

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, July 5, 2012 at 4:01 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

POINTS OF ORDER

Roll Call

PRESENT: Tim Bandyke, Tom Rockwood, Don Crigler, Bob Pinner and Patricia Jackson.

ABSENT: None.

STAFF: Aaron Grisdale and Paula Le Duigou.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Ms. Jackson, to approve the minutes of June 21, 2012 as presented. Mr. Bandyke abstained from the vote and the minutes were approved (4-1)

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR - 12-330 Request of Daniel and Maryam Hoult for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install fencing at 800 South Washington Street.

Maryam Hoult, applicant, addressed the Board.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the fence was partially built.

Ms. Hoult stated that it was but would be replaced.

Mr. Rockwood asked if it was replaced with the same type of fence.

Ms. Hoult said that it would be with a solid, one sided fence that would go further along the driveway.

Mr. Bandyke asked if it would be extended along the side yard.

Ms. Hoult said yes, it would cross the driveway, have a gate, and attach at the stairs.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the picket fence in the front would remain the same.

Ms. Hoult said that it would.

Mr. Bandyke asked if it was stained.

Ms. Hoult said that it was stained a redwood color and the new fence would be stained transparent.

Mr. Rockwood asked what the material of the fence would be.

Ms. Hoult stated that it would be cedar and look like untreated cedar with the transparent stain.

Mr. Rockwood said that he was familiar with the property and had no issues with the request.

Mr. Pinner asked if it would be capped as the photo showed.

Ms. Hoult said that it would be flat all the way around.

Ms. Hoult showed the Board where/what it was in the photo.

Ms. Hoult stated that it would have a plain, square black cap with no top board.

Mr. Rockwood said that he was concerned about the height of the fence because it seals off the back yard and creates a blank wall.

Mr. Grisdale stated that this size and type fence is permitted under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Pinner asked what the height would be of the fence.

Ms. Hoult stated that it would be six feet tall.

Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, the grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the request as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

BAR-12-335 Request of Thomas Schloemer, on behalf of Calvary Baptist Church, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a fence at 844 Amherst Street.

Mr. Thomas Schloemer, applicant, addressed the Board stating that he would be building a fence for the Church as his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Rockwood asked if this would be a straight line fence.

Mr. Schloemer said it would be 80-84 feet long.

Mr. Rockwood asked if it would be stained or painted.

Mr. Schloemer said that the Church would like to paint it, at which time he showed the Board the color chosen by the Church.

Mr. Crigler asked about the length. The Board discussed the location and length of the fence.

Mr. Rockwood asked if there would be a gate or some kind of access through the fence.

Mr. Schloemer said there would not.

Mr. Pinner asked if the area near the Church offices would be open.

Mr. Schloemer said that he believed it would be open. Mr. Schloemer's Father stated that it would stay the same as it is now.

Mr. Rockwood asked if there was a representative of the Church present to discuss the other fencing.

Mr. Schloemer said that there was not.

Mr. Rockwood asked if there only approval they were seeking was for the 80 foot fence that would separate the parking lot from the playground.

Mr. Pinner asked if it would be just along the parking lot.

Mr. Schloemer said yes.

The applicant's Father and the Board discussed the location and length of the fence.

Mr. Bandyke asked if it would be pressure treated wood.

Mr. Schloemer said yes and that they would not paint it right away.

Mr. Crigler suggested they use a solid hide stain in the color they wanted because it would last longer.

Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Mr. Pinner, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the request and color as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

BAR -12-340 Request of 31 LLC for a Certificate of Appropriateness to change the façade, side, and rear elevations of the property located at 31 East Piccadilly Street.

Mr. Court Pifer, applicant, stated that they had uncovered some of the façade and found that the top half of the building on the side was cast block.

The Board and Mr. Pifer discussed photos.

Mr. Pifer stated that the top half was block and the lower half is stamped mortar with a variable large brick style with reds, grays, and blues in it.

Mr. Pinner said that it was like a fake stone wall.

Mr. Pifer said that it was and an unappealing look.

Mr. Pifer referred to the elevation plan in the packet.

Mr. Pifer stated that the fake mortar façade doesn't come up over the proposed cornice and it would be covered by the proposed store front.

Mr. Pifer said that they will remove it to show the architectural block that was there before to bring it back to its original block state.

Mr. Bandyke said that it's the original construction.

Mr. Pifer said that it was and it's the actual load bearing front wall.

Mr. Pifer said that the current large front window will be replaced with multiple windows with the entrance on the side.

Mr. Pifer introduced the architect, Larry Belkin.

