

MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
JUNE 27, 1989
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

Present:

Robert Freer, Vice Chairman
Douglas Gilpin
Larry Herbert
Margaret Van Yahres
Jean Hiatt
Don Sours

Absent:

Robert Moje

Staff Present:

Fred M. Boger

Mr. Freer called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. and called for consideration of the minutes.

A. MINUTES

The minutes of the May 23, 1989 meeting were approved as corrected.

B. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 89-6-326

632 Ridge Street
Replace Steps
Otis Lee, Applicant

Mr. Boger stated that Mr. Otis Lee has submitted an application to replace the front wooden steps on the building at 632 Ridge Street with brick steps. The brick to be used will match the existing brick on the porch. Mr. Lee is also proposing to change the surface of the porch from wood to concrete. The reason for this change is that water is leaking into the room below the porch. The wood surface has been replaced, but it has not solved the water problem.

We have reviewed this application and have the following comments:

- a. This building has historically had wooden front steps. We feel that the use of brick steps will significantly alter the exterior appearance of this building.
- b. We cannot support the use of concrete for the surface of the front porch because it would be introducing a new material on this historic structure. We understand Mr. Lee's problem and would consider the use of brick on the surface of the porch if it is appropriately designed.

Mr. Lee was present and explained to the Board why the proposed change in materials was necessary. After a lengthy discussion, the Board voted to deny the application because the application did not contain sufficient details which could be used in determining the appropriateness of the proposed work.

2. BAR 86-6-327

500 Court Square
New Railings & Steps
John B. Hull, Applicant

Mr. Boger stated that Mr. John B. Hull, President, 500 Court Square Association has submitted an application to construct a wooden fence 42" high around the two lower housings on the roof at 500 Court Square. This fence is necessary to protect people from falling. There would also be two sets of stairs - one 8-ft. 10" tall and the other 4-ft. 8" tall. Since the work is well set back from the edge of the main roof (ten stories high), little, if anything, could be seen from the street. The fence will be painted red and the stairs stained green.

We have reviewed this application and have no major objections to it. In fact we believe the owners of the building should take advantage of the view from the rooftop of this building.

Mr. Hull was present and briefly responded to several questions from the Board. Following the discussion the Board voted to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that Mr. Hull meet with a representative of the Department of Community Development in December to determine if the railings and stairs should be painted (or stained) and, if so, what color they should be painted.

3. BAR 89-6-328

1204 Rugby Road
New Fence/Tree Removal
Tom & Kemp Hill, Applicants

Mr. Boger stated that the description of the proposed work is clearly presented in the attached letter from Van Yahres Associates, Landscape Architects. Also, Ms. Kemp has explained in detail the reasons for the proposed change to the exterior grounds of Stonefield.

We have reviewed the proposal and find that it has been well thought out and recommend approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Also, we would like to thank Mr. & Mrs. Hill for being sensitive to the architectural heritage of this historic building and grounds. This extra effort on their part will significantly enhance the exterior appearance of this building and grounds.

Ms. Van Yahres, representing Mr. and Mrs. Hill presented the plans to the Board and explained in detail the design of the picket fence. Several Board members expressed their concern about the proposed half-inch spacing of the pickets along the Rugby Road side of the property; they felt that the spacing should be at least one to two inches.

Following a lengthy discussion, the Board voted to approve the plan with the condition that the applicants and their landscape architect restudy the the Rugby Road section of the fence for the height and spacing of the wood members,

with the idea (potential) of increasing the spacing between the pickets. Also, the applicant should study the detail at the top of the posts to determine if it would still be appropriate for the fence. Once this work is considered, the revised elevation drawing for the Rugby Road section of the fence is to be resubmitted for review and approval. The Board members indicated that they would be willing to look at the revised drawing individually instead of waiting until their regular meeting in July.

Ms. Van Yahres abstained from voting on this application due to a conflict of interest.

The revised drawings were submitted on June 29, 1989, and they were approved by the Board with Mr. Sours voting "no" and Mrs. Van Yahres abstaining.

4. BAR 89-5-325

1512 E. Market St - Addition
Republic Capitol Corp. Applicant

Mr. Boger stated we have reviewed the revised elevation drawings; the roof pitch has been lowered and the design of the windows modified for the addition. We feel that these modifications to the original design improve the compatibility of the addition to the existing house. However, final details for the addition and site must be submitted for approval.

