BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW Work Session Tuesday, April 1, 2003

Mr. Carr called the Work Session to order at 7:30 P.M.

Attendance: Mr. John Carr, Chairman; Mrs. Laverne Stebbins; Ms. Heidi Miller; Mrs. Martha Sheley; Mr. James Treffinger; Mr. Jack Gramann. Absent: Mr. Charles Graham. Also present: Mr. Ryan Shrimplin, Planner.

Las Piramides - Exterior Lighting

Mr. Dave Eaton, representing the property owner, stated the lighting existing on the building is a variety of incandescent lights. There is no existing lighting in the parking area. There are three (3) landscape lights and three (3) lights shining on the building which are colored bulbs. Five (5) post lights with globe fixtures are located across the front of the building, two (2) of which are proposed to be removed and relocated in the area of the patio. There are a variety of wall packs used throughout the exterior of the building. The light on the front chimney does shine onto the street area, however, a shield could be installed to down-direct the light. At least three (3) wall packs are angled toward the parking lot. Three (3) of the globe lights were existing prior to the purchase of the property by the current owner, as well as all of the ground-mounted lights and wall packs.

Mr. Shrimplin stated that in researching the City's files, he found photographs of the property taken in 1992. The photographs showed the ground-mounted spotlights directly in front of the building and a pair of coach-style post lights on either side of the entrance walkway. The coach lights were destroyed in the mid-1990's by a runaway truck. The photographs also show one (1) wallpack on the north elevation and one (1) gray spotlight on the west elevation.

Since that time, several additional lights have been installed without approval by the City. The unapproved lights are as follows:

South Elevation

- 1. Five (5) pole lights, each containing three (3) globes
- 2. One (1) floodlight mounted to the chimney
- 3. Two (2) lights mounted to the wall other either side of the front entrance
- 4. One (1) ground-mounted floodlight located in the southeast corner of the property
- 5. Three (3) ground-mounted floodlights containing green and red lenses
- 6. Two (2) ground-mounted lights facing the ground sign

West Elevation

- 1. One (1) ground-mounted floodlight located near the eastern edge of the parking lot
- 2. One (1) light mounted to the wing wall at the southwest corner of the building
- 3. One (1) wallpack light on the west dormer wall
- 4. Three (3) wall-mounted floodlights on the west wall

North Elevation

1. One (1) floodlight mounted to the porch at the northwest corner of the building.

Mr. Shrimplin stated that it may be possible to modify some of the existing lights to conform to the Zoning Ordinance. The red and green lenses could be removed from the front spotlights. In looking at the three easternmost globe lights, the armatures are bolted to the post. The armatures could easily be removed, leaving only a single globe fixture on each post. The two (2) westernmost globe lights could be relocated to the east elevation. The wallpack lights could be replaced with a uniform set of lights that keep the light down-directed and do not produce glare. Regardless of what changes are made, an exterior lighting plan for the entire property, including a ground-level light plot, must be submitted to the City for approval.

Mr. Eaton stated that he would develop a new lighting plan and light plot by mid-April and submit it to the Planning Department for Staff review so that it may be reviewed by the BAR on May 6^{th} .

Dr. Heather Morgan - Ground Sign

Mr. Shrimplin stated that the Planning Department had received a Special Approval Application for a new ground sign at 138 South Main Street. The applicant, Dr. Morgan, had already replaced the existing ground sign with the new sign without approval by the City. Mr. Shrimplin stated that because the sign depicted two backgrounds - white and blue - the sign was required to be referred to the BAR for approval.

The BAR members agreed that because the sign did not introduce additional colors for the second background, it was appropriate. The BAR instructed Staff to place the application on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.