



**MINUTES  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
TOWN OF WARRENTON  
November 19, 2015  
7:00 P.M.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Architectural Review Board (ARB) convened on November 19, 2015 at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building.

Dr. Melissa Wiedenfeld, Chair, called the meeting to order and a quorum was determined. All members were present: Mr. Carter Nevill, Mr. Steve Wojcik, Mr. Jay Tucker, Dr. Carole Hertz and Town Council Ex-Officio member Mr. Jerry Wood. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning and Community Development was present and represented staff.

**Purpose Statement**

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated the Purpose of the Architectural Review Board; Statement of Qualifications of Architectural Review Board to be: The Board makes a decision on applications in order to preserve the character of the Historic District of the Town of Warrenton on behalf of the Town of Warrenton. Decisions of the Board are based upon the Historic Guidelines and a decision for each application is made based upon its own merits. Those decisions do not constitute precedence for any future decisions.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Dr. Wiedenfeld moved the meeting into the first item on the agenda, which was the approval of minutes. With no minutes for approval, the item was tabled until the December meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Dr. Wiedenfeld moved the meeting to the next agenda item, new business. Considering there were four applications for Certificate of Appropriateness before the ARB applications, one of which was determined to likely move through the board's comments quickly, the ARB moved the **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-38 – Exterior improvements to convert the garage structure to a microbrewery facility at 41 Beckham Street** to the top of the agenda. Dr. Wiedenfeld then provided the meeting procedures to applicants. Applicants are to raise their hands to get the attention of the chair before speaking, to come up and state their name for the record, and describe the project. Then staff will provide information on the proposed project before the Board addresses the applicant with questions. Everyone will have an opportunity to speak, but once a motion is made, public discussion is over, even if there is further discussion within the board.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 15-38 – Exterior improvements to convert garage structure to microbrewery facility at 41 Beckham Street.**

Mr. Hricko addressed the board as the applicant for COA 15-38. The project described will encompassing the entire block. The first phase is the current mechanics garage, which is roughly 2,600 square feet of space. Before the ARB at this meeting is the conversion of the garage into a microbrewery. In subsequent phases, the brewery would like to expand into the two other buildings on the site, which are all connected. There are long range plans to develop the other buildings, possibly into a beer garden with landscaping and access to a roof deck that would be very visible from the town side.

For exterior improvements to the building, the proposal is to have a painted concrete block exterior shell for the building. Other proposed features include a new roof on the building, new gutters and down spouts, and replacing the wooden garage doors with windows in the same pattern as the garage doors. The garage currently has a certain pattern of divided lights, horizontal and vertical, that would be replaced with storefront divided light windows to give an impression of a garage door without being a garage door. This will help honor the fact that this was a garage and keep a semi-industrial look. The thirteen-foot high doors, would be folding doors that completely open from the interior to the exterior, into a trellised area supporting shade devices such as shade sails or sliding shades.

Around the perimeter of the beer garden, it is proposed to install a cable railing with stainless steel horizontal rails and metal painted support framing. The other two sides of the building have an industrial sash that would be removed since they are deteriorating and not energy efficient. A new window and metal siding on the outside to matching the existing metal will mimic the industrial sash. For lighting, as a good neighbor they want to stay away from harsh lighting by installing a sort of dome shaped pendant light that will hang down from the trellis structure. This comprises the proposed changes to the exterior of the building.

Dr. Wiedenfeld thanked the speaker and asked if there was additional information Ms. Sitterle wanted to provide from the staff analysis.

Ms. Sitterle provided the ARB the following additional details on the project. The garage is a non-contributing portion of the building because it was added circa 1940 or 1950s era at some point. In addition, because there are different criteria in the guidelines for non-contributing structures, there is some flexibility with the non-contributing portion of the structure. Essentially, the strict application of the guidelines that normal apply to historic structures do not apply in this particular case. It was also noted that the changes proposed are minor in nature and that the project will retain the original existing openings. Any exterior improvements such as the trellis and landscaping can be removed at a later time should someone wish to return the structure to its' current condition. Staff deferred to the board for their review and analysis of the proposed materials and changes to the structure.

