
Meeting Date: November 1, 2017

215-255 EASTERN SE & 750 CHERRY SE - REQUEST FOR NEW BUILDINGS

BACKGROUND:

The project in question is in regards to two new buildings previously approved for construction on vacant lots, one on 750 Cherry SE and the other on 215-225 Eastern SE.

Brief summary of past events:

An advisory discussion was held in 2014 where the developer sought feedback on three potential redevelopment scenarios:

- 1) Retain 758 Cherry house in place and build a 3 story apartment building at 750 Cherry and a 3 story building along Eastern.
- 2) Move 758 Cherry elsewhere in the district and build a 3 story building at corner that would extend south along Eastern and west along Cherry.
- 3) Move 758 Cherry west one lot and build a three story building from the corner south along Eastern.

After a considerable amount of discussion and public comment, numerous issues and concerns were raised with regard to the massing and design of the proposed buildings as well as a firm finding that moving the existing house would not be permitted.

The applicant returned to the HPC on October 1, 2014 for formal review of construction of what was essentially 5 three story buildings (two along Cherry and three along Eastern) and underground parking. After the review and considerable public input about the incompatibility of the massing, scale and design of the proposed infill the HPC denied the request and suggested the applicant create a committee with neighborhood representatives and Rhonda Baker to help formulate a development plan that may receive better support and fit the guidelines.

The owner and architect convened a committee with community representatives and HPC staff who met several times to discuss goals, desires, plans, massing, designs and placement. The owners returned to the HPC on April 1, 2015 with a new application for infill on these lots that resulted from these meetings. The request was for two structures; one 2.5 story building on Cherry and a 2 story building on Eastern. The HPC found this proposal with lesser massing, better proportions and more appropriate and compatible designs and materials to meet the guidelines and standards and approved it, minus the balconies for 750 Cherry SE.

Unfortunately the project did not move forward. The owner is attempting to rejuvenate this project, but in doing so they have made alterations to the previously approved plan. The changes affect massing, scale, proportions, design and material and as such the matter was brought back to the HPC through a public hearing to ensure public involvement, on August 16, 2017. At the public meeting the HPC expressed concern over several of the changes and as such tabled the application to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the concerns.

The applicant will be back before the HPC with a revised set of plans on November 1, 2017.

PRESERVATION GUIDELINES:

New Construction

Recommended:

The success of new construction within a historic district relies on understanding the distinctive architectural character of the district.

Retaining site features that are important to the overall historic character.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features and open spaces.

New construction siting should be reviewed based on existing district setbacks, orientation, spacing and distance between adjacent buildings.

Design new construction so that the overall character of the site, site topography, character defining site features and district vistas and views are retained.

Conform to design guidelines involving site and environment.

Design new buildings to be compatible with the surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing proportions and roof shape. Giving special attention to proportions of the front façade.

Utility connections shall be placed to minimize visibility from the street.

Design the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion and size of window and door openings in new construction to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings.

Utilize window and doors in new buildings that are compatible in material, subdivision, proportion, pattern and detail with the windows and doors of surrounding historic building that contribute to their character.

Select materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding historic buildings that contribute to their historic character.

Design new buildings so that they are compatible but discernable from adjacent historic buildings.

The introduction of compatible but contemporary new construction can add depth and contribute interest to the district if the new design and location reflect an understanding of and compatibility with the character of the district.

Not Recommended:

Introducing any new building that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the settings historic character.

Introducing a new feature that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys the site patterns and vistas.

Introducing new construction on to a site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys relationships on the site.

Environment & Site

Recommended:

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features and open spaces.

Paving

Recommended:

Paving should be consistent in design, materials and scale with historic features. For paving, simple scored concrete, stone, paving brick or other historic materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or exposed aggregated or other modern concrete treatments.

Paving of rear yards will be reviewed based on site configurations, historical features and hard surface to grass ratios.

Not Recommended:

The paving of front and side yards for surface parking is not recommended as it jeopardizes the relationship between building and streetscapes.

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

#1

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

#2

The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

#3

Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

#4

Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

#5

Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

#6

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color; texture and other visual qualities and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical or pictorial evidence.

#9

New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

#10

New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

STAFF NOTES & GUIDELINES

In your packets you will find the originally approved plans from 2015 and those submitted for review this past August which are labeled August Plans. Additionally the minutes from the previous meetings are also included.

As it relates to the staff report I will only be focusing on the elements that have changed between the August design and the new design (November Plans) and not re-iterate every nuance of the request.

Should the HPC come to make a motion it must be remembered that there are currently two active plans before the HPC, the August Plan and the November Plan and any motion must address each.

