

MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 26, 1989
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

Present

Mr. Robert Moje, Chairman
Robert Freer
Jean Hiatt
Larry Herbert

Absent

Doug Gilpin
Peggy Van Yahres
Don Sours

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

A. MINUTES

The minutes of the August 22, 1989, regular meeting were unanimously approved or corrected.

B. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. BAR 88-1-296

804 E. Jefferson Street
Landscape Plan
Carter-Gilmer Project

Mr. Boger stated that staff had reviewed the landscape plan and had the following comments:

- a. We feel a more substantial shade trees along the south bank would be more appropriate than the crabapples "snowdrift".
- b. We question the proposed use of Bradford pear trees between the cottage and the main house. This type of tree does not relate to the existing trees on this site.
- c. Additional landscaping needs to be added to the east bank.
- d. We would like to see some type of landscape edging at the entrance to the parking lot in order to separate the parking area from the sidewalk.

Ms. Nancy Long, architect, was present to explain in detail the proposed landscape plan. Several Board members expressed concern about the proposed use of Bradford pear and crabapple trees on this site because they appear to be inappropriate.

After considerable discussion, Mr. Herbert moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the landscape plan subject to the following conditions:

- i Ms. van Yahres and the Department of Community Development are authorized to administratively approve the type of shade trees to be used on the site. The proposed use of crabapple and Bradford pear trees are inappropriate. Also, if trees are to be planted in the area where the Bradford pear trees were to be placed, they must be natural deciduous trees.
- ii The two shade trees near the dumpster enclosure as shown on the approved site plan must be installed. However, these two trees can be a smaller shade tree type instead of one of the larger varieties.
- iii The fourteen Nellie Stevens hilly plants at the southwest corner by the steps can be added to and planted along on the east bank in clusters and be supplemented with other landscaping plants. In the area where the holly was to be located, junipers can be used on the slope. The Board recommends that this area be heavily mulched.
- iv No additional landscaping will be required at the entrance to the parking area.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Freer and unanimously passed by all members present.

3. BAR 89-7-329

414 Park Street, Repainting
John Zunka, Applicant

The Board voted to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness to repaint the exterior of the building the white color as proposed, and to authorize Mr. Boger to administratively approve the trim color.

4. BAR 89-8-332

616 Park Street,
New Dwelling
Mr. & Mrs Randall Brandt,
Applicant

Mr. Boger briefly presented the staff report. Mr. Stephen von Storch, architect, Mr. Ron Wiley, attorney, and Mr. and Mrs. Brandt were present to discuss in detail the revised plans with the Board.

Mr. von Storch told the Board that the design of the garage is not being reviewed at this time. Only its proposed location is shown on the plan. The landscape plan has not been changed. The roof of the dwelling will be dark charcoal gray asphalt shingles. A number of changes have been made to the design for the new house as requested by the Board.

Mr. A.E. Howard, 627 Park Street, addressed the Board and expressed concern about the use of asphalt shingles on the roof, the use of brick, and the proposed location of the house on the site. A number of other residents briefly spoke and expressed similar concerns to those of Mr. Howard.

BAR Minutes (September 26, 1989, meeting)
Page Three
October 27, 1989

The Chairman suspended the meeting at 4:45 p.m. and reconvened it at 5:10 p.m. at the site on Park Street. Mr. Stan Tatum, adjoining property owner, expressed concern about his lack of screening for the parking area, drainage and trees along the side yard.

Mr. Herbert said there appears to be a siting problem. We have the pastoral setting and the Campbell house. The proposed location may interfere with the original rhythm of space.

Mr. Wiley said the proposed dwelling is not a carriage house, but a home for the Brandts and should be viewed that way.

Several comments were made by area residents about the sidewalk and driveway. Mr. von Storch said the Brandts are willing to delete the sidewalk and connect the entry to the building via the driveway.

Mr. Herbert said there are differences of opinion associated with the project, and we will not be able to resolve all of them.

Ms. Hiatt said she would like to see metal or slate used on the roof instead of asphalt shingles. Also she would like to see the house pushed further back.

Mr. von Storch said the Brandts want to keep the large poplar tree and moving the house back will kill the tree's root. This type of tree is sensitive and disturbing the root system will kill it. This is a significant tree and the Brandts want to keep it.

Mr. Moje said the revised house plans are a significant improvement over the original plans and he could support approving the house in concept subject to resolving the other issues. Mr. Moje said he has a problem with the setback of the house. He would like to see the house pushed back to the terminus of the porch in the Campbell house.

Mr. Wiley said his clients would agree to delete the sidewalk as suggested and would be willing to use slate on the roof. However, they will not agree to changing the location of the house.

Mr. Moje said there are architectural ways to bridge the structure and save the tree.

Following further discussion Mr. Herbert moved to approve the design of the house subject to the following conditions:

- a. The roof will be slate or metal
- b. A sample of the brick and mortar color must be submitted for review and approval.
- c. A sample of the paint colors must be submitted for review and approval.
- d. The Board must review the final detail plans for the house, and deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed location of the building

as shown on the site plan. A revised site plan should be submitted at the next meeting.

Mr. Freer said he has concerns about separating the house from the site in this motion. The Board should either approve or deny the project in a single motion. Mr. Herbert said the intent of the motion is to show Mr. and Mrs. Brandt that we are trying to resolve the issues.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Hiatt and passed by the following vote:
Ayes: Hiatt, Moje, Herbert; Noes: Freer. Abstentions: None.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

There was none

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, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.