

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on October 4, 2007 at 15 N.Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

PRESENT: Saunders, Farris, Bandyke, Rockwood, Lore

ABSENT: Shore, Belkin

VISITORS: Steve DeStefano, Susan Good, Rachael Chisholm, Don Crigler,
Franklin Wright

MINUTES: Minutes of October 4, 2007 as amended.

Mr. Lore, seconded by Mr. Farris, moved to approve the minutes of September 20, 2007 as presented. Mr. Rockwood abstained.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Rockwood, moved to approve the minutes of September 6, 2007 as amended.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR-07-91 – Request of Albert Kane to construct an Accessory Building at 112 Wolfe Street.

No one was available to answer questions of the Board. Review was based on Home Depot brochure showing the desired model. It is to be an all wood storage structure, painted white and with two windows. Structure appears to meet criteria but the Board had questions to be addressed.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Rockwood, motioned to table the application for further consideration. Motion passed 5-0-0.

BAR-07-92 – Request of the Gables, Inc. to paint exterior at 1 S. Washington Street.

Rachel Chisholm requested re-approval of Certificate of Appropriateness (BAR-00-56) dated 7/21/00.

Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, motioned for re-approval of BAR-00-56. Motion passed 5-0-0.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-07-89 – Request of Steve DeStefano to enclose porch, add window and gutters at 304 N. Kent Street.

Mr. Bandyke motioned to approve replacement of materials on existing enclosure with one additional wooden window (28 x 36), replacement of the existing T-111 siding with German siding and augment the gutter with green guttering to match the rest of the house. Mr. Farris second the motion. Motion passed 5-0-0.

OLD BUSINESS - DEMOLITION

Mr. Saunders stated that the Public Hearing on the five properties designated for demolition has closed. The Board is now open for discussion on the individual Properties. He requested that the Board keep in mind that we do not have requests for new construction. We are to determine if the building is of historical significance, and whether to tear down or not tear down. There is a risk that if the building is torn down we will be left with an empty lot. We are strictly looking at whether they are significant or not.

DISCUSSION pro/con demolition opened for 404, 406, 408, 418, 412 ½ & 414 S. Kent Street. Mr. Saunders opened the discussion, followed by Mr. Lore, Mr. Farris, Mr. Bandyke, and Mr. Rockwood.

MR. SAUNDERS:

The Criteria for Demolition has been reviewed a number of times. If these buildings are to be rebuilt, there isn't a lot that can actually be restored in terms of windows, doors, siding, etc. These in all probability have been replaced or altered. We will get rebuilt what looks like a new house built on an existing foundation. In most cases the siding on these houses needs to be redone, windows will have to be redone, and placement of windows will be changed. Essentially, they are going to look like new built.

If you look at Section 14-6-2.6 of the Zoning Ordinance it reads: "Would retention of the building promote the general welfare by maintaining the increased real estate values, generating business, creating new positions, attracting tourists and making the City a more attractive and desirable place in which to live?"

Keep in mind that in some cases keeping these houses may be a detriment to the work that has already been done in restoring the building. In some cases these buildings, their location, and the way they are configured, may result in a patch job to meet code and make them livable because it is the only thing that is going to be economical to do. We are going to decrease real estate values instead of increasing them.

MR. LORE:

The Southern Entry into the City by Cameron, Braddock and S. Kent Streets is characterized by a variety of mostly two-story smaller scaled row houses dating from the late eighteenth through the early twentieth century. The group of structures in the middle part of the section reflects the nature and character of the S. Kent neighborhood. There would be substantial rebuilding to make these houses livable and still maintain the architecture and nature of the streetscape character. We know that what is being proposed are more modern houses, Victorian Style. We will lose the character of the neighborhood to a certain degree.

Criteria for Demolition #4 and #5 do apply – Would retention of the building help preserve the historic character of the district? Would retention of the building help preserve a historic interest in a place or an area of the city? (Additional criteria #9). And Additionally – we are considered if alternatives to a demolition exist. I'm not sure that all alternatives have been explored. Organizations in the City have expressed interest in acquiring the structures in some kind of adapted use of them.

There are at least 4 criteria considered that apply. If all alternatives had been explored, including the process the state of Virginia sets out to put the house on the market for a short period of time at current market value, and it does not sell, then BAR, City Council, and city of Winchester are irrelevant because the Virginia state statute provides a mechanism for demolition following a prescribed attempt to sell the property. It appears from the testimony at public meeting that there is interest in acquiring these properties and doing something else with them.

MR. FARRIS

The collective demolition of these properties which are at the entryway into the city is a concern. Each property's historical significance should be considered when it comes to the issuing of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The structure at 408 S. Kent is out of character with the neighborhood and would be classified as non-contributing to the Historic District. There is an appeal process should the applicant decide to counter the decision, should one be made to deny the request. City Council would take into consideration all considerations and concerns which came before BAR.

MR. BANDYKE:

Much of the reflection is of individual feeling – should they be healed and put on the market. Should these buildings be taken down and construct something that is more attractive, more user friendly but along the vernacular of the houses that were there. Another concern is what they would look like when put back – believe they should look like that period. I would be strict on reconstruction. They haven't been on the market as yet – no one has been given an opportunity to buy them. Once they do find out what the cost will be – they will have to make the decision as to what to do with them. There are reasons to take them down and there are reasons to save them. Speaking about character

of the neighborhood as is – hard to replicate. As BAR members we are not to look at these buildings from an economic aspect only as an architectural aspect.

MR. ROCKWOOD:

Adopts comments of Lore and Farris. These buildings are basically an entire block within the historic district. Testimony by local and state preservation organizations, and by local and state preservation organizations, and by local residents spoke of the architectural and historic significance of these buildings. If we approve their demolition, the opportunity to preserve them is lost forever. Before doing so, the properties should be placed on the market to allow a buyer, who will preserve these buildings, the opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. Farris, second by Mr. Rockwood, motioned to deny demolition of 404 S. Kent Street. Motion carried 3-2-0.

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

Mr. Farris, second by Mr. Lore motioned to deny demolition of 406 S. Kent Street. Motion carries 3-2-0.

BAR-07-51 – Request of CF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a single family dwelling located at 408 S. Kent Street.

Mr. Lore, second by Mr. Bandyke, motioned to approve demolition of 408 S. Kent Street. Motion carries 5-0-0.

BAR-07-52 – Request of DF Crigler Associates, Architects, for approval of demolition of a two family dwelling located at 412 1/2 and 414 S. Kent Street.

Mr. Farris, second by Mr. Lore, motioned to deny demolition of 412 1/2 and 414 S. Kent Street. Motion carries 3-2-0.

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

Mr. Farris, second by Mr. Lore, motioned to deny demolition of 418 S. Kent Street. Motion carries 5-0-0.

ADJOURNMENT - 5:05 p.m.

BAR MINUTES – OCTOBER 4, 2007