Mr. Wood was had no comments at the time.

Mr. Nevill spoke to the question about the lighting fixtures and commended them on keeping an industrial look.

Mr. Wojcik did not have any issues, but asked what color of paint they were considering for the exterior (adding that while color does not matter to the board).

Mr. Hricko did not have colors decided as of yet, but detailed that it will be a neutral color. The trellis and the windows would stand out against the building, but not be a garish color.

Dr. Hertz asked if this would be consistent with the churches and the schools needs. She asked if noise or lighting would infringe on the school.

Mr. Hricko explained that the lighting should not infringe on the school because it is completely self-contained.

Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked Mr. Tucker if he had any comments or questions. Mr. Tucker had several technical comments and a statement. It appears the project wants to use powder-coated connectors for some of the structure. Mr. Tucker offer that whatever motion is made, that the project be permitted to use hot dipped galvanized fasteners in lieu of the powder coated and paint them whatever color. The second comment concerned the windows that abut or face to Second Street. In that location, the pavement is twelve inches from the building and the proposal has an awning window closed in. It was asked if the awning window would be fixed or limited so they do not extend into the street and if they were aware that might be a problem. Mr. Hricko replied that the tanks will be located in that spot, so it is likely that those windows will not be opened.

Mr. Tucker admired the applications thoroughness, thoughtfulness, compliance with the issues of the guidelines and recommend the board approve the project as presented.

Dr. Wiedenfeld had several questions, asking if anything was going to happen to the main part of the existing building. The response was no, not in the first phase.

Dr. Wiedenfeld understood a later phase would address any changes or alterations to the existing building and asked if the building was in use by the Bridges. The reply was yes, for a certain period.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Mr. Tucker to clarify what his issue was with the windows. The response was that the windows were not a parking issue but a zoning issue.

Dr. Wiedenfeld pointed out where the parking would be located and asked if for the time being there would be no beer garden, but just parking. It was explained that parking will remain as is with some landscaping for now.

Dr. Wiedenfeld pointed out on the plans that the Beckham Street side is the main entrance and inquired if there would be an attempt to have something noticeable on the Lee Street side, such as a dual entrance. Mr. Hricko explained that a second front would be developed because people would not want to walk over to the other side of the building.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked about the materials to be used on the parking. Mr. Hricko indicated that it parking will remain gravel, for the time being.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the new windows will mimic the old, with metal on the outside and painted wood on the inside, but operable as awning windows. Mr. Hricko said yes.

This was the end of Dr. Wiedenfeld's questions. She added that it was a nice reuse project because it honors the original structure even though the structure is not considered contributing to the historic district. She then asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Tucker then asked if there was any smell or scent that emanates from a brewery when you are brewing beer.

A representative of the developer said there is a smell when you are brewing beer and there is no way around it. The smell is no different from cooking something, which in this case is grain. It does have a distinct smell, but not like when you are cooking brownies. It is an offensive smell.

Another representative said when there is a coffee roaster in a brewery; the brewery smells are far less permeable and offensive than a coffee roaster. It is not as heavy a smell.

Dr. Wiedenfeld indicated that the mayor and several council members were present. One council member then stated that this is a great opportunity for the Town of Warrenton and revitalization of Lee Street.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that she met Mr. Godfrey earlier today and was happy to have him attend as well as Ms. Stinson. Dr. Wiedenfeld then asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Nevill made a motion to approve the application for Certification of Appropriateness 15-38 exterior improvements to 41 Beckham Street with the following conditions, a building permit is required.

Mr. Wojcik seconded the motion. A vote was taken of all members, the motion passed unanimously.

