

*******DRAFT MINUTES*******

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, March 6, 2024
7:00 p.m., City Council Chamber
City Hall

Members Present:

James Spencer
Michael Lyons
Bud Adams
Nastaran Zandian
Theresa del Ninno

Members Absent: Andy Scott, Margaret Miller

Secretary: Bill Conkey, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Lanning Blaser, Senior Planning Technician

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review Public Hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Scott was absent. All other members were present.

II. MINUTES

Consideration of minutes from the February 21, 2024 meeting.

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review approved the February 21, 2024 Meeting minutes, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

New Business

3 BAR#2024-00038 OHAD

Request for alterations at 201 Gibbon Street
Applicant: Mary Denby with MHD Builds

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Ms. del Ninno, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the removal of the existing chimney and defer the replacement of the second floor windows at BAR#2024-00038. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

REASON

The applicant will explore options regarding the replacement of the two second floor windows.

SPEAKERS

Mary Denby, representing the owner, presented the proposed modifications.

Nick Kalivretenos, the Window Man, stated that he has reached out to various contractors in an effort to repair the window, but they have all said that the window cannot be repaired.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams asked the applicant for the reason for the removal of the proposed chimney. The applicant responded that the removal would allow for interior modifications to move forward.

Mr. Adams asked if the wood on the interior of the two windows is in a condition where it could be restored. The applicant noted that there is wood at the interior of the muntins.

Mr. Adams agreed with staff recommendations regarding the replacement of the two windows. He was concerned about the removal of the existing chimney, noting that the Design Guidelines discourage the removal of chimneys that are a character defining feature.

Mr. Lyons expressed concern that the existing windows cannot be restored. He supported the removal of the chimney noting that it is a secondary chimney.

Ms. Zandian stated that she was undecided on the removal of the chimney but supported the staff recommendations regarding the replacement of the windows.

Ms. Del Ninno supported the removal of the chimney as a secondary element and the repair of the windows in lieu of replacement.

Mr. Spencer introduced the discussion of re-building the window in lieu of replacement or repair. He noted that with much of the existing wood in degraded condition, the original glass is the most valuable part of the window. He noted that the window could be rebuilt in wood utilizing the original glazing.

The applicant clarified that there are other existing chimneys that will remain on the property and date to an earlier period. He further noted that staff administratively approved the replacement of other windows on the property with double pane windows and that if these are not replaced then they will not match. Mr. Conkey explained that staff had mistakenly approved windows that do not comply with the Administrative Approval Policy.

Ms. Del Ninno asked about the difference between the ground floor windows and the second floor windows in this area. Mr. Conkey explained that based on a staff site visit, the ground floor windows appear to be newer than the second floor windows and their replacement was approved through an administrative procedure.

Mr. Kalivretenos noted a previous correspondence between the applicant and staff that indicated that these windows could be replaced through an administrative review process. Mr. Conkey explained that a recent site visit associated with this submission uncovered the original fabric.

Mr. Spencer reiterated his request to the applicant that the existing window be re-built out of wood using the original historic glass.

4 BAR#2024-00040 OHAD

Request for alterations at 419 S Royal Street
Applicant: Old Presbyterian Meeting House

BOARD ACTION: On a motion by Mr. Lyons, and seconded by Ms. Zandian, the Board of Architectural Review voted to accept the request for deferral of BAR#2024-00040. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0.

REASON

SPEAKERS

Jim Beall, applicant representing the Old Presbyterian Meeting House, presented the project and explained the project objectives and summarized the application. He provided photos of numerous parking lot lights throughout OHAD that are taller than those proposed here.

Sean Murphy, 417 S. Royal, spoke in opposition, feeling that the proposed lights are not appropriate and that the light will intrude on his property.

Laura Campbell, 109 Harvard St, spoke in support.

Kevin Coyne, 418 South Pitt, expressed concern about the solar panels and wants the western light moved.

