

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

POINTS OF ORDER

PRESENT: Tim Bandyke, Patrick Farris, Tom Rockwood and Don Crigler.
ABSENT: Catherine Shore and Bob Pinner.
STAFF: Vince Diem, Aaron Grisdale and Paula Le Duigou.

Mr. Tony Williams, City Attorney, introduced Morgan

Approval of Minutes – December 1, 2011

Don Crigler moved, seconded by Patrick Farris, to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed 4-1-1. Mr. Rockwood abstained.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR 11-718 Request of Christopher Eyre for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a shed at the rear of the property located at 435 North Braddock Street.

Chairman Farris moved, seconded by Mr. Rockwood, to table this request because the applicant was unable to attend the meeting to discuss his plans. The Board also requested to have exterior scale drawings of all four elevations.

BAR 11-723 Request of Alec Bouldin, Shandin Properites, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new addition at rear of structure and to install a wood fence at 427 North Loudoun Street.

Chairman Farris invited the applicant to address the Board, and informed him that his application for demolition would be heard at the January 19 public hearing.

Chairman Farris said, looking at the application that the front portion of the structure consisted mainly of painting and repair and could be approved at an administrative level.

Mr. Rockwood asked the applicant to clarify whether the two additions at the rear of the structure were the ones to be removed and the location of the new addition, as well as the location of the new work on the front of the structure. The applicant confirmed this for Mr. Rockwood. Mr. Rockwood asked to see the color samples which Mr. Grisdale showed to the Board.

Mr. Crigler asked if the roof would be replaced on the existing part of the structure. The applicant confirmed that it would. Mr. Crigler asked if there was a tenant in the structure and the applicant stated that there was not and that he had recently left.

Mr. Pinner arrived

Chairman Farris stated that due to changes in the BAR guidelines, paint changes were typically approved administratively. He also clarified that if any of the fabric of the structure needed to be replaced it should be like for like. The applicant stated that the shutters, windows and gutters would all remain the same and be repaired as needed. The Board discussed which elevations would be approved administratively and which would fall under the application for demolition. They agreed that the applicant could move ahead with all but the west portion where the demolition would take place if approved at the public hearing.

Chairman Farris asked if the roof of the sunroom would be replaced. The applicant stated that it would, that all roofs would be replaced like for like.

Chairman Farris moved on to the fence part of the application. Referring to the picture provided by the applicant, he asked if it was the south line between the subject property and 419 North Loudoun Street and if that was the only location. Mr. Crigler stated that the applicant could take a current plot plan and map out where the fence would be located. The applicant stated that he wasn't sure that he would be installing a fence after all and if he did it would be one of the last things that he would do. He said that he would resubmit his application if he decided to do it. Mr. Rockwood asked if the fence would be located in the front of the property, the applicant stated that it would not. Mr. Crigler informed the applicant that it was very helpful for the Board to see what materials would be used on projects and pictures depicting the finished product.

Chairman Farris asked the Board to take a look at the plans for the addition and while they would not act on this request until the public hearing, he felt that it would be beneficial to provide feedback to the applicant with comments on things that could be improved in the overall plan.

Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Don Crigler, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness As presented pertaining to the front portion only of the subject structure. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rockwood confirmed with Chairman Farris that the motion was particularly for the renovations to the existing structure that will be retained, same for same, like for like.

Chairman Farris informed the applicant that he could proceed with the front portion work and that the rear portion would be addressed in the public hearing. Chairman Farris asked the Board to look at the plans for the rear addition and provide feedback to the applicant at this time.

Chairman Farris suggested that the windows on the rear structure match the windows on the front portion. The applicant stated he would.

Chairman Farris stated that he liked the portico over the side door and asked the applicant to replicate the gingerbread on the side as well. The applicant stated he would.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the columns on the side entrance were round or square. The applicant stated that they were turned wood and said that he would replicate the existing columns.

Mr. Crigler asked the applicant to clarify the size of the fascia board depicted in the drawing.

Chairman Farris asked the applicant if he was going to retain the brick supports and pylons on the front stairs. The applicant stated that he would do it as much as possible, depending on the porch stability. If needed, he would have to rebuild with new.

Chairman Farris informed the applicant that his property was the debris field for the fort from the French & Indian War that had been located at 427 North Loudoun, and that if he needed to dig below the plow zone he should contact the Department of Historic Resources to get their sign off on the site.

Mr. Crigler asked the applicant if he would use a triangular attic vent to match the roof pitch.

OLD BUSINESS

None

OTHER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.