

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, November 1, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

POINTS OF ORDER

PRESENT: Tom Rockwood, Tim Bandyke, Don Crigler, Patricia Jackson, Kevin Walker, Peter Serafin.

ABSENT: Bob Pinner.

STAFF: Aaron Grisdale and Irene Terrill

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR-12-547 – Request of Tommy Beavers for approval of a front porch located at 17 East Monmouth Street.

Chairman Rockwood invited the applicant to address the Board with an update. The applicant stated he wanted to replace the siding. He looked for signs of an original porch but found none. He is ready to begin work on a new porch. Chairman Rockwood asked the applicant how it would be constructed and Mr. Serafin asked for the dimensions of the columns. The applicant said he preferred that it be straight columns using 4 X 4's and 1 X 6's with a chamfered edge around it.

Chairman Rockwood asked the applicant how it would be constructed if the columns were tapered. The applicant said he would just order square tapered columns. Mr. Serafin asked how big the columns would be at the base. The applicant said anywhere from 7 to 8 inches.

Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant to confirm that it would be the same porch design that was put on another home. The applicant confirmed this. Mr. Bandyke said he knew tapered columns were not used on that porch. Six to seven inch square columns were used instead which seemed to look fine. Mr. Bandyke told the applicant that everything must be *wooden*.

Mr. Bandyke asked the 3 Board members who are architects to comment on the steepness of the metal roof. They had no comments. Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant if the porch would have gutters. The applicant confirmed that. Mr. Bandyke stated that the applicant could use either galvanized *or* aluminum half-rounds and that would be acceptable. The applicant asked if copper could be used, and Mr. Bandyke stated that would be even better.

Mr. Crigler commented that the design as drawn is a 7 to 8, maybe 12 inch pitch, front to back. The applicant confirmed that as his best estimate also. Mr. Crigler told the applicant that he *prefers* the square columns as vernacular style and it should be at a minimum of 7 inches square, and the applicant should pad out at 4 x 4 if using 7 inches as internal. The applicant stated he would accommodate the Board with wider columns if that is their preference.

Chairman Rockwood asked the applicant that if the wraps were 4 X 4, would the columns be 5 inches. The applicant replied 5 or 5 ½ inches. Chairman Rockwood stated that would be too thin. The applicant stated he wanted smaller columns to fit the small porch which is only 4 or 4 ½ feet wide. Chairman Rockwood said the porch was only a yard from front to back. Mr. Bandyke stated the slope of the roof appeared to be 12 :12 or 10 : 12 ratio. The applicant confirmed that would be the side view of the front slope which is less than 12:12. The gutters would be around the three sides. Chairman Rockwood asked where the gutter drain would be. The applicant stated the west side going down the hill; referencing the drawing it would go to the right, and he confirmed that it would be close to the house & discharging down the slope of the sidewalk.

Chairman Rockwood asked if the Board members had any concerns about the roof pitches. Mr. Serafin stated he wanted to see a flatter porch roof such as a 3:12 ratio coming out from the side of the house to the front, but said it was not a major concern. The applicant offered to compromise and make it a 5:12 ratio because steeper is his preference. Mr. Walker asked the applicant what the pitch is on the house's gable. The applicant said he thinks it's a 10:12 ratio. Chairman Rockwood asked Mr. Serafin for comment. Mr. Serafin said the application as submitted would be fine.

Chairman Rockwood sought resolution from the Board members on the minimum square size of the columns. Mr. Crigler stated he wanted to see a minimum 6 inches square. Mr. Bandyke agreed with 6 inches. Chairman Rockwood said 6 to 7 inches would be acceptable. Regarding BAR-12-547, Chairman Rockwood made a motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness for the front porch as designed, with the exception that the columns must be *square*, no less than 6 inches and no more than 7 inches in size. Mr. Bandyke made a second on that motion. Chairman Rockwood amended the agreement with a motion to include the installation of half-round gutters, seconded by Mr. Bandyke. Chairman Rockwood asked the Board members if they agreed. Mr. Crigler and Mr. Serafin said yes. Chairman Rockwood asked for a voice vote. It passed with no opposition.