SITE

Instead of the originally proposed underground parking which allowed for greenspace above, the August Plan illustrated parking at the rear of the Eastern building consisting of asphalt surface parking and buffer landscaping. A driveway was introduced to the north side of the new building. A driveway and angled parking was created at the south boundary of the project to allow for one way traffic flow.

Concern was raised over the amount of hard-surfacing and parking between the new structure and the house to the south (especially related to the parking being so close to the house and in the front yard).

November Plan removed the angled parking by the house on Eastern and added three parallel parking spots adjacent to the south wall of the new building. The width of the each driveway is 14' the added parallel parking on the south sides adds 8' feet of additional surfacing to that driveway. The landscape area between the south drive and the house to the south is 13'8".

No other site elements appear to have changed from the August submittal.

GUIDELINES

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features and open spaces. What is the impact of the rear parking area, the driveways, and the side yard parallel parking to relationships and spaces?

New construction siting should be reviewed based on existing district setbacks, orientation, spacing and distance between adjacent buildings. What are the existing setbacks and orientation of features of the neighborhood? Are all the features of the proposed site design compatible?

Paving should be consistent in design, materials and scale with historic features. For paving, simple scored concrete, stone, paving brick or other historic materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or exposed aggregated or other modern concrete treatments. The previous approved proposal had a driveway and it was proposed to be concrete. Is the change in material to asphalt appropriate? The existing parking lot at 750 Cherry SE is asphalt as is the one behind 200 Eastern and other establishments along Cherry's business corridor but is the use of asphalt for the driveway appropriate and compatible?

The paving of front and side yards for surface parking is not recommended as it jeopardizes the relationship between building and streetscapes. Is the proposed parallel parking along the south edge of the new building, which adds to the overall width of the hard-surfacing in this location appropriate and compatible with the character of the neighborhood? How does it, or does it, affect spatial relationships, site vistas and patterns?

750 CHERRY SE

Per the submittal the overall massing and scale of this previously approved structure will remain as approved. The height was slightly reduced from 33.8' to 32' but the width, depth and placement remains the same. However, all of the site dimensions are not present (example, the front setback is missing) on the new submittal and as such, should it be approved the motion should reference a requirement to match the previous approval from 2015.

The main change noted in the August Plan with this structure related to exterior materials. The previously approved building had an exterior clad entirely in brick while the new structure has brick at the garden level of the front elevation and the front 1/3 of the garden level of the west and east elevations, which transitions into CMU.

Per the August Plans the bulk of the structure would be clad in a varied reveal clapboard style fiber cement board siding. The reveals vary between 4” and 8”. This was an issue for the HPC at the last meeting and as such the applicant has revised the siding design for the November Plans. The new style has lighter sections of the siding with a 4” reveal and the darker sections with an 8” reveal.

The skirt board will be 8” wide fiber cement trim and window trim will be 3.5”. The design and finish (smooth) of the siding and trim needs to be verified.

GUIDELINES

The success of new construction within a historic district relies on understanding the distinctive architectural character of the district.

Design new buildings to be compatible with the surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing proportions and roof shape. Are the proportions of the proposed materials compatible with the surrounding district?

Select materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding historic buildings that contribute to their historic character. Are the proposed materials compatible in how it relates to the surrounding district?

Design new buildings so that they are compatible but discernable from adjacent historic buildings. Is it?

Introducing a new feature that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys the site patterns and vistas. Introducing new construction on to a site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture or which destroys relationships on the site. Is the change in material and thus the change to the design compatible?

215-225 EASTERN SE

<u>Approved Building</u>	<u>August Plans</u>	<u>November Plans</u>
Width 130’	Width 114’ 6”	Width 114’ 6”
Depth 64’	Depth 58’	Depth 58’
Wings 42’ wide-32.6’ deep	Wings 38.6’ wide-30’ deep	Wings 40’ wide-31.8’ deep
Courtyard 46’ wide-32.6’ deep	Ctyd 28’ wide-30’ deep	Ctyd 28’ wide-25.8’ deep
Height 32.6’ for the entire structure	Height for wings 28’ for rear structure 38’	Height for wings 28’ for rear structure 38’
Porches - 4- 2 story	Porches - 2 large two story	Porches-4 -2 story

6.8” Deep-Width ?

