

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, January 19, 2012 at 4:01 p.m. in Council Chambers at Rouss City Hall, 15 North Cameron Street.

POINTS OF ORDER

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

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Patrick Farris moved, seconded by Don Crigler, to approve the minutes of January 5, 2012, as amended. Cathy Shore abstained.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

PUBLIC HEARING

BAR-11-728 Request of Alec Bouldin, Shandin Properties, LLC., for approval of demolition of an addition at 427 North Loudoun Street (*Map Number 173-01-I-33-><01*) pursuant to Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Farris opened the public hearing

Mr. Alec Bouldin, applicant, stated that the rear structure is lacking integrity and is basically a barn that was added onto the house and built with old furring strips with no bottom plates, some sitting directly on the ground and are rotted. The chimney that lies atop of the structure, inside is supported with old 2x4 and lathe strips, which makes it very unstable. He said that the only historic significance could be the German siding. He said that the addition they intend to replace it with will probably have more historic significance than the existing one. He said that they would use painted lathe board, reclaimed wood windows to match, gingerbread and exterior doors that are old to replace in the back. He said that as it sits now, it does nothing for the street and he believes that the addition will brighten up the area.

Chairman Farris closed the public hearing

Mr. Crigler said that he had no issues with the request, and Chairman Farris agreed.

Chairman Farris asked Mr. Diem if he had any comments to add, to which he added that staff has no objections with partial demolition of the addition at the rear of the structure. He said that because of this he felt that it had not been necessary to incorporate a staff report in the agenda packet as he did on another case before the Board at another meeting.

*Don Crigler moved, seconded by Catherine Shore, to grant a certificate of appropriateness for **BAR-11-728** - Request of Alec Bouldin, Shandin Properties, LLC., for approval of demolition of an addition at 427 North Loudoun Street (Map Number 173-01-I-33-><01) pursuant to Section 14-3-2 of the Winchester Zoning Ordinance, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.*

OLD BUSINESS

BAR 11-723 Request of Alec Bouldin, Shandin Properties, LLC., for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construction a two story addition at rear of structure and to install a dog eared, 4x4x8 wood fence at 427 North Loudoun Street.

Chairman Farris said that the detail was what they requested, including especially the fence and its appearance. He also noted that the applicant intended to reclaim windows as feasible and reuse them where possible as well as German siding. He said these things lend to the integrity of the overall appearance.

Chairman Farris noticed that both porches' columns matched one another. Mr. Bouldin stated that they would attempt to make the brick peers the same. Mr. Crigler asked if it would be a full height wood column on the side porch. The applicant stated that they intended to match the front porch with brick peers to the side porch if possible. He said that they would be reclaiming brick as much as possible for the peers. Chairman Farris said that it sounded different from the drawing that was submitted to the board, of the parged block foundation, it looked like the columns were affixed internally to that parged block foundation. He said that he was referring to the north elevation. Chairman Farris said that he did not have a problem with the applicant reproducing the peers; he just wanted to point out that it was different from what was submitted. He said that he was fine with it, and Mr. Crigler added that he should submit a new drawing. Mr. Crigler said that he should make the porch larger because the brick peers would be 16"x16" and the columns were 8x8. The applicant asked if it would hold up the request. Mr. Crigler said that they would approve the application as is, but if the applicant decided to make a change, to bring it to the Board between when he does. Chairman Farris said that it wouldn't stop the applicant from beginning work and he should have plenty of time to resubmit a drawing if he decided to make the change. Mr. Crigler asked for clarification on the size and location of the attic vent from the applicant. Mr. Bandyke asked if there was going to be a concrete poured pad on it. The applicant said that it would be concrete with little to no step down because it's almost ground level so it will be a small concrete pad. He said that at the current time there is a large rock ledge in the driveway, so they will see how they can manipulate that when they do the alterations. He doesn't see much of a pad there. Mr. Bandyke asked for clarification of the location of brick on the porch underneath the fence depicted on the drawings. The applicant said that it was an idea they threw around because the porch sits on brick peers and columns that support the roof. Mr. Bandyke asked if the applicant would install gingerbread on the rear (west) elevation. The applicant said that they would do it on the front and sides because you can't see the rear from the street. Mr. Bandyke said that it wasn't necessary.

Mr. Bandyke asked what type of siding the applicant planned to use on the addition. The applicant said that the original structure is wood lathe siding and the addition at the rear is German siding. He said they intended to use lathe siding with the same width as the existing on the back to match the front. Mr. Bandyke asked what the exposure was of the existing siding and the applicant responded that it was 4 inches.

Chairman Farris asked Mr. Diem if the setbacks were in order, he said they were.

