WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, May 14, 2002

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review meeting was held on Tuesday, May 14, 2002, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence. Also present were Zoning Administrator Murphy and Zoning Officer Beck.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Brendel motioned to approve the consent agenda as presented.

ARB #36-02 Griffith/234 Griffin Avenue – Exterior Change (enlarge fencing for trash containers) - approved

ARB #40-02 CWF/Taliaferro-Cole Stable/220-C West Duke of Gloucester Street – Exterior Change (ADA compliance) - approved

ARB #41-02 National Center for State Courts/300 Newport Avenue – Exterior Change (change roof color for addition)- approved

ARB #45-02 McCord/611 Richmond Road – Addition to single-family dwelling - approved

ARB #46-02 CWF/Binns Fashion Shop/435 West Duke of Gloucester Street – Addition to retail shop - approved

ARB #48-02 CWF/Cheese Shop – 410 West Duke of Gloucester Street – Addition to restaurant - approved

ARB SIGN #20-02 IZOD/3032 Richmond Road – Building Mounted Sign -approved

ARB #47-02 Themo/24 The Palisades – Exterior Change (sunroom & mechanical screening) - approved

Recorded vote on the motion:
Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.

Abstain: Mr. Freiling, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence on ARB# 40-02, ARB #46-02 & ARB #48-02.

ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT

ARB#127-01 Saint Stephen Lutheran Church/612 Jamestown Road – Exterior Change (Add chiller and redesign roof of church addition)

William Henry Harris, Architect, and James Lytle, Architect, were present to discuss the revised plans for Saint Stephen Lutheran Church. Mr. Harris noted the plans were revised to accommodate a new chiller and mechanical systems in the building. He noted the following changes to the building:

East Elevation:

- Changed door to paneled door with transom.
- Deleted window and moved windows over door.
- Added flat roof for chiller unit with brick screen.
- Added louver in gable over the door
- Added standing seamed metal roof.
- Several roofline changes from the original approval.
- Added brick chimney for boiler stack.

West Elevation:

- Changed door to paneled door with transom.
- Move windows.
- Added flat roof for mechanical equipment with brick screen.
- Added standing seamed metal roof and other roof to the left of the louver.
- Added louver in gable.
- Added brick chimney for boiler stack.

South Elevation:

- Added louver in gable.
- Remove five windows.
- Added flat roof areas for chiller and mechanical equipment.
- Brick screening for chiller and mechanical equipment.
- Added brick chimney for boiler stack.

North Elevation:

- The roof elevation has changed to be somewhat flatter and wider than the original approval due to the changes in the roof on the new addition.

Mr. Spence asked if the brick screening around the chiller and mechanical equipment was solid brick or pierced brick. Mr. Harris stated that it was pierced brick so the system would meet the building code requirements for air intake.

Ms. Williams asked why the five windows were removed? Mr. Harris noted two windows were removed due to space needs for the mechanical equipment in the kitchen with the other three windows being removed because of the exposed staircase. Ms. Williams suggested they recess the brick where the windows were removed instead of having brick walls. Mr. Harris stated that recessed windows could be installed on the rear elevation.

Mr. Sandbeck asked the size of the louver on the south elevation? Mr. Harris stated it was 4'x4'. Mr. Sandbeck suggested adding dormers to improve the look of the north elevation.

The Board followed with a discussion on the aesthetics of the south and north elevations and whether a different approach could be taken to improve these elevations. Mr. Sandbeck suggested extending an area in the center of the roof for dormers thereby reducing the length of the roof on the north elevation. It was the general consensus of the Board that modifying the roof would make the addition more harmonious with the front portion of the church. Ms. Murphy noted if changes were made to the roofline that the brick screen would need to be extended around the chiller.

Mr. Williams asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on this request.

Susan Dell, 322 Indian Springs Road, asked Mr. Harris and the Board if this project was going to benefit the residents of Indian Springs because it sounds like the building was going to look like a barn with blind windows. Mr. Harris stated that the addition would improve the looks of the building from Indian Springs Road because now they just see two metal doors.

Ms. Dell also asked if the driveway was going to encroach any closer to the Indian Spring neighborhood. Mr. Harris noted that the original driveway was not being relocated and that the addition would be inside the area between the original driveway and the existing building.

Bill Dell, 322 Indian Springs Road, stated that the revised plan to eliminate windows on the south elevation was dramatic, but he was more concerned with noise from the chiller. Mr. Harris stated it would less noisy because there would be six compressors in the chiller compared to the ten compressor units as originally planned. Mr. Lytle added that the noise would be projected upward instead of outward since the units have been relocated on the roof with a brick screen enclosing the units.

