

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on, May 17, 2007 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:30 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

PRESENT: Bandyke, Lore, Shore, Belkin, Farris

ABSENT: Saunders

VISITORS: Richie Pifer Jr., Court Pifer, Robert Scott

MINUTES

Mrs. Shore, seconded by, Mr. Bandyke moved to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2007 meeting. The Board requested that the minutes of the April meeting be inserted into the next packet for the Board's approval. The motion passed on a vote of 5-0-1 with Mr. Farris abstaining.

CONSENT AGENDA

BAR-07-28- Request of The Brass Hat for a projecting sign at 106 W. Boscawen Street

BAR-07-29- Request of Lewis Costello to change the color of the roofing at 130 South Cameron Street

Mr. Lore, seconded by, Mr. Farris moved to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed on a vote of 5-0-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman

Review of revised copies of BAR Application

The Board moved the New Business to the end of the meeting.

In the absence of Mr. Saunders, Mr. Belkin assumed responsibility of Chairman.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-07-20- Request of South End Fire Company for demolition at 17 West Monmouth Street

Chairman Belkin opened the public hearing.

Chairman Belkin asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in reference to the request.

Mr. Lewis was at the meeting to speak on behalf of the Fire Department. Mr. Lewis stated that the Fire Department had been sited for the canopy and they would like to remove the canopy.

Chairman Belkin closed the public hearing.

Mr. Belkin asked Mr. Lewis what the Fire Department planned to do with the brick palasters and curbing.

Mr. Lewis stated that they would probably remove them also because the new medic and pumper is on its way and they are outgrowing the current Fire Department. He added that they own the actual Fire Department and the buncutter building.

Mr. Belkin asked how it would impact the historic district. He also stated that would normally compare what is there to what will be there afterwards, however, this situation is different.

Mr. Lore stated that the motion should reflect the fact that the columns will need to come down also.

Mr. Belkin asked what will happen where the canopy frames to the existing building. Mr. Lewis replied that they would prepare it in a month or so because they currently have a contractor.

Mr. Bandyke stated that the canopy must come down and the curb should also come down so that the building does not look like a gas station.

Mr. Lewis said that right now the Fire Department leases it to a storage and carpet store.

Mr. Farris said that this demolition is different because it has to be done to comply with City regulations. He added that he would have discomfort in approving a piecemeal demolition, however, if demolition occurs they may replace it with something better. He asked Mr. Lewis what the timeframe for completion is? Mr. Lewis replied that he would think it would be completed in the next three months.

Mr. Farris, seconded by, Mr. Lore moved to approve **BAR-07-20-** Request of South End Fire Company for demolition at 17 West Monmouth Street with the condition that the applicant replace all existing materials with like materials and that they take down the palasters, curbs and pillars. The motion passed unanimously.

BAR-07-25- Request of Richard W. Pifer Jr. for Demolition/New Construction at 120E Cecil Street.

Chairman Belkin opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richie Pifer Jr. was present to speak at the meeting.

Mr. Pifer presented elevation drawings and like details.

Mr. Belkin stated that he was in the process of developing a new plan for how to present an application for new construction and he would like to go over the project item by item.

Mr. Pifer stated that the siding would be James Hardy pre finished cedar. He said that it was not smooth because it was a little different and wouldn't be too out of character. Mr. Belkin stated that the guidelines state that smooth siding must be used because textured sidings can look artificial. Mr. Pifer stated that he would be willing to take out the cedar and swap for smooth siding of the same color. Mr. Lore stated that in the past Hardy Board had been approved on secondary elevations but this is to be used on a primary elevation. Mr. Belkin stated that the guidelines say it can be used on new construction and secondary construction. Mr. Pifer said that on 310 S Kent St Hardy Board was used because the original siding could not be distinguished. Mr. Belkin said that this was predicated on the fact that there was no existing siding.

The Board referred to their guidelines for the use of hardy plank siding. Mr. Lore said that the working rule is that hardy plank can be used on new construction and secondary surfaces. If it's at the edge of the historic district they would be more lenient.

Mr. Pifer stated that he would prefer not to use wood siding because hardy plank is pre-painted and more durable.

Mr. Farris stated that this was partly an issue of scale because the structure is small and part of the streetscape. He said that he was imagining something reminiscent to reconstruction of the barber shop because it looks too perfect and new even though it is wood.

Mr. Pifer said that he was dealing with a neighborhood that has substantial problems and just painting something and renting it out will not help the neighborhood.

Mr. Belkin stated that the demolition is contingent upon what follows it. He added that was concerned with what will replace it.

Mr. Belkin asked if the corner boards are 5 ¼ and 3 ½. Mr. Pifer stated that they are wooden. Mr. Belkin asked if 3 ½ were too thin. Mr. Bandyke said that he could not tell exactly if it is same for same. If it is not same for same it has to be 5 ½ by 6. Mr. Belkin stated that it should be amended to say 5 ¼ by the width of the existing. Mr. Pifer said that the problem was that it might be too detailed.

Mr. Farris left the meeting at 5:11 pm.

Mr. Bandyke stated that 3 ½ seems like it would work. Mr. Pifer said that he didn't think he had seen any 5 ½ inch cornerboards. Mr. Belkin confirmed that the trim is white and the porch posts are 6 x 6 white. Mr. Pifer replied that he could order 6 x 6 or sue ¾ boards and box in the posts, depending on what is most cost effective.

Mr. Belkin asked what the stoop was constructed of. Mr. Pifer replied that it was concrete and it will be broomed concrete in the new house.

