

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on July 19, 2007 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:30 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

PRESENT: Bandyke, Belkin, Farris, Lore, Rockwood, Saunders, Shore

ABSENT:

EX OFFICIO

& STAFF: Gaynor, Minor, Griffin, Grisdale, Van Diest, Moore, Lewis, Smith

VISITORS: Sandra Bosley, Marc Handy, Bob & Sue Pinner, Ed Shoup, Don Crigler, Lowell Baughan, Pamela Zontine, Linda Ross, Howard Kittell, John Woolschlager, Stan Corneal, Ron Mislowsky, Warren Hofstra, Charley Gaynor, David Edwards, Jennifer & Shawn Roop, Susan E. Good, Alice W. Vance

MINUTES

The minutes for the July 5, 2007 meeting will be approved at the next scheduled meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Belkin suggested adding **BAR-07-61** to the consent agenda if the applicant could confirm the sign was metal and not plastic. The applicant or a representative was not available at the meeting. Therefore, the request was tabled.

Mr. Lore suggested adding **BAR-07-62** to the consent agenda.

Mr. Lore, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, motioned to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Saunders stated that since the public hearing was going to take some time, he wanted to address some of the other requests first.

BAR-07-46 Request of Shawn Roop and Jennifer Shea-Roop for approval of fence at 558 N. Braddock Street

Mr. Saunders stated that since the applicants were at the last meeting, the BZA had approved their fence. Mr. Roop added their cable was installed today so the satellite dish would be removed.

Mr. Belkin asked what color the fence would be. Mr. Roop stated white or off white but Mrs. Roop asked if it had to be a color. Mr. Saunders stated it would not but the applicant

needed to tell the board what they are going to do or the board could give the option of keeping it wood or painting it white. Mr. Belkin stated that he would approve it on the condition it was painted. Mr. Lore stated it would look half way finished if it was unpainted. Mrs. Roop stated that they would stain it if it was not painted to protect the wood. Mr. Belkin suggested that some stains are colored white. Mr. Roop suggested a cream color because they did not want something that was too white. Mr. Saunders suggested the applicants give the board a color range. Mr. Roop stated an off white to the color of their house which is almond. He added that he did not want the fence to look like a white billboard because of its size.

Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Farris, moved to approve BAR-07-46 with the condition the fence be painted in a color ranging from the color of their house to an off white.

The motion passed 7-0-0.

BAR-07-54 Request of Thomas Chasler for approval for paint color change, installation of a ceiling fan, installation of light fixtures and installation of concrete in the front yard at 201 E. Boscawen Street

Mr. Chasler presented his request.

Mr. Belkin asked if the concrete would cover the entire front yard. Mr. Chasler stated it is not much of a yard, probably 20 feet by 12 feet. Mr. Belkin stated he would have a problem with a concrete yard on the corner of Boscawen and Kent. A totally paved front yard would impact negatively on the area. He added that he would go with pavers instead of stamped concrete. Stamped concrete is not consistent with the period.

Mr. Saunders asked how much square footage we are talking about. Mr. Chasler about 20 feet by 10, it would be to the right of the sidewalk. The other part of the yard is grass.

Mr. Saunders asked if the applicant would have an objection to brick pavers over concrete. Mr. Chasler stated he thought stamped concrete would look better.

Mr. Belkin asked why not put in grass. Mr. Chasler stated he has had liter problems in the past and has 4 inches of gravel and weeds to remove.

Mr. Saunders stated that the guidelines state to use historical materials such as brick. He thought the pavers would look better but concrete is listed as approved materials.

Mr. Bandyke stated that he thought pavers would look better and have a less intense impact.

Mr. Farris asked the applicant if he would be opposed to his request being approved with substituting brick pavers for stamped concrete. Mr. Chasler stated he has used brick pavers before and has a problem with weeds. The stamped cement is more attractive, it

doesn't separate, and it is easier to walk on. He added it is more expensive but looks better.

Mr. Farris stated from an aesthetic point, he would prefer the brick pavers in respect to the age of the structure and the streetscape. Mr. Chasler stated the stamped concrete gives the appearance of brick pavers.

Mr. Saunders confirmed the color of the stamped concrete would be a dull brick red. Mr. Chasler stated that is correct, it would be dull not bright red.

Mr. Belkin stated it is a small front yard. If it is a residential structure, it deserves a front yard. If it has to be paved, since it is commercial now, I still believe it needs to be traditional materials.