Mr. Pifer stated that they loved the courtyard feature in the rear of the structure. He said that from the interior you can see that it was not an enclosed space.

Mr. Pinner stated that the front was fake, and Mr. Pifer said that it was and that there was never a second floor on the structure.

The Board and Mr. Pifer discussed the designs the second floor access and the courtyard.

Mr. Pifer pointed out the west elevation and some new openings proposed. He said that they added a sliding door to the second floor with a new balcony surrounded by a black iron rail.

Mr. Pifer said that they were proposing three colors schemes for approval.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the entire West elevation was in the cast concrete block.

Mr. Pifer said that it's standard flat masonry running the length of the side. He said the only architectural block in on the front corner.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the west front corner to the second story begins, will it mimic the front.

Mr. Pifer said that the side elevation will be plain, sandy block and that the second story is the fake Tudor that they put on top of it.

Mr. Pinner said that what will be on the side is a concrete wall from the front to the back.
BP – concrete from front corner to back.

Mr. Pifer said that that was correct. He said that that was what was existing and would not be changed, but to remove the Tudor siding to expose it.

Mr. Crigler asked about the north elevation and the existing imitation stone on it. Would it be left that way?

Mr. Pifer said that that was correct.

Mr. Crigler said that that was there before it was "Tudorized".

Mr. Pifer said that it was.

Mr. Pifer said that the top portion of the building that has a stepped front, and they are proposing to make that a one cornice detail.

Mr./ Pinner asked if a more historic style door could be used in place of the sliding glass door.

Mr. Pifer deferred to Mr. Belkin.

Mr. Belkin said that on the side elevation the materials are more industrial with steel sashes and that aluminum seemed appropriate.

Mr. Rockwood stated that after all it would be installed in the concrete wall.

Mr. Belkin said that you could go with a darker color if you used a French door, but they were not interested in using a wood sliding door. He said that this door would be obscured from the ground.

Mr. Rockwood said that he felt they had a nice plan that incorporated the steel windows and that basically they are working with an industrial 1930's building. He said that he felt that the aluminum frame was not an issue in that context.

Mr. Belkin said that their idea was to concentrate on the façade, and rather than redo the side elevation, work with what was all ready there.

Mr. Crigler asked if they would maintain the alley access.

Mr. Pifer said they would.

Mr. Crigler asked if the alley was on their property.

Mr. Pifer said that it was as well as some of the parking spaces.

Mr. Crigler said that he liked the balcony but felt that the first truck to cut through the alley would take it out.

Mr. Pifer said that it wasn't a public alley.

Mr. Crigler asked if they would consider a Romeo and Juliet style balcony.

Mr. Pifer said that one reason they chose to have a balcony was to give more space to the upstairs.

Mr. Rockwood asked what the depth of the balcony was.

Mr. Belkin said it was three feet.

Mr. Crigler asked is the windows were typical industrial style with single glazing, and if they were planning to install storm windows.

Mr. Pifer said that they were attempting to keep as much of the original frames as possible.

Mr. Crigler said that they existing windows are historically inefficient.

Mr. Pifer said that on the interior they would essentially have another window. He said that they want to maintain the historical industrial look on the outside.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the first floor would remain commercial and the second become an apartment.

Mr. Pifer said yes.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the first floor commercial would be split into two suites.

Mr. Pifer said it would remain one unit.

Mr. Crigler asked if the cornice work would be wood or Fypon.

Mr. Belkin stated that they would use both in different areas and paint it.

Mr. Bandyke said that he had no issue with them using it but would prefer that the Fypon be out of arms reach. He said that if you could reach it without a ladder then wood should be used because once it's painted you can't tell that it's Fypon.

Mr. Rockwood said that in a 1930's industrial structure you had more leeway in the material choices. He felt that it was in the nature of the building to leave the steel window casings and the cast block. He said that the Fypon doesn't trouble him as much as it would if it were on an older house.

Mr. Belkin said that it wasn't difficult to leave the lower floor in its original character, but one change that did entail more tolerance was the sliding glass door and balcony on the second floor.

Mr. Rockwood asked Mr. Belkin if he could get a door that could mimic the two over two proportions of the other windows.

Mr. Crigler felt that it didn't really do much architecturally.

Mr. Crigler asked if they were just going to paint the side elevation or make any other changes to the mortar.

Mr. Pifer stated that their intention was to put most of their efforts into the façade and to keep the side elevation as much to character as possible.

Mr. Pifer stated that they had three color schemes that they were looking at.

Mr. Rockwood asked if there was a particular one that they favored.

