The meeting was opened by John Landis, co-chair, at 7:05pm. The minutes approval for June and July was first. It was moved and seconded that both months be approved. No errors were noted. Both months were approved.

**8136 Germantown Avenue**

- **Presentation:** Boris Karol described the business as a smoothie shop. The property had a variance to be used as a restaurant, but the variance was allowed to lapse. They will spruce up the property. There will be no changes on the exterior except for painting and a new sign. Sixteen neighbors from the City list were notified by registered mail. Richard Snowden stated that he owns some of properties on the list and that he did not receive any notices. The City provides a list of surrounding addresses but not the owners’ addresses. The second floor apartment is currently vacant. Joyce Lenhardt noted that the City Planning Commission belatedly notified the CHCA about this variance need, so this action is late. R Snowden asked about improvement of the façade and suggested restoration to an earlier time. He suggested the pent roof should be removed and the original windows be restored. Bahia Bowls will be a tenant in a building owned by a landlord. The business owners do not control the building. B Karol agreed to work with Streetscape as much as is possible.

- **Comments/Action:** J Lenhardt suggested modifying the LUPZC motion with the inclusion of working with the Streetscape committee to look at improvements and to reach out to neighbors, suggested neighbors on either side of the property and directly across the street. The motion that is forwarded to the Board is: It is moved that the committee support the request for the variance with
the following provisos: opening hours should be 8 am to 8 pm, possibly extended to 10 pm, the premises, including the exterior areas are cleaned in the morning and the evening, a menu is provided to the committee, there is no takeout window, signage and exterior alterations, including paint colors, are worked out with the Streetscape Committee, approval is limited to this specific business and that restrooms are provided, reach out to neighboring properties. The motion was passed.

248-250 E Evergreen Avenue
• Presentation: Before the presentation J Landis provided an overview of the process. Larry McEwen, architect for the project, presented the project, noting that the owners could not be in attendance. He introduced Stephanie Boggs, attorney, and Rob Lamb, realtor. He explained that the property existed as three lots since at least 1927. IN 1927 there was a wood barn on the rear lot. The lots were consolidated in 2008. An addition to the twin was planned for the rear and to the side. This was deemed to be too expensive. As of right the building could cover up to 50% of the property. It was decided to return the property to the original 3 lot configuration with one house build on one of the lots. The side yards should be 4’ each, the rear yard 15’. Two refusals were given for 248 (in its original configuration); one for side yard and one for less than required lot width. 250 was given one refusal for the rear yard. Technically, there is the required rear yard, but, with the easement, the side yard was calculated as 7’. There would be two parking spaces for each house. There has been informal conversation with 246 about 246 purchasing the open space behind that house. Plantings are planned for both sides of the easement, which will be 12’ wide. Concern was expressed for a large maple in parking are behind 246. The tree is not in the parking area and there is no building planned for this area at the moment. The building planned for 250 will be 35’-6” tall. There will be 42% coverage. The new house will step back in the bay window area of 248. L McEwen showed elevations and sections, as well as solar studies. There is no or little back yard, but there is a large deck over the garage. He also provided a view of the streetscape with 250 inserted.

• Committee Comments: It was noted that the LUPZC meeting was to include materials, which were there but not shown and an addition of more detail was needed. Recommended changes to the building were shown. J Lenhardt noted that a proviso regarding materials could be added to the recommendation to ZBA regarding materials. Patricia Cove noted that HDAC has concerns about the project, including the massing, building on a non-buildable lot, the contributing structures around the lot and the character of the street. HDAC did not support the project. L McEwen noted that the lot for 250 is of buildable size; 248 does not make the minimum width.

• Audience Comments: Josh Horowitz, attorney for 252 owners, stated that there is an expectation that there would never be a house built on the lot. As it is now, there is one lot. There is no undue hardship. He urged the committee to vote against the project. L McEwen responded that the house fills in the patterns on that street. J Landis noted that committee decisions are not driven by precedents. A neighbor asked about the street patterns behind the houses. This building breaks up the character of the street in the rear. It was asked how the LUPZC voted on the project without details. A neighbor asked about landscaping and the construction schedule. Lori Salgonicoff asked about the precedent of what was being done. It was suggested that the 27’ width of 250 be reduced to 25’ and the extra 2’ be added to 248’ to bring it closer to compliance. The L-shape of the lot was noted not look right. The difficulty of parking on this street was mentioned. The quickest building schedule would be desired; Trucks and workers are a burden to the neighborhood. A
neighbor pointed out that the maple tree at 246 drops branches. R Snowden stated that the project would probably not be approved by the CHCA board at the next meeting. In commenting on the numerous planters planned for the house, a neighbor noted that the many planters on the block are empty most of the year. J Lenhardt noted that without the need for a variance, this meeting would not happen. By right, 248 could be demolished and a giant house could be built on the consolidated lot.

•Committee Action: J Landis called for a motion. It was noted that the meeting tonight had posed many concerns and comments. A recommendation for support with provisos could be made and passed tonight. Revisit with HDAC to change its non-support to support. P Cove noted that she would present this to the HDAC but does not know if it could be supported. R Snowden suggested a small working group to explore making the project more acceptable. Laura Lucas noted this was important and was possible as the hearing is two months off. Joyce Lenhardt moved that a decision about the project be tabled until the September meeting. In the interim, a subcommittee will be established to work with the applicants and neighbors to address concerns including massing of the rear, trees and landscaping, construction and time frame, and to formulate provisos. The results will be presented publicly at the next DRC. It was suggested that the HDAC be involved. The subcommittee should include neighbors

Adjournment
• The meeting was adjourned at 9:40pm.