Mr. Lore stated that it is a prominent corner and an important part of Old Town.

Mr. Chasler stated he would amend the application. Mr. Saunders stated the applicant has chosen to amend his application to brick pavers instead of stamped concrete.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mrs. Shore, motioned to approve BAR-07-54 as amended. The motion passed 7-0-0.

NEW BUSINESS

BAR-07-59 Request of Daniel McKee for approval of attic window replacement, chimney demolition and skylight installation at 116 W. North Avenue

Mr. McKee presented the request. He stated the homeowner is finishing the attic and adding rooms upstairs. The concerns were the deteriorating chimneys. The homeowner would like to remove the chimneys. The chimney on the east side of the house, the homeowner would like to replace it with a skylight. This particular chimney is viewable from the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Belkin stated the house has 3 chimneys and asked if they were talking about the one on the back of the house if you are standing on North Avenue. Mr. McKee stated they want to remove the one in the back and the one on the front, east side. However, only the chimney on the front will be replaced with a skylight. The rear chimney will be patched.

Mr. Rockwood asked if any of the chimneys are functional and what they connect to. Mr. McKee stated they have not been functional for years and do not have any flues or liners. They were connected to wood burning stoves in the basement but there are not fireplaces in the house. He added that you can see daylight in some of the mortar joints.

Mr. Farris asked if a cost analysis has been prepared for the homeowner. He wondered if it might be less expensive to repair the chimney instead. Mr. McKee stated they have not broken it down for the homeowner but the concern is there is deterioration in the home as well.

Mr. Belkin stated the guidelines say to retain all existing chimneys and skylights that add to the character of the house. It also states do not install new elements such as chimney or skylights. The bottom line is that the chimneys add to the character of the house. A traditional skylight would be a dormer. Mr. Saunders stated that in the past, skylights have been turned down. Mr. Belkin asked if the applicant could add a dormer instead. Mr. McKee stated there is already a dormer in the house so that is not an option. If you take the chimney down, you would see the patch in the roof compared to putting a skylight in.

Mr. Saunders stated that the area is fairly visible from the street and it would not be appropriate for a skylight to be there.

Mr. Lore stated that the streetscape is characterized by large homes with chimneys. His concern is that if the board approves to begin taking out chimneys for convenience, it would be hard to stop.

Mr. Saunders stated that this is a two part request. He asked if anyone on the board had questions about the windows. Mr. Belkin asked where the windows are located. Mr. McKee stated all of the windows are in the attic, 1 in front and 3 dormers in the rear.

Mr. Saunders asked if the pane configuration would be the same. Mr. McKee stated they would. Mr. Belkin asked if the replacements will be in the same frame. Mr. McKee stated yes.

Mr. Saunders stated we have two parts, the windows and the chimneys/skylight. He asked if Mr. McKee would be opposed to approving the windows and not the chimneys. Mr. McKee said that was the homeowner's optimum solution. We knew there would be some opposition to the aspect of the approval. Mr. McKee added that he needed the windows. Mr. Saunders asked if he wanted to amend the application for the windows and come back for the chimneys. Mr. McKee agreed.

Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Farris, motioned to approve the request for the window replacement as presented. The chimney demolition and skylight installation have been deleted from the approval. The motion passed 7-0-0.

BAR-07-58 Request of Winchester Evening Star, Inc for a conceptual discussion on the demolition of 215 and 221 E Boscawen Street and 216 Sharp Street

Mr. Saunders stated that if you read the Zoning Ordinance, it states that we cannot consider an application for a public hearing until after you have submitted a full application. He stated the board has the information submitted and can take a look at it but cannot take any action on it until after a full application has been submitted.

Lowell Baughan stated that he is seeking some general thoughts to see if we can possibly remove buildings located on the properties. If what the owner is seeking is possible, they will proceed with drawing up a plan. If it is not, they will stop. His clients want to

maintain the streetscape on Boscawen. Mr. Baughan asked if the concept has any way of proceeding.

Mr. Saunders stated that we have had this before. A lot of public hearings today are for demolition. He stated the applicant does not have to go any further with the concept and the board does not need any more information from him. Mr. Saunders added that the proposal is different from what they have seen before but he did not want to give the applicant a false impression.

Mr. Saunders stated that since the public hearings are individual cases, if a guest's statement covers all of the demolitions, they do not need to speak for each property.

