

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 4:01 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

PRESENT: Tim Bandyke, Patrick Farris, Tom Rockwood, Catherine Shore, Don Crigler and Bob Pinner.
ABSENT: None.
STAFF: Vince Diem, Aaron Grisdale and Paula Le Duigou.
VISITORS: Mark Lore, Larry T. Omps, Ken Connor, Frank Wright, Dick Helm, Lawton Saunders, Richard Bell

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Catherine Shore moved, seconded by Tom Rockwood, to amend the October 6, 2011 minutes as recommended. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATION

EHT Traceries made a presentation to the Board concerning the study that they had completed on the downtown historic district.

CONSENT AGENDA

BAR 11-654 Request of Kenneth Connors, on behalf of the subject property owner, Deirdre Cochran, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a black, wrought iron decorative fence in the front yard of the property, located at 122 Peyton Street.

Don Crigler moved, seconded by Tom Rockwood, to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness as recommended. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

BAR-11-642 Request of Richard S. Helm, on behalf of the subject property owner, for approval of demolition at 326 – 330 North Cameron Street (*Map Number 173-01-S-3*), pursuant to Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Rockwood withdraws from the discussion due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Diem stated that the request for demolition of a building 75 years of age or older was advertised in the *Winchester Star* on November 14, 2011 and November 21, 2011.

Mr. Diem, reading the staff report, stated that Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance (hereinafter “the Ordinance”) requires that buildings which are 75 years of age or older may not

be demolished until a certificate of appropriateness has been issued by the Board of Architectural Review through the public hearing process.

§14-3-2 No building which existed in the Historic Winchester District seventy-five (75) years ago or prior thereto shall be demolished or removed in whole or in part, except for additions to the building which are less than seventy-five years (75) old, unless and until an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall have been approved by the Board of Architectural Review. No such application shall be considered by the review board until a public hearing has been held per Section 23-7-1 of this Ordinance. Every such application shall be accompanied by a filing fee as per Section 23-8 of this Ordinance.

Section 14-6 of the Ordinance specifically addresses criteria for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. Furthermore, Subsection 14-6-2, et al, outlines considerations the Board is required to make, when determining the appropriateness of an application to demolish a building which existed in the Historic District seventy-five (75) years ago.

§14-6-2 Before a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued for the demolition of a building or structure which existed in the Historic District seventy-five (75) years ago or prior thereto, the review board shall consider among other things:

§14-6-2.1 Is the building of such architectural or historic interest that its removal or disturbance would be to the detriment of the public interest?

Staff Analysis: As identified in the recently published Architectural Inventory report by EHT Tracerics, Inc., “Both of these buildings [326-330 North Cameron Street] were associated with Wm. B. Baker and Co.’s Winchester Steam and Flouring mill complex that was in operation in this area by the 1870s. By 1885, the building along North Cameron Street was used as a grocery retail operation and the large brick warehouse to its east as a fertilizer warehouse. According to the Sanborn maps, by the early 1900s, they were both used as part of the Baker & Co. Wholesale Grocers. Retaining sufficient integrity, they are contributing resources within the Winchester Historic District...”

The vernacular structure located at 110 East Fairfax Lane is described as a “two-and-a-half-story formed concrete building constructed ca. 1912 as a planing mill for the Glaize & Brothers lumberyard. The planing mill is one of the oldest surviving industrial buildings in the Glaize & Brothers lumberyard complex. Glaize & Brothers is one of the oldest and best known Winchester industries. Although the buildings are still owned by the Glaize family, the lumberyard is now closed. These resources are contributing to the Winchester Historic District...”

§14-6-2.2 Is the building of such interest or significance that it could be made into a national, state, or local historic shrine?

Staff Analysis: Staff has identified no substantiating reason or justification for the subject buildings to become a national, state, or local historic shrine.

§14-6-2.3 Is the building of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture, and/or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense?