Mr. Belkin confirmed that the windows would be MW Jefferson. Mr. Pifer replied that they were using the 400 series which are 100% wood, however, they basically look like the 200 series but they are more durable. Mr. Belkin asked if they were clad. Mr. Pifer replied that he was not sure. Mr. Bandyke stated that the house next door was 200 series, but the sash is wood. Mr. Pifer added that the 400 series is also already painted. Mr. Belkin asked why they decided to go with the 200 series. Mr. Pifer replied that the maintenance for the future homeowner will be less. Mr. Belkin stated that they should use the 200 series.

Mr. Pifer stated that initially they had looked at two over two windows but every house down the street was different and the architect recommended six over six or eight over eight. Mr. Belkin asked if the proportions were accurate. Mr. Pifer replied that 30x46 and 20x32 are what they order. The entire sash is 30x46 and the shapes are accurate and drawn to ¼ inch scale. Mr. Belkin expressed concern that the windows were sized according to the scaled drawing.

Mr. Belkin stated that the door has a casing of ¼ x 3 x 6 panel wooden on the front and the rear door is not visible. He stated the roof would be cross gated pre-finish standing seam with a gable on the back and the porch roof is to be 4 x 12. The front gable will be 10x12 and the rear gable will be 9x12. He said that the gutters will be five inch half rounds with a five inch downspout. He stated that there would be square top board fencing. Mr. Pifer replied that they want to fence in the side and rear yard and the west side elevation is where the gate will be. He said that the gate would be between the window and the porch and about the same distance on the other side. It would be six foot, continuous board on board and not painted just treated. Mr. Lore said that they have accepted pressure treated posts before in outside seating areas. Mr. Belkin said he thought that they didn't accept them. He asked Mr. Pifer if they will be hiring a fence company. Mr. Pifer said no the fence is for security because of the issues in the neighborhood. Mr. Lore asked if there were many fences in the neighborhood. Mr. Pifer said the one to the left has wrought iron and chain link, while the others are dilapidated. Mr. Belkin said that he wanted the replacement to look attractive and exposed pressure treated wood on ninety percent would be fine, but, across the front paint would be preferable. Mr. Belkin added that everything Mr. Pifer presented was itemized and clear however he still had a problem with the siding and at least the front should be wood.

Mr. Pifer stated that wood will weather different than the hardy and it will look different and not be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Belkin said that the whole thing could be wood and then it would set precedent. Mr. Pifer replied that relative to what is there now the hardy

plank is attractive and economical for owners and the guidelines do not say that it is inappropriate. Mr. Lore said that the guidelines say that limestone and wood are the most appropriate and this rules out synthetic siding. Mr. Pifer stated that the state website mentions that hardy plank siding is okay. Mr. Lore said that one part supports hardy plank while the other half claims that is better than other replacement siding and has more authentic resemblances and is cost effective in low income neighborhoods. Mr. Lore stated that this might cause a precedent problem because someone else might want to use the material in a different neighborhood. Mr. Belkin stated that the problem with hardy plank is that it is pre painted. He suggested painting over it on the front of the house if Mr. Pifer could match the color. Mr. Pifer replied that even brushed paint has a different sheen than sprayed paint. Mr. Bandyke said that he had never used the pre painted smooth siding but if Mr. Pifer used that on the side and painted the front that might be acceptable. He added that the manufacturer will send the paint with the siding although painting over it might affect the warranty. Mr. Pifer said that he didn't want to paint it because on the right side he needed a fire rating and the hardy plank works toward this. Mr. Belkin stated that the paint might not last fifteen years. Mr. Bandyke said that you are only getting three to five years at the most out of the paint and that the hardy plank will last much longer.

Mr. Pifer said that if the BZA approves the setback it will be further back than the others. Mr. Belkin asked Mr. Pifer if he would consider unfinished hardy and painting it or the wood. Mr. Pifer said that he didn't want to ruin the historic district, but he would not be willing to put wood up and the cost it will take to paint is a lot. Mr. Bandyke said if Mr. Pifer used prepainted he didn't know what the sheen would look like, but since the structure will be new and not rehabilitated the rules might be different and if the hardy plank was previously approved then it might be acceptable. He added that he didn't think he should use wood and hardy together. Mr. Lore added that if they approve this the Board cannot deny it to someone else and that it needs to be noted that the case for doing this is revitalizing a low income neighborhood.

Mrs. Shore stated that the Board should not make it harder to renovate something than it already is.

Mr. Bandyke reiterated that it had already been approved at another location.

Mr. Lore, seconded by, Mrs. Shore moved that **BAR-07-25-** Request of Richard W. Pifer Jr. for Demolition/New Construction at 120E Cecil Street be approved with the condition that the drawing is accurately represented on a scale of ¼ inch; the James Hardy siding is smooth in texture in consideration of the fact that it is not deemed to present an unduly disrupted effect on the streetscape.; the windows are 200 series MW Jefferson; and the fencing may be pressure treated but the front would be painted. The motion passed unanimously.

BAR-07-06-Request of Richard W. Pifer Jr. for Demolition/New Construction at 314 S Kent Street.

Mr. Bandyke, seconded by, Mr. Lore moved to table **BAR-07-06**-Request of Richard W. Pifer Jr. for Demolition/New Construction at 314 S Kent Street until the June 7, 2007 meeting.

BAR-07-30- Request of Braddock Street United Methodist Church for installation of an awning at 115 Wolfe Street

Mr. Bandyke, seconded by, Mr. Lore moved to table **BAR-07-30**- Request of Braddock Street United Methodist Church for installation of an awning at 115 Wolfe Street until the June 7, 2007 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 pm.