Mr. Pifer said that they did not and were unsure which color they would finally choose.

Mr. Bandyke said that anything would be better than what is there now.

Mr. Pifer said that their effort was to preserve it and to go with what surrounds it, not throw just anything on it.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the Board had feelings, either pro or con, concerning the color schemes presented.

The Board felt that there was no preference.

Mr. Rockwood felt that all three could be approved and have the applicant choose which color he preferred.

Mr. Crigler suggested giving conceptual approval of the three schemes and come back to the Board with the selected scheme. He was concerned about approving all three and having the applicant return.

Ms. Jackson asked if it were possible to render a drawing with the different schemes for them to view.

Mr. Belkin said that it was possible.

The Board discussed with the applicant the colors and how a choice might be made.

Mr. Crigler stated that the Board does not normally approve multiple schemes but the final choice of applicants. He said that he felt that the Board didn't have issue with the schemes chosen but were concerned that the applicant could find that in the process of painting that none of the three color schemes were working.

Mr. Crigler stated that having to return to the Board wouldn't slow him down because the Board meets twice a month.

Mr. Pifer said that it would slow things down in the sense that if they chose one of the three schemes and didn't like it, they could try one of the other schemes and not wait.

Mr. Crigler said that he was proposing to give conceptual approval on the three schemes, which means that the Board, for the record, would need to know which one was chosen.

Mr. Rockwood said that he would not call that conceptual, but rather actual approval.

Mr. Pifer asked if the Board meant that he could use one of the schemes and when they have chosen, come back to the Board and let them know which one was used.

Mr. Bandyke asked who put the colors together.

Mr. Pifer said that the architect and designer did.

Mr. Bandyke said that he didn't think it was necessary for the applicant to return for the colors because there was a lot of thought put into this request.

Mr. Rockwood stated that if the applicant were to use one of the three color schemes presented, he saw no reason for him to return to the Board.

Mr. Bandyke said that as long as one of the schemes was used, the applicant did not need to return to the Board for approval.

Mr. Rockwood felt that approval of all three would be sufficient, as well as having the applicant notify Mr. Grisdale of his final choice.

Mr. Crigler stated that he would like to see the front elevation in the three schemes.

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Ms. Jackson, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior remodel and the three conceptual color schemes as submitted, with the applicant notifying staff of the final choice.

The motion passed (4-1) Mr. Crigler was opposed.

The Board discussed the use of Fypon on the lower levels with Mr. Belkin.

OLD BUSINESS

BAR - 12-285 Request of David Logan on behalf of the property owner, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install storm windows at 125 West Boscawen Street.

Mr. David Logan addressed the Board.

Mr. Rockwood asked Mr. Logan about the samples that he brought with him.

Mr. Logan suggested that the Board consider allowing metal storms to be used in the Historic District. He said that they have been used on other historic structures.

Mr. Pinner asked if they were on the outside of the windows.

Mr. Logan said they were and went on to explain how the windows worked.

Mr. Logan said that he was proposing that the bottom of the window be screen, although they were designed to have them both on the top or bottom.

Mr. Logan said that they are custom measured to fit each window exactly.

Mr. Rockwood said that one thing that made these better than triple track is that the frame is so narrow that it almost disappears and has no profile.

Mr. Rockwood asked what the frame color would be.

Mr. Logan said he would match the trim color.

Mr. Rockwood stated that it would visually disappear and essentially be a permanent storm window.

Mr. Crigler felt that it was a vast improvement over triple track.

Mr. Pinner thought that they were excellent and had been looking for something like this for his home and is better than what had been approved before.

Mr. Bandyke said that they Board had never approved this type before, only replacement or same for same.

Mr. Rockwood said that the only thing that it did do was obscure the relief of the original munions.

Mr. Bandyke asked if the center of the storm would match the center of the window.

Mr. Logan said that it did.

Mr. Bandyke said that wooden storms had been approved in the past and that this would be the first time an aluminum window would be approved.

Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the storm windows as presented.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Approval of meeting schedule for July 2012-June 2013

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Ms. Jackson, to accept the meeting schedule for July 2012 – June 2013.

Mr. Grisdale stated that it was recommended by the City Attorney to adopt a meeting schedule.

Also included was a power point distributed by the City Attorney's office pertaining to meeting requirements and state code for meetings. The City Attorney would be willing to make a presentation to the Board if they desired.

Mr. Grisdale encouraged the Board to consider attending the Preservation Virginia meeting in September 2012. The Board was sent an email pertaining to the meeting.

ADJOURN

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.