*Staff Analysis: According to the EHT Tracerics survey, the **primary resource** structure [326-330 North Cameron Street] is a “large two-story, multiple-bay brick building, Italianate style, ca. 1875, comprised of two adjacent buildings that are united by a heavily bracketed*

wooden cornice...” The foundation is of stone construction and the exterior walls consist of brick veneer, featuring American bond on some portions and stretcher bond on others. The secondary resource structure is a “large, two-story brick building ca. 1880 as a warehouse for the Baker & Co. wholesale grocers. It is a five-bay, shed-roofed brick building that rests on a stone foundation. The walls facing Baker Street are laid in five-course American bond and have been painted with advertisements that have almost faded. They include: the name “Baker & Co. Wholesale Grocers,” the written script of a “Coca-Cola” advertisement, and “Blocker West Virginia Mail Pouch Tobacco.”

There appears to be nothing of such old and unusual or uncommon design for the industrial planing mill building located at 110 East Fairfax Lane, which could not be reproduced without great difficulty and/or expense.

§14-6-2.4 Would retention of the building help preserve the historic character of the district?

Staff Analysis: Yes. A number of historic buildings have been renovated or rehabilitated within the surrounding neighborhood over recent years, with additional plans moving forward for another. The most recent examples include: the Snapp Foundry; the George Washington Hotel; the City Meat Building – Reader & Schwartz Architects; Piccadilly Public House; along with proposals being considered for the Winchester Towers. The majority of properties within this particular area of the district have benefitted from rehabilitation and adaptive re-use of the structures, while taking advantage of tax credit incentives. Opportunities exist for a similar effort with the subject property, which may allow for retention of the streetscape, historic facades, and overall context of the structures along North Cameron Street and East Fairfax Lane.

§14-6-2.5 Would retention of the building help preserve a historic interest in a place or an area of the City?

Staff Analysis: Yes. With the aforementioned renovations of surrounding properties within walking distance of the subject properties, retention of the buildings would preserve a historic interest in place and area; especially, as one of the recently renovated properties consists of a luxury hotel, within close proximity to the Old Town area of the City.

§14-6-2.6 Would retention of the building promote the general welfare by maintaining the increasing real estate values; generating business; creating new positions; attracting tourists, students, writers, historians, artists, and artisans; attracting new residents; encouraging study and interest in American history; stimulating interest and study in architecture and design; educating citizens in American culture and heritage; and making the City a more attractive and desirable place in which to live?

Staff Analysis: The structures, in their current deteriorating and dilapidated condition pose certain threats to public health, safety, and welfare; and as such, have previously received a preliminary determination of blight. Without a complete restoration effort or adaptive re-use of the buildings, the properties would certainly not promote the general welfare of the City and may actually decrease real estate values; threaten business development in the neighborhood; and, may dissuade tourists, and others from desiring to visit the area. The following photographs depict the current conditions of the subject properties and should be taken into account by the Board of Architectural Review, when considering the appropriateness of these demolition proposals:

Mr. Diem, referring to the overhead power point, discussed the photographs of the buildings in the request, stating that several were taken by City Staff.

Mr. Diem read the Code Compliance violations at the former Valley Lumber Site.

1. Countless broken windows, missing window panes, broken stiles, loose glass within the sashes around the entire complex of buildings.
2. Countless openings; doors, windows panes, bay doors, and/or siding are missing throughout the entire complex.
3. Electrical service pulled away from structure, exposed wires with wire nut caps.
4. Peeling/flaking paint on window frames, wood siding, and majority of plywood covering the windows is untreated around the complex of buildings.
5. Double door has missing/damaged door trim, exposing the wood frame and creating a gap around the opening and door.
6. Debris around the property; mattress, litter, building material.
7. Damaged 2nd story door, missing sections of wood paneling.
8. Plywood off 1st floor opening suggests that vagrants have been inside building, with beer bottles, and graffiti found.
9. Accessory structure porch roof column has been knocked down by fallen bay door, causing the porch roof truss system to crack/sag and pull away from the accessory structure.
10. Building stone foundation is missing stone, and has a large opening in foundation.
11. A wood beam is rotten under the side loading dock.
12. Fascia board loose.
13. Downspout missing on the rear of structure.
14. Large section of roof collapsed on or around 3/11 due to wind.
15. Damaged metal roof, fascia, and brick missing from collapsed roof.
16. Corner of accessory structure missing door/wood siding, and back of building is missing bay doors and sections of wood siding.
17. Damage to brick around entrance, header has exposed wood could possibly have damaged to wood support beam. Untreated plywood covering entrance.
18. Entrance has doors that do not fit correctly within the opening, causing large gaps around the bottom, and damage to the plywood covering one door.