Mr. Blake Hurt, representing Republic Capitol Corp., was present and discussed at length the plans for this project. Following the lengthy discussion the Board voted to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition, subject to the following conditions:

- a. The Board accepted the change in the window design on the northwest elevation to wood two over two windows. It is the Board's understanding that the visual impact of the wall will be softened by landscaping. The proposed landscape plan to screen this wall must be submitted for review and approval.
- b. Although the Board prefers a metal roof on the addition, it accepted Mr. Hurt's explanation why it cannot be done. A sample of the roof shingle and a color sample of the paint for the existing metal roof must be submitted for review and approval. The Department of Community Development is authorized to administratively approve the shingle color and metal roof color after consulting one of the architect members of the Board.
- c. The Board reaffirmed its earlier decision on allowing the use of masonite siding on the proposed addition. A sample of the paint to be used on the exterior of the addition and existing building must be submitted to the Department of Community Development for review and approval.

- d. The existing trees must be accurately identified on the final plan by species and size. Also any trees to be removed must be shown.
- e. A tree protection plan must be submitted for review and approval.
- f. The use of Bradford pear trees to screen the parking area is not appropriate for this site. The parking area should be screened with a low year-round screen. The Board is aware that three new shade trees must be provided, and a white ash would be an acceptable species for these trees. The trees may be located elsewhere on the site; however consideration should be given to locating them at the entrance to enhance the entry on to the property. The screen around the parking area and the required new trees must be shown on the final landscape plan.
- g. The Board expressed concern about the proposed use of a chain-link fence along the southern boundary of the property. A natural fence or screen should be developed from the Market Street entrance and extend back past the parking area. The natural fence must be shown on the final landscape plan which must be approved by the Board.
- h. Final plans for the addition with details and dimensions must be submitted.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Don Sours briefly discussed with the Board his concerns on the type and quality of information required for Certificate of Appropriateness applications. The Board agreed that it should review their checklist to see if any changes are necessary.

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were none

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none

F. BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS

There were none

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
AUGUST 22, 1989
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM**

Present

Mr. Robert Moje, Chairman
Robert Freer
Larry Herbert
Margaret Van Yahres
Jean Hiatt
Don Sours

Absent

Douglas Gilpin

Staff Present

Satyendra Singh Huja
Glenn Larson

Mr. Moje called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and called for consideration of the minutes.

A. MINUTES

The minutes of the June 27, 1989 regular meeting were unanimously approved as corrected.

B. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 89-8-331

Rear Wall Replacement

Mrs. Purcell, the applicant, made a brief statement about the proposed project and the need to proceed as quickly as possible. She noted the expense involved and that she had worked with an engineer in reviewing the new design. Mr. Huja explained that a bond should be posted to insure completion of the project. There was general concern about the cost of the porridge coat. Mr. Sours stated that the wall should be structurally engineered and that some financial assurance should be given that the porridge coat would be applied. Mr. Moje suggested that the color match the abutting wall of the Van Groll property. Based on this discussion, Mr. Sours moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal be approved as submitted with the following conditions:

- a. The wall is properly engineered for structural soundness.
- b. A bond be posted assuring that the wall will receive a porridge coat within one year of today's date.
- c. The color of this coat match the color of the abutting wall of the Van Groll property.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Herbert and approved unanimously by all members present.

Mr. Von Storch, the architect representing the applicant, gave a brief overview of the project. Mr. Moje pointed out that the right to build on the site was not an issue, and that the board needed to concentrate on the design proposed. A number of members of the public gave brief statements about their concerns. Mrs. Ashlyn Smith suggested, among other things, that the proposed house should be aligned with the Campbell house. Mr. Stan Tatum noted the drainage problems at the rear of his property caused, in part, by run-off from the site. He felt that assurance should be given that drainage problems should be addressed. There was additional discussion about the proposed design and its completeness. Some time was spent discussing some possible design modifications suggested by Douglas Gilpin. Mr. Von Storch said he would take these ideas into consideration, and noted they were legally required to assure that construction on the site would not increase run-off. There was additional discussion about landscaping, sidewalk alignment, fencing and brick varieties.

There was general agreement that the application should be deferred until the next meeting, at which time the board could review amended designs based on suggestions made. It was agreed that the board need more detail on such things as materials proposed for the roof and driveway, as well as final brick and mortar samples, a revised landscape design that accommodates drainage requirements and a different sidewalk design. Based on this consensus, Mr. Freer moved deferral of this application until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Hiatt and approved unanimously. Mr. Herbert noted that he had a business relationship with the Brandts but not with this particular application.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

The board asked about the status of a couple of pending projects. It was agreed to defer the election of officers until Mr. Boger could review the current terms of the board members

D. MATTERS BROUGHT BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was none.

E. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

There was none

F. BOARD MEMBER'S REPORT

Mr. Freer noted that he was concerned that his next door neighbor was planning to cut down a tree in his back yard.

G. DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT

There was none.