

## BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on July 3, 2008 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall

**PRESENT:** P. Farris, L. Belkin, M. Lore, L. Saunders, T. Rockwood

**ABSENT:** C. Shore, T. Bandyke

**VISITORS:** James Twaddle, John Willingham, John Nagley, Tyler Thompson, Tom Flegal, Gary Spitalsky, Jonathan Rose, Shawn Twigg and Sandra Bosley (PHW),

**MINUTES:** The Minutes of June 19, 2008 were reviewed. Mr. Lore, seconded by Mr. Farris motioned for approval of the minutes as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

### CONSENT AGENDA

*Mr. Lore, seconded by Mr. Farris motioned to amend the consent agenda by removing BAR-08-60 and adding BAR-08-63, 08-64, and 08-65.*

*Mr. Saunders recused himself.*

*Motion carried 4-0-1. (Mr. Saunders abstained)*

**BAR-08-59** Request of Realty Direct to install a hanging sign at 19 S. Cameron St.

**BAR-08-63** Request of Adams-Nelson Property Management, Inc to paint the roof, walls, trim, doors and windows at 303 S. Loudoun St.

**BAR-08-64** Request of Adams-Nelson Property Management, Inc to paint the roof at 307 S. Loudoun St.

**BAR-08-65** Request of Adams-Nelson Property Management, Inc to paint, install storm windows and replace gutters at 9 & 11 W Clifford St.

*Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Lore, motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to all items on the Consent Agenda.*

*Motion carried 4-0-1. (Mr. Saunders abstained)*

### NEW BUSINESS

**BAR-08-60** Request of Mary McConnel to erect a conservatory on the back of the existing house at 717 S. Washington St.

Mr. Saunders asked why the application stated that only the right side gable would be seen from the public right-of-way when the entire addition would be clearly seen from Pall Mall St.

Mr. Twaddle stated that he was strictly speaking about what would be seen from Washington St. He agreed that because it is a corner lot it would be seen from Pall Mall St.

Mr. Belkin asked what materials would be used.

Mr. Twaddle explained that it will be made from aluminum, glass and some wood.

Mr. Saunders stated that the materials are not totally compatible; however he doesn't feel that it takes away from the character of the home.

Mr. Belkin stated that according to the guidelines the structure has to be responsible and in keeping with the neighborhood. He felt the skylight was out of character and doesn't fit historically. Mr. Belkin supplied the applicant with pictures taken around the historic district showing sunrooms that were built of wood yet allowed for light. His opinion would be to re-work the addition, introducing more wood, and possibly using a roof with skylights set in.

Mr. Lore agreed with Mr. Belkin stating that it is very visible from the street and would be out of character for the neighborhood.

Mr. Twaddle stated that he submitted the design the homeowner chose and is not opposed to re-working the addition to add more wood.

*Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Belkin motioned to table BAR-08-60, giving the applicant an opportunity to re-work the design of the addition.*

*Motion carried 5-0.*

**BAR-08-58** Request of Christ Episcopal Church to install a projecting sign at 114 W. Boscawen St.

Chairman Saunders asked is anyone was present for this case.

Seeing none, *Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Lore motioned to table BAR-08-58 until someone could be present for questions.*

*Motion carried 5-0.*

**BAR-08-62** Request of Hunter Hurt to install windows and a walk in cooler at 315 E Cork St.

After some discussion between the members, it was decided that the cooler and the windows would be visible from the public view during the fall months so they would both have to be considered.

A representative from the R. Hunter Hurt firm stated that Mr. Hurt could not attend today. He would try to answer any questions the Board might have.

Mr. Belkin asked what the windows would be made of.

The gentleman stated that they would be wood in a vinyl casing.

Mr. Rockwood asked what the other windows were made of.

The gentleman wasn't sure. He stated that the reason for vinyl was for functionality but he was pretty sure they could use wood; however he would have to check with Mr. Hurt.

Mr. Saunders asked if any of the members had an issue with the cooler. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

*Mr. Farris, seconded by Mr. Lore motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the walk-in cooler and table the windows portion until more information on materials could be obtained.  
Motion carried 5-0.*

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**BAR-08-41** Request of Tom Flegal to erect a fence at 501 & 501 ½ Fairmont Ave.

Mr. Belkin asked how tall the fence is.

Mr. Flegal stated it is 4ft.

Mr. Belkin read from the guidelines stressing that the only fence that is opposed is chain link, which this is not, it is wire.

Mr. Flegal explained that his property butts up to the train tracks, not another residence. The honeysuckle will grow through the fence making it appear as a garden fence.

Mr. Saunders felt that since there is an existing fence there, this would be considered a repair.

Mr. Rockwood stated that since there is an existing fence it would be hard to suggest another type at this point.

*Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Farris motioned to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for BAR-08-41 specifically for an American wire fence. The proposed wire fence is to be located in the rear yard facing agriculture character and in this context is an appropriate design and material.*

*Motion carried 5-0.*

**BAR-08-48** Request of Jonathan Rose to add front portico at 108 W. Cork Street.

Mr. Saunders stated that this plan looked almost identical to the old one.

Mr. Rose stated that as per Mr. Bandyke's suggestion, he has provided more detailed sketches. He included a picture of a portico on Cork St. to show precedence.

Mr. Belkin asked if the Mr. Rose planned on removing the door and using the old opening.

Mr. Rose said no, he would be removing the old arch and rebuilding the sidelights. He eliminated the pilasters and included detail of the balusters and hand rail. He stated that he understood the purist view, however requesting latitude in the case is not unreasonable.

Mr. Nagley, the owner, asked if the design is what is in question at this point. He felt that two points should be taken into consideration. He is looking to protect the entrance; the weather is rotting the wood. Also, the gymnastics it takes to enter the residence. You have to walk up the steps to open the storm door, walk back down the steps to allow for the storm door to completely open and then walk back up again to go in through the door.

Mr. Belkin suggested that the storm door is what's impeding the entrance because it opens out while the main door opens in.

Mr. Belkin stated that he did some research on the house, because of its age and category at the time those types of houses did not have porches. Porches didn't come into play until after the revolution. He felt the characteristics of the house, because it has lasted 200 years, with the direct-in entrance, just as how the house probably was originally is something that the BAR has to try to preserve. He provided pictures of example of pictures taken around the City showing a cantilever covering that would still allow for the straight-in entrance. He stated that what is being proposed is being taken from buildings that were built much later and are not in keeping with the time period.

Mr. Nagely stated that this house was build well after 1788, after the revolution, so there would have been porches.

Mr. Belkin stated that seeing the jack arch and the front elevation's relationship to the sidewalk clearly show that this is how that house was.

Mr. Rose stated that Mr. Belkin was making an assumption. There is no way to know whether or not this was how it was originally built.

Mr. Belkin stated that he is making the best judgment that he can. He felt that this design is inappropriate for this particular property. Mr. Belkin suggested that the other members have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Saunders stated that this door configuration is not original to the house. The pediment, sidelights and railing are no more original than the porch that's being proposed. He added that they could argue whether the proposed design is appropriate or not. He didn't care for the way that the door sets down below the windows and he didn't agree that the side steps are unheard of. He agreed that there is no way to prove what the house looked like.

Mr. Belkin added that is why we have architectural history.

Mr. Saunders continued by saying that the door has been terribly altered.

Mr. Thompson stated that they cannot come out any further because it would impede the walkway.

Mr. Rockwood stated that he didn't notice the jack arch last week, bringing to reason that what was probably there was a 3-4 light transom in that space without a porch.

Mr. Rose stated that the architectural design shouldn't be the only thing taken into consideration with this design.

Mr. Nagely continued by saying that Mr. Thompson's mother is handicapped and could be living with them in the near future. Due to the current design, they have to take her in through the back off the alley. He stated that he is protective of their home. He did research before they came up with the design so they could argue that all day long. His biggest concerns are entry and protection.

Mr. Rockwood asked if a portico of the kind shown in their photographs and the ones that Mr. Belkin provided meet those needs.

Mr. Rose stated that cantilevering the porch would mean adding steel and pretty evasive construction as far as what you're getting at the end.

Mr. Belkin stated that Mr. Rose was making it sound like bridge construction, when there would not necessarily need to be steel involved. He felt that this option is one that is more sympathetic to the house.

Mr. Rose stated that he is not stepping out of what is in character for this town and that there are examples of many porches with side entries.

Mr. Belkin stated that you can find an example of anything in this town. He added that the important thing to consider is not whether those types of entries exist in town, but whether they also exist on buildings that the architectural historians know are from that period.

Mr. Saunders suggested that everyone stick to the facts.

Mr. Farris stated that this isn't the first time that, architectural style aside, the preservation philosophy that has to be applied is colliding with the pragmatism that also has to be considered. He stated that everything has to be considered while maintaining constant and consistent standards. He stated that he agrees with Mr. Belkin in the philosophy that he is applying. He acknowledged that it's clearly a new doorway with newer materials. He stated that Mr. Belkin has presented some ideas that would be a compromise which would be less obtrusive than what a porch would be. He asked if one of those options would assist in rectifying the issues.

Mr. Nagely stated that the storm door is necessary. Side entry would be the only angle that they have found that would work. He will need to be able to get the mother in the house.