#### **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-34 Window Replacement at 7 N. Fifth Street, IOOF Lodge.**

Dr. Wiedenfeld brought up the next item, introducing Rene D. Kreutter, agent and president of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows (IOOF). Mr. Kreutter is also president at five different state levels across the state of Virginia. The lodge is a very old, historical building going back to 1843 when it was built and since then bought and sold. During the Civil War it occupied as Union and Confederate hospital operations five different times, sharing the blood of both north and south. IOOF has a deep reverence for the structure.

Recently IOOF secured funds for building renovations. There is an attachment to that historical building. The historical portion of it, the downstairs area, is a fellowship hall and a kitchen, adjacent to the original building. The upstairs is the original hall where business is conducted twice a month. The IOOF goal for activities is to take care of the orphans, to educate them, and bury the dead, using about twenty thousand dollars a year. IOOF also donates to the food bank. Citizens of the community come in for numerous necessities because of financial conditions or a shoulder to lean on and IOOF tries to give them guidance. IOOF goes singing at the nursing homes at Christmas time, and tries to be active in the community.

Since IOOF has been able to secure funds to improve the kitchen, which is currently inoperable as

the plumbing will not drain. Water freezes in wintertime and windows leak very badly. IOOF is going to get heating and air conditioning in portions of the building that do not have it currently. The agent for IOOF is a Virginia State Class A general contractor who has worked on everything from shopping centers to six story high-rise office buildings and will be the one working on this project. IOOF would like to improve a window in the kitchen, making it more attractive for members, to bring in more members. The belief is that where you can share a meal, you can create fellowship, which they are not able currently. A window in the middle of the kitchen wall faces the Baptist Church and the IOOF has spoken with the reverend of the church to ask if the church has any concerns with IOOF's intent for the window. The reverend said he would be happy to have any improvements to the structure and it will not be objectionable.

IOOF intends an all steel frame single glass window in place of the old window. Pictures were presented to the board showing the rental property, the old building, and where the kitchen is located. Pictures also show the current window, interior and exterior, the condition they are trying to improve, and the neighboring window at the Baptist Church. The profile of the window is the same as the window IOOF wants to replace it with. An example of the new vinyl-insulated window was provided at the meeting. The agent felt that the window was one of the higher-grade windows he has seen as a general contractor. The agent also felt that this would be excellent way to improve the thermal factor for the interior of the building, which is an interest shared by the Town has an interest and building department. The agent had people suggest keeping the old window and put glass over it. However, the agent felt that option has a greater potential for mold. The proposed unit can be painted any. The stucco on the exterior of the building will receive paint. End of presentation. Agent asked if there were any questions.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Sarah Sitterle, representing staff, if she had any comments.

Ms. Sitterle responded yes and explained that the proposal does not meet the guidelines or the Department of the Interior standards for rehabilitating historic properties because it is a historic building and the guidelines say that vinyl is not a preferred material for windows. The window is located on the backside of the building facing the interior courtyard of the Baptist Church and would not be visible from the right of way. Staff defers to the board on discussion of the details provided this evening by Mr. Kreutter.

Mr. Kreutter stated the window under discussion is in the 1950's building, not the 1840's building. The 1840's building is the historical part of the lodge, including the fellowship hall and the ritual hall. This building in question was built adjacent to that in the 1950s. Mr. Kreutter then showed the board where the rental part was and where the kitchen was located.

Mr. Tucker indicated that he wished the information presented about the project had been included with the original submission, allowing the ARB more time to review the materials. It was asked if the window in question was operable.

Mr. Kreutter's response was that the new window does not have to be operable because they are open to the ARB's view. It currently has two operable side lights with a stationary pane in the middle.

Mr. Tucker then clarified that his question was if the current window was ever opened.

Mr. Kreutter stated that they do not open the window because it is too rusted together.

Mr. Tucker asked if the window was approved and operable, how would it open and what its form would be.