Mr. Diem said that there were several deteriorating conditions, along with the perpetual vacancy of the buildings that precipitated a preliminary determination of blight to be filed against the property. In response to the preliminary determination, the owners have submitted a conceptual

outline of a re-development scheme, which includes the demolition of ~~three~~ **four** structures; including 320 North Cameron Street; 326-330 North Cameron Street; and, 110 East Fairfax Lane. The age of at least ~~two~~ **three** of these structures dates back to the late 1800s and the buildings are noted as being contributing resources to the City's nationally-designated historic district. With substantial rehabilitation and an adaptive re-use of the structures to suit the current economic market and long-term sustainability, **perhaps** two of these structures could be preserved, at least in part, to maintain the current streetscape and historical context of the area. Any re-development plans proposed by the owners should either incorporate this possibility, or reflect the scale, massing, and architectural integrity of the existing buildings, if new buildings are proposed to replace the existing.

Staff recommends that the Board of Architectural Review grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of 320 North Cameron Street; and, consider ~~at least the partial~~ demolition of 326-330 North Cameron Street. **Staff further recommends that the Board consider granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for at least the partial demolition of, and 110 East Fairfax Lane.** Full-scale demolition of ~~the latter two properties previously mentioned,~~ **326 North Cameron Street and 110 East Fairfax Lane** is not recommended.

Mr. Farris stated the Board could now ask questions of staff.

Mr. Pinner stated that the majority of the blight issues could have been eliminated through normal maintenance. The same expectation is had of a property owner who has a home. Because the property owner has let it degrade to this point it is expensive to salvage and they now want to knock it down. He said that other property owners have rehabilitated properties even though it was expensive, because it was their responsibility, instead of knocking them down.

Mr. Crigler said that on 110 Fairfax Lane, that staff recommended a partial demolition and asked which portion. He also said that he saw no significance to the structure, it wasn't well built.

Mr. Diem, referring to the overhead photographs, stated that what he was suggesting by a partial demo was that if the scale or massing along the street is what is important to maintain the appearance and context of buildings in that neighborhood, perhaps a partial demo could include from a midpoint back where additions could be added on to but retaining the original structure that could be rehabilitated or adaptively reused along the streetscape so the same appearance can be kept in the front. He said that this was not something that the applicant had presented or considered at this point, it was merely an idea, and if the applicant decided to present something like this, he did not see any objection to it from a staff's perspective.

Mr. Crigler asked what the exterior materials were. Mr. Diem said that based on the report it was formed concrete. Mr. Farris stated that the age of the structure, massing, and preserving the streetscape were contributing factors for Mr. Diem's suggestion. Mr. Diem confirmed it was.

Mr. Bandyke confirmed for Mr. Crigler that the structure was formed concrete. He said in response to Mr. Pinner's comments concerning the condition of the structures, that they had been this way for a long time, and that they were well suited for the function they served, but now that they aren't being utilized anymore they have deteriorated further.

Mr. Farris opened the public hearing.

