

## **BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES**

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

**PRESENT:** Patrick Farris, Tim Bandyke, Tom Rockwood, Bob Pinner, Don Crigler  
**ABSENT:** Cathy Shore  
**STAFF:** Vince Diem  
Paula Le Duigou

Chairman Farris called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.

### **Approval of Minutes – September 1, 2011**

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Mr. Pinner, to approve the September 1, 2011 minutes as recommended. The motion passed 4-1-1, with Mr. Rockwood abstaining.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Farris asked the committee if there were any objections to moving **BAR 11-526** and **BAR 11-538** to the Consent Agenda.

**Mr. ?** made comment concerning **BAR 11-538**, stating that he wasn't sure that you could see the fence area from the street. Mr. Farris confirmed location of the rear of the property with the applicant and stated that the public right of way in the rear of the property makes the property visible from the street. Discussion pertaining to access and street visibility at the rear of the property was had between the commissioners.

Mr. Farris opened discussion of **BAR 11-526**

Mr. Diem stated that this property was partially located in the historic district and suggested that because of the topography, setbacks, and right of way, this was an item best suited for the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Farris asked Mr. Diem if the section where the construction was taking place was outside the historic district. Mr. Diem stated that it was.

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Mr. Farris to move **BAR 11-526** to the Consent Agenda as recommended.

**Mr. ?** moved, seconded by Mr. Farris, to move **BAR 11-539** to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Crigler stated that there were not many drawings of the proposed project. Mr. Farris stated that that the portion of the property where the construction is to take place is not entirely in the historic district.

Mr. Crigler asked if the Board should be ruling on it at all. Mr. Farris stated that technically they were not ruling on it therefore they were moving it to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Diem clarified the location of the construction in relation to the historic district and it's visibility to the public right of way. Based in this information he recommended that the item be placed on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Crigler asked for clarification of when an item was placed on the Consent Agenda. He believed that items placed on the Consent Agenda had had a prior look over by the Board as well as being in compliance, and therefore were approved as is.

Mr. Farris stated that it can also be used when an application meets the stipulations of the Board in every regard and doesn't require further discussion.

Mr. Farris moved, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, to move **BAR 11-539** to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Farris moved to accept the Consent Agenda as amended, Mr. Pinner seconded the motion.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Farris informed applicant of **Bar 11-539** that his request was approved by the Board.

The applicant, Mr. Roberson, asked if he could make changes, and Mr. Farris stated that the application had been approved as submitted and he suggested to the applicant that he not make changes as he would need to bring it before the Board again.

**Bar 11-526** - Request of Beau Bassler, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove existing 8¼" reveal smooth beaded Masonite® siding and replace with 7¼" reveal smooth beaded Hardi-plank® siding.

Mr. Farris asked if the members had had a chance to view the subject site.

The representative for Mr. Bassler, who is also his contractor, was available for questions and would be answering for the applicant since he was not in attendance.

Mr. Farris opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Farris asked if the entire building was being resided. The contractor responded that they would be working on one side at a time, and that the siding was only available in 7 1/4" reveal.

Mr. Rockwood asked if they had considered replacing the siding with wood. He realized that they were replacing existing Masonite.

Mr. Crigler asked if the Masonite had replaced wood siding. The contractor said that it was possible.

Mr. Pinner was concerned about placing Hardi-Plank in the front and sides because of visibility. He felt that it was acceptable in the rear of the property because of the setbacks. He was very concerned about setting a precedent.

Mr. Bandyke stated that a precedent has all ready been set and that if they take the Masonite off, the Hardi Plank is the next best solution, it's closest to Hardi-Plank as opposed to wood. Mr. Crigler felt that the Masonite was probably put on prior to the Board's existence. Mr. Bandyke stated that the use of Hardi-Plank was all ready approved on Kent Street.

Mr. Pinner stated that the house on Kent Street was asbestos siding. Mr. Rockwood stated that at some time they all had wood siding, and this site had been replaced at some point with Masonite, and he feels that the applicant is within his right to replace it with Hardi-Plank.

Mr. Farris stated that Hardi-Plank is talked about a lot and gets approved for new construction, non-primary elevations, and sometimes side elevation if they aren't visible. In this case, you could replace like with like when you have a historic fabric, i.e., Masonite with Hardi-Plank, or non wood siding.