BAR-12-549 – Request of Houseworks LLC for exterior changes including new doors, a handrail, and exterior light at 201 South Braddock Street.

Chairman Rockwood introduced the request to the Board.
Mr. Walker abstained.

The applicant stated they are seeking approval on the lighting fixture above the barber shop door and replacing both doors, one facing Braddock Street and the other facing Cork Street, and painting both doors an approved blue. The applicant also stated the iron railing at the step-down to the barber shop door would match the neighbor's railing.

Mr. Serafin asked if the request was for 2 doors only. The applicant said yes.

Mr. Serafin asked the applicant if something is wrong with the existing South Braddock door. Her reply that it is "old" drew friendly laughter. She proposed that the door be a "three-quarter light" instead of a "half-light" style as is indicated in the formal request. Chairman Rockwood asked the applicant if the "three-quarter light" door would be single pane or would the door have divided light panes similar to the existing door. The applicant stated single pane so that any future business would be able to put a sign on it. Mr. Crigler noted that if single pane, the mullions would be missing. Mr. Crigler asked what material the door would be. The applicant stated oak. Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant whether she could acquire a new door that more closely matched the existing door, a style with more character. The applicant agreed to try.

Chairman Rockwood stated a door similar to the existing door would not interfere with a potential tenant's desire for signage. The applicant asked if she would need to resubmit the

request if she were able to find a door more suitable to the Board. Chairman Rockwood said no, that she could consider it approved.

When asked by Mr. Bandyke and Chairman Rockwood, the applicant confirmed that both doors would be painted blue and the surrounding trim would be white.

Chairman Rockwood led a discussion on whether the Board was ready for a motion.

Mr. Crigler said he prefers two-thirds or three-quarters glass for the Braddock Street door as a second option, again noting that the mullions would be lost. Mr. Crigler said he would approve that door or the door requested by the applicant.

Chairman Rockwood asked for comments from the Board regarding the railing.

Mr. Bandyke said it was fine. The applicant stated it would be black.

Mr. Crigler made the motion to grant approval for BAR-12-549 with an amendment that the Braddock Street new door will either match the pattern and size of glass that the existing door has or will be a new door with a clear glass panel of approximately the same overall size. The stated purpose was to give the applicant a second option if she can't find a door similar to the existing door. Ms. Jackson made a second on the motion. The motion passed by a voice vote with no opposition.

Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant if she had given any thought to the lock set. The applicant said no. Mr. Bandyke recommended to her that she select a new lock set which *looks* old, and a dead bolt with a long thumb-latch if possible. The applicant said yes.

Chairman Rockwood asked for a voice vote and the motion passed with no opposition.

BAR-12-525 – Request of Bell Building LLC for a replacement door at 10 West Boscawen Street

Chairman Rockwood opened the discussion.

The applicant asked to replace the door due to a fire incident when the lock was broken and was not replaceable. She said the new door will exactly match the existing door at 6 West Boscawen Street. The applicant confirmed to Chairman Rockwood that the doors are adjacent and made of wood. The applicant stated the new door would just be a stained finish.

Chairman Rockwood asked for comments from the Board and there were none.

Mr. Bandyke made a motion to approve the certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Crigler made a second to the motion. The motion passed with no opposition.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-12-436 – Request of James Lockard of Lockard Properties, subject property owner, for approval of demolition of an existing structure at 110 West Boscawen Street (*Map Number 173-01-E-19*), pursuant to Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Rockwood opened with the remarks that this request was previously scheduled for a public hearing, but the Board closed the hearing after the comments that were given at that time. He stated that two Board members have inspected the property's structure and were ready with a photo presentation. If the public wants to comment on the presentation here, the hearing will be reopened to get those suggestions.

Mr. Bandyke opened the presentation saying that Mr. Lockard, Mr. Walker and Mr. Grisdale took a tour of the exterior and interior of the building. He stated that Mr. Walker added explanations to the photos they took, and the viewing of the presentation is the first time for the Board members gathered.