The applicant Dick Helm, 311 Fairmont Avenue, addressed the Board. He said the buildings are what they are and they are there because they have complied with the wishes of BAR and in the interest of preservation. He said that the utility of the structures is basically spent, they were uniquely suited for their purpose, and they have not explored the option of conversion. He said that 110 Fairfax isn't pretty and if he were to make it pretty, it wouldn't be what it is today. It has no services, no plumbing, it was used for storage, and restoration is not where they see the property going. He said the sensitive parts are along Cameron and Baker Streets. They are old and look nice because we thought they should. We have replaced the doors and windows three times that he can remember and within two months of doing that, there are vagrants breaking in. We come back and put plywood up and it remains a hollow shell of a building. Eighty years ago there might have been something to save inside, but not now. He said the back side of the structure is probably the worst structure on the property. It was a warehouse for forty years. He said the on Baker that building is problematic in that what you might want to preserve of the streetscape may be the worse part of the structure. He said that there is a serious bow the length of the building, and it's showing signs of making moves that they are not comfortable with. He said that the function of both of the buildings on Baker and Fairfax unfortunately for them to mount the type of redevelopment effort that it would take, it's going to require other access points and leveraging other frontage on Cameron Street. He said what they are contemplating is that where the Baker Street building is that there would be parking and /or vehicular access from the interior of the property. Similarly on Fairfax Lane, where the mill building is, that will be the vehicular access point to serve the back of the property. The idea is to redevelop the property so that there are new viable entities all along Cameron Street and hopefully Baker. The interiors need to be accessible on both sides of the property.

Chairman Farris asked if the Board had any questions of the applicant or staff.

Mr. Pinner said that there appeared to be no formal plan for what will happen with the site if they demolish the buildings. He asked Mr. Helm if that was correct and he stated that they had no formal plans with the City. Mr. Pinner then said that you do have plans for parking and vehicular access. Mr. Helm said that they have something in process but it is not something that he is prepared to share at this point. He said that he understood Mr. Pinner's concerns but due to pending legislation that states that if you share plans in return for a conditional demolition, there are fines and penalties if you don't follow through with them, therefore I am not comfortable sharing them with the Board.

Mr. Bandyke asked Mr. Helm if it were possible engineering wise to incorporate the façade of the 326 Cameron Street property in his plans, would he do it? Mr. Helm said that he could not answer that from an engineering standpoint, but aesthetically he could. Mr. Bandyke asked if the Baker Street property had serious engineering problems. Mr. Helm said that it had both site and structural issues. Mr. Bandyke said along the Baker Street façade, Mr. Helm interjected that the interior had issues as well. Mr. Helm said that he did not see how you could build a structure that salvaged the existing façade. Mr. Bandyke said that it was possible.

Mr. Crigler asked for clarification on the interior construction material of 326 Cameron. Mr. Helm stated that it was all wood. Mr. Crigler asked if it was conventional framing or timber. Mr. Helm said that it was post and beam. He said that the back had been open for four years. Mr.

Crigler asked if the exterior was brick veneer over wood framing, Mr. Helm stated that it was brick and plaster.

Mr. Farris asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak concerning this request.

Richard Bell, 119 Peyton Street, Board of Preservation Historic Winchester. He said that they do have concerns about any proposed demolition and particularly about what may be considered demolition by neglect or as a response to blight from the City. He said that the City is at risk of losing infrastructure and buildings of potential quality and contribution to our streetscape by blight or demolition. He said that he would respect that the applicant is doing the best that he can with respect toward the community streetscape and the current conditions. He said that they are asking the Board to consider the primary streetscapes of Cameron and to a lesser degree, Fairfax and Baker. He then discussed properties in the City that were in poor condition but rehabilitated with great success into assets that retain the story of the community. Mr. Bell said that what we as the community should be looking at is the time necessary for the applicant to develop a reasonable redevelopment plan. He said that it cannot be swept under a rug nor hauled away in a dump truck. He said that the Board should give consideration to the applicant creating a well thought out, engineered redevelopment plan to address the potential for redevelopment. He said that an adaptive reuse requires a creative way of thinking and not just an elimination of a bygone use.

Frank Wright, Cork Street, President, PHW, expressed his great concerns of demolition by neglect. He said that these properties have been allowed to set and deteriorate over time and then the owner comes back and says that they can't fix it, defeats the purpose of preservation. He said that he understands that resources have to be put where they can do the most good, but he said that properties cannot be allowed to deteriorate to the point where they have to be taken down. Mr. Wright discussed the feasibility of stabilizing the wall on Baker Street and feels that there is a rush to demolish without the owners coming forward with structural engineering reports and a possible alternative solution.