Mr. Spence asked if there were any compressor units on the ground with the revised application. Mr. Harris stated that one unit would remain along the side of the building adjacent to the Cedar's Guest Home. He also noted that this unit would be screened.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB #127-01 conditioned upon revised plans being submitted to the Board with the following:

- Windows being restored to the stairwell on the rear elevation;
- The wall being extended around the chiller to screen it from Jamestown Road;
- Dormers being added as discussed at the meeting.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB# 42-02 Hornsby/311 Indian Springs Road – Exterior Change (vinyl siding)

Lois Hornsby, owner, and Robert Hornsby were present to discuss their application for installing vinyl siding. Mr. Hornsby apologized to Board for starting the job without approval from the Architectural Review Board. He noted that after talking to staff, that vinyl siding is not appropriated in **Zone 1** of the **Architectural Preservation District**, but he thought since they had installed some vinyl siding on the rear adjacent to the carport seven years ago, that they could grandfather the whole house.

Mr. Williams noted that vinyl siding was installed on a very small section adjacent to the carport on the rear, which would not justify allowing vinyl siding on the remainder of the dwelling. Mr. Williams also noted that staff reports the existing wood siding was in good condition and scraping and painting could be an alternative that would meet the ***Design Review Guidelines***.

Mr. Hornsby stated that vinyl siding was proposed because the dwelling was painted three years ago and that mold and mildew had ruined the paint job.

Mr. Brendel asked Ms. Murphy when was the last time vinyl siding was approved in this area? Ms. Murphy stated that there were a couple of residents on Indian Springs Road (the Dell's and one down the street from the Hall's) that were denied the use of vinyl siding and instead installed hardiplank siding to be in compliance with the ***Design Review Guidelines.***

A general discussion followed with the Board agreeing that vinyl siding was not appropriate and does not meet the ***Design Review Guidelines***, which specifically prohibits the use of vinyl siding. They noted that the dwelling was a fine example of craftsmanship and detailing and that vinyl siding would not be appropriate for this dwelling or the neighborhood.

The Board asked the applicant if she wanted to withdraw the application or have a formal vote on the application. Mr. Hornsby asked the Board to make a formal vote on the application.

Mr. Williams motioned to deny ARB #42-02 because the ***Design Review Guidelines*** prohibits the use of vinyl siding in **Zone 1** of the **Architectural Preservation District.**

Recorded vote on the motion:
Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB# 43-02 Hornsby/703 Tanyard Street – Exterior Change (vinyl siding)

Lois Hornsby, owner, and Robert Hornsby were present to discuss the plans for installing vinyl siding at 703 Tanyard Street. Mr. Hornsby explained that the house at Tanyard Street is rented and that the cedar shingles are in bad condition and proposes to install white beaded vinyl siding instead of gray as noted on the application with white trim to make the property look better.

Ms. Murphy asked Mr. Hornsby if he was going to replace the cedar shingles on the detached garage with vinyl siding. Mr. Hornsby stated yes that he proposes to install white vinyl siding on the garage to match the dwelling.

Mr. Williams motion to approve ARB #43-02 condition upon white vinyl siding being installed on the dwelling and garage.

Recorded vote on the motion:
Aye: Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB# 44-02 Hewitt/112 Washington Street – New single-family dwelling

Matthew Patrick was present to discuss the plans for a new dwelling at 112 Washington Street. Mr. Patrick noted that all materials and colors meet the ***Design Review Guidelines.***

Ms. Murphy noted that this application was not put on the consent agenda because of the location of the dwelling from the street. She noted that other dwellings were located closer to the street and that this being the first of five dwellings on the street the Board would need to decide whether the front setback for the house is acceptable. She noted that she recommended approval because the applicants were trying to save a large magnolia tree in the front yard and that the dwelling was small and could be considered a dependency structure when taken in context with other dwellings on the street.

Mr. Patrick noted that the owners were trying to save a large magnolia tree in the front yard. It was the general consensus of the Board that due to the size of the dwelling and saving the large magnolia tree justified the proposed location of the dwelling.

Mr. Walker motioned to approve ARB #44-02 as presented.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Ms. Williams, Mr. Freiling, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Brendel, Mr. Sandbeck, and Mr. Spence.
Nay:	None.
Absent:	None.
Abstain:	None.

Minutes of April 23, 2002 meeting.

The minutes were approved as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm.

Jason Beck
Zoning Officer