Chairman Farris moved, seconded by Mr. Bandyke, to grant a certificate of appropriateness for BAR 11-723 Request of Alec Bouldin, Shandin Properties, LLC., to construction a two story addition at rear of structure and to install a dog eared, 4x4x8 wood fence at 427 North Loudoun Street, with the attic vent on the West elevation being made larger and placed flush with the fascia board.

Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant if the gable on the west elevation projected out and the applicant confirmed that it did.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Farris reminded the applicant that the Board had approved his request exactly as submitted, so if he wanted to make any changes later to the porch he would need to bring them back to the Board for review and can provide a drawing of just what he wants to change.

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 stated that the Board had had an opportunity to see the subject shed which is visible from a right of way, the alley behind Braddock and Fairmont Streets.

Mr. Chris Eyre asked the Board if they had the updated drawings and addressed the Board's concerns about material choices. Chairman Farris said that the original application mentioned vinyl, and the applicant said that he would be changing that to wood frame. He said that he was trying to find old wood windows without grids but that it was difficult to find them. The applicant said that the shed would be board and batten with a metal roof with colors to match the main house. Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant to confirm the material for the siding; the applicant stated that it would be either Hardy plank or real wood siding. The applicant said that he was veering away from Hardy plank because of the cost. Mr. Bandyke asked the applicant if he would install the siding on the vertical if he used Hardy plank. The applicant said that it would be a vertical 12" board and batten if he used it. The Board and the applicant discussed the types of Hardy plank made and the dimensions.

Mr. Crigler asked about the garage door. The applicant said that the door will slide to one side. He said that he was going to use the original eight foot door but cut it down to six feet. The applicant said that he had made a mistake on the drawings and Mr. Crigler suggested that they get updated ones. The applicant said that the scale was all the same, he had just drawn over the door that was there already. Chairman Farris asked if the French doors were pocket doors. The applicant said that they will swing open. Mr. Bandyke confirmed with the applicant that he would have one sliding door and one French door. The applicant said that the interior is split into two areas, a workshop and a garden shed.

Chairman Farris said that he would like to go ahead especially since the applicant could not be at the last meeting. He assured the applicant that the Board had no interest in delaying him; however, as Mr. Crigler pointed out they would like to have updated drawings. He said that they are fine, but they give a less than clear idea of what the applicant wants to do. He said that typically when there is new construction, the drawings are more detailed with dimensions

especially so there can be a record of what was done. He said most applicants do this. Chairman Farris said that he isn't an architect; he's an historian, so he defers to the others on the Board who are in these matters. The applicant stated that the drawings that he was passing out to them were new. Chairman Farris said that if the other Board members were comfortable accepting the drawings received today of the new material, then he would be fine with it. He asked the Board if the applicant needed to resubmit the drawings for approval. Mr. Crigler asked if the applicant was constructing the shed himself. He said that he was but would have help from a Class C to do the framing. Mr. Bandyke asked if it going to be a post foundation and the applicant said that it would be. Chairman Farris said that before they went further was the Board comfortable with this, and Mr. Bandyke said that he was still deciding. Chairman Farris said that to him the design was fine considering the location, even though it will be visible from some public rights of way. Chairman Farris asked the applicant if the paint scheme was going to match the house and the he said that it would. Chairman Farris said that the scale was acceptable as well. Chairman Farris asked Mr. Diem if the definition of the structure was of any concern to any of the other boards, stating that he knew that on other occasions there had been issue with a structure appearing to be another dwelling. Mr. Diem stated that it was not an issue, it was an accessory structure. The applicant stated that it was a garden shed. Mr. Bandyke asked if the French doors would be wood doors, the applicant stated that they would. Mr. Bandyke asked if there would be any composite, the applicant said no and that he had not purchased them yet. Mr. Bandyke let the applicant know that he could not install any plastic, he must use wood or hardy, have a metal roof, and no aluminum gutters on the structure. The applicant said that he was not installing gutters. Mr. Bandyke said that he may want them and that they should be ½ round, and the applicant stated that anything he did would match the main house. Mr. Bandyke asked what the floor would be, the applicant stated that he hadn't decided what the floor would be, he said it would be raised OSB with tile or vinyl. Mr. Bandyke asked if it would have electricity, and the applicant said that there would be and that there was in the past. Mr. Bandyke asked if the applicant was tearing down an existing structure and he said he was. The applicant stated that the building had been condemned. Mr. Diem said that the Building Official had rendered it unsafe. The applicant stated that he is replacing the existing structure. Mr. Crigler said that he didn't have objections to the design; he would like to have a better record of the exterior. He said that as a Board they are more concerned with the exterior look than the function of the interior. He said that what they look for is a record of what is being built, so that they can say they approved particular designs. The applicant asked what is was missing on his drawings. Mr. Crigler said that they were missing straight lines, dimensions, more of an architectural presentation. The Board discussed with the applicant what appropriate drawings looked like. Mr. Crigler stated that the scale was off on the drawings and pointed discrepancies on the drawings as to the dimensions. The applicant was more than happy to make adjustments because he was eager to get going on his project. Mr. Crigler stated that what they were looking for was something that they could place in a file and say, this was what we approved. The applicant said that he wondered what dimensions he was missing. He said that he felt he was being fairly detailed with the dimensions he noted. Mr. Crigler said that there was one side elevation and he assumed that the other side would be the same. The applicant said that it was. The Board showed the applicant on his drawings what he was missing. The applicant said that he could come back next week but he really wanted to get started on the job. Mr. Crigler asked if the existing building was down, the applicant said no. Mr. Crigler said that that could come down in two weeks. The applicant said that he has a bunch of stuff in it and once he takes down the building he wants to be able to start on the new one. Mr. Bandyke said that the Board was there two weeks ago when this case was on the agenda, but the applicant did not attend. He said that if the applicant had attended then the Board would have told him then what they were telling him at this meeting, to which at this meeting in all probability, he could have gotten a certificate of appropriateness for the request. The applicant said that he had gotten an email telling him that vinyl was unacceptable,