Robert Dunne, 914 Jefferson, spoke in support of the proposed lights, noting that other parking lots have similar lights.

Joseph McCoy, 421 Earl, spoke in support of the proposal, noting that parking lots do not have historic precedent; old lights do not function in an efficient manner.

Paul Anderson, 1306 Prince, appreciates the mix of residential and other uses, noting that a parking lot with lights is important.

Steve Milone, 907 Prince, felt that the design does not comply with guidelines and that bollards with warm lights would be appropriate.

Boyd Walker, 1307 King, said the proposed lights are inappropriate and too close to neighboring buildings.

Liz Walker, 405 Wilkes, felt that lights below the fenceline could provide adequate light and that a motion detector would set off light and intermittent intervals. In her opinion there is adequate light now and new lighting is not necessary.

Yvonne Callahan, 735 S. Lee, Old Town Civic Association, spoke in opposition, saying that solar panel bollard lights are available and that the proposal does not comply with City Code. She noted that Saint Mary's has installed compatible lights. She wants the solar panels at the west side removed from the proposal.

Mary Hill, 424 N. Peyton, discussed the need for a lighted parking lot.

Robert Wiles, 400 Cameron Station Blvd, noted that the existing light was in place when the neighbor purchased the property and that the neighbor has a southern exposure.

The applicant explained that they had originally requested leeway to work with owners on the neighboring properties. Illustrations in the application package include one or two panel options. They are concerned about lowered solar panels and noted that Saint Mary's lights are taller than those proposed for this site. At Saint Mary's the bollards are part of the walkway, not the parking lot itself, and the parking lot lights are much taller than those proposed for the OPMH lot. The photometrics demonstrate the light spill and indicate that it barely reaches 417 S. Royal. Also, everything proposed complies with City Code.

DISCUSSION

Board questions after presentation:

Mr. Spencer asked how light poles will be anchored if the concrete bases are removed and is there concern about cars hitting the poles if the bases are removed. Mr. Beall explained that the lights would have below grade concrete foundations with bollards in front for protection. Mr. Spencer also expressed concern about headroom clearance with solar panels at fence height on N side.

Ms. Del Ninno asked about foot candle study and if cutting the pole would be possible. Tom Moser, OPMH, explained that cutting off base would make it impossible to attach the pole to a footing. Also, the pole is tapered so the fixture itself cannot be moved lower on the pole.

Ms. Zandian asked if the poles must be moved after being lowered. Mr. Beall explained that it would be simpler to move them but will keep them in place if the BAR prefers. Ms. Zandian also asked if these lights were in place before 2020. Mr. Beall explained that there were two 15'5" lights (6" taller than these poles) in the lot prior to 2020: one on west side and one on south. Ms. Zandian also asked when church activities end, which Mr. Beall explained changes depending on the activity. The lights are on timers to shut off a certain amount of time after sunset. Those times can be changed based on the usage of the lot.

Mr. Lyons asked if the original lights were electric and could the new lights be electric. Mr. Beall explained that they could not find where the electric service came from and that Dominion Electric didn't know either. The lights no longer work. Dominion said it would be very challenging to fix them. Solar powered lights support Eco-City agenda. Mr. Lyons also asked about the trees.

Mr. Adams asked if there are City streetlights nearby. Mr. Beall noted there is one near SE corner of property which does not shed light onto the parking lot. Mr. Adams noted that the BAR does not take trees and landscaping into consideration. A long discussion on trees and potentially trimming trees ensued.

Mr. Spencer asked Mr. Conkey as to whether or not these lights had been approved. Mr. Conkey explained that they were, but the approval has expired so this is to be considered a new application. The proposal is to lower the previously-approved lights by 2'.

Ms. Del Ninno asked questions about battery capacity and length of illumination. Mr. Beall said that in the winter, they would probably be on for 5 hours after sunset, although it would be longer if

they hold a Christmas Eve service. The battery is limited to a 6 – 7 hour time period. Ms. Del Ninno asked if one panel would be sufficient. According to the manufacturer, two are required.

