, Geico Insurance Agency

Agent: Adam Wakulenko, Adirondack Sign

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Commission is in receipt of a letter from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation voicing concern regarding the rear signage as well as the luminosity. Typically, we do not see this type of signage on the rear entrance of a business.

Mr. Wakulenko stated this signage is the rear entrance to the office. The applicant is looking to provide a visual for the entrance to his suite in the building adjacent to the parking. Mr. Wakulenko stated the applicant is proposing a 16 x 54 sign on the rear of the building. It will have an opaque background with illuminated letters. A visual of the sign was provided to the Commission, noting similar type of signage on the building for another business.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated she does not believe any signage on the rear of the building appeared before the DRC. We would not have approved that signage since one of the functions of the DRC is to ensure that there is an emphasis on main entrances. We would typically not approve signage outside a back entrance like this. Should the applicant require a sign on the rear what we would typically see is a small sign typically mounted above the door and not illuminated. Would the applicant consider a door sign in this location?

Will Schrade, owner stated they are proposing the sign in this location so as not to damage the historic brick. There is an existing vent hole which we are trying to cover with the signage. This is the employee entrance and New York State client photo car inspections are done in the rear of the building

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated she appreciates the applicant trying not to damage the brick any further. However, in this instance she does not see any reason to attach signage to the brick. What would be appropriate would be to attach signage on the door or immediately above the door.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the location of the signage, size, illumination versus no illumination, historic guidelines regarding signage, and aesthetics on the rear of the building. Also, whether the entrance access meets building code requirements.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated if you view the entire back of the building it does have a lot going on. There is no store signage on the rear of the building other than the signage which appears not have come before the DRC for approval. These entrances are secondary entrances. This is not an ADA compliant entrance and should not be considered a primary entrance for the business. She advocates signage on the door.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated based on the conversation there appears to be no objection to a small sign mounted to the door. It would be beneficial for the applicant to have a conversation with code enforcement prior to approval of a wall sign on the building. The Commission had no issues with the front façade signage, and we will move forward with that approval.

Leslie DiCarlo made a motion in the matter of the Geico Insurance Agency Signage, 506 Broadway that the application be approved with the following conditions – the Broadway façade signage is approved as shown on the attached plans. The applicant will return for further discussion on the rear signage. Rob DuBoff seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

NOTE:

The agenda was heard out of order due to lack of representation for the following application. The application was deferred to later in the agenda.

RECUSAL:

Rob DuBoff recused from the following application.

3. **20200864 BALLSTON AVENUE TOWNHOMES, EXTERIOR**, 96-116 Ballston Avenue, Architectural Review of 18 townhomes and architectural significance for demolition of existing structures within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

Applicant: Steven Gottman and Michael Ginley

Agent: Brian Osterhout, Environmental Design Partnership; Dave Trojanski, Contractor

Mr. Osterhout provided a brief history of the project for the DRC. The applicants purchased the property in 2007. It underwent significant renovations. DRC visited the site and approved the improvements which included non-historic modern elements including a ramp, new windows, and a new standing seam metal roof. SEQRA was completed. In 2017 via the ZBA, City Council and Planning Board the area was re-zoned to T-5. SEQRA was completed for that application. Applications for the redevelopment of the property were initiated in 2018 with a Special Use Permit application and Site Plan Application for an 18-unit townhouse development. Coordinated SEQRA Review began in 2018. ORPHP was contacted and correspondence noted no impact regarding any archeological impacts for the buildings or property. Planning Board issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration in January 2019 as well as a Temporary Special Use Permit for the proposed development. Site Plan was approved in January 2020. Appearances before the Real Estate Committee to allow usage of the former paper street in the rear of the property which was approved. Permanent Special Use Permit was granted for the project in 2020. DOH approved and stamped the plans in 2021.