specifying what to do to submit again, and to be sure to attend the next meeting, so he did that. He said that he is hoping to get sign off and if he can't he will come back. He explained to the Board what he had done to improve his drawings and stated that he could write in the information that the Board needed. Chairman Farris said that he didn't want to give the applicant the impression that the Board was being obstructionist; he used the example of the requests made of the prior applicant and what information they expected. He stated that he didn't expect the applicant to have computer software to generate plans, but the final record needed to be clear and legible by people besides the Board well into the future because often precedent is looked at by future applicants, and that drawing is record of what was done. The applicant stated that he understood. Chairman Farris said that he was comfortable with asking the applicant to come back with more a detailed application that included clearer drawings and lines that Mr. Crigler was asking for. He said that the two weeks between meetings would give the applicant time to satisfy the requirements of the Board and begin the demolition of the existing structure. Chairman Farris stated that he did not want to give the impression that the Board was obstructionist, but that they do need to follow the standards. The applicant that he was looking at what he had and he stated that he wanted to know succinctly and clearly what additional information he needed to present. Mr. Bandyke said that the applicant might want to use a ruler to straighten out lines, and to try to make it look more informative by including everything. He said that the applicant did not have to be perfect but did need to include all the dimensions. Mr. Bandyke said that at this point they did not have it on paper and this would be included in the minutes to become part of the permanent record. The applicant stated that even after that being said, he still wondered what information was required. Mr. Crigler gave examples of fascia sizes, brick sizes, making sure there is a 9 to 12 pitch, window sizes, what kind of lights he would use. He discussed the differences between the side elevation and rear and the difference in the windows. He said that the applicant needed to make a decision, put it on the drawings, and bring it back to the Board. Mr. Crigler said the drawings were inconsistent, that he needed to clean up the exterior drawings, because that was what the Board focused on. He said that the Board was all right with the concept and design; all they needed were more details. Chairman Farris said that if the applicant wasn't sure of something to err on the side of caution and add information. The applicant stated that he thought he was and that he had pretty much everything mentioned in the plan, not all on one page. Chairman Farris stated that the applicant did not have all of the information, i.e., dimensions. Mr. Crigler gave the example of a corner piece in the drawing and that if the applicant had someone who was helping him with the siding they could advise him as to what they would use. Mr. Crigler and the applicant discussed what was needed at the corners with board and batten siding. Mr. Bandyke asked if the black metal roof was a standing seam pre-painted black metal roof. The applicant asked if it mattered and stated that he was going to have a roofing company put the roof on. Mr. Bandyke gave an example stating that if this were a house, to which the applicant stated he could understand the needs if this were a house. Mr. Bandyke said that the qualifications were the same in the historic district by commanding the same attention. Mr. Bandyke explained to the applicant the types of roves that were acceptable. Mr. Crigler said that it appeared that the applicant was using an acceptable type of roof, but due to the lack of detail they needed to clarify what his intention was and needed it on the drawings. Mr. Bandyke said that he understood the applicants' frustration but that the devil was in the details and it was important that they had the exact information in order to approve what was being done. He said that the applicant would need to follow the approved details in his work and that if he didn't he would need to remove what was done and construct accordingly. He stated that the Board was trying to avoid that for the applicant. Chairman Farris asked if the foundation was concrete and to make sure it was on the drawings.

Chairman Farris moved, seconded by Mr. Crigler, to table the request until the February 2, 2012 meeting to allow the applicant more time to provide further detail to the Board.

OTHER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:42 pm.