

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, March 15, 2012 at 4:03 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street

POINTS OF ORDER

Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Bandyke moved, seconded by Ms. Shore, to approve the March 1, 2012 minutes as presented. Mr. Rockwood abstained.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR - 12-127 Request of Kenneth Connors, on behalf of the property owner, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install two egress fire doors at rear of property located at 168 North Loudoun Street.

Mr. Connors explained where the doors would be located and that they would be visible from Piccadilly Street via the drive thru at the bank and that the materials he would use to fill in would match the existing brick and trim paint colors.

Mr. Rockwood asked if the door would be flush to the building and whether it would have windows, Mr. Connors stated that for safety reasons it would be flush and windowless.

Chairman Farris entered the meeting

Mr. Bandyke asked if the door was a fire door. Mr. Connors said that it was not, it was a safety door. Mr. Bandyke said that if it's not a fire door then it wouldn't need to be steel.

Mr. Rockwood asked Mr. Connors if the door would be exiting a public area in the restaurant. Mr. Connors said that the area had been a pool hall in the past, a bar had been added and that the owners were seeking a nightclub license at the current time. Mr. Rockwood asked if Mr. Connors was required by the fire marshal to install two doors that do not have to be fire doors but do need to be additional egress doors and Mr. Connors said that they were and that they wouldn't be

opened but in an emergency. Mr. Crigler asked if there would be exterior hardware and Mr. Connors said that there wouldn't be because there has been a theft problem in the area.

Chairman Farris asked the applicant if the reason for choosing metal was for security and Mr. Connors said that it was. Mr. Crigler said that he could get a metal door with a wood grain design. Mr. Connors said that he could but he chose this door to match the others in the alley that are on the bank addition. Mr. Rockwood stated that the addition was not historically correct. He said that while he understood the need for additional egress he was concerned that a steel door did not fit the area. He said that he would rather see something that was more in keeping with the materials and style that was all ready there. He said that the guidelines were pretty clear about the materials and styles required for alterations of commercial facades. Mr. Connors stated that he had no issue with utilizing a six panel steel door. Mr. Rockwood stated that he understood the need for the door but that if the opening is remade, it will look like a steel door and not resemble wood at all. He said that he saw no issue with a solid wood door without a window. He said that they could work around the window and hardware concern for a commercial space and still meet the need for security, but steel would not be appropriate.

Chairman Farris said that he had not thought too much about the materials because it was a commercial space and steel is a traditional material. He said that he did agree that the style should match the character of the building. He asked Mr. Connors if he would be willing to investigate wood options. Mr. Connors said that he would but he was concerned about safety. Mr. Bandyke said that it would need to be a special order door. He said that he sees this as a commercial establishment and would lean toward a six panel door or a metal door that resembled old wood. He stated that a wooden door would be expensive and subject to the elements and would need more care. Mr. Connors said that there are variations of design in metal that may fit the requirements. Chairman Farris asked the Board to clarify their concerns, was it style or material that was most important? Chairman Farris asked Mr. Connors what his timeline was and whether he could come to the next meeting with other design options. Mr. Connors asked the Board to clarify what they would like to see. Chairman Farris asked for a finish that matches the appearance, age and style of the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Crigler moved, seconded by Chairman Farris, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness only for the door located on the South side of the structure. The Board requested that the applicant return with other options for the door located at the rear of the structure to reflect the appearance, age, and style of the surrounding buildings. The motion passed unanimously.

M. Bandyke asked Mr. Connors if the fire code was requiring him to install two doors, he said that it was. Mr. Rockwood stated that the Board's guidelines were very clear on side and rear of structures and the integrity of the materials used. He said that he has never seen a steel door that resembled wood, so he was not persuaded that they could use a steel door. He said that he had no objection to the motion but that he objected to work being done on the jamb of the north door. Mr. Crigler said that if Mr. Connors was installing a wood jamb he would only need to route out the hinge positions. He asked Mr. Connors if the door would come pre hung. Mr. Connors said that it would. He said that whatever door he got would be pre hung. Chairman Farris asked Mr. Connors to bring both steel and wood examples.

OLD BUSINESS

None

OTHER DISCUSSION

Mr. Diem introduced Morgane Zander, Assistant City Attorney, to the Board.

ADJOURN

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.