Mark Lore, 414 Courtfield, said the he would echo the comments made by the PHW members. He said that when he was on their Board there was preliminary work looking at redevelopment of the north side of Winchester, as an opportunity to preserve and build on the industrial history of the City. He said that these buildings as run down as they are were seen as a basis for redevelopment to keep the streetscape character as a linchpin for defining the neighborhood. He discussed developments using existing structures in Winchester. He said that without any idea of what the applicant plans to do with the property, he felt that there was little point in proceeding forward at this time.

Mr. Helm stated that the reason that he is ~~hear~~ here is because the property has been ~~sighted~~ cited as blighted and he is obligated to address this. He said that he would be delighted to hear suggestions on how to deal with these unusual properties which have been industrial for a long time. He described the eight open bays which he stated are very difficult to secure and maintain. He said that he is not challenging the intent of the Board or the desires of PHW, but they as property owners are not saying they want these buildings to go away, they are responding to the blight and this is the most logical thing for them to propose. He said that they are not trying to erase history but respond to the demand placed on them by the City.

Mr. Bell said that the blight ordinance has been in use for a few years and it has been brought up in a few properties, including the Taylor Hotel, which is still standing because forward progress is being made on the development plan. He said that there is a precedent set for as long as you have

forward progress being made on a plan you are satisfying the requirements of the blight. He said that the applicant doesn't have to have a solution today, but maybe what they would be comfortable with and what are the flexibilities and limitations of the site. He said if they do through their redevelopment plan determine that they need to tear certain parts or whole buildings down, they will better know what they are up against. Mr. Helm said that the whole problem with his conversation is that that message to this body is that they need to confer with staff.

Mr. Wright said that approval of a certificate of appropriateness would be a good solution but if the Board denied the request of the applicant that could prevent him from re-applying sometime in the future once he has a plan. He said that the applicant would need to shift from a conceptual discussion or get feedback and withdraw the application, otherwise it would go to vote and a denial could present challenges.

Chairman Farris closed the public hearing

Mr. Farris asked the Board how they would like to proceed with the discussion, by case, address, or in their entirety.

Mr. Bandyke said that he would like to take each property by itself. Mr. Diem suggested to the Board that they table the request for 45 days and to request a structural report on the properties. Mr. Farris said that he was concerned about keeping the applicants pocketbook in mind. He said that the more the Board requests the more they will have to spend towards the application. He said that they do not want to needlessly give demolition permits in the historic district, but there was more than one concern and he wants to consider the ambient impact on the applicant. He said that there is the suggestion from staff to table this request for 45 days, and if that is decided the Board could request a structural report of each individual structure at that time. Mr. Farris said that he is aware that the applicant is before the Board due to the blight citation, but if the Board had the opportunity to review a plan of redevelopment it would assist the Board in making a decision for instance the 110 Fairfax Lane Property. He asked that if this building is demolished what were the plans for the site afterwards.

Mr. Crigler suggested tabling the request to give time for everyone to deal with each one of the issues. He said that the Board should give the applicant some indication of where the concerns of the Board are particularly structurally. He acknowledged that 110 Fairfax was going to be the most expensive to remove as well as being one of the least architecturally significant structures. He also stated that 320 Cameron was non-contributing but more investigation of the warehouse at Baker Street could be warranted.

Mr. Farris stated that two things were being discussed, one was whether to table the request and if the Board does what will it request of the applicant in the interim. Mr. Farris asked the Board to table for 45 days and Mr. Bandyke said that the Board should grant permission to demo the 320 Cameron Street property. Mr. Farris said that this request would be addressed under new business.

Mr. Bandyke, referring to the overhead projection, asked Mr. Diem to clarify a shed structure on the Baker Street property. He asked if all the structures on the property were to be demolished, or if the Board could look at them individually. He was informed that they could be examined separate from one another.