Mr. Osterhout provided a visual of the site which is 1.37 acres in size. The design concept has been advanced. The benefits of the project are less density than zoning allows, enhanced pedestrian connections on Ballston Avenue, enhances the area where the former paper street existed, provides for civic space and a community bus shelter streetlights and street tree and resolves existing encroachments. In January of 2018, a letter was received from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation noting the house was constructed in 1906 and might be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This was discussed numerous times during the Planning process. In summarizing the project and property has been before the ZBA, Planning Board, City Council and Design Review Commission several times over the past 14 years. Numerous SEQRA decisions have been made. Historical and or architectural significance has never been an issue. The building has modern elements. OPRHP review was conducted as part of SEQRA review for Special Use Permit and Site Plan Approval. OPRHP determined the properties are not eligible. All permits and approvals are in place to move forward.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair requested Vince DeLeonardis update the Commission regarding the role of the DRC this evening.

Vince DeLeonardis, City Attorney stated the chronology of the project was done very well by Mr. Osterhout. This project does go back several years beginning with re-zoning and proceeding to the Planning Board with the Special Use Permit and Site Plan Application which did include SEQRA review with a Negative Declaration. The determination for demolition is still under the purview of the DRC. Regarding demolition, we are guided by Section 7.5.6 because this is in the Architectural Review District and the standards for demolition are like those in the Historic Review District. The Board must first determine if these structures have any historical or architectural significance. If that determination is made in the positive than the DRC would continue with secondary determination if the structure can be preserved and the burden is on the applicant to show good cause regarding that criteria. SEQRA Reviews have been conducted and did touch on Briefly an adverse or significant environmental impact which is different from what this Commission must consider.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated this property is in the Architectural Review District, constructed in 1906. What we are tasked with is to review this property, determine if there is any historical or architectural significance. Based on that determination we will then be able to steer the applicant in a direction or move onto discussing the demolition of the property and move onto the townhomes that are proposed.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated she was unaware of the correspondence from the OPRPH. Preliminary research on the property shows the Woodley Estate and it being subdivided. There is not a lot of information on this estate. She is unaware of what information was provided to the State Historic Preservation Office regarding this home or previous estate. An article was provided back in 2019 which does speak of this area and former estate. Ms. Bosshart stated she feels this area should be surveyed as well as the subdivision of this estate.

The Commission reviewed the existing structure noting the standing seam roof, porch columns, or windows are not

original to the home, the uniqueness of the property, demolition of a perfectly fine building with many architectural features remaining, and how the proposed project will change the neighborhood in the future with a new development.

Mr. Osterhout stated as part of the Special Use Permit application a public hearing was held with no public opposition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the land formerly known as the Woodley Estates, while that has a rich history the question is whether this structure was a contributing structure to the estate. The land appears to be historic but that this structure may not have been considered as a contributing structure to the estate. There is a letter from SHPO who determined no impact on the architectural or historic resources for the NY State and National Register of Historic places? The Chair stated this is in the Architectural Review District. It is an older home built in 1906 with many historic aspects of the home having been removed over the years. Does anyone on the Commission feel strongly regarding the historical significance of this property?

Sean Smith stated in the article provided by the Preservation Foundation there was a cutout of an article from the local newspaper itemizing when they began to rebuild homes for sale on this property. The article is from 1875 which lines up with this home in 1906. It speaks of choice building lots be roughly 100 feet by 150 feet. Based on this information it appears this home was not part of the original estate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated based on the information provided and conversation with the Commission the Chair feels comfortable moving forward with demolition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation spoke regarding the challenge the Commission is charged with this evening. However, going forward what needs to be considered by the DRC is that the area around this through a CLG grant we could do a bit of survey work of the buildings in this area and think about what this looks like going forward. Perhaps acknowledgement of the history of the area could be incorporated somehow into this project. Perhaps there needs to be more research on the context of this area's development.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if there are any interior doors or woodwork from an original staircase it would be appropriate to reuse those products or donate them so that they would not be destroyed or lost during deconstruction. The Chair questioned the proper protocol for moving this application forward.