BAR-07-48 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a two-story building located at 126-128 East Cecil Street.

Mr. Saunders opened the public hearing.

Don Crigler stated that the board is familiar with the project. The new design will be closer to the original house that was on the property. He added that he has photos of the current condition of the property.

Tommy Kipps presented an African American Heritage pamphlet showing the property as a tea room. Mr. Kipps stated the property should stand due to its heritage, its history and its uniqueness.

Ron Mislowsky stated that he works on the Community Development Committee for the Spot Blight Program. A couple of these units were identified as blighted by City Staff. The committee and the owner have worked to improve the properties and cure the blight. The committee sees the request as a positive for the City and for potential home ownership where there would not be any.

Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

BAR-07-49 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a dwelling structure located at 404 South Kent Street

Mr. Saunders opened the public hearing.

Mr. Crigler presented photos of the current property and the proposed homes. He stated the concern with this property is it was originally a one room structure with framing added to the rear. Judging by the large picture windows, the property was used as a store for years. To bring it to current residential standards will take a significant amount of money. He added the wood frame in the rear is not aligned with the brick on the house.

Franklin Wright from Preserving Historic Winchester stated he would like what he says to be applied to the remaining applications. Mr. Wright stated that PHW is a non-profit

organization to protect historic Winchester. PHW stands as a stakeholder since they own 18 properties on Kent Street. He added that PHW is committed to the future of Kent Street and committed to the goal to provide affordable housing. Mr. Wright met with the Rose Foundation and agreed not to oppose the demolition of 507 Kent Street. PHW did not oppose 128 Cecil because of structure's condition. PHW did not oppose demolition to 126 Cecil because it is Ms. Jackson's wish. PHW did not oppose the alteration of 128 A & B Kent Street. It had always been a duplex and not a single family home. Mr. Wright stated that he discussed at length the proposals with Rose Foundation. They presented 2 proposals but now only 1 is before the board at this time. Changing the houses will change the nature of the block. To do so because it is cheaper or easier is not sufficient for the board or the City's residences. These properties are a significant part of history and African American history.

David Edwards of the Department of Historic Resources stated Winchester is one of two promising districts in Virginia. He applauded the BAR for protecting it. These homes are modest but offer a lot to the streetscape. It would be a considerable blow to the whole fabric of architectural structures that is delicate. The area represents high income and smaller income families of 200 years ago. He added that tax credits go to owners in the historic district. He asked the board to give the properties a chance of being proposed.

Howard Kittell serves on the PHW Board of Directors stated he wanted to express his opposition to the proposal. More than 3 decades ago, the people of Winchester created this district to recognize and preserve the community's history. This destruction would be devastating to the historic district and the streetscape. There are options for redeveloping all or some of these structures under consideration that don't require demolition. The BAR should take these into consideration and please deny this request.

Patricia Zontine of 1218 Rodes Circle stated that she managed the Revolving Fund for the PHW. The Revolving Fund purchased homes and sold them to people with the condition they would renovate the home to a certain level. This was successful on South Loudoun Street which was in worse shape than Kent Street. They have done this with several properties on Kent Street and Clifford Street as well. She asked the board to deny the proposal and see the value of the properties and work to find other solutions for renovation.

Mr. Wright presented a letter from John Lewis, a member of PHW, who could not attend the meeting. Mr. Lewis wrote that since restoration costs equal construction costs, why spend the money on demolition. Mr. Wright stated that clear cutting an entire block of 100 year old properties tears a hole in the fabric of the street. The Rose Foundation says these properties are not worth saving or economical to improve the buildings to be marketable. He doesn't believe the Foundation has considered the tax benefits and has no cost basis in the properties. He added that PHW is not opposed to all demolition just inappropriate demolitions. The Rose Foundation has not provided evidence of why these structures should be demolished. Once they are demolished, they are gone forever.

Warren Hofstra of 506 W. Leicester Street encouraged the board to think carefully and deny the demolition. He supports the effort in Winchester to restore the historic district. He asked the board to think carefully and deny this request. He stated that if this community could find preservation solutions for problems of blight, Winchester could become a model for the entire state.

Linda Ross of 529 Jefferson Street stated Kent Street is important and a unique street. She presented an 1843 picture of Winchester where you could see all of the buildings that have been preserved in the City.