Mr. Farris reiterated the motion to table and the need for a conceptual redevelopment plan should demolition proceed. He informed the applicant that the purpose if the conceptual plan was to

prevent him from incurring fees and allow him to make a presentation to the Board that would not bind him. Mr. Helm said that he would rather not make a presentation due to legislation before City Council that is pending concerning this subject. Mr. Farris said that he understood but at the BAR level conceptual discussions take place and Certificates of Appropriateness are not granted based on that information, nor is it binding. He said that it is merely a vehicle to exchange information with the Board so that at some time in the future when the applicant is ready for actual construction or demolition, they can then reappear before the Board with the details.

Mr. Bandyke asked for clarification as to what the applicant needed, site plan with elevations, or model? The Commissioners discussed what was expected. Mr. Helm stated that he could provide a conceptual plan tomorrow but it would not be something that had gone through staff review. Mr. Farris stated that that was the very type of plan that was reviewed by the Board in a conceptual discussion. He said that there are no details beyond where the buildings were to be placed.

Mr. Helm stated that the reason that there is legislation pending is because there are great conceptual plans that are presented and then never followed through on. He said that that was not his intent, his intent at this time was that he is not willing to go down that road if there are discussions talking about tagging penalties to those kinds of presentations. He said that he would prefer that his application be reviewed based on its merits. He stated that they have a need to deal with the citation of blight. It's difficult to put a bandage on buildings that will not and should not be fixed. He said that he needs to know what is important to the Board and what is the defining line between what is an appropriate and inappropriate demolition and he will work with them. Mr. Farris said that they were coming to the same point.

Mr. Farris said that he was willing to not request a plan from the applicant because of the pending legislation, but he would like to have an engineer's report on each structure, as suggested by staff, which defines the stability of each. Mr. Helm asked for the definition of stability. He asked if it was preserving the façade, the footprint or the streetscape and that he was willing to modify the application. Mr. Farris stated that his main concern was the exterior, not the interior, or the primary elevation and what is highly visible from the street. He said his concern is the structural stability of the buildings that would allow for the retention of what is visible from the street at both the Baker and Cameron Street sides. He said that is his primary concern and what occurs on the interior is not of a concern, nor the other structures on the interior of the property. He said that what is seen from the street is of the most importance. Mr. Farris gave examples of other structures in the City in similar condition and how they were dealt with.

Mr. Crigler said that the bowed wall on the Baker Street structure would be of interest to the Board structurally to take a look at. He rhetorically asked if it was laid that way or had it occurred over time. He said that masons can lay a wall that way and the Board would like to know if that was the intention of the mason or had it occurred due to age and neglect. An engineer's report would help in determining this and whether repairing it was feasible.

Mr. Bandyke said that the two facades on Baker and Cameron is where the sticking point is. Mr. Farris said that he didn't want this to impact the applicant any more than it all ready does, the Board needs to make a decision and the way for them to do that was to be armed with the best information possible. He said that the buildings have been like this for twenty years so 45 days more won't make a difference at this point and that he isn't concerned at all about the 1985 structure or 110 Fairfax. He stated that the Board needs to know how they can assist in maintaining the streetscape along Baker and Cameron. He asked the applicant to provide a report

on the Baker and Cameron Street properties so the Board can have an informed discussion, and that the tabling for 45 days would be beneficial to everyone concerned.

Mr. Helm asked if the Board could segregate the applications into two, southern and northern buildings. Mr. Farris said that he couldn't see any reason why that couldn't be done. He said that the application could be retooled during the 45 day period, and Mr. Helm could work with staff to separate out the structures. Mr. Helm asked if they could do it at this meeting. Mr. Farris said the Board could table portions of an application and grant permission on others. Mr. Diem offered to the Board and applicant that BAR 11-642 include 326 and 330 N. Cameron Street, which are the two buildings that appear to present the most problem for the Board, with the future of these two structures in their current state in question. He said that 110 Fairfax Street is identified on BAR 11-643, which could be acted on at this time without being tabled further. BAR 11-634 is under new business and could be acted on separately as well, so the applicants request to handle the cases individually has all ready been done and presented as such on the agenda. He said that if the Board felt inclined to table full demolition approval for 326 and 330 but grant appropriateness for partial demo of the shed structures that are referenced on the south side of 330 N. Cameron Street, staff would have no objection. He said that it would convey the message that the applicant is interested in abating the blight and working within the parameters that are established by a number of different ordinances concerning blight. The applicant attending this meeting demonstrated intent to resolve the situation that has been identified. He said that if 45 days is insufficient, the Board could make a recommendation that staff hold in abeyance any further enforcement of the blight ordinance for this property until further redevelopment schemes have been identified or this matter has been fully vetted with regard to which buildings would be preserved and to what extent. He said that even if it were to go to a six month period of holding into abeyance, presenting any of these properties to City Council for a formal declaration of blight has not yet occurred. Mr. Farris stressed the desire of the Board to work with the applicant and assist him in abating the blight.

