City of Columbia

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW TEAM

January 11, 2021

CALL TO ORDER:

The January meeting of the Architectural Design Review Team for the City of Columbia was called to order at 9:05 a.m. The meeting was held in Conference Room A, City Hall basement level.

ROLL CALL: All present and included the following:

Present were: Mr. Austin Brass
Mr. Glenn Harper
Mr. Randy McBroom
Mr. James Sloan
Ms. Kara Williams

Others attending: Mr. Kevin McCarthy, Planning Associate
Ms. Sandra Richardson, Secretary
Ms. Melissa Sanders, Planning Associate

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Williams made the motion to approve the December minutes, with Mr. Harper seconding the motion. The motion passed with a vote of five to zero.

AGENDA ITEM #2
Case #ART-2021-0269

Request from WES Engineers and Surveyors for new construction design approval on Pulaski Highway being Tax Map 113 Group 80.19.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Brass presented the Team with the details of the agenda item. The revised submittal does show a 4'brick veneer base on the west, rear, and front elevations. The primary façade material is EIFS an approved material per the guidelines. The building does show articulation; however, the 4' brick veneer base does not run along the side elevations visible down Park Plus Drive toward Pulaski Highway.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Gerald Vick, WES Engineers, and Al Nickel, KCS, were present to answer question. Discussion included façade elevation, paving, grass, resubmittal plans better address the guidelines, brick base on the east side, material going all the way around, how to stop the brick on the side of the building, low visibility, loading dock, continuous flow, bringing the brick all the way to the canopy in the front,

materials have to be consistent on all sides, and better to have brick at the base of the wall for maintenance in general. Mr. Brass stated the guidelines from the applicability sections says structures with frontage along arterial or collector roadway as identified by the transportation plan or visible of the right of ways along side roads. Park Plus Drive is not considered an arterial or collector street; however, when we delve into the standards it talks about the material section, and the articulation that we just reiterated. If it is visible from an arterial or collector road it does have to have the articulation every 35 feet. However historically if it's the primary material of the building it runs on all elevations. This would be an example of the primary material is EIFS; however, on all elevations there is showing a brick base just not on one particular elevation. Further discussion included the location, width, east elevation width, and design side. Mr. Harper moved to approve subject to the east side receiving the 4' brick base. Further discussion included meeting the requirement, adding additional brick, appearance, the brick does comply, the east side doesn't comply, having 4' brick on the side, bricking the back portion that is in the grass, stair rail, site plan, area from loading dock down will be concrete, retaining wall, curve line, lower on the back side, steps, north elevation deeper transition with more brick, start and stop at the door, and trash drop area a natural stop area. Mr. seconded the motion to include the four feet of brick on east side. Mr. Sloan later amended the motion to say that the brick on the east side would stop at the curve, that occurs on the north side, and then it terminates after the trash enclosure so that the loading dock area has that turn down concrete. It will also need the brick on the north and south side needs to go down a grade so that these elevations are more accurate. Mr. Harper stated that he agreed with the amending of his motion. Further discussion included taking a picture, and a resubmittal. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Sloan. The motion to approve with conditions passed five to zero.

AGENDA ITEM #3
Case #ART-2021-0283

Request from ViViD1 Architecture for new commercial construction approval at 204 East 6th Street.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Brass presented the Team with the details of the agenda item. The building does meet the guidelines regarding the material. The primary material is brick on all elevations; however, on the left and right in the rear elevations the building

does not appear to be unbroken. It is more than 35 feet; however, there is no articulation that is shown on those elevations.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Darrell Hayes, and Mr. Patrick Carter, were present to answer questions. Discussion included site location modulation requirement, the rear elevation faces the back of the building which is East, the church is on the property line, property line, functioning as a museum, selling cars, parking across the street, unbroken wall, pilasters, close to the historic district, windows, detail on the front façade, blank facades, level of detail, and rear elevation is flat. Mr. Brass stated the guidelines states the use of architectural detail to provide visual interest including but not limited to: columns, large windows, entry ways, beams, poles, or glass. Pilaster is a typically seen element; however, that is not the only option. Additional discussion included traditional look, pilaster does not go with the look of the building, downtown appearance, the large windows, articulation bump outs, developing out, industrial look, carry the soldier courses all the way around, newer brick, seeing a different pattern on the north side, looking like a window was there, left and right elevation, attached buildings, gutters, the herringbone is utilizing material that is already on the building, price point, appearance, and sending in revised elevations via email. Mr. Sloan made the motion to approve with the stipulation that the applicant send a revised set of elevations for the board to make sure that they understand the intent. This is to include the soldier coursing accents that are on the front elevation all the way around the building on all four sides. On the left and right side, the north and south sides respectively to have brick accent openings or what looks like filled in openings where windows would have been. Mr. McBroom seconded the motion. Mr. Brass stated to be clear on the minutes this is a conditional motion and the applicant will provide revised renderings. Mr. Sloan stated the foe openings on the two long sides, and then on the back side just the soldier course. The motion to approve with conditions passed five to zero.

AGENDA ITEM #4
Case #ART-2021-0285

Request from Bobby Lovell for new building construction on Hatcher Lane being Tax Map 100J Group D Parcel 23.00 adjacent to 1217 Hatcher Lane

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Brass presented the Team with the details of the agenda item. This proposal does meet the guidelines.

Discussion and Motion:

Mr. Bobby Lovell, was present to answer questions. Discussion included vacant lot, location, the pilaster on the west side, rock, material, meeting the intent of the ordinance, breaking it up, historical, add material, stone on the front, put stone in the breaking point, brick the whole thing with soldier course, two soldier courses, compliance, intent, rendering, colors, traditional brick, soldier course above and below the windows. Mr. Sloan made the motion to approve with the removal of the two pilasters on the long east and west elevations, and the addition of a soldier course stepped out by a half inch on the top and the bottom of the windows on all four facades of the building. This is an alternative compliance. The motion was seconded by Mr. McBroom. Motion passed five to zero. Further discussion included we have the original submittal, placement of the soldiers, no windows on the back of the building, and keep the soldiers the same way all the way around.

AGENDA ITEM #5
Case #ART-2021-0299

Request from Gabby Marroquin for new office construction on the corner of Cord Drive and Pulaski Highway being Tax Map 113 Parcel 59.02.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Brass presented the Team with the details of the agenda item. Currently this is a vacant lot; however, it will be visible from Pulaski Highway. Articulation would not be required.

Discussion and Motion:

The applicant was not present. Discussion included awning over the door, detail, the applicant is aware of the meeting today, color, material, windows, location, compatibility, and it is not a metal building. Mr. Brass moved to approve, with Ms. Williams seconding. Motion to approve passed four to one, with Mr. McBroom voting nay.

OTHER BUSINESS:

There was no new business to discuss.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Brass made the motion to adjourn with Ms. Williams seconding. Motion to adjourn passed five to zero. Meeting adjourned at 10:07 a.m.