

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, August 15, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall, 15 N. Cameron Street, Winchester, Virginia.

POINTS OF ORDER:

PRESENT: Chairman Rockwood, Mr. Bandyke, Mr. Walker, Mr. Serafin

ABSENT: Ms. Jackson

STAFF: Aaron Grisdale, Nasser Rahimzadeh, Catherine Clayton

VISITORS:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Chairman Rockwood called for additions or corrections to the minutes of August 1, 2013. Mr. Walker stated that on page 3, paragraph 3, second sentence should be deleted as it is not relevant. Chairman Rockwood then called for a motion. Mr. Bandyke moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Walker seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed, 4-0.

CONSENT AGENDA:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

BAR-13-423 Request of Our Health, Inc., for a certificate of appropriateness to place a fountain on the property located at 329 N. Cameron Street (Map Number 173-01-M-2-01), zoned Central Business (B-1) District with Historic Winchester (HW) District overlay.

Applicant stated that they would like to install the fountain that was removed from the downtown mall, on their property at 329 N. Cameron Street and that they intend to have it appear as close to its original appearance as possible.

Chairman Rockwood reiterated that it is the fountain from the downtown walking mall and then asked if they were planning to have water running through it. Applicant stated that it is the same fountain and that they do intend to have water through it. Mr. Bandyke then asked what type of container it is going to sit in to which the applicant stated that it will be a 12 x 12 concrete bowl

with the original capstone on it. The applicant further stated that the 20 inches from the ground to where a person would sit will be brick and then the capstone for the seating.

Chairman Rockwood then stated that this is yet another situation where it is unclear as to how the BAR mandate does or does not extend to public art and freestanding sculptures. He stated that he has not seen anything in the guidelines one way or the other. Mr. Bandyke questioned the type of material to be used for the bowl and the color. The applicant stated that it will be a thinset concrete and have a darker gray, like a Virginia Bluestone color that is local here.

Chairman Rockwood then called for a motion. Mr. Bandyke moved to grant a certificate of appropriateness to BAR-13-423 as submitted with the following comments:

- 12 x 12 concrete bowl with original capstone
- 24 inches deep
- Brick veneer on the outside
- Gray color on the inside
- Permits for electric and plumbing, as appropriate

Mr. Walker seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 4-0.

BAR-13-424 Request of CCAP for a certificate of appropriateness to construct a handicap ramp and to remove shutters at the property located at 106 S. Kent Street (Map Number 193-01-V-4-01), zoned Central Business (B-1) District with Historic Winchester (HW) District overlay.

Representative of Pearl Properties, LC, owner of the building, approached the Board and stated that he is not aware of whom the applicant is but that Pearl properties has a contract to sell the property to CCAP and it is, in part, contingent upon this approval today for their handicap ramp. He then stated that he can only speak for the owner of the property and that he was advised that a representative of CCAP was to be here for the meeting.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the ramp next door is being used as an example for what will be done to which the representative stated that he believes that is what is to be done but that he has not seen the plans and that he is not authorized to speak for CCAP.

Chairman Rockwood stated that this is a dramatic alteration of the front of this house and there is a side door which, if you constructed a ramp going back to the parking in the rear, would be a lot less intrusive and wondered if anyone had given that any thought.

Mr. Grisdale advised that he could a little to the application and stated that he, the Building Official, Planning Director, Flood Plain Manager/City Engineer went out to the property about a month or month and half ago to speak with Fran Ricketts about their potential use of this property. One of the issues facing them is the accessibility in to the structure because it would be a change of use through the Building Code and further complicating this issue is that the property lies within the floodway. Town Run runs just to the South of the property so there is very limited space for them to construct an accessibility ramp and be in compliance with the Flood plain provisions. Essentially the understanding is that there is a cone around the property

that can be used in terms of the building area that will not affect the floodplain. Being located in the floodway, I do not believe that you can have any negative impact to the base flood elevation so this is the pretty much the only area they can build and be in compliance with the floodplain provisions as well as meeting certain ramp requirements as far as the Building Code as well. Therefore, this is why they chose this particular space upon advisement from the City in order to accommodate that access in to the building.

Mr. Bandyke reiterated that new shrubbery would be in place in order to obscure the ramp and that the porch will stay the same. Chairman Rockwood stated that the drawing appears to indicate that the shrubbery will stop at the landing and are there supposed to be steps going down from that landing so that you can have access by step. The representative stated that there is now a walk from the sidewalk to the porch with steps going to the porch so I am not sure what you mean. Chairman Rockwood stated that the porch steps are at the porch right now and it appears based upon the drawing that you are planning to make a landing, 5' by 5' projecting from the porch, which will then allow the ramp to come up the front of the house. The representative stated that he does not know because he was given access to the plans.

