

## **BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES**

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on, April 16, 2009 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

**PRESENT:** Lawrence Belkin, Tim Bandyke, Mark Lore, Lawton Saunders and Catherine Shore.  
**ABSENT:** Patrick Farris and Tom Rockwood.  
**STAFF:** Vince Diem and Angie Walsh.  
**VISITORS:** Sam Long and Emily Skiles

### **MINUTES**

Tim Bandyke moved, seconded by Lawton Saunders, to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion passed unanimously. (Belkin, Shore and Lore abstained.)

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**09-27** Request of Jeffrey Skiles to replace 2nd story gray porch flooring with tiger wood flooring at 423 S Washington St.

**09-29** Request of Lawton Saunders to install 2 new wood windows at 19 N Washington St.

**09-32** Request of Community Foundation of the Northern Shenandoah Valley to add a sign to the existing freestanding sign at 530 Amherst St.

Catherine Shore moved, seconded by Tim Bandyke, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for all items on the Consent Agenda.

Motion carried unanimously. (Saunders abstained.)

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**09-26** Request of Burke Suda to install a temporary sign on the Cork Street side of the building at 141 S Loudoun St.

Mr. Saunders questioned whether this item should be on the agenda at all, being a temporary sign.

Mr. Diem explained per definition it is not temporary sign. A temporary sign would be made of something like canvas, such as a Grand Opening banner or Sale sign. The question is if it is appropriate. The applicant intends to replace it but by all definition this one is not temporary. Special Event signs must be removed after the event or at most 2 weeks. This sign is synthetic polymer or metal and is permanently affixed to the building. Mr. Diem added that the applicant submitted the application after receiving a violation from the City for putting up the sign without getting BAR approval. The Board will have to make a decision.

Mr. Saunders agreed that the sign had already been up more than 6 months. The problem he had with it is calling it temporary. He asked if it's approved when will the applicant have to take it down. A temporary sign is not under the prevue of the board.

Mr. Diem stated that the time that it's been up indicates that it is not a temporary sign and it is permanently affixed to the building.

Mr. Saunders wanted to know for sure what was going to be left there because the materials aren't specified in the application.

Mr. Lore added that the size is larger than guidelines permit. It should not exceed 18" in height. This one is very large.

Mr. Belkin assumed it was temporary because of its material. He questioned if the city is going to continue to treat it as a temporary sign. He also agreed with Mr. Saunders that materials would have to be submitted for the permanent one.

Mr. Diem stated that in this case the sign is considered permanent.

Mr. Belkin agreed suggesting that the Board ignore the word temporary because of the time it has been in place.

Mr. Bandyke suggested adding to the motion that within one month it would have to be brought back before the Board.

Mr. Saunders asked that no matter what the motion that the Board should vote on what the applicant is asking for, which is a temporary sign.

Lawrence Belkin moved, seconded by Catherine Shore, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for **09-26** with the following comments:

This approval is for a **temporary sign** as requested by the applicant. All design and color concepts for the permanent sign will need to be brought before the Board for approval before it is installed.

Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

**09-30** Request of Sam Long to remove vinyl siding and replace with architectural stone veneer at 118 N Washington St.

Mr. Long brought a veneer sample for review. He explained that it will only be applied on the front façade. The porch roof will be removed completely simply because he doesn't like the design.

Mr. Lore asked why it would only be applied to one side.

Mr. Long explained that it was mostly for aesthetics. The vinyl has been on since the 80's and he doesn't like it.

Mr. Saunders stated that the vinyl is already there. He felt the stone would look better than the vinyl.

Mark Lore moved, seconded by Lawrence Belkin, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for **09-30**, as presented.

Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

### **HISTORIC PLAQUES**

**09-24** Request of John Riley to install a historic plaque at 317 S Cameron St.

**09-31** Request of Reader & Swartz Architects to install a historic plaque at 205 - 213 N Cameron St.

Lawrence Belkin moved, seconded by Mark Lore, to grant Certificates of Appropriateness to historic plaque applications, **09-24 and 09-31**.

Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **OTHER DISCUSSION**

Mr. Diem presented the Board with a rough draft of the revised historic guidelines. City Council will be discussing them at the upcoming P&D meeting in hopes of creating a panel to assist in coming up with a final draft. The panel could possibly be made up of members from this board as well as City Council, Planning Commission and the Preservation of Historic Winchester. He explained that the intent is to differentiate between the guidelines because up to this point projects have been looked at through one lens. Mr. Diem gave some examples of how the standards can be changed. For example, he explained that substitute materials could be allowed in such cases where the owner of a property was not interested in rehabilitating the property just maintaining it.

Mr. Saunders agreed saying that he would rather see a vinyl window put in instead of allowing the building to fall down because the owner cannot afford the Kolby & Kolby wood windows the current guidelines call for.

Mr. Lore stated that the Secretary of Interior standards oscillate back and forth making it very difficult to walk a clear line.

Mr. Belkin pointed out the Residential Rehabilitation section of the current guidelines for windows. It emphasizes retaining, patching, and repair windows, to only replace when they are beyond repair. He was concerned with what Mr. Diem was purposing because it meant that if a person was not interested in rehabilitating their property they would not

have to go by the strict guidelines that other property owners would. He felt that giving people options to make that choice would be a mistake because everyone would take that road in order to avoid the BAR.

Mr. Diem explained that there is no flexibility for a property owner who intended to get a historic plaque or apply for tax credits. He reiterated that not all owners want to rehabilitate their properties.

Mr. Saunders felt that what this would mean is that all small projects would be administratively approved, which he said isn't necessarily a bad thing. He would not want to be on the Board if this is how it would be done because they would have nothing to fall back on. Right now, they fall back on consistent guidelines and without them the Board's decisions would be arbitrary.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.