

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, September 6, 2012 at 4:01 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

### Roll Call

**PRESENT:** Tim Bandyke, Don Crigler, Bob Pinner, Patricia Jackson, Peter Serafin and Kevin Walker.  
**ABSENT:** Tom Rockwood.  
**STAFF:** Aaron Grisdale and Paula Le Duigou.

### Approval of Minutes

*Ms. Jackson moved, seconded by Mr. Crigler, to approve the August 21, 2012 minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.*

### CONSENT AGENDA

None

### NEW BUSINESS

**BAR - 12-434** Request of BB & T Corporation for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the ATM machine located at 115 North Cameron Street.

Matt Boyle, applicant, addressed the Board and stated that BBT wanted to change out the existing ATM and replace it with newer, upgraded model. He said that the space that is on either side in the brick bump out does not allow for service of the unit and the submission outlined the changes that they were proposing in order to fit the new unit in that location.

Mr. Boyle proposed that the existing brick bump out be removed and install the new one in order to get the service clearances that they need.

Mr. Bandyke asked how they service the unit today.

Mr. Boyle stated from the rear and sides and went on to explain how the machine was serviced.

Mr. Pinner asked if the bump out needed to be extended to accommodate serving the machine.

Mr. Boyle stated that it needed to be widened but not extended out into the driveway in order to service it.

Mr. Serafin asked if the machine was serviced from the inside or outside.

Mr. Boyle said outside and this was known as a thru the wall model machine.

Mr. Boyle explained that there was need for room on the sides of the ATM as well to service it and that was why they needed to make the opening wider but not deeper.

Mr. Pinner stated that he had concerns about the large bank signs that have been cropping up in the City and he wanted to know if this was in accordance with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Grisdale stated that he did not feel that there was a sign issue with the request before the Board.

Mr. Walker asked how the sign was lit.

Mr. Boyle stated that it was internally lit with florescent light and would only be lit at night as well as downward casting.

Mr. Boyle explained where the lighting was for Mr. Crigler.

Mr. Serafin asked if this was a standard unit that was put in most banks.

Mr. Boyle stated that it was and the reason for changing it was for the new branding and marketing.

Mr. Serafin said that he had a big problem with the material, it being glossy aluminum and back lit which would make it glow at night. He said that amount of light was getting larger and the amount of brick was getting smaller, and the materials were going from traditional to more of a service station or commercial look.

Mr. Serafin asked if there was a standard unit that was utilized in historic districts.

Mr. Boyle said that it varied by district, and what was presented was what they preferred to see, but they do make adjustments on a case by case basis. He said that this was their best case scenario but if the Board would not approve it they would return with a different design.

Mr. Pinner asked Mr. Boyle if he had photos of other locations with the machines in historic districts.

Mr. Boyle stated that he did not.

Mr. Bandyke said that he was shocked by the size of the unit. He said that he would rather see brick utilized with the signs in other locations on the drive thru. He said that this design is in your face and very visible from the main street.

Mr. Bandyke said that he would like to see the brick bigger, put the machine in, and place the logo above it.

Mr. Walker said that he would prefer something more incandescent and with indirect lighting.

Mr. Boyle asked if LED lights would be better.

Mr. Walker said that in historic districts you do not tend to see that type of lighting.

Ms. Jackson asked if Mr. Boyle could provide examples to the Board.

Mr. Boyle said they do have different options and explained them to the Board. He stated that this presentation was the Bank's preferred option, but they could go from there.

Mr. Pinner stated that he was upset by the large sign that had gone up on the Wells Fargo building and he would like to prevent it from happening more in the City. He said that there was no need for a gas station look next to City Hall.

Mr. Boyle asked if they were to construct a bump out in masonry, make the header box alone and not be back lit, would that be a more viable option.

Mr. Bandyke asked Mr. Boyle to clarify the location of the header box.

Mr. Boyle stated that he could take the Board's suggestions to the bank because they did not want to upset anyone, they just wanted the newest upgraded model ATM that they have.

*Mr. Serafin moved, seconded by Mr. Walker to table the request for new designs until the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously.*

**BAR - 12-437** Request of Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace deteriorated doors and to renovate the stain glass windows fronting on 26 & 38 West Boscawen Street.

Robert Taylor, applicant, stated that this was a request to replace the Boscawen Street doors and to renew the stain glass windows. He said that this was phase 2 of their ongoing renovation project to address some of the appearance issues on the Boscawen Street façade.

Mr. Taylor said that the windows would be tackled first with the lead being replaced, the windows cleaned and repaired, and new protective covering placed over them. He said that the Lexan covers will be replaced with laminated safety glass because the Lexan yellows over time.

Mr. Bandyke said that it would basically be a same for same update.

Mr. Taylor agreed and further stated that they would be replacing the trim around the windows as well.

Mr. Bandyke asked about the doors.

Mr. Taylor said that the second part of the project would focus on the doors facing Boscawen Street, for a total of 6 doors. He said that the doors range in age from 40-60 years old with 2 of them in relatively poor condition.

Mr. Taylor said that the administrative door, the double door shown in the photos, and the door in the GMOC building which is a single door with two side lights. He said that they thought that the unit was original to the early 1930's with the exception of the door panel which was replaced in 2004 with a Home Depot grade door when the building was renovated in 2003.

Mr. Taylor said that the plan was to start with these two doors and create a model of a higher quality door using solid wood doors proposed.

Mr. Taylor showed a sample of the door to the Board.

Mr. Taylor stated that these would be custom doors. He said the plan is to stain the doors a red oak color rather than paint them red, which is a Lutheran Church tradition.

Mr. Pinner asked if the stain would protect the doors as much as paint.

Mr. Taylor said that it probably wouldn't but the door manufacturer had a factory finish which would be applied to the doors and essentially puts a stain on it and then puts a couple of coats of automotive clear coat over that to protect against the elements.

Mr. Crigler asked if solid doors would be installed for the administrative building.

Mr. Taylor said yes.

Mr. Pinner asked if there would be lights on this door.

Mr. Taylor said they would replace with a solid door.

The Board and Mr. Taylor discussed the location of the lights.

Ms. Jackson asked if there would be brass kick plates.

Mr. Taylor said yes.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the side lights would be changed.

Mr. Taylor said that there would be new ones, but they would be exactly the same as the existing ones with the trim being painted white with the door panels being stained.

Mr. Serafin asked if the doors on the administrative building were original.

Mr. Taylor said that they were not. He referred to the photos that he supplied to the Board explaining what had been there in the 1950's.

Ms. Jackson asked about an area on the façade and whether it had had a window there at one time.

Mr. Taylor said that at one time there had been a stain glass window that had been covered in the 1950's. He said that they would remove the plywood, restore the existing stained glass, and cover it with the safety glass.

Mr. Pinner asked if the original window was still there and Mr. Taylor said that it was.

Mr. Taylor said that it was.

Mr. Walker asked if there were stained glass lights in the 1924 door.

Mr. Taylor said that it was not stained glass but clear, beveled.

Mr. Serafin said that the light division of the existing administrative doors seems to mimic the doors in the 1925 photo. He asked if they had considered using the same on the new doors.

Mr. Taylor said that they had and then decided that they wanted to create a more uniform look across all six of the doors.

Mr. Pinner asked if they would be replacing the two small side doors on the sanctuary building.

Mr. Taylor said that they would be part of later phase when they have the money available.

Mr. Serafin said that in the photos there was a sanctuary door that appeared to be a half door.

Mr. Taylor said that the doors that are not part of this request are oak, slab doors that have been painted red.

Referring to a photo, he pointed out that years ago the doors had been stained and not painted. He went on to discuss the doors with the Board.

Mr. Taylor said that when they do replace those doors in the next phase, they intend to follow the design of the new doors.

Mr. Serafin said that the door that was chosen doesn't match the six panel administration door or the single panel door.

Mr. Taylor said that they wanted to get away from the plain flat door that is on the sanctuary and have not entertained raised paneled doors because they did not want to get anything too contradictory on the front of the building.

The Board and Mr. Taylor discussed photos of the façade and doors of the administration building.

*Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Mr. Serafin, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of two doors and the Lexan covers over the stained glass. The motion passed unanimously.*

**BAR-12-446** Request of 31 LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove an exhaust stack at the rear of the structure and to propose a second story addition on the southern portion to create a two bedroom apartment at 31 East Piccadilly Street.

Mr. Bandyke stated that at the last meeting, the colors had not been chosen.

Mr. Court Pifer stated that they have not chosen the colors yet and were working out details on the accents.

Mr. Pifer stated that they were seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the exhaust stack on the south side of the structure and to add a two bedroom in a second story.

Mr. Pifer said that the stack is not attached to anything on the inside but there are a few guide wires to hold it up. He said that they would need to use equipment to remove it and the brick chimney under it.

Mr. Bandyke asked what the stack was made of and Mr. Pifer said that it was steel and not original to the structure.

Mr. Pifer outlined the location and structural changes needed for the second story addition for the Board.

Mr. Pifer proposed using 7 inch smooth finish Hardi plank for the siding and stated that it would follow in the color scheme that would be chosen as the final. He stated that the roof would be shingles and would include gutter half rounds with a pre finish.

Mr. Pifer explained the bump out between the first and second floors which was designed to give depth between the first and second floors.

Mr. Bandyke asked if that would be on the west side only.

Mr. Pifer said yes. He said that on the east side they were unable to do anything because of the zero lot line there including an overhang because that would go into the airspace.

Mr. Pifer said that on the northeast side there is a wooden pile aster to give a feeling of relief and break up the long line and to incorporate the second floor. He said that it helped to not give the building the feeling of a floating split story building.

Mr. Pifer said that on the north side of the building they have incorporated steps coming up from the landing that connects to a cat walk access to the back apartment.

Mr. Pinner asked what type of cat walk it was.

Mr. Pifer said that it would be constructed of composite to help deter deterioration. He said that since it cannot be seen, he didn't think it would be an issue.

Mr. Bandyke agreed.

Mr. Pifer said that that while doing interior prep, his crew saw that the back shed roof had major joist damage and structural issues so it had to be removed.

Mr. Pinner asked what the existing roof over the old cleaners was made of.

Mr. Pifer said that it was standing seam.

Mr. Pinner asked if they had considered using that instead of shingles.

Mr. Pifer said that the cost difference was prohibitive and that other structures in the same block that have shingles. He cited other locations in the City that have shingles.

Mr. Pifer quoted a portion of the BAR ordinance that referenced new construction, remodeling/renovations section for the historic district.

Mr. Pifer said that since the area is set back fairly far and that it is not a main structure, shingles would be sufficient.

Mr. Serafin asked what the depth of the second story overhang was.

Mr. Pifer said that it was 8 5/8 and that it would have a smooth finish relief. He said that they had a horizontal smooth line there to help break up the two so there wouldn't be CMU hitting a Hardi plank siding.

Mr. Crigler asked if there was any reason to put plaster on the first level block.

Mr. Pifer said that the only reason would be for looks.

Mr. Crigler and Mr. Pifer discussed the block walls and the overall design of the second story addition with the foundation.

Mr. Pifer said that one of their options was to use one color so that it would have a uniform look.

Mr. Crigler said that a normal band of trim that was 6-8 inches would work between the overhang and block below.

Mr. Serafin said that Hardi Plank did come in 8 foot lengths.

Mr. Pifer said that he could look into that if the Board decides that that is what they want.

Mr. Serafin asked about the 8 5/8 overhang size and how that size was chosen.

Mr. Pifer said that his architect had made the suggestion. He stated that the overhang had originally been larger but they narrowed it so that box trucks could still access the alley.

Mr. Walker asked about the aluminum windows and Mr. Pifer stated that they had all ready been approved in a previous BAR meeting.

Mr. Pinner asked if it were possible to make the new windows on the back porch conform to the others.

Mr. Pifer said that they were and that was also why they kept the grid size, to mimic the other windows.

Mr. Pifer wanted to point out that the back door had been approved with an overhang, and since they were adding a bump out to the second story, they had removed it and installed a light.

Mr. Pinner said that it made more sense with the bump out.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the door was for the apartment.

Mr. Pifer said that it was for the office and that the apartment was accessed thru the catwalk.

Mr. Bandyke asked where the parking was for the building.

Mr. Pifer said that they have spoken with the neighbors and they have a verbal agreement with them pending other items, such as an easement in the alleyway, so they are looking to remove the easement and have parking in the rear. He said their intent is to have parking for the tenants and a few employees.

*Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Ms. Jackson, to approve the request with the following condition:*

- a. Return to the Board with a redesign of the horizontal banding and the vertical balaster, as well as the two corners on the overhang on the south and north elevations.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**BAR -12-354** Request of Harold Ostrender of HG, LLC, to seek approval for a two phase façade change to the front and side elevations of the property located at 316 South Cameron Street. (Porch rails to be presented)

Mr. Grisdale stated that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting due to a work conflict and was directed by the Board to supply them with examples for their review.

The Board discussed the choices that were provided to them by the applicant.

*Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Ms. Jackson to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the porch rails as follows:*

*Porch posts CPP5C*

*Newl post CNP3*

*Pickets C24*

*Cap rails as submitted*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

**BAR-12-378** Request of Joyce Bean for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the siding with Hardi Plank at 13-15 East Cecil Street. (Discussion of findings)

Mr. Bandyke stated that the Board had been out to see the siding that had been exposed by the applicant. He said that it appeared to be wood German siding in reasonable condition.

Ms. Jackson asked if the existing siding had been removed in more than one area.

Mr. Bandyke said that it had been removed in both the back and front.

Mr. Grisdale stated that at the last meeting the applicant was going to expose the under siding to see if it was usable, and if so they would use that in place of Hardi Plank. He said that she would return at a later time for color approval.

*Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Mr. Pinner, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the old siding and expose the existing wood German siding. The applicant will need to seek approval from staff for colors at a later date.*

*The motion passed unanimously*

## **OTHER DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the overhang on the Pifer property and when they should interject their opinion for personal preferences in design cases.

## **ADJOURN**

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.