

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, December 3, 2013

Mr. Graham called the meeting to order about 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Chair Charles Graham, Mr. Jaime Garrett, Dr. Richard Hoback, Mr. Edward Ross, and Mr. Frank Holloway. Also present: City Planner Steve Feverston, Planner Andrew Rodney and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver.

EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS

Mr. Thorp had notified the Planning Department of his absence.

MOTION: Mr. Garrett made a motion to excuse the absence of Mr. Thorp. Mr. Holloway seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No changes were noted for the minutes of October 1, 2013.

MOTION: Dr. Hoback made a motion to approve the minutes of the Board of Architectural Review meeting on October 1, 2013, as distributed. Mr. Garrett seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P-2013-0056 Amendment to An Approved Plan—Pink Shutters – Applicant, Deb Teeters, 27 W. Main Street.

Mr. Feverston explained that the applicant had repainted the shutters on Jolie Boutique to a vivid pink not on the approved color chart for the Architectural Preservation District. He said that the *Design Review Criteria* allows one base color and two complimentary trim colors and establishes acceptable colors. Choices, such as those made by Ms. Teeters, must come to the Board for specific approval. The colors previously approved for the building were Hamilton blue with buff trim. The Planning Department recommended denial of the application because the vivid pink was not typical of the historic district and because there were no other examples in the area.

Deb Teeters, owner of Jolie Boutique, said that the painting of the shutters was a gift from her daughter in memory of her grandmother who had died of breast cancer. She said that fashion and style were her business and that it was important for clients to be able to find her boutique. She said she had received an overwhelming outpouring of support from clients after using the pink color. She also noted that painting the shutters required working from ladders and that safety was an issue should they need to be repainted.

Dr. Hoback said he was shocked when he saw them. He asked if the color was on the chart. Mr. Feverston stated that the closest color was an approved color for accents on signs. Bright colors

may be used as accent colors for less than 5% of the area of a sign. Nothing similar was approved for buildings.

Ms. Teeters reiterated that the bright color was more reflective of her business and her personality. When she asked about the procedure to procure approval, Mr. Feverston noted that the Board of Architectural Review had the authority to approve or disapprove her application. If the requested color was denied, the applicant would have 15 days to appeal to Council the decision of the Board of Architectural Review. Changing the color chart was unlikely to be a successful endeavor. Significant research had gone into determining which colors were already in the APD and what would be appropriate for the buildings there. Any change would be an extensive process and most likely not have a positive outcome for her.

When Ms. Teeters stated that her daughter was not aware of the color palette when the painting was done, Mr. Graham asked for more details on the hardship that repainting would cause. Ms. Teeters stated that her business had improved because people were able to find her shop. She stated that she would very much like to keep the shutters pink.

Mr. Feverston noted several negative calls to the City complaining about the color scheme. He stated that, for all practical purposes, she was making the whole building a sign. The pink shutters were an attention-getting device directing shoppers to her business.

Comments from several board members followed. Mr. Holloway stated that it was unfortunate that the painting was done prior to approval, but the integrity of the historic district was also important. Mr. Garrett noted that the whole issue could have been avoided if the applicant or her representative had asked first.

Ms. Teeters apologized for the oversight, but still requested that the board vote to allow the color scheme.

MOTION: Mr. Holloway made a motion to deny the requested amendment to the approved plan. Dr. Hoback seconded the motion. By a 5-0 vote, the pink shutters were denied. Mr. Feverston explained that the applicant had the right to appeal this decision to City Council by filing the appeal paperwork and fee with the Clerk of Council within fifteen days.

Application P-2013-0057: Temporary Banner – Applicant, Kevin Murachanian North Main Street.

Mr. Feverston gave a brief report on a request by Mr. Murachanian for a red and white temporary grand opening banner from December 9 to January 7 on his newly expanded business at 264 A North Main Street. It is the same sign approved for use when his business first opened. Staff recommended approval of the application.

MOTION: Mr. Garrett made a motion for approval of the temporary banner requested by Mr. Murachanian in Application P-2013-0057. Mr. Holloway seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

BAR Submittal Calendar for 2014

The calendar for the submittal of applications and the dates for Board of Architectural Review meetings had been distributed prior to the meeting. Board members made no additions or corrections.

MOTION: Mr. Holloway moved for approval of the submittal calendar, as distributed. Dr. Hoback seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 ayes.

COMMUNICATIONS

As this was the last Board of Architectural Review meeting that Mr. Feverston would attend as City Planner, he thanked the board for the progress made in the historical preservation district over time. When he started in the 1980's, the downtown area was dormant and mostly empty space. He also thanked the Board for the work on the *Design Review Criteria* that guides decisions in the APD and stated that his career had been a very rewarding labor of love. Each of the board members congratulated him and commented on his outstanding service.

The next meeting of the Board of Architectural Review is scheduled for January 7, 2014 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

There being no further business, Dr. Hoback made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Garrett seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote.

Charles M. Graham