Vince DeLeonardis, City Attorney stated Section 7.5.6 outlines the first threshold question – Architectural or Historic Significance. If the Commission determines no historical or architectural significance, then the Commission would proceed to subsection (a) which allows the Commission to approve the application for demolition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the Architectural Review application for the proposed demolition of the structures located at 96-116 Ballston Avenue, specifically focusing on 96 Ballston Avenue for the following reasons: While the location of the property area has a rich history the structures themselves do not appear to be original or necessarily contributing structures to that estate. Based on this evening's discussion as well as SHPO correspondence submitted previously the DRC has determined that this property does not have Architectural or Historical significance contributing to the fabric and resources of City of Saratoga Springs. Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the proposed demolition of the structures located at 96-116 Ballston Avenue, that the application be approved. Chris Bennett seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

Mr. Trojanski, Contractor stated all the information has been submitted to the Commission for the development of this project. We will be prepared to discuss the post demolition townhome project at the next DRC Meeting scheduled for March 3, 2021.

NOTE:

Commission Member Rob DuBoff resumed his position on the Board.

The agenda was heard out of order. Representative present for Application #2.

RECUSAL:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair recused from the following application.
Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair assumed the duties of the Chair.

2. **#20210052 RIVER FARM LLC, ENTRANCE ADDITIONS**, 687 North Broadway, Historic Review of exterior modifications within the Urban Residential-1 District.

Agent: Michael Tuck, Balzer Tuck Architecture

Mr. Tuck stated the applicant was before the Commission in 2019. At that time, we spoke of returning before the Commission for the improvements on the West Façade. What was initially presented the Commission was not impressed with the proposed plans and requested the applicant return. Since that time, the applicants have pursued rehabilitation tax credits and have made some modifications to the original plan. A view of the existing building was provided to the Commission as well as the proposed site plan. The carriage house portion of the property has been sold off and is now a separate residence. The rear portion of the lot was sold off and a residence has been constructed there. Since our previous approval, the owners have decided to not construct the balustrades on top of the porch on the east elevation. There is an existing door which will remain with the installation of a historic wood door. Views of all elevations were provided for the Commission. The south elevation will now have a 3 x 3 landing with steps to the west from the existing doorway, which is a new addition to the project. On the west elevation the proposed balustrades are no longer being proposed over the office addition. What is currently being proposed on the west elevation and has received from the State Historic Preservation Office approval of the proposal to the National Park Service is the removal of the existing bay. The applicants have decided to maintain the narrow winding stairs to the basement. There is a desire to finish a portion of the basement for laundry facilities. By incorporating a small bay addition on the west side solves two problems. It mediated the scale issue from the prior meeting and provided a safe means to the basement area. Views from the southwest show a porch, columns and piers which were located from an open porch. This porch is about 50 years old. Our intent is to keep it in place and restore it. Maintain the existing rail system, then integrate the covered porch system into a covered side entry to the building mudroom. Stone will be used from the demolition of the foundation. A visual of the plan was provided to the Commission. Examples of the proposed materials was also provided to the Commission.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair stated these seems like appropriate modifications. The west elevation bay ties in nicely to the south porch.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission.

Rob DuBoff stated this looks great it is a great solution as well as the re-use of materials in incorporating what is being proposed. Any consideration to changing the upper doorway back to the window it once was.

Chris Bennett stated he loves the changes; this is a nice project.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Ellen Sheehan stated this is a job well done.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated they are pleased with this exciting project.

Rob DuBoff made a motion in the matter of the River Farm LLC Entrance Additions, 687 North Broadway that the application be approved as submitted on plans dated February 10, 2021. Ellen Sheehan seconded the motion.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair resumed her position on the Commission.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair resumed her position on the Commission.

4. **#20200216 ALVARO RESIDENCE**, 206 Nelson Avenue, Historic Review of exterior modifications and final details within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the applicant appeared before the Commission back in May where they received approval for Mass and Scale. The applicant was meant to return before the Commission for final details which did not happen. Work has begun. The applicant is before the Commission this evening to review what work has been done and to discuss the application moving forward.