Sue Pinner of 124 E. Clifford Street stated that she grew up on the east side and has stayed on the east side. She has no desire for a grand home. She likes the character and architecture of the area. They are simple homes that are the tradition and backbone. She suggested an engineer go through them to see if they are structurally sound. To go in and make these homes new would destroy what the neighborhood is. The people are proud of Kent Street.

Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

BAR-07-50 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a single-family dwelling located at 406 South Kent Street

Mr. Saunders opened the public hearing.

Mr. Crigler stated that these comments will apply to the remaining of the cases. The Rose Foundation has committed to rehabbing and restoring and preserving 4 properties on Kent Street rather than requesting demolition. In regards to 404 and 418 South Kent Street, these properties are not near the condition of other similar properties on Kent Street. If they were, we would not be requesting demolition. After restoring these properties, all you are going to have is a new home with historic studs. On the inventory sheet for 408, there is a two story structure that is no longer there. To leave these structures in this condition, you would eventually end up with their demolition because of their disrepair they have now.

Mr. Wright responded by stated that the other structure on the property of 408 was a house that burned down. He believed it was Ms. Jackson's father's home. PHW has offered to move 408 to another location at their expense. This would open 2 more lots for them to build on. He added PHW does not think the Rose Foundation is bad. Both of them have used good faith but, it has come to this. We believed that all of the possibilities have not been applied and ask that the applications be denied.

Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

BAR-07-51 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a single-family dwelling located at 408 South Kent Street

Mr. Saunders opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak at that time. Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

BAR-07-52 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a two-family dwelling located at 412½ and 414 South Kent Street

Bob Pinner of 124 E. Clifford Street stated he has lived around the corner from the property since 1987. The area has had its problems but it's on an upward swing. It may not be fancy or that historically significant but that is not a reason for demolition. Knocking down this many houses in one stretch will gut the work that has been done by a lot of people in that neighborhood and is not appropriate.

Danny McKee stated that he met with John Lewis and discussed the 1976 inventories on some of the properties in question. In the inventories, they rated average or poor in terms of condition and historical significance. Most of the properties are boarded up so it won't be taking them away from anyone but safety is a concern as well.

Frank Wright stated that he thought Mr. McKee misspoke on the architectural significance in 1976, all of the properties were average and one was listed as good. He added that plenty of people are willing to do the work.

Stan Corneal stated he commended Vivian Jackson for doing this with the Rose Foundation. However, he feels the houses should be kept and renovated but kept affordable for people.

Tim Mischato stated he believes in preserving the past but sometimes we wait a little too long. When a building cannot be saved without keeping a majority of it intact, we have failed. He would like to work in identifying these projects before they are beyond repair.

Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

BAR-07-53 Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a single-family dwelling located at 418 South Kent Street

Mr. Saunders opened the public hearing.

Mr. Crigler concluded by presenting the two concepts up for review. The first concept saves the two end properties. The second concept demolishes the whole street.

Charlie Gaynor of 1601 Handley Avenue tried to express the City Council's opinion of the properties. The properties are vacant and have been ignored for a long time. He asked everyone to consider that people have stepped up to the plate with money to take care of these properties today. He invited the public to attend the Community Development Committee Meetings.

Mr. Rockwood asked Mr. Gaynor about the financial assistance he mentioned. Councilor Gaynor stated that in the last budget, money was set aside for neighborhood improvements. We haven't given any money to the Rose Foundation. The money will be spent on sidewalks and the common areas.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the money would be available if another group did the work or is the money specific to this particular group. Councilor Gaynor stated that we are trying to develop a template and format for assisting in development without getting in our own way with inspections or anything else. Some of the money was to assist the Rose Foundation with the demolition.

Martha Shickle stated the Rose Foundation submitted an application for funding to support the project. If anyone else had submitted an application, they would be considered too. Mr. Belkin asked what the status of the application is. Ms. Shickle stated that the Rose Foundation was notified that upon getting approval, the funds could be available.

A citizen asked if unless the properties are demolished, would the City not provide funds if the properties are renovated. Councilor Gaynor stated the Rose Foundation submitted an application just like anyone else could. The citizen asked if a group applied, would the money be given for renovation. Councilor Gaynor stated he could not speak for the application process but it is open to everyone who wanted to make an offer.

A citizen asked if the money is only available if all the houses are torn down. Councilor Gaynor stated that he did not say that. The application depends on the decision made by the BAR.

