

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MINUTES

The Board of Architectural Review held its regularly scheduled meeting on, November 20, 2008 at 15 N. Cameron Street, at 4:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, Rouss City Hall.

PRESENT: L Belkin, M Lore, T Rockwood, P Farris and C Shore.
ABSENT: T Bandyke, and L Saunders.
STAFF: Zoning Administrator Vince Diem & Secretary Angela Walsh
VISITORS: Mr. Buckner & a Representative of M&M Properties.

MINUTES

After some discussion on a motion revision, Mr. Belkin asked that the minutes be brought back for a second review after they are edited.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

BAR-08-93 Request of M&M Properties to remodel a commercial building at 8-16 E Monmouth Street.

The applicant stated that the building is a 1950's garage that she would like to improve. She wasn't aware that they needed a building permit for siding, when she attempted to attain one she was told that she needed BAR approval first.

Mr. Belkin asked if the windows have been replaced as well.

She said that they have been replaced.

Mr. Farris stated that the entire structure is 1950's, there is nothing historic about it.

Mr. Lore asked what the building was being used for.

She stated that it houses four (4) apartments and a workshop.

Mr. Belkin stated that the issues are the siding and the windows. He asked what the siding is made of.

The applicant stated that it is beaded hardy siding.

Mr. Rockwood asked about the metal supported roof structure that's mentioned in the application.

She stated that they are little mini porch roofs that they want to add. They will be placed over the doors. She wanted to add architectural detail so that it is more fitting to the district.

Mr. Belkin stated that there are four (4) of those. He asked what supports them.

The applicant stated that they are supported by decorative brackets. There are no plans to place columns there.

Mr. Belkin stated that the guidelines discourage use of substitute material on principle elevations, however it doesn't rule it out in new construction. He explained that those rules are there to try to maintain historic character, which this building has none of. On a historic building with wood siding, the guidelines would not allow hardy plank, but this is not a historic building. He asked what the rest of the Board thought.

Mr. Farris stated that this is a non-contributing structure. This is not altering an historic structure, it post dates the era that the guidelines are trying to protect. He had no issues with using the hardy plank in this case.

Mr. Lore asked if she considered using wood on the front elevation

She stated that she had not, that cost and maintenance was a concern.

Mr. Rockwood stated that he is inclined to see it as new construction. He would expect it to have a wood front.

Mr. Lore stated that the circumstances are particular. He reminded the Board that the guidelines for new construction don't allow synthetics. Hardy plank was not known at the time the guidelines were written. As the product evolves and develops it would take on a lot of the wood characteristics.

Mr. Farris stated that this building is non-contributing. The garage door for instance, is 20th century. It would not be masking the buildings age, it would be bringing it visually into the surroundings, which would be an improvement. He reminded the Board that they were not dealing with a historic structure or brand new construction, so he was not opposed to using hardy plank. It will just be covering up cinder block.

Mr. Rockwood asked if she had permission to cover the attached property with siding as well.

She stated that they have permission to do the front and there is a privacy fence that blocks the side view.

Mr. Belkin stated that the hardy plank company also has a narrower exposure about 5 or 5 and a quarter which would have been more appropriate.

The applicant stated that the bead finish only comes in a 6 in the cedar mill.

Mr. Belkin stated that there is no trim board around the windows and the sash is vinyl. He asked what the surround is made of.

App stated that it is all vinyl. She explained that cost was an issue. There was nothing to save, not even the jam. It only had storm windows covering and they have to meet rental codes.

Mr. Farris stated that vinyl windows are tougher. He explained that the Board is not deaf to the cost but it is more difficult to approve, even with new construction.

Mr. Belkin stated that they have not allowed wood windows to be replaced with vinyl. Wood windows have been demanded because the guidelines are clear. Looking logically at what was started with, the selection seems reasonable.

Mr. Lore asked if there is some way to deal with the vinyl sashes.

She stated that they can be painted but then they would have to continue to re-paint it. She explained that they settled on that material to lessen the maintenance

Mr. Belkin stated that the older buildings look the way they do, due to the layers of maintenance. If the guidelines allowed building using synthetic materials that never needed maintained the district would look like Disneyland. He explained that part of the responsibility of owning a building in the historic district is that maintenance will be required.

Mr. Rockwood agreed. This building is unique in the problem it presents. Using wood would not persuade anyone that this is a historic structure. He felt that a wood for vinyl would not alter the character of this building. He had no problem with using a vinyl sash in this case.

Mr. Belkin suggested that the applicant come back with details on the roofettes.

Mr. Farris asked that sample brackets be brought when it is brought back to the Board.

The applicant stated that they will make the brackets themselves.

Mr. Belkin stated that the Board can't say whether or not the brackets are appropriate without knowing what they look like.

Mr. Lore asked if the meter box would be moved.

App explained that it will be painted because the electrician stated it can't be moved.

Mr. Lore suggested that she plant something in front of it to screen it.

Mr. Farris asked if the roofettes have been withdrawn from the application.

App stated that she will withdraw the roofettes and will resubmit the application with materials.

It was moved by M Lore, seconded by T Rockwood, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the BAR 08-93 as submitted. This approval is based on the fact that this work planned on this non-contributing structure is not replacing any material associated with contributing structures in the historic district.

Mr. Belkin suggested that the proposed roof units over the doors are not a part of the motion and that the applicant will come back with those materials.

Mr. Lore amended the motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the portions of BAR 08-93 dealing with siding and windows on the building with the understanding that the proposal to install the metal supported roof structure will be brought to the Board separately. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rockwood.

Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

BAR-08-94 Request of William Buckner to remodel an accessory building at 442 N. Loudoun Street.

Mr. Buckner stated that the corrugated metal was removed and he wanted to put on hardy plank and paint it to match the colors of the house.

Mr. Farris asked why he chose hardy plank instead of wood.

Mr. Buckner stated that it was the contractors suggested hardy plank.

Mr. Belkin stated that this location makes him wonder why the borders of the historic district are in these areas. It's in the backyard on an alley. He asked what sides the windows would go on.

Mr. Buckner stated that they would be on the south and east side. The garage door will face the alley.

Mr. Farris left the meeting.

Mr. Buckner stated that the windows on the west aren't visible. He asked to amend the application to repair the roof because it is in good shape, he would rather paint it.

Mr. Belkin stated that he has no problem with the lack of details in this case because of the location. The only problem he had was with the vinyl windows. He felt that the historic district was drawn too large and this shouldn't be in it, however you can clearly see all the houses. He felt that wood windows should be installed.

Mr. Lore asked why he is putting in so many windows. He suggested limiting the windows to be able to afford wood.

Mr. Buckner stated that the wood windows are more expensive. He suggested limiting it to one window on the south and north and not install the one on the rear.

Mr. Belkin felt that it would keep with the guidelines and was a great solution.

It was moved by T Rockwood, seconded by C Shore, to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to BAR-08-94 for the wooden pedestrian and garage doors, with wood windows on the north and south elevation and a vinyl window on the west elevation. The roof will remain the same but will be painted and smooth surface hardy plank siding will be installed. The colors will match the existing house.

Motion passed unanimously 4-0. (Mr. Farris left the meeting)

OLD BUSINESS

BAR-08-92 Request of the Winchester Rescue Mission to repair and remodel the building at 414 N. Loudoun St.

No one was present for this item. Mr. Belkin suggested that it will be moved to the next agenda.

OTHER DISCUSSION

None

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:13pm.