Agent: Sue Davis, SD Atelier Architecture

Ms. Davis provided a visual of the project. She reassured the Commission that the Mass and Scale approval back in May of 2020 is still the intended result. The character of the small-scale vernacular of the house will not change. The front gable façade, the windows, as approved, the gable returns will be reconstructed with a structurally code compliant roof. The gable roof return measurements were documented by the contractor through measurements and photographs. A visual of the design originally presented was provided to the Commission. The non-contributing rear portion would be removed. The new addition will have a link to connect to the existing structure with the addition and the design premise for that has not changed. Once construction commenced, the original foundation and the exterior walls required shoring and stabilization in some areas. The structure was compromised and unsound. We are very tight to the property line and required the foundation being addressed. In January of 2021 there was a question how to tie the new roof to the old roof. We had discussions with the contractor and the entire front original roof framing was entirely exposed, indicating that the north and west wall were 4-6 inches out of plumb. We had to remediate the corner to stabilize the structure. Photographs and drawings were provided to the Commission indicating the measurements and issues involved. There was no structural ridge, the ceiling ties were located too high to be effective, the rafters were not secured to the balloon framed wall and top plate which had rot and water damage and was sagging, the gable end wall studs were not continuous up to the top indicating they had been cut and scabbed onto at one point. The engineer determined the roof was not structurally stable and would not pass current design snow loads. These structural concerns were transmitted in a letter dated January 15, 2021 to Bradley Birge with a copy to Jenn Merriman for distribution to the Commission and other relevant parties. After

receiving no response after ten days the rafters were removed which was also relevant to what was on the building permit and set of drawings. At that time, the concerns were brought forth to the Building Department and a stop work order was issued on January 26, 2021 and we were instructed to appear before the DRC. We cannot build onto a roof plate that is not in good shape. We agreed to maintain the original height in our ZOOM meeting with Patrick Cogan to avoid any zoning issues. This was always the intent. A visual of the drawing which was submitted was provided to the Board.

Our intention was to rebuild in kind. These are the most significant details of the structure. Ms. Davis provided details on the materials noting fiber cement board siding with exposure to match the original, color to be determined by the owner, cornice returns to be fiber cement board or Boral. The columns will be an 8-inch Tuscan style fiberglass, the front porch stoop to be bluestone over concrete, the windows Anderson Wood wright 400 series with the exterior trim as proposed on the elevation and roof material architectural grade shingles. This was all provided on the elevation notes as well.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated it is quite frustrating when an applicant has been received partial approval on Mass and Scale to allow them to obtain a building permit and construction begins prior to final approval. Final approval was never issued. Had proper procedure been followed we would not have a half deconstructed home exposed to the elements.

Ms. Davis stated there was an attempt to reach the Commission. She was unaware that Bradley Birge had left nor was she aware that Jenn Merriman had not passed it along. The building permit did call for new rafters and was in the narrative. There was no attempt to try to hide anything.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair reviewed materials with the applicant's agent. The Chair questioned if there was any historical trim work remaining on the structure.

Ms. Davis stated there is not, however the contractor did take photographs and measurements and the idea is to replace in kind with the same dimension and location using a Boral product being aware of the fire rating issues.

Chris Bennett spoke regarding this structure now a completely new building losing some of the feel of the old home, wooden decking versus proposed bluestone would be more appropriate. Locating an old historic front door to bring back the feel of the old home. Perhaps some old historic features and natural products to remind everyone this was once an old historic structure.

Rob DuBoff questioned the use of the Boral product. He prefers the use of a fiber cement product for the trim. We typically would not approve plastic or synthetic products for use on a historic structure. It seems you are using synthetic products for use on this historic rebuild. There is nothing natural proposed.

Sue Davis stated their concern is the location of the structure on the property line and meeting current fire rating codes. These products have been used on other applications of this nature and have been approved.

Chris Bennett stated he shares Rob concerns as well as the concerns of the applicant's agent. More natural products would look more historically correct on the old portion of the rebuild versus newer products.

Ellen Sheehan agrees with Chris perhaps an old historic door would go a long way on the front façade on this home. Secondly, the cedar timbers on the patio reads a little rustic for this building. Perhaps fiberglass columns for the patio roof would be more appropriate.

Sue Davis stated this is the applicants request. This will be somewhat hidden by a hedge and landscaping.