Porches had enclosed brick side & front walls with metal rails	Only the first floor front walls are brick. The sides of the first floor porches are open with metal rail. The second story portion will be fiber cement panel rather than brick.	Returned to all brick porches with metal rails. Sides enclosed with brick. Returned to originally approved design.
Porch columns were brick	Porch columns panel	Returned to all brick
Exterior material brick	Brick only on base of porches & “wings”. Majority will be varied reveal & 8” fiber cement clapboard siding and panels.	Brick porches & base of wings. Rest 4” or 8” reveal fiber cement siding, CMU & panels.
Areas between windows metal panel	Areas between windows & vents-fiber cement panels.	Areas between windows fiber cement panels. Vents were removed.
No wall venting included	Large vents in west walls.	No wall vents.
Cast stone coping/cap	Metal coping	Metal coping
No rails or structures on the roofs roof	Metal rails & structures on roof.	No rails or structures on roof

Footprint

The overall footprint from the Approved Plans to the August Plans shrank by 15’x6’ but this seems to have been made up for by adding height to the rear 1/3 of the building raising it 10’ above the height of the front portion of the building. The only readily noticeable reason for the change in the footprint and height is to accommodate a driveways to the north and south and angled parking and an auto drop off along the west, in lieu of the underground parking.

The November Plans as it relates to footprint haven’t changed much from the August Plan other than:

- Southwest stair tower no longer projects past the south wall of the “wing”. It has been incorporated into the structure by expanding the “wings” to a 40’ width thus, squaring the structure off.
- As noted the wing footprint expanded from 38.6’ to 40’.
- Courtyard remains the same at 28’ wide but the depth shrank to 25.8’.
- Rear 3 story section was pushed forward/east into the courtyard 6’.
- The overall width of the building is 114’ 6”.
- The distance from porch to sidewalk is 9.9’.
- The “wing” depths increased by 1.8’ while the rear 3 story depth shrank by 1.8’ but the overall depth remained the same as previously submitted.
- The porches were again separated out to four independent structures similar to the original approved submittal. **The width is not known** but the depth is 6.8’.

Features

- Siding designs and materials have changed from varied reveal clapboard the red areas having a 4” reveal and the grey having an 8” reveal.
- Siding designs used are still: clapboard, panels, CMU, and brick.
- The brick carried up the columns to clad the entire porch structure similar to the original approval.
- Open ends on the first floor of the porches were re-enclosed with brick to match the originally approved design.
- **Rear/west façade the large vents were removed, staff is unclear how they intend to address the venting they provided?** In place of the vents the clapboard siding was installed.
- To address concerns over the 3rd story feeling disassociated from the rest of the building they added windows and brought forward the center section into the courtyard making the design of that section continuous.

GUIDELINES

The success of new construction within a historic district relies on understanding the distinctive architectural character of the district.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features and open spaces. The placement of the structure has not changed save for the changes in footprint noted above. The proportions from the approved plan to the August/November plans have changed as it relates to structure to open space both in context of the site plan as well as the structure itself with regard to the “wings” and courtyard. Are the established historic relationships maintained? Is it compatible?

New construction siting should be reviewed based on existing district setbacks, orientation, spacing and distance between adjacent buildings. Is the distance to adjacent structures appropriate? Is the spacing between structures and within its own design elements appropriate and compatible with the district?

Design new buildings to be compatible with the surrounding buildings that contribute to the overall character of the historic district in terms of height, form, size, scale, massing proportions and roof shape. Giving special attention to proportions of the front façade. Is the overall massing both in height and footprint compatible and appropriate for the immediate district? The roof is flat with a parapet, which is something evident in the immediate vicinity on historic buildings.

Design the spacing, placement, scale, orientation, proportion and size of window and door openings in new construction to be compatible with surrounding historic buildings. The overall placement and window to wall ratios have not changed between the approved plan and the August plan. However, there were changes on the east façade of the 3rd floor in the November plan. The overall proportion of the building did change from the approved plan to the August plan including the size of the “wings” and the courtyard. Additional revisions occurred between the August and November Plans. Are the new proportions as illustrated in either plan compatible with the district?

Utilize window and doors in new buildings that are compatible in material, subdivision, proportion, pattern and detail with the windows and doors of surrounding historic building that contribute to their character. The windows and doors remain as previously approved as it relates to design, operation, dimensions, overall location and materials. With the exception of the 3rd floor east which has been revised since the August submittal. Changes did occur in August submittal that are also evident in the November plans as it relates to the detailing around the windows. The panels between the windows were changed from metal to fiber board panels, is this still compatible with the district?

Select materials and finishes that are compatible with historic materials and finishes found in surrounding historic buildings that contribute to their historic character. Are the materials proposed appropriate and compatible with the historic district? Is the proposed combination of siding types and styles appropriate and compatible?

The introduction of compatible but contemporary new construction can add depth and contribute interest to the district if the new design and location reflect an understanding of and compatibility with the character of the district. Design new buildings so that they are compatible but discernable from adjacent historic buildings. Is either the August Plan and/or the November Plan compatible yet differentiated as a product of its time?

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment. Is this a minimal change to the environment?

New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. Is either plan compatible?