Mr. Bandyke said there is a visible gap between this building and the one next to it. The roof flashing is the only thing that attaches the two buildings. He showed the log substructure along the alley that runs between the buildings. The lap siding was put on in the 1800s. From the back of the house looking forward can be seen the part of the foundation which worried Mr. Lockard. Mr. Lockard had expressed concern that it appeared to be listing or sinking or settling in that specific part. It was hard to see, but the photo was an attempt to capture that.

Mr. Bandyke stated the chimney had been repointed at the top and needs repointing lower down, due to a little bulge there. The stone foundation goes down into the basement. Mr. Walker pointed out the coal chute on the south side of the cellar, which is the side nearest the street. Mr. Bandyke continued. The basement was dirt under that section and had been dug out long ago. The foundation was undisturbed and the logs underneath were spray-painted white. He noted some of the cribbing underneath that holds up part of the beams at the edges. The original dirt ground is undisturbed and the cribbing is above that. The logs are 16-foot spans and they are over-spanned.

Mr. Bandyke described the first floor inside which has exposed beams as the most handsome part. He stated the dry wall is exceptionally well scribed to the logs, praising the workmanship.

Looking at the stairwell coming up to the landing, Mr. Walker pointed out an opening which revealed what could be the original thickness of the exterior wall. Mr. Walker and Mr. Bandyke described inside the attic. Looking out a window to the south can be seen the brick building which has flashing that connects the two buildings. They saw no evidence that the buildings had ever been connected with a gable or anything else, except for the existing flashing at the roof line. The rafters are mortise and tenon and they are pegged, which they could see. Mr. Walker explained some of the floorboards had been removed and they could see the joists.

Mr. Bandyke stated the west wall shows studs. The chimney is at the center of the building. The rafters had all been numbered, which was visible. The rafter tails sit on a plate which sits on the logs.

Mr. Walker showed the floor joists between the attic and the second level. They measured about 20' X 6", and are rough-sawn timber.

Mr. Bandyke stated the second-story level was mostly finished off with dry wall and plaster so that the original wall was not visible. Chairman Rockwood asked if the window casements were original. Mr. Walker explained that from the way the windows pivot inward that they are either original or act as the originals.

Mr. Bandyke stated the second level was a full apartment with a kitchen and a bedroom in the back that was added in 1947. In the front of the original part of that same level was a full bath and either a bedroom, study, or parlor, and then a living room with a set of stairs that goes up to the attic.

Mr. Bandyke stated the metal roof is in good shape. When they looked at the front of the building, the left side of the building was vertical up to the top of a small pediment over the alleyway. The pediment has an arched entry where you can walk through. From the top of the arch to the top of the roof there is a slight bulge to the building, but it is not listing and there is no cracking or settling in the foundation or the building structure. It is not leaning.

Mr. Walker stated the floor joists did not appear to be soft. Mr. Bandyke confirmed that they poked the joists. There was only a *little* dry rot. Mr. Bandyke stated that the integrity of the floor joists is in pretty good shape. The foundational cribbing which supports the floor joists in the inner area of the house was shored up over the years and was not done very well. To achieve optimum strength of the floor, that part would need work. The stone foundation was cobbled over the years. It's on virgin ground, dug out, and stones laid on virgin ground. The ground contact to the logs is low, very close. The limestone block that they used for chinking was cobbled over the years. The bracing was not done very well, just done as necessary.

Chairman Rockwood asked if the foundation could be shored up and is there a proper way to do that to stabilize the building if needed. The intent would be to make an improvement on that building, while leaving those foundation cribs in place.

Mr. Bandyke had noticed a little bit of log damage, water damage that can be seen as you go down into the basement. The water traces were on the back of the house before they had put the addition on. At that time, the log damage was ignored. It would be possible to take the siding off probably on 2 sides at least if you wanted to inspect the walls that the lower sill log sits on. That area was difficult to see well enough. After the actual siding is taken off, concrete could be used in the repair. The logs sit on limestone on dirt. Don Crigler stated that was not uncommon for the period.

