

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES**

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on, May 20, 2010, at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

- PRESENT:** Lawrence Belkin, Tom Rockwood, Catherine Shore, Patrick Farris and Don Crigler.
- ABSENT:** Tim Bandyke and Lawton Saunders.
- STAFF:** Vince Diem and Angela Walsh.
- VISITORS:** Gloria Dill and Noah White

**MINUTES**

Mr. Rockwood moved, seconded by Mr. Crigler, to approve the minutes of May 6, 2010 as presented.  
Motion passed unanimously 3-0. (Belkin and Shore abstained)

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**HP 10-278** Request of Patrick Farris to install a historic plaque at 505 N Loudoun St.

*Mr. Rockwood moved, seconded by Mrs. Shore, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.  
Motion passed unanimously 4-0.*

**Mr. Farris arrived late.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**BAR 10-267** Request of Gloria Dill to get approval for decorative paint applied to the exterior of 201 E Boscawen St.

Mr. Farris stated that this application is a difficult one because it falls under art, not a material or color addressed in the guidelines.

Mrs. Dill explained that the building looked drab after the snow, she wanted to brighten it up. She stated that the customers seemed to like it.

Mr. Rockwood was concerned how this type of application could open the door for all sorts of decorative art within the historic district. While this was well done, he could not see a way to control it in the future.

Mr. Crigler agreed that this was a difficult one. He stated that not everyone enjoys a plain building. He did not see a way to distinguish a difference in appropriateness.

Mr. Belkin pointed out that this is a commercial establishment. He asked if that would be enough in helping to determine what is appropriate, adding that a sign would not be appropriate on a person's home.

Mr. Rockwood agreed but felt it could bring contentious issues such as TU TU pink.

Mrs. Dill explained that she was limited on color and signage, pointing out the sign on the side of her deli had to be removed due to the limitations. This was a way that she could stand out in a crowd.

Mr. Belkin suggested that instead of painting wisteria she actually planted it.

Mrs. Dill pointed out that people would be limited to the inside of the deli because it would attract bees.

Mr. Belkin pointed out the location of the property. He stated that it is surrounded by brick buildings. It would be different if it was in a neighborhood.

Mr. Rockwood agreed, stating that it was reversible.

Mrs. Dill stated that she talked to the neighbors and they all seemed to like it. She requested that the art be accepted.

Mr. Crigler agreed that it does brighten the structure and is attractive; however he was concerned with the fact that art is subjective. He stated that he had no issue with this application.

Mr. Belkin stated that he just did not want to see this property set a trend.

Mr. Crigler suggested that it be approved with a condition that they restore it to the original color once their lease is up.

*Mr. Rockwood moved, seconded by Mr. Farris to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to BAR 10-267 with the condition that the painted decoration be removed upon the vacation of the lease by the tenant.*

*Motion passed unanimously 5-0.*

**BAR 10-284** Request of Willis White to replace existing windows on the second floor at 603 S Loudoun St.

Noah White, representing Willis White, explained that the windows are single pane metal frames that are original to the building. The reason for replacement is to make them more energy efficient with the ability to hold a window air condition unit. Cost is a concern because there are 36 windows that need to be replaced.

Mr. Rockwood asked if a window can be obtained proportionate to what is there.

Mr. White explained that the window would limit putting an AC unit in.

Mr. Crigler stated that since it is an industrial building a double hung window does not fit the style but a sliding window would not fit either.

Mr. Belkin stated that he was in not in favor of approving this application. He felt this building had an internal integrity. Changing the sashes to a thicker profile would degrade the building

which has some value. The building is not something that would be considered high art but in time the building value would increase. He suggested that the applicant repair the sash and then install a new window on the inside. As far as the AC issue, he suggested that ductless mini split AC units be installed. He stated that they are more expensive but it is not the boards' responsibility to find the cheapest way but the most appropriate way.

Mr. White stated that he looked into that but it was too expensive. Most of the renters are on a fixed income and would not be able to afford the increase to pay for that. He stated that they have no intention of doing it cheap but they also have to be efficient.

Mr. Rockwood agreed that the requested window is not the right window for the building.

Mr. White explained that their intention is to leave the exterior metal sash but some are corroded.

Mr. Farris asked that considering the age of the structure, the location of the windows and leakage if the cost would balance out over time.

Mr. White stated that he was not sure about that, but the cost of the duct-free AC is \$4000 plus per unit and there are nine (9) units.

Mr. Belkin stated that the conversation was getting off track. The preservation of the windows with the existing glass is the proper approach.

Mr. Rockwood suggested that the applicant rethink feasibility. He stated that he was reluctant to approve this request without looking at how to save it and address the needs.

Mr. Belkin stated that the guidelines are clear about avoiding the replacement of windows. He added that the applicant may find that restoring those windows will make the property more valuable.

Mr. Crigler stated that the corner windows are unique; he was concerned with the loss of character. He asked about the condition of the windows and if they could be saved.

Mr. Diem verified that the condition is not great. He was convinced that they would have to re-fabricate some of the metal to restore what is there. He stated that he recognized the need to preserve historic integrity but that the reason for the change had to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Rockwood asked the applicant if he would prefer to withdraw and come back at a later date or table it until the next meeting.

Mr. White requested that the application be tabled.

Mr. Rockwood moved, seconded by Mrs. Shore, to table BAR 10-284 at the applicant's request. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**TA 10-247 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLES 14 AND 21 OF THE WINCHESTER ZONING ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Mr. Diem explained that the recommendations from the last meeting have been implemented in this new draft. He requested that the board give their approval on this draft so that he could present it to Council at their upcoming meeting.

Mr. Belkin requested that this item wait until the upcoming meeting so the majority of the members can be present for the vote.

Mr. Diem agreed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18PM.