Mr. Farris discussed the difference between materials and replacing like for like in different areas in the City, i.e., South Kent Street. He stated that he felt that this project was different from the ones on South Kent, and warranted further discussion.

Mr. Bandyke said that everything aside, the premise is allowing Masonite in the historic district. Is Hardi-Plank more historic than Masonite? If the contractor changes the reveal to a smaller reveal to give it a more clapboard look, he has no objection in this case, going from Masonite to Hardi-Plank. He felt that it would be nice if a smaller reveal could be used and more in keeping with the feel and that you couldn't really ask the applicant to make that change because he was using same for same. Mr. Rockwood felt that they couldn't object because the house was all ready sided in Masonite.

Mr. Crigler felt that many historic homes made improvements before the Board was established and didn't use wood siding because people objected to wood because of the need to paint more frequently which is not the case now due to improvements in paint. The same can be said of aluminum guttering. If they remove it and replace same with same the Board can't have any say in it.

Further discussion was had pertaining to the size of the reveal and replacing it with a smaller one and what the size of the original siding was.

Mr. Crigler agreed with Mr. Bandyke that a smaller reveal was more desirable.

Mr. Bandyke and Mr. Farris discussed the architectural elements of the home and the overall effect of the materials used.

Mr. Farris asked the applicant's contractor if there had been any discussion pertaining to utilizing wood siding and if he would consider using wood instead. Mr. Farris asked the contractor if he felt comfortable answering in the applicants stead. The contractor state that he had all ready purchased the materials and that the applicant didn't want to alter the look of the home and keep the color the same.

Discussion was had pertaining to color, trim, lathe and bead of the siding.

Mr. Rockwood felt that what was proposed would be an improvement.

Mr. Farris wanted to address Mr. Crigler and Mr. Pinner's concerns and stated that personally he felt that this was a non-traditional siding being replaced with non-traditional siding. If this had been a request to replace wood with Hardi Plank he would feel very differently about it. He

felt that the building may even look better with the smaller reveal proposed and with the color remaining the same. He is interpreting this as a like for like rule with much of the original character being preserved.

~~Mr. Farris stated that if the applicant had not already purchased the materials he may have asked the applicant to consider wood as an alternative. Because he had he did not feel that they could make this request of him.~~

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Tim Bandyke, **Bar 11-526**, to grant a certificate of appropriateness as presented.

Mr. Bandyke asked that the comment pertaining to purchased material be struck from the record.

Mr. Farris motioned a second time with all in favor and Mr. Crigler dissenting.

**BAR 11-538** - Request of Anne Williams for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 54" high black aluminum fence in rear yard of property at 118 Peyton Street.

Mr. Farris asked the applicant to define the location of the fence on her map.

Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant about a small section between her home and her neighbors on the west, if there as a gap there. She stated that the gap would be closed.

Mr. Farris asked if there were any questions pertaining to style choice, none were asked.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Don Crigler, **Bar 11-538**, to grant a certificate of appropriateness as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Bandyke asked if Wells Fargo would be asked to paint their sign with a less bold color. Discussion about the location of the sign took place.

Mr. Bandyke asked about LG. Mr. Diem stated that the Pastor wanted to make a presentation to the BAR.

Mr. Farris asked which church it was, discussion occurred about the location of the church and the condition of the paint on the structure.

Mr. Farris raised the issue of the Sarah Zane building, that the colors were not uniform and that the majority of the paint job had been completed but it appeared incomplete around the windows. It was asked if the Board had required that the window trim be a certain color and Mr. Farris could not recall if it had been and that color could be approved at an administrative level.

Mr. Bandyke felt that this was why a color palette should be established and that the Board should determine what is appropriate. In the past a Williamsburg palette was used as a guideline.

Mr. Farris wanted to clarify that they needed to talk to the property owners to see if the work had been completed on the Sarah Zane building. If not, then they needed to be reminded to complete it.

Mr. Bandyke wanted to go on the record in support of establishing a color palette.

Mr. Crigler stated that a multi faceted palette could be established with lots of choices to help people choose complimentary colors and take out the guess work.

Mr. Farris stated that as a Board they could revisit what was considered administrative approval if need be.

Mr. Diem introduced Paula Le Duigou as the new secretary.

### **OTHER DISCUSSION**

Mr. Diem stated that he was an architect and was qualified to make administrative decisions if needed.

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 pm.