Mr. Bandyke mentioned that the Board of Architectural Review refrains from making any economic evaluations or decisions. He stated the house itself is going to need work, but it's lasted in that condition for a long time. He also acknowledged that Mr. Lockard has done a little bit of work to the house. While recognizing the house will need more work, Mr. Bandyke stated the house is worth keeping. He said it will take a little bit of exploration regarding the foundation. Mr. Walker stated that he didn't see anything that made him feel unsafe in there.

Mr. Bandyke stated that the building is occupied, both upstairs and downstairs. The walls downstairs and upstairs seemed intact too.

Chairman Rockwood asked for the date and age of the materials. He asked if the siding is original, and asked if the foundation beams were original.

Mr. Bandyke stated that he thinks the siding on the alley side is the original clapboard siding. He said the siding on the front is not, that it is a different material. He stated that the material on the back of the house is also different than original. Mr. Bandyke stated that he was certain the logs are original.

Mr. Crigler asked if the floors are original.

Mr. Bandyke said yes. He said that they are, of course, White Pine, hard pine.

Mr. Crigler asked if the roof is original.

Mr. Bandyke said that yes, the roof is original and in pretty decent shape. Someone has been taking care of it. The chimney would need to be partially re-pointed. Upstairs in the attic, that portion of the chimney showed some spalling on the plaster up close, possibly caused by a little leaking which softened it up. The inside of the chimney appeared to be in good shape, but probably it will need to be capped just for safety's sake. He asked someone to confirm that the chimney is not being currently used. A gentleman in the audience commented, and then Mr.

Bandyke reaffirmed that the chimney needs to be capped, and then just partially sealed from the inside with silicone.

Chairman Rockwood asked for any public comments to the Board on this inspection of the building that had just been presented.

John Barker, Vice President of PHW, spoke to identify himself.

Someone else from the public audience stated that Mr. Lockard wished to speak too.

Chairman Rockwood expressed appreciation for Mr. Lockard's coming remarks.

John Barker concurred with the previous conclusions that the structure needs work but is worthy to save. He stated that the structure had a gable end butting up against the brick building next to it, circa 1880. He noted that the brick building came afterwards. He stated the basement of the subject property appeared to have been built after the fact. He stated that collectively they didn't think the floor was too bouncy for a house that was two hundred years old. He said the floor joists are obviously over-extended, but they didn't think it was too excessive. Mr. Barker said they are sympathetic to the financial liability of a project like this, but at the same time they don't believe there is cause for taking down an almost two hundred year old house. It was built in 1825, and short of some kind of an engineering report telling them otherwise, they believe the house is in acceptable condition, that it doesn't need to be demolished. He said PHW would be happy to help Mr. Lockard with anything in their means to help save this structure. He reiterated that the structure is considered a contributing resource in Winchester's Historic District, so therefore it is eligible for tax credit work, and PHW would be more than happy to work with Mr. Lockard if that was a route that he wanted to take. He repeated their conclusion that the structure should not be demolished.

Chairman Rockwood asked if *anyone* had questions, and then acknowledged Mr. Wright.

Mr. Frank Wright, President of PHW, stated that he agreed with Mr. Bandyke's description of the subject property. He said this structure is a treasure that we have and certainly not worthy of demolition.

Mr. Wright reminded the Board of its duties under the ordinance. He said a Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the demolition of a building if that is under consideration.

Under the ordinance 14-6-2, there are several things that must be considered:

2.1 -- Is the building of such architectural or historic interest that its removal or disturbance would be a detriment to the public interest? Mr. Wright stated that clearly that's the case.

2.4 – Would the retention of the building help preserve the historic character of the District? He stated that clearly it would.

2.5 – Would retention of the building help preserve the historic interest in a place or an area of the city? He stated that clearly it would.

2.6 – Would retention of the building promote the general welfare by maintaining the increasing real estate values; generating business; etc etc...and making the City a more attractive and desirable place in which to live? He stated that clearly it would.