Mr. Farris asked if getting rid of the columns, cantilevering the top and having the steps as presented would be something that would work. He asked Mr. Belkin if that would be an option.

Mr. Belkin stated that sometimes there were steps that came up from two sides. He explained that having them from one side changes the central look. He explained his idea of conservation and preservation; 'what has come down you try to stay with'. He stated that the problem with rain on the door isn't a problem that just developed; it's been there for 200 years. He said that the cantilevered top would help with that. He explained that there are sacrifices that you have to make living in the historic district.

Mr. Nagley asked Mr. Belkin if it would be okay to have a cantilever top with stairs on both sides.

Mr. Belkin stated that it's a democracy. He is just trying to keep the building the way it was. He admitted that it's not the same door but he is convinced that based on the history and what is there to be seen, it's pretty clear there wasn't a porch there.

Mr. Rose explained to Mr. Nagely that adding the cantilever top would cause the loss of the side lights.

Mr. Belkin suggested using a door with large panes of glass.

Mr. Thompson stated that it's the original door and doesn't want to change it.

Mr. Saunders stated that he isn't disagreeing with Mr. Belkin however everyone has an idea of what it should look like. Ideally it had a transom. He stated that the doorway isn't original, the streetscape probably isn't original. He stated that what's there is no more in keeping with what's being proposed. He stated that if it was more of the original door he would be against the change but its not.

Mr. Nagely stated that with the storm door they would not be able to use the second stairway.

Mr. Saunders explained that from a practical standpoint that's probably true but it would be a compromise assuring it's in keeping with the character.

Mr. Lore agreed with Mr. Farris. He stated that because he isn't an architect he cannot suggest anyway to make this work but its obvious that until practical use of the door is resolved its going to diminish the attractiveness of the house as a place to live and is not going to do any favors for the historic district. He asked if cantilevering the top and putting stairs on both sides is something they would consider.

Mr. Rose stated that the brick is soft, cantilevering the top would mean using steel.

**Mr. Farris left the meeting.**

Mr. Nagely explained that the front was water damaged long ago so it concerns him when Mr. Rose suggests putting in metal.

Mr. Rose explained that this is the reason for the columns; they carry a lot of weight.

Mr. Rockwood stated that it's clear that the house has had a lot of alterations done from the windows to the right addition. He would not argue with a plan to return to a jack arch transom doorway. He stated that the door that's on there now is no credit to the building. He stated that he may make another choice if it was his house but he cannot deny the suggestion that's being proposed.

Mr. Belkin suggested that maybe Mr. Rockwood was only looking at this one way. He stated that there are solutions that can be just as functional. He stated that the proposal may be functional but it doesn't do anything for the 200 year old house of which there isn't an unlimited quantity.

Mr. Moore added that there wasn't a plot plan provided with the application.

Mr. Saunders stated that he asked Mr. Diem that question at the last meeting but wasn't given a clear answer.

Mr. Moore stated that it is not uncommon for homes in this district to sit right on the front property line. A plan showing the proposed porch in relation to the property lines would be necessary prior to a building permit being issued. If the proposed porch were to constitute any encroachment into the public right-of-way, it could not be built.

Mr. Rose stated that the porch would be built where the existing stairs already are.

Mr. Moore explained that there are existing encroachments throughout the Historic District that are non-conforming, but these cannot be increased in their nature. First, the property lines would have to be determined. He added that the BAR could still act on a COA, but the applicant needed to realize that the porch still may not be able to be constructed.

Mr. Saunders disagreed, stating that if this item is denied and then he found out he couldn't build it out as far, he would not be able to come back with a new design. He suggested that the applicant get a plot plan first and verify that it can be done, then come back with the same design.

Mr. Lore stated that he would rather not move forward until a zoning decision can be made.

Mr. Nagely asked that the item be tabled.

*Mr. Belkin, seconded by Mr. Lore motioned to table BAR-08-48 until the applicant can obtain zoning approval.*

*Motion carried 5-0.*

**Mr. Belkin left the meeting.**

**BAR-08-55** Request of North Cameron Properties, LLC to recognize exterior changes sent to the Department of Historic Resources and Secretary of the Interior for 410 N. Cameron St and 403-415 N. Cameron St and Baker St.

Mr. Moore presented the plans that were sent to DHR and the Secretary of the Interior. He explained that Mr. Willingham will need approval in order to be granted a building permit.

Without a quorum present, the Board could not act on a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Sounders suggested that they could grant conceptual approval and have the applicant come back for a COA.

*Mr. Lore, second by Mr. Rockwood motioned to grant a conceptual approval of the design details with the condition that Mr. Willingham come back before the Board for materials and colors.*

*Motion carried 3-0*

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

None

### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Meeting Adjourned** 6:00 p.m.