Mr. Kreutter stated it would operate the same direction as the current window, which is a casement window, swinging out. The new window would be double hung. The existing window is a steel World War II era, single glazed, one-inch thick window swinging out into the courtyard.

Mr. Tucker then asked if this window was to be over the kitchen sink.

Mr. Kreutter said yes.

Mr. Tucker asked if there were to be cabinets below the sink.

Mr. Kreutter stated that there are cabinets, as seen on the diagram. He then showed Mr. Tucker the drawing. The cabinets are at 36" and will be down to 34" for handicap codes.

Mr. Tucker asked if this was the acoustical lay in ceiling.

Mr. Kreutter said yes.

Mr. Tucker then asked him if he was aware, that the guidelines have trouble with plastic.

Mr. Kreutter was aware they do, but because of the efficiency factor, they wanted to take advantage of technology and enjoy the performance and life extension of the plastic to limit future spending needs. Cost is always a consideration for an improvement.

Mr. Tucker asked if the window was available in a custom size to suit the opening.

Mr. Kreutter stated yes, the company would make it to fit, which was one of the reasons they went with the proposed window. A wood window does not have the same efficiency factor according to thermal examinations and it is more costly.

Mr. Tucker asked, if he would consider the following motion. To service and maintain the windows (reglaze where necessary, paint, refinish the existing steel windows), leave them in place, and order one casement window that opens into the building, placing it on the inside of the building. This would keep the historic nature of the building unquestioned, because they would be working on the inside the building (interior alterations) and not have to come before the ARB.

Mr. Kreutter's response was that the new window would have to be stationary glass, because if the casement window were on the inside it would not marry up with the existing steel window opening.

Mr. Tucker stated that if the casement were inside then they would not need to lock it. That they could do away with the fastening hardware, save the hinges, swing it inside, and attach whatever they prefer on the inside. The idea is to help the project breeze through the ARB by making it an interior alteration, removing the need for questions about maintaining the existing steel window. The casement provides better energy efficiency, and another layer of glass so there would be no

movement of air against the window, Mr. Tucker wanted to offer this idea consideration to the board.

Dr. Hertz questioned why one window could open but the other could not.

Mr. Tucker replied that the steel window does not open now and the IOOF does not intend to open it in the future. An inside casement can swing in, allowing one to clean the steel sash window and removing any security issue with having it open or closed. It is also out of sight and can have two-three-four large panes of glass, without any muntin inside to conflict with the appearance of the original steel window. The issue is not about the beauty of the original steel window. IOOF can do this on the inside. The only concern from Mr. Tucker is that the locking mechanism is in the wrong place with the casement installed backwards. However, the lock does not matter if on the inside of the existing steel window.

Mr. Kreutter stated if another unit were placed on the inside of the existing old window, IOOF would make it a solid, stationary, inoperable window. Another concern is about deterioration on the inside. The window is taking on moisture, leaking through, which the IOOF can fix with caulk. However, as an old window, there is no weather stripping between the operable surface and stationary portion of the glass. This allows dirt in there, which would not be cleanable

Mr. Tucker replied that, he could appreciate Mr. Kreutter's concerns as an owner of a 1935 building. His windows have industrial steel sash windows, which have been retrofitted with foam gasketing at the opening sash, so there is no air infiltration. IOOF can use sealant around the perimeter of the sash to stop the flow of any air. Mr. Tucker insisted that the IOOF could make the repairs without affecting the exterior appearance of the building. Mr. Tucker suggested using at least two sashes that open to the interior for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Kreutter replied that they would only be partially able to reach all of the glass for cleaning.

Mr. Tucker suggested using the full width of operable sash, or two units if it takes two units.

Mr. Kreutter response was that even with two pieces with a stationary glass pane in between there, it would still be an issue.

Mr. Tucker stated that there is no need for stationary glass, just solve the problem, so that from the inside, you can clean the glass.

Dr. Hertz inquired as to how the window can be restored to remove caking and cracking.