Mr. Wright continued by saying that the question is not whether the building *needs* repairs, but rather whether the building *can* be repaired. He stated it's not a question of whether it's convenient or even whether it's *costly* to repair, but one *must* repair, must take care of the

property in the Historic District. He urged the Board to deny this application for Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the building, and thanked the Board.

Chairman Rockwood again asked for any public comment on the inspection report presented earlier in the hearing. None were offered.

Chairman Rockwood closed the public portion of the meeting and invited the Board to take up the matter in light of the report given.

Chairman Rockwood said that this structure was an interesting building to examine and he was actually pleasantly surprised at what the inspectors found. Regarding original materials, and the structure being intact, he stated that it is his personal view that this structure has already been confirmed as a contributing structure in the Historic District.

Chairman Rockwood stated that the history which the Board heard last time reinforced his opinion in that regard. Both the Revolutionary War history and the subsequent Civil War history specific to the structure had been unknown to him and he found this history interesting. He continued that this structure is rehabilitatable according to the report given. He stated that he is certain the structure is not beyond that. He clarified that the intent of the ordinance regarding demolitions is that it provides opportunity to take on this project before the building is lost forever. He stated that the demolition request ought to be denied, but he welcomed hearing any opinions from any Board member that were contrary to his own view. None were offered.

Chairman Rockwood asked for a motion to deny the request for demolition in BAR 12-436.

Mr. Bandyke read the ordinance to the Board from Article 14, Section 6.2 to Article 14, Section 6.3 as follows:

- 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?
 - 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?
 - 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?
 - 14-6-2.4 Would retention of the building help preserve the historic character of the district?
 - 14-6-2.5 Would retention of the building help preserve a historic interest in a place or an area of the City?

- 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?
- 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?
- 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?
- 14-6-2.4 Would retention of the building help preserve the historic character of the district?
- 14-6-2.5 Would retention of the building help preserve a historic interest in a place or an 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?

Chairman Rockwood stated that those are the criteria set forth in the Winchester Zoning Ordinance for consideration in approving or denying a request for demolition.

Mr. Bandyke made a motion to deny the request of BAR 12-436, thereby denying a permit to demolish the structure. Mr. Crigler seconded the motion.

Chairman Rockwood asked if there was any other discussion to be made. None was offered.

Chairman Rockwood observed that discussion in the previous public hearing about the historic significance of this building and its owners through the course of its life *are* significant facts. He emphasized that this particular block is in close proximity to the *heart* of the Historic District and the block contains *many* historic structures already, and this building really fits in like a set of teeth. To remove this building from that line of attached buildings, he said, would be highly disruptive to the streetscape. He stated it's obviously an older building and contributes materially to that streetscape. He said the materials are intact, the façade is intact, and the scale is congruent with the other buildings in the block. He stated it is a building which contributes significantly to

that *specific* streetscape. It is an old and unusual, uncommon design in the sense that there aren't very many of these structures that remain in the city, and that if we have one still in existence we should take every effort possible to preserve it. He said it may be a vernacular type of construction in its day but it's no longer common in our day, and he thinks it's exactly for this purpose that we have this Historic District. Therefore the retention of this building *would* help preserve the historic character of the District and help preserve interest in the Historic District as a whole. He further explained that the loss of these structures one at a time would mean the loss of the Historic District itself.

Again, Chairman Rockwood invited comments. None were offered.

Mr. Grisdale said that as a point of order, a voice vote by each individual member was required, not a collective vote.

Chairman Rockwood stated that the motion to deny was made, so a vote which is in favor of a motion is in essence a vote to *deny* the application.

The clerk started the call to vote:

Mr. Bandyke: Yes

Chairman Rockwood: Yes

Clerk stated Mr. Pinner is absent.

Mr. Crigler: Yes

Ms. Jackson: Yes

Mr. Walker: Yes

Mr. Serafin: Yes

Chairman Rockwood stated the motion is carried.

Mr. Bandyke said that concludes the matter.

1. OTHER DISCUSSION

none

2. ADJOURN 5:08

*****APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE MUST BE PRESENT
AT THE MEETING**