Discussion after the hearing was closed to the public:

Mr. Adams would prefer more and shorter lights that are compatible with adjacent residential properties. He felt that the solar panels are too large and would like to know if shorter lights would be possible.

Mr. Lyons had hoped for a resolution between the parties. He felt that the proposed lights are not appropriate and that the applicant should pursue other options. He also felt that the solar panels should not be included in the project.

Ms. Zandian felt that the lights should be warmer and that the applicant should consider other options that are more compatible.

Ms. Del Ninno appreciates the lowered panels and wondered if there is an option to increase battery life or make the panel smaller. She noted that parking lots need tall lights in order to ensure that the entire lot, including the center, is lit.

Mr. Spencer found the fixture height acceptable and that the design would be okay if the panels could be reduced in size. He felt that the light temperature should be warmer and that bollard lights would not work. It's possible that more appropriate fixtures may exist. He asked the applicant if they would like to request a deferral so that they may work with the neighbors and also get more information from the light manufacturer which they could explain to the Board. Mr. Beall said they would be happy to continue to work with Mr. Murphy. He asked for clarification as to exactly what information the Board wants from the manufacturer: adjustable temperature, a smaller solar panel, and a larger battery. Mr. Spencer advised that the applicant should try to get rid of one of the solar panels if possible.

Mr. Lyons requested they return with a completely different option.

Mr. Spencer asked that staff research appropriate parking lot lights, identifying any historically appropriate fixtures.

Mr. Beall asked if the Board finds the new lights at Safeway and Saint Mary's School appropriate.

Mr. Moser asked if the Board would grandfather in the previous lights that were in place prior to the existing ones, which they still have. They were from 40 years ago, a pole with lanterns with 360 degree lighting. Mr. Conkey would have to check with Code to make sure they comply with current regulations.

Mr. Moser asked the Board for clarification: they are asking the applicant to abandon the investment they made based on the 2020 Board approval, delayed by Covid, installed according to the 2020 approval.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review adjourned at 9:35 pm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

BAR2024-00030 OHAD

Request for signage at 823 S Washington Street

Applicant: Prankies Kitchen and Cocktail Bar

BAR2024-00046 OHAD

Request for signage at 829 S Washington Street

Applicant: Old Town Kitchens Inc.

BAR2024-00048 OHAD

Request for deck replacement at 727 Ford's Landing Way

Applicant: Kathleen Turner

BAR2024-00049 PG

Request for window replacements at 718 N Columbus Street

Applicant: Eric Bodley

BAR2024-00051 PG

Request for front door replacement at 211 N Payne Street

Applicant: Wendy J Lereah

BAR2024-00052 OHAD

Request for roofing replacement at 328 S Lee Street

Applicant: Ricardo Navarro

BAR2024-00055 OHAD

Request for hand railings and alterations at 208 S Saint Asaph Street

Applicant: Virginia Bennett

BAR2024-00056 OHAD

Request for front step repairs at 1020 Prince Street

Applicant: Todd Pickell, Vaughan Restoration Masonry

BAR2024-00060 OHAD

Request for gas lamp installation at 611 Cameron Street

Applicant: Edward Reynolds

BAR2024-00061 OHAD

Request for fence installation and spot lights at 626 S Saint Asaph Street

Applicant: Laura Herron

BAR2024-00063 OHAD

Request for signage at 115 S Union Street, Suite A

Applicant: Creation Sign LLC/ Hee Jin Chang

BAR2024-00068 OHAD

Request for gas lantern replacement at 311 Queen Street
Applicant: Terry Maiden

BAR2024-00069 OHAD

Request for window replacements at 416 S Pitt Street
Applicant: Michele Cappelle

BAR2024-00070 OHAD

Request for door replacements at 700 S Fairfax Street
Applicant: Ronalda Meson