David Shore stated that he thought the assumption going around is that if Rose is not allowed to do this, the properties will stay the way they are. He believes the properties will be absorbed by the renovation/restoration community. He felt if the properties were put on the market, they would be sold in one month. Councilor Gaynor stated that would be Rose's choice to do that. He added that if they are not approved, Ms. Jackson would have to sell them and people would have to buy them which would start the application process all over.

Ms. Shickle stated the Office of Housing and Neighborhood Development sent out a notice of funding available with general requirements the City has established. In this notice, the priorities were homeownership and neighborhood conditions. Rose sent in an application for assistance for demolition, water and sewer tap fees, and site development. The application was reviewed but approval was held because of the approval processes they would have to go through. She added that she could not give any answers on what funds would be available for other projects because she has not seen any proposals. This is the only proposal that has been brought before them.

Mr. Wright stated that there are others in the community who would step up today as well. If the decision is to rehabilitate the properties, he is convinced it can be done with

either private or non-profit money. The funds used for demolition raises a separate issue. Although he is not an expert, he stated he believed the City cannot use funds for demolition of historic property without the approval of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Tommy Kensky stated that he bought 401 and 403 Kent Street in the 80's and operated the store for 12 years. He has been in the area for 20 years. We couldn't get the City to put in a street light and now they are talking about tearing a block down. The reasons why the street is like that is because Ms. Jackson was a very nice woman who let people rent for hardly anything. The City put pressure on her and she was overwhelmed with what they demanded of her. The Rose Foundation came in and they worked out an agreement. He thought the neighborhood needed to be saved and not put new home in. He offered to step up to the plate and buy two of the properties right now.

Kay Muterspaugh of the Rose Foundation stated that Ms. Jackson is a very good friend who trusts her with many of her personal items. Ms. Jackson's biggest desire is to have affordable housing for the people of the neighborhood and not investors. She has been approached by many people to purchase the properties but she dreams of affordable housing on Kent Street and a save neighborhood.

Councilor Gaynor stated that Winchester has 25% more renters than homeowners. It is part of the plan for the homes to be occupied by those who buy them. This is a small step in the right direction.

Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing.

Mr. Saunders asked Mr. Grisdale if the board has 60 days to make a decision. Mr. Grisdale stated that is correct.

Mr. Saunders stated that they received a lot of information and heard from a lot of people. He did not think the board is ready to make a decision tonight or even discuss it. He added that he hoped PHW and Rose could get together and come up with a win/win situation for a compromise.

Mr. Crigler asked if the board would consider acting on 126 & 128 Cecil Street since PHW is not opposed to that request. Mr. Belkin stated he would prefer to discuss all of the properties at the same time. Mr. Saunders stated they are individual requests and must be considered individually so this one could be talked about separately. Mr. Farris stated he would like to wait on the Cecil Street properties too. Mr. Lore stated that it is up to the BAR to make the decision on these properties and the fact that PHW is not opposed to this property does not give them the authority to approve this. It is the BAR's responsibility to decide.

Mr. Saunders agreed that the endorsement of PHW is not a determining factor. He added that all of the properties will be handled separately but they will not be pulled apart because of less opposition. Mr. Rockwood pointed out 2 members of Council and a

number of people came to speak who may not be able to come back. Mr. Saunders stated that Rose and PHW may want to see what other options are available after listening to the comments made tonight.

Mr. Crigler stated the original proposal was to keep 404 and 418 Kent Street which is reasonable to the Rose Foundation. We have been attempting to work with PHW but unfortunately, we don't agree. PHW has offered to move 408 and we are willing to work with 404 & 418.

Mr. Belkin asked if they have considered expanding to the rear of the properties. Mr. Crigler stated that it has been considered but it can't be done on some.

Mr. Belkin stated that this is important enough to mull over and discuss at the next meeting. He is in favor of tabling the requests and continuing it next time.

Mr. Bandyke stated he would like to see the inside of the homes. Mrs. Shore agreed. The board was informed that 1 tenant at 406 will not let them in but Mr. Crigler offered to give a tour of the properties.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the properties have been transferred to the Rose Foundation. Mr. Crigler stated that a portion has been transferred and the others are under contract. Mr. Rockwood confirmed that 406 and 418 are still titled.

Mr. Belkin asked about the affordability and asked Mr. Pifer want his properties on Kent Street sold for. Mr. Pifer stated he thought the asking price was \$220,000 for one and \$234,000 for the larger unit.