Discussion ensued regarding the window materials proposed and what existed on this home prior to construction.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated originally this property appeared before the Commission for a demolition of a historic property. The applicant then reappeared with a new proposal for saving the historic structure. The expectation was that as much of the historic structure was going to be saved and reused.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation spoke regarding the project and its appearance before the DRC when discussion ensued regarding what was underneath the siding, what condition it was in, and what details could be uncovered. She did note that the use of wood on the front façade is appropriate and has been used in other applications before the DRC. Perhaps this would read more historic. It is disappointing to see that it is now all new construction, and this is unfortunate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the original intent was to save the original structure and to keep it as intact as possible and now it is not the case. There have been suggestions by the Commission regarding the use of natural materials. We have been given the responsibility of assuring that these types of projects happening in the Historic District are done to the Secretary of the Interior Standards. We will discuss and come to some type of consensus.

Rob DuBoff stated he always prefers the use of natural products. The applicant's agent has some constraints with fire rating codes being on the property line for one of the elevations. He appreciates the recommendation of the Preservation Foundation noting the opportunity to use the natural materials elsewhere on the structure. The current choice of windows is appropriate for this structure throughout. Regarding the columns a wood product is preferred rather than fiberglass.

Leslie DiCarlo stated the most important thing is that what is left of this original house is maintaining its presence on the streetscape. Maintaining the location, the size, and the feel of it as you travel past it. The overall design is great the way it steps back. I do not think in this case the cement board is inappropriate because you are basically rebuilding it.

Leslie Mechem stated she has no objection to the fiber cement siding. Since the fire code requires it one side it might be more consistent to have it on the entire structure.

Chris Bennett stated he would look at the small details. The addition is the addition. The main structure could be fiber cement board siding creating the soffits and the fascia. An all-wood window looks softer and rounder corner and are much lighter versus an aluminum clad window. I would use an older wooden door and a wooden porch with a square turn column, perhaps old porch columns. Differentiating the old between the new.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the applicant's agent if they are receptive to using natural materials to preserve some of the feel of the old structure.

Ms. Davis made several suggestions regarding the use of natural products on the original portion of the structure. She will speak with the applicant regarding the Commission's recommendations. Perhaps the window trims and the columns as suggested.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair summarized what the Commission has discussed with the applicant's agent. Old wood for the columns on the porch as well as wood for the decking and porch. Wood trim around the windows on the front façade and on the south side of the original structure. The remainder of the materials seem appropriate. The gable returns will remain intact.

Leslie Mechem made a motion in the matter of the Alvaro Residence, 206 Nelson Avenue involving Historic Review of exterior modifications and final details we approve with the following conditions – the applicant will use natural materials, wood trim around windows and the trim on the south side of the original structure. The applicant will use a natural wood product for columns and will use a tung and groove product for the decking. Steps as presented. Sean Smith seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Rob DuBoff, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Sean Smith, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

The Board recessed at 9:17 P.M.

The Board reconvened at 9:19 P.M.

5. **20200412 TAIT LANCE RESERVE WORKFORCE HOUSING**, 114 Tait Lane, Architectural Review of 12 buildings (202 units) of mixed income workforce housing with supportive activities and site amenities within the Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood District.

Agent: Thom Nester, NRP Group, LLC, LA Group; RDL Architects

Mr. Nester stated the Commission has reviewed this project previously. We are here this evening to finalize the materials and provide updates per the Commission's recommendations. A visual of the site plan was provided. The project consists of three major building types two of the larger apartment buildings and the town homes. Visual renderings of the project were provided. Mr. Nester provided views of all buildings and elevations noting the use of fiber cement board siding, dropped the stone height in several locations. Views of the clubhouse were also provided. The material pallet was reviewed using fiber cement board siding, stone in the accent areas and where possible, along with the proposed lighting and color scheme. Vinyl windows are still being proposed for the project.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Commission originally discussed raising the structure further above grade than originally proposed. It appears you have raised the structures somewhat, and according to the T-4 district is appropriate.

