

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

Board of Architectural Review
Wednesday, February 3, 2021
7:00 p.m., Virtual Public Hearing
Zoom Webinar

Members Present: Christine Roberts, Chair
Purvi Irwin
John Sprinkle
Robert Adams
Lynn Neihardt
Christine Sennott

Members Absent: James Spencer, Vice Chair

Secretary: William Conkey, AIA, Historic Preservation Architect

Staff Present: Stephanie Sample, Historic Preservation Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Spencer was absent. All other members were present at the meeting by video conference.

Ms. Roberts stated that Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic emergency, the February 3, 2021 meeting of the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) is being held electronically pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2 3708.2(A)(3), the Continuity of Government ordinance adopted by the City Council on June 20, 2020 or Section 4-0.01(g) in HB29 and HB30, enacted by the 2020 Virginia General Assembly (Virginia Acts of Assembly Ch. 1283 and 1289), to undertake essential business. BAR board members and staff are participating from remote locations through Zoom Webinar. The meeting can be accessed by the public through broadcasted live on the government channel 70, streaming on the City's website and can be accessed via Zoom hyperlink on the docket.

II. MINUTES

2. Consideration of the minutes from the **January 21, 2020** public hearing.

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2020 meeting, as submitted.

III. ITEMS DEFERRED FROM THIS HEARING

3. BAR #2020-00598 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a new standalone pole adjacent to 500 South Royal Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Deferred

By unanimous consent, the Board of Architectural Review accepted the request for deferral of BAR #2020-00598.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. BAR #2020-00626 OHAD

Request to install small cell facility on a utility pole on public property adjacent to 400 South Washington Street.
Applicant: Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Amended

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Ms. Irwin, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2020-00626, as amended. The motion carried on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sprinkle recused himself.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The applicant work with staff to determine the possibility of painting the subject pole black.

REASON

In General, the Board did not have concerns about the proposal but found that Mr. Milone's request to have the subject pole in black finish a good idea

SPEAKERS

Mr. Stephen Milone, resident at 907 Prince Street, asked the item to be pulled off the consent calendar since he had requests and questions about the project. Mr. Milone requested that the new pole's base be underground and not projecting above grade as shown in the plans, he also requested the wireless boxes to be placed towards the sidewalk side instead of the street's for visibility concerns, and finally he requested the pole to be painted black to match the other poles in the street such as traffic poles and meters.

Mr. Milone also had questions about the viability to have the small cell antennas on the traffic poles instead. Mr. Conkey clarified that the traffic poles were found not resistant enough to support the small cell facilities and discarded by the City as an alternative.

Mr. Schakola, representing Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless, was available to answer questions and clarified that the wireless carrier does not own the pole and has no jurisdiction over Dominion poles, but he could ask Dominion if the pole can be painted black instead

DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Neihardt found Mr. Milone's suggestions relevant but clarified that the BAR does not have authority to act on such. She asked the applicant for the possibility of having Dominion painting the pole black. Mr. Schakola said that he could reach out and make the request to Dominion. There was no more discussion.

2. BAR #2021-00001 OHAD

Request for alterations at 419 North Columbus Street.

Applicants: Robert and Randee Blume

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Ms. Neihardt, and seconded by Mr. Sprinkle, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00001, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

3. BAR #2021-00003 PG

Request for alterations at 634 North Alfred Street.

Applicant: Dean Joseph Fajerski

BOARD ACTION: Approved, as Submitted

On a motion by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Sennott, the Board of Architectural Review voted to approve BAR #2021-00003, as submitted. The motion carried on a vote of 5-1.

REASON

The Board agreed with the staff recommendations that the roofing may remain but that the windows and door should be replaced to meet the requirements of the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS

Dean Fajerski, Property owner, was available to answer any questions.

Gail Rothrock, 209 Duke Street, representing HAF, Supported the staff recommendations and inquired about public outreach regarding residents in the historic district.

DISCUSSIONS

Ms. Irwin stated that she was disappointed that this application is for after-the-fact approval. She agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the door and that the 6 over 6 vinyl windows are inappropriate. She stated that she would like to see the asphalt roof replaced with standing seam metal to match the original roofing.

Mr. Sprinkle stated that he agreed with staff recommendations regarding the windows and door.

Ms. Sennott stated that she agreed with the staff recommendations.

Ms. Neihardt stated that she agreed with the comments of her colleagues and staff recommendations.

Mr. Adams stated that he agreed with staff recommendations

Ms. Irwin voted to oppose the motion because she felt that the asphalt shingle roof should be replaced with a standing seam metal roof.

4. BAR #2021-00004 OHAD

Request for partial demolition/ encapsulation at 414 North Union Street.
Applicant: David L. Charney

5. BAR #2021-00005 OHAD

Request for addition, alterations and waiver of rooftop HVAC screening at 414 North Union Street.
Applicant: David L. Charney

BOARD ACTION: Deferred for Restudy

On a motion by Ms. Irwin, and seconded by Ms. Neihardt, the Board of Architectural Review voted to defer BAR #2021-00004 and BAR #2021-00005, for a restudy. The motion carried on a vote of 6-0.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

N/A

SPEAKERS

Mr. Steve Kulinski, project architect, represented the applicant and answered questions. He advised the Board that the current owner is the original owner, having purchased the property in 1974. The proposed alterations will help him to age in place, transition into retirement, and better utilize the house.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Adams felt that the third-story dormer on the primary/east elevation looks too massive and disrupts the solid/void pattern of the blockface.

Ms. Irwin noted that this dormer glass is taller and bigger than the windows below, therefore creating a heavy feel to the top of the house.

Ms. Sennott felt that the windows look narrow. Mr. Kulinski explained that they are the same size as the existing openings, but the lack of shutters makes them appear smaller.

Ms. Irwin likes the casement windows and the overall direction of the design. However, she felt that the front dormer does not relate to the other windows on the house.

Ms. Sennott felt that the metal cladding of the dormer makes it look off-center and out of alignment. Ms. Irwin agreed that it looks unbalanced.

Mr. Adams' primary concern was the size of the dormer glass; he had no issue with how the dormer relates to what is below. The design is otherwise well done.

Ms. Roberts said the design needs refinement and a better understanding as to how it fits into the neighborhood. She suggested adding divided lites to the dormer.

Ms. Irwin disagreed on the need for divided lites. She was more concerned with the alignment, feeling that if the dormer is better aligned, it may not look so heavy.

Ms. Neihardt asked if the dormer could be pushed back, made to disappear more.

Mr. Adams agreed that recessing the top could help. He liked the second-floor bay and recommended that the architect repeat that bay on the top floor to provide a level of harmony.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

6. Review Updated Roof Policy

Ms. Sample gave a brief presentation outlining the revised roof policy language which was to be integrated into the *BAR Policies for Administrative Approval* document. The Board made minor changes to the proposed language and voted to integrate the policy into the inclusive policy document.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board of Architectural Review hearing was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS

The following projects were administratively approved since the last BAR meeting:

BAR #2020-00611 PG
Request for roof replacement at 1607 Princess Street.
Applicant: Mark Smith

BAR #2021-000009 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 421 Wilkes Street.
Applicant: Indie Grant

BAR #2021-00014 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 318 Commerce Street.
Applicant: Rick Plotkin

BAR #2021-00018 OHAD
Request for roof replacement at 603 South Lee Street.
Applicant: Ellen McCallie

BAR #2021-00027 OHAD
Request for siding replacement at 315 South Pitt Street.
Applicant: Peter Verne

BAR #2021-00028 PG
Request for roof replacement at 318 North Columbus Street.
Applicant: Colin Young

BAR #2021-00029

Request for roof replacement at 212 South Pitt Street.

Applicant: Nancy Woodford

BAR #2021-00030 OHAD

Request for window replacement at 4 Alexander Street.

Applicant: Margaret Fitzsimmons

BAR #2021-00044 PG

Request for door replacement at 1016 Queen Street.

Applicant: Alan Gordon