Mr. Saunders requested that Staff organize the tours with the Rose Foundation. Mr. Grisdale agreed that would be possible.

Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Farris, motioned to table BAR-07-48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53 until next week. The motion passed 7-0-0.

BAR-07-60 Request of Painter-Lewis PLC for approval of a parking lot at 19-23 ½ S. Braddock Street

Ed Shoup stated that they demolished the building on the property three years ago. Since then, the costs of rebuilding have increased out of his budget. However, he needs to address the problems that exist on the property now. He presented pictures of the property that showed the current safety issues. He is proposing a parking lot on the property. He added that even though he has put a fence around the area, 4 people crossed over to sit on the large concrete block during Apple Blossom.

Mr. Saunders asked how long a Certificate of Appropriateness is good for. Mr. Grisdale stated 1 year. Mr. Saunders stated that he would not be able to apply for a building permit

under that Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Shoup stated he understood and stated today would be a fresh application.

John Lewis stated that parking lot would be two levels covering both lots. There is an outcrop that will be raised with a retaining wall around it. They would put planters around the lot instead of guard rails. There will also be under drains to take rain water from the upper level to the sewer system. The City has not seen the plans. It was his understanding that he would have to come before the BAR before submitting a site plan.

Mr. Belkin stated that this is the danger with approving demolition. He added that he is not sure approval would have been given originally if they knew they would be getting a parking lot. Although, he did not think this was the original plan.

Mr. Saunders stated that it would be better than what is there but his concern is the main feature of the parking lot has not been addressed. He does not have a problem with the parking lot but is concerned with the appearance of the retaining wall. Mr. Lewis stated the retaining wall has not been designed yet. Mr. Bandyke asked that a side elevation be given.

Mr. Rockwood asked if this was to be a way station where the applicant would eventually build on the site or if it would be a permanent lot. If it is permanent, will it be run by the city or will it be a private lot. Mr. Shoup stated it would be a private lot. His plan is to build on the lot but it is not a good time for him to do it right now. Mr. Saunders stated that Mr. Shoup would have to come back for approval of the building. If approval is granted, it would only be for the parking lot.

Mr. Rockwood stated going back to Mr. Belkin's point, the board approves demolition with the design of a structure to be put back on the property but we have no fixed point when that will occur.

Mr. Saunders stated the only thing we are dealing with now is the parking lot. To build a new structure on the property, the applicant will have to come back to the BAR.

Mr. Saunders stated the applicant would still need to come back with the design of the retaining wall. Mr. Farris added that he would like to see the materials to be used before voting. Mr. Saunders stated the parking lot is okay but the retaining wall is a big part of it.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Rockwood, motioned to table BAR-07-60. The motion passed 7-0-0.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-07-31 Request of David R. Madison for the approval of siding installation at 305 N. Loudoun Street

David R. Madison presented pictures of what is underneath the current siding. He stated they want to keep the colonial items on the top of the front and put Hardiplank over the siding.

Mr. Belkin asked what the current siding on the house is. Mr. Madison stated it is aluminum with several different types of wood underneath that have been patched. He would like to put ½ inch plywood over what is there and cover it with Hardiplank. Mr. Saunders stated that what has been done in the past is if the siding is original and can be patched, go back and patch it. It appears in this case, there has been so many patches that you can't go back to the original, in those cases we have allowed the use of Hardiplank.

Mr. Belkin stated he would personally oppose Hardiplank and approve wood. Mr. Rockwood stated he would agree with that.

Mr. Saunders stated that in the cases that Hardiplank was approved, the house did not have any siding on it just plywood.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the applicant has removed the siding. Mr. Madison stated he has not removed it. When he unhooked it to take the pictures, he could see the wood has been cracked from the nails where it is thinner.

Mr. Bandyke asked if we are skipping a step by not taking off the aluminum siding to permit a good look at what is there. Mr. Saunders stated that we can do anything but he is hearing an opposition to Hardiplank. He asked the applicant if he is at the point that he has to remove it anyway. Mr. Madison stated that was correct but there are three different types of wood on the house.

Mr. Farris stated he could not personally approve the application because he cannot see the extent of the damage and doesn't know what would be covered up.

Mr. Belkin stated that the board is saying we will approve something, take this stuff off and present us with possible solution.

Mr. Saunders added that the only Hardiplank being approved is smooth.

Mr. Saunders stated to leave this as old business.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.