Mr. Nester stated the buildings were raised about eight inches from the surrounding grade.

Tamie Ehinger, Chairman stated we will review one building at time.

Ellen Sheehan spoke regarding Building A, rear elevation. It appears originally three doors were proposed and now one door is shown. Was that a cost saving measure?

Mr. Hosack stated it depends on what building you are looking at. Some buildings with parking on both sides the front elevation would be the same on both sides. Those buildings with more of an outdoor courtyard area in the rear of the building is where the storefront windows were changed to the single door to appear more residential.

Rob DuBoff questioned the trim work material and how the cement board panels would be attached.

Mr. Nester stated the trim work is cement board for the trim. The cement panels are surface fastened and painted so they are concealed.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the stone base and the decrease in the size from the previous presentation. Has there been any thought regarding the new exposed areas which will have a fiber cement clapboard having those painted out or a different color to allow for more of a solid basing on that? An earlier rendition it read better it sat well. It looks chopped up now, it is lost its base and looks squatty. Maybe a color change would help in this area.

Leslie DiCarlo stated it seems arbitrary. It is supposed to read as a water table, but it is arbitrarily applied.

Mr. Nester explained their reasoning for lowering the stone on the water table.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the Commission if there were any further thoughts or comments on the vinyl windows proposed. We appreciate the change to the fiber cement product which is much more appropriate. We have not yet nor does the Chair envision the Commission approving a vinyl product on a large-scale residential project such as this?

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the use of vinyl windows.

Mr. Nester continued with elevation views of Building B. The reduction in the use of stone is only on the two larger buildings. The townhomes stonework has remained unchanged.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the venting and location of these on the buildings.

Mr. Hosack stated some of the venting will be out the sides for the water heaters and the furnace. They are currently actively coordinating that. Typically, they do the floor space rear wall, and the top floor will be taken through the eaves. They try to minimize them as much as possible.

Mr. Dirr spoke regarding the venting and the locations as noted trying to minimize the effect as much as possible.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the lighting.

Mr. Dirr stated typically on the main entrances to the buildings there would be lighting to accent those entrances and a smaller light on the balconies or patios for each of the units.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned the location of the air conditioning units and condensers and how they are being screened or masked as well as the meter banks.

Mr. Dirr stated they are anticipating a split system so the condensing units will be ground mounted, clustered around the building, and screened.

Mr. Nester stated they would use landscaping to mask those units.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair questioned if there is any additional feedback regarding the facades of these buildings. The Chair indicated perhaps a color change or a creative proposal for filling in those blanks that the stonework has left. We can proceed now to the townhomes.

Mr. Nester proceeded to the townhomes. We have also switched the materials to cement board siding as well. We did raise the heel heights on every other townhome just to add a shadow line.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there were any thoughts for the applicant.

Leslie Mechem, Vice Chair stated the variegation of the front and the roof line works well. There is a lot of white. Could the parts that project forward have a variation in terms of color. It was very apparent in the 3D rendering. It appears as a white wall, perhaps a creamier color. It presents a very uniform façade. It works well on the apartment buildings but on the townhomes it is overwhelming.

Ellen Sheehan likes the uniformity of the townhomes. A light grey could work. The white is quite stark and harsh.

Chris Bennett stated this is an opportunity to have some fun with this and do something unique with color. These are people homes and perhaps each unit have some sort of uniqueness.

Rob DuBoff questioned the use of gutters. Is there an internal gutter system?

Mr. Nester stated there is a shallow gable that will cricket the water to the gutters. He provided views of the proposed guttering.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience who wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Commission has provided feedback. In summary the reaction is positive. The fiber cement changes are particularly good. Vinyl windows is something which needs to be addressed. Additional details on penetrations, location of the lighting, the location of any condenser units and the proposed screening.

Suggestions were provided regarding and addition color scheme and options. Overall, this is a terrific project. A welcome addition to the west side of Saratoga and we look forward to seeing it completed.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, February 24, 2021 at 5:00 P.M.
Design Review Meeting, Wednesday, March 3, 2021 at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:13 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Approved: 03/03/2021

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline