## MINUTES OF THE

## BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

APRIL 23, 1991

Present:

Absent:

Larry Herbert
Margaret Van Yahres
Todd Bullard
Jean Hiatt
Courtney Sargeant

Kurt Wassenaar Blake Caravati

Staff Present:

Fred Boger

## A. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS

1. BAR 91-04-356

361 N. First Street New Wall Maj. Jeffrey F. Addicott, Applic.

Mr. Boger said that Major Addicott has recently removed a small retaining wall adjacent to the south side of his dwelling, and constructed a new retaining wall using the same type of brick used on the rear porch enclosure.

We have reviewed the wall and if the request had come to us earlier, our recommendation would have been for a rock wall to match the wall in front. However, the work has been completed, and it is not a significant change to the building and, as a result, staff has no objections recommending approval of the brick wall as constructed.

After a brief discussion, Ms. Van Yahres moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new wall recently constructed on the south side of the property. The Board also brought to Mr. Addicott's attention the requirement that any future exterior changes to his building or grounds which are visible from a public street or place, must be approved by the Board before they are made.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Sargeant and unanimously passed by all members present.

2. BAR 91-04-357

801 E. High Street Exterior Improvements C. Carson Talley, Applicant

Mr. Boger said staff had reviewed the information submitted, and believed that the proposed work will significantly improve this building which is in need of maintenance and repair. However, staff has the following concerns with the proposed work:

BAR Minutes (April 23, 1991) Page Two June 19, 1991

- a. The proposed brick paver for use in the walks, and handicapped ramp does not appear appropriate for use with the existing brick on the building. Also, the color of the new brick should be more compatible with the existing brick.
- b. We understand the need for the repair work under the front window, and filling in of the holes in the building. However, the mortar color used for this repair work is too light and should be replaced with mortar that closely matches the existing mortar color. Allied concrete has a number of mortar samples which would be used to try and match the existing mortar color.
- c. A sample of the mortar to be used for the walkways and handicapped ramp must be submitted for review and approval.

Mr. Kurt Train, Architect, Ms. C. Cason Talley and Mr. Lawrence Whitlock were present, and discussed with the Board the proposed work for the exterior of the building. After a brief discussion, Ms. Van Yahres, moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as presented with the condition that the porch is painted or stained the same color as the front door. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hiatt and unanimously passed by all members present.

3. DBAR 91-04-358

540 Park Street, New Cottage R.S. & J.M. Tatum, Applicants

Mr. & Mrs. Tatum are proposing to build a small cottage on the rear of their lot at 540 Park Street. After reviewing the plans we have the following comments:

- a. The applicants are proposing to install a couple of new materials which have not been used in the historic district for new residential construction. The Board is requested to carefully consider these new materials before approving them.
- b. The design of the cottage should complement the main house and not detract from it.
- c. The main house has a metal roof. The applicants have proposed to use a fiberglass shingle roof for the cottage. We believe a metal roof may be more appropriate to use on the cottage in order to match the roof on the main house.
- d. The exterior of the cottage will have masonite beaded siding. The main structure presently has stucco siding. Stucco siding may be more appropriate for use on the cottage in order to maintain a harmonious relationship with the main building.
- e. There is no indication on their plans as to the type of windows to be used on the cottage. We believe the windows should be wood casement windows.

BAR Minutes (April 23, 1991) Page Three June 19, 1991

The windows on the north elevation should also be the same as on the front.

- f. The foundation will apparently be block which will be embossed to look like brick. This may not be an appropriate material for use in the Architectural Design Control District. We prefer to see the foundation constructed with brick instead of block.
- g. The elevation drawings show lattice on the front porch and on the side addition. The front porch should have individual spindles instead of lattice.
- h. The lattice on the shed appears to be inappropriate for use in this building.
- i. The edge of the roof should remain on the same line instead of stepping down as proposed. This off-set does not appear to be appropriate for use on the cottage.
- j. All trees on the site that are to be removed must be identified and the reasons for their removal stated.
- k. Prior to issuance of any building permits for the cottage, the applicants will have to have the lot subdivided into two lots. This will require a new sidewalk along Farish Street the full length of both lots.

Ms. Judy Tatum was present and discussed at length the proposed design for the cottage. Following discussion, the Board concluded that it could not approve the application at this time, but would defer action on it to allow Mr. and Mrs. Tatum to study the following comments:

- a. The window height on the second floor may not meet building code requirements.
- b. There are too many new materials being proposed for this building, such as the masonite beaded siding, PVC lattice, and painted brick embossed block. In order to respect the architectural character of the District, authentic materials need to be used.
- c. The cottage has too many architectural styles associated with it. The Board prefers one style be used which is compatible with the architectural character of the District.
- d. The porch height on the side may not meet the Building Code requirements
- e. The proposed lattice may not comply with the Building Code requirements
- f. The Board prefers to see another roof material used instead of the proposed fiberglass shingle.

BAR Minutes (April 23, 1991) Page Four June 19, 1991

- g. The porch should have vertical spindles instead of lattice for the railing
- h. The roofs along Farish Street have eaves on them. This building should reflect this architectural feature because it would give more character to it.
- i. Windows on the rear should be the same as the ones on the front
- j. The cottage should be situated on the site plan parallel to Farish Street
- k. Concrete bricks should be used for the foundation instead of embossed block.

## 2. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

FMB/vm