Mr. Grisdale stated that he believes that the ramp will cover the existing steps and that there will not be any steps going up, it will just be the ramp. Chairman Rockwood stated that according to the plans, you will just be looking at a ramp that is 17 inches off the ground and the walk will no longer be a useable means of access to the building other than to walk up the ramp. Chairman Rockwood then asked Mr. Grisdale what the difficulty is with putting a ramp at the side door on the north side to which Mr. Grisdale responded that it is understanding that the way the floodway provisions work there is such that the direction of water flow is from west to east as Town Run flows so there are some provisions in the design guidelines for the floodplain that there is the cone-like area on the front of the house that would not negatively impact the base flood elevation but if it would be on the north side of the house that could potentially negatively impact the base flood elevation. Mr. Serafin stated that they do not want a person to raise the grade in the flood area because it would raise the water level on someone else in some other area and generally if you do do that, you need to do engineering studies to get approval for that. Mr. Grisdale stated that in the north section they would have to do engineering analysis and prove that there is not going to be negative impacts at all to the base flood elevations and the only way to get around that would be to seek a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals which may not receive a favorable recommendation from the staff because of the negative impacts it potentially could have other property owners further down the floodway.

Chairman Rockwood then asked if Mr. Grisdale knew what CCAP wanted to do with the space to which Mr. Grisdale responded that it is his understanding it will be additional storage space for clients to go and pick up goods such as clothing.

Mr. Bandyke stated that they intend to construct the ramp out of pressure treated material and it is not going to look very attractive. He then stated that he would be more inclined looking at the one next to it which is an excellent example and have them do something like that not necessarily using brick pavers for the side. Even if it was concrete with brick pavers on the side so that it basically looks like brick. He stated that he does understand the need for these types of ramps but that the pressure treated ramps that you see are pretty ugly. Having two ramps

together is going to acerbate how they are going to look separately. He also stated that he would have trouble with the material.

Mr. Serafin stated that if it were to be made out of wood, he would like to have more information about the deck boards whether they are to be tongue and groove, 5 ¼ treated decking board, radius edge, what the skirt would be and what would be under the skirt so that when you are looking at the ramp what are you seeing. He would also like to have an elevation drawing. Also, if it is going to be out of wood, what are all of the pieces going to look like. He then stated that the plantings look nice but in a year, the plantings may die and then you are left with the ramp. The design is in perpetuity and the plants are not.

Chairman Rockwood stated he would be interested in knowing how much engineering it would take to figure out if the side ramp would be compliant with the floodway as well and it does not seem to be a complicated matter to figure out. Mr. Grisdale stated that he believes that they are not inclined to go that way because of the advice of the City Engineer, it did not seem that that would a feasible option.

Mr. Walker then stated that the location of the ramp is not really an issue but rather the materiality of the ramp. He then stated that he could see a ramp that mirrors the one next to it and he could also see a correctly done wood ramp but he would have to have more information.

Chairman Rockwood then stated that they have not even discussed the shutters. He stated that the shutters are not hinged but they are wooden and attached to the building and they are the only set of shutters on the building as best he can see.

Chairman Rockwood called for a motion to table. Mr. Bandyke moved to table BAR-13-424 until the September 5, 2013, meeting with the caveat that they can remove the shutters and that they provide additional information as it relates to the wood ramp, specifically the type of materials to be used and elevations or if they change it to stone.

Mr. Serafin seconded the motion to table. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed, 4-0.

BAR-13-434 Request of Woodward S. and Jennifer Bousquet, for a certificate of appropriateness to remove a chimney in the rear of the property located at 17 E. Leicester Street (Map Number 213-01-A-19-01), zoned Residential Business (RB-1) District with Historic Winchester (HW) District overlay.

Mr. Bousquet explained to the Board that the old chimney is pretty hard to find in the pictures that he included as well as in the City's documentation which only mentions one chimney. Also, the chimney is allowing water in to the house, it is in bad state of repair, and it is not functional. They are proposing to remove it, close over the hole, and put shingles over it to match the rest of the building.

Chairman Rockwood asked if the chimney is on the original brick portion of the building or on the framed addition to which Mr. Bousquet responded that it is on the original brick portion but that it not visible from the public thoroughfare.

Hearing no questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Rockwood called for a motion. Mr. Walker moved to grant a certificate of appropriateness to BAR-13-434 as submitted. Mr. Serafin seconded the motion. Voice vote was taken and the motion passed 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

OTHER DISCUSSION:

Mr. Grisdale approached the Board with the idea of having the agenda packets sent as an electronic PDF document with paper copies available at the time of the meeting to help save some money for postage and time expended with copying and assembly.

Mr. Walker stated that he would prefer a PDF however, he stated that the only issue he would see is the color scans because colors differ with scans but since we will have the actual material, it would be preferable to him. Chairman Rockwood asked if there was only going to be one paper copy to which Mr. Grisdale stated that each person would still get their own paper copy. Chairman Rockwood stated that he has no problem with it and he is willing to try it. Mr. Bandyke stated that he likes the paper copy and that he opposes it but he will try it. Mr. Serafin stated that he is willing to try it that way for a few months.

Mr. Grisdale stated that the packets would be forwarded as a PDF electronic document with hard copies available at the meeting and if it becomes an issue, we can address it.

Chairman Rockwood then stated that the Board is two members short for having a full complement and questioned whether City Council had plans to fill them. Mr. Grisdale advised that City Council is open to filling the positions and would like to be fully staffed. If the Board knows of anyone interest, the application is available on the City's website for completion and submission.

ADJOURN:

Having no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.