Mr. Kreutter replied that IOOF would have to replace the glass with existing glazing that is not loose. The difficulty is in making it with operable side lights, with gasketing around that so it is secured and sealed. The unit would have to be painted.

Dr. Hertz asked if it was an easy restoration.

Mr. Tucker stated he has this done the process to many steel windows dating to 1935. To repair the glazing, the glazing compound becomes rock hard. It is then chiseled out and new glass and glazing compound are installed. The IOOF was welcomed to look at the windows at 17 S. Fifth Street that

were restored around 20 years ago with no maintenance and needed only to be painted.

Mr. Kreutter expressed interest in visiting to see the windows in question.

Mr. Tucker said if IOOF wants this discussion could be tabled and continued next month, or they can do the repairs all on the inside.

Mr. Kreutter was open the ARB's advice, because they know the regulations better. He just needs guidance on is justified for the IOOF to do. Mr. Kreutter can make the window satisfy existing openings with the same pattern, and it look exactly like the existing windows.

Dr. Hertz asked Mr. Kreutter's thoughts on putting a secondary window in.

Mr. Kreutter stated that his opinion as a general contractor is to not double glaze unless you have proper airflow and maintenance capability to take care of it. The window in question will require a casement on the other side and stationary in the middle. The concern then being how much of the stationary window can be reached for cleaning.

Mr. Tucker stated that since these are custom size windows, all three could be operable, except for the mullion at 4 or 5 inches.

Mr. Kreutter stated Mr. Trucker is accurate.

Mr. Wojcik asked if the original structure has windows facing the Baptist Church.

Mr. Kreutter's response was no, the other windows along there are in the different tenant spaces.

Mr. Wojcik inquired about using an insulated wood clad window as an alternative before stating that the double window may be a problem and asking how many exits are there for egress.

Mr. Kreutter stated there is only one door going into the room, but that the window is a little far off the ground, risking injury if using the window for egress.

Mr. Wojcik then suggested an insulated wood clad window would work, because the exterior is wood and is visible from the street.

Mr. Nevill appreciated Mr. Tucker's attempt to find a solution. In reviewing the Towns' guidelines and the Department of the Interior's recommendations on the maintenance restoration for steel windows, there is overwhelming evidence and suggestion that it is in the interest of the board to preserve the restoration of the windows as is. The kitchen windows are visible to the courtyard and are consistent with the remainder of the building. Consistent with the architecture and the nature of the historic significance of that period, it is important that the ARB do anything possible to preserve those windows for historic preservation. Mr Nevill respects that the IOOF is trying to achieve the best solution for the viability of the kitchen, and wants to find a solution that meets both the IOOF's goals and preserves what is significant in the end. Mr. Nevill does not think it is in the best interest of preservation to change to a different material when all the other windows are rolled steel. For architectural consistency and the appropriate use of the building, the ARB needs to find a compromise that keeps the steel windows while finding a solution that suits the IOOFs needs. The

evidence advises the ARB to be on the side of preservation. The ARB wants to see the IOOF have energy efficiency and preserve what we the ARB is entrusted to protect.

Mr. Kreutter explained that this 50's building has other tenants who want to get rid of the steel windows. There is one other window in the courtyard and the rest are all between the building, where they will not be seen. If IOOF were to improve the building, they would like to have the windows be energy efficient and match the look of the windows in church.

Mr. Nevill explained that the ARB has to look this issue in terms of the existing building and not the building it is next to because of the historical and architectural significance. Mr. Tucker's approach, allows IOOF to proceed without ARB assistance.

Mr. Wood stated that he sits on the board but does not have a vote. He represents Town Council. He is happy to see people come up to the ARB who are willing to work with together with the ARB to get the right solution to the problem. Vinyl and aluminum windows are a no-no according to the guidelines for historic properties. Mr. Wood wanted to tell Mr. Kreutter that he appreciated the applicants' willingness to work with the ARB.

Mr. Kreutter stated that he has been on planning commissions, and has been on the other end of the table.