Mr. Diem said that not ignoring the public safety and welfare issues that go along with a property that receives a preliminary determination of blight, if those matters can be addressed in the interim, staff has no objection to not enforce the blight ordinance further until this is fully resolved and vetted. He stated that he believed that if a motion came from the BAR and majority affirms that motion, the recommendation goes to the City Manager, because ultimately it is the City Manager's authority or through his designee, to act on a blight ordinance, as that is how the ordinance is written. He said that the recommendation would go from the Board to the City Manager in that forum because of what's involved, the period of construction, or redevelopment plans that are in the works, and that it is your recommendation in the best interest of preservation or retaining a Winchester historic district that all avenues be exhausted before this is brought to City Council for a formal declaration. He said that he felt it would be appropriate and would be unique in that it's never been done before to date. He stated that other properties had been held in abeyance and are moving forward and they have not been taken down because they have been making incremental progress.

Mr. Helm said that he would caution against making that recommendation because it could impede his right as an applicant to appeal. He said that the Board may not have legal standing to make that recommendation and he would prefer to keep working with the Board rather than make a formal declaration. He said that time was of the essence, primarily with the first two.

Mr. Farris said that he understood the applicant's position, and that it appeared that making a recommendation was a sticking point to the applicant. He said that the issue would probably not be pursued vigorously at this time because the applicant would be making progress.

Mr. Farris moved, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, to table **BAR 11-642** and grant a certificate of appropriateness for demolition of the shed appendages to the rear of the subject structures as identified in the meeting, and to provide upon return to the Board, a structural report on 326-330 North Cameron Street, minus the demolished sheds, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

BAR-11-643 Request of Richard S. Helm, on behalf of the subject property owner, for approval of demolition at 110 East Fairfax Street (*Map Number 173-01-S-4*), pursuant to Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Don Crigler, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

BAR 11-634 Request of Richard S. Helm, on behalf of the subject property owner, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing structure (ca. 1985) at 320 North Cameron Street.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Bob Pinner, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rockwood returned to the meeting.

BAR 11-644 Request of Larry T. Omps for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remodel the east elevation of an existing structure by removing a one-story porch roof and replacing it with a two-story porch structure at 13 West North Avenue.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Tim Bandyke, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented. The motion passed 5-0-1, Mr. Rockwood abstaining.

BAR 11-664 Request of Our Health Community Enterprises for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an awning on the front of the building at 411 North Cameron Street.

Mr. Farris asked if the setbacks on the sidewalk met code. Mr. Diem stated that they did not and that the applicant requested a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals, which was tabled so that they applicant could return with another proposal with a different design. Mr. Diem said that the applicant's hope was to get a favorable recommendation from the BAR regarding setback exemptions. Mr. Farris said that he felt that the applicant's request left more questions than it answered and that the information submitted was not sufficiently detailed.

Mr. Rockwood asked why the awning was needed. Mr. Diem said that it was the applicant's desire to provide some protection for the aging and affirmed seniors who would be offloaded at the location. The Board members discussed the location of the posts in the sidewalk and their impeding foot traffic.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Don Crigler, to table the request pending more information from the applicant. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Diem stated that the LG sticker was removed from the Piccadilly Street rooftop.

Mr. Diem and Mr. Bandyke discussed what items staff was able to approve without Board input.

OTHER DISCUSSION

No other items were presented for discussion.

ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.