



Historic Landmarks and Preservation Districts Commission

Report of the Architectural Review Committee

MEMO

September 21, 2018

RE: 18COA1073

The Clifton Architectural Review committee met on June 27, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. at 444 South Fifth Street, Conference Room 101. Members present were Jay Stottman (Presiding Chair), Pam Vetter, Jessica Murphy, Edie Nixon, and Dave Marchal. The owner/applicant Jackie Green and architects Rachel Harmon and Dan Spitler were also present. Case manager Becky Gorman presented the staff report. Mr. Green and the design team presented the project and described the main concepts behind the project including sustainability, density and innovative design. The committee asked questions about various aspects of the design to understand the project.

Public testimony included 3 speakers in opposition, 2 speakers with general comments and concerns. Staff received 2 emails in opposition of the project.

The committee discussed the height and massing of the building not fitting in with the context of the adjacent buildings which are residential, as well as its relation to the broader context of the district. The committee also discussed the mix of commercial and residential uses and building types in the area. Several members emphasized the priority of the streetscape context on New Main Street, and immediately adjacent to the project. The committee discussed the conflict with Addition design guideline A5 as a concern with regard to the Addition Design Guidelines, but similar conclusions relative to the New Construction Design Guidelines. The committee members stated that for improved compliance with the Design Guidelines, a smaller building would better fit the rhythm of the streetscape with massing and scaling. A variety of design options and approaches were discussed with the applicant. The committee asked Mr. Green if he desired more time to consider the design with respect to the comments and discussion to that point, and if there was some flexibility in the project. Mr. Green agreed to further consider the comments and discussion of the committee, and reconsider some aspects of the proposal. Mr. Green agreed to advise staff when he was ready to return to the Committee for further review of the project – either revised or as originally submitted. .

A motion was made by Murphy to defer the case until the applicant comes back with a revised proposal and seconded by Vetter. The motion passed unanimously.