Mr. Tucker stated the issue here is what he calls the termite factor. Little changes like this, here and there, eat away at the historic district. This may be a small issue, one window, but may grow to be two-three-four windows. This degrades little portions of the historic district, which is what the ARB is trying to avoid.

Mr. Kreutter understood and appreciated the ARBs comments, interest, and concerns. He is at the meeting to hear the ARBs thoughts and wants to find a solution collectively within the guidelines.

Mr. Nevill said there are guidelines from the Department of the Interior and suggestions for restorations. Mr. Kreutter was provided the guidelines.

Mr. Kreutter was familiar with the guidelines promised to take them to his board. He felt fortunate to have worked on the oldest building in Maryland. As a summary, he thinks they should treat the outside, clean it up, make the old windows retain their appearance, and see what interior glass could be used they can operate.

Mr. Tucker agreed that this was a good solution.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that a consensus seems to have been reached. She suggested the ARB table this issued in case IOOF wants to come before the ARB again. If the solution is all interior work, then IOOF will not need to come before the ARB again.

Mr. Tucker made a motion to amend the application for **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-34 for the proposed window replacement** at the IOOF Lodge at 7 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street with the following recommendation: that the existing steel window be restored to the best of the owner's ability and that any desires to improve the weather conditions of the window be done on the interior of the building. If anything other than restoring the existing steel window is desired, the owner is to come

back to the board to present whatever that may be.

Mr. Nevill seconded the motion. The motion passed.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 15-36 – Install exterior handicap accessible ramp** at First Baptist Church, 39 Alexandria Pike, Michael Russell, agent.

Dr. Wiedenfeld moved the meeting to the next item on the agenda, COA 16-36 and asked if Mr. Russell was present.

Mr. Kevin Jackson explained that Mr. Russell was unable to attend and that he was there as a supervisor for MD Russell Construction. He apologized for not having more knowledge about the project, explaining that he was seeing the plans for the first time. He has been through the church and understood that this project is for an exterior handicap accessible ramp. He then provided details on the project area. There is an existing door, towards the side of the church, which faces BB&T Bank. The ramp would come off the backside of that, which is on the backside of the building facing the parking lot. It would be made of pressure treated lumber with skid proof tread.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Ms. Sitterle for any staff comments.

Ms. Sitterle responded yes and explained that the ramp is proposed to be attached to an existing concrete porch. The porch will remain intact. It is unknown at what point the rear porch was added, and whether it is original or built after the original construction. It would meet handicap accessibility requirements according to code and have the slip resistant coating on the ramp. The guidelines do not indicate preferred materials for handicap accessible ramps. She noted that the Guidelines do mention the materials for decks, which there is a preference for pressure treated material. However, the ramp in question is a different structure. Staff deferred to the board for their determination on the appropriateness of the ramp and the materials to be used.

Mr. Jackson explained that this was designed for ease of installation and cost effectiveness to try to keep within the church budget. The church is open to suggestions on design and materials.

Mr. Nevill appreciated the willingness to address the pressure treated wood and possibly paint it and meet the requirements for ADA. The requirements of ADA take a certain amount of precedence.

Mr. Wojcik was fine with if it was painted.

Mr. Tucker has difficulty with pressure treated wood, painted or not, in that the result is not with the character of the architecture to which it is attached. He felt that wrought iron like the existing rail is more appropriate. ADA issues are not the ARBs jurisdiction. It appears the graspable handrails were not shown, which is a Building Official problem. Mr. Tucker's preference is that the design be revised to iron construction, in keeping with the character of the building, rather than the proposed white painted wood.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the ARB guidelines recommend that handrails and balusters are designed so they compliment the building and become a design amenity instead of an intrusion. She felt that because this was going to be attached to the 1890 portion of the church and not the modern addition, an effort should be made to make the design more in keeping with the historic structure. She found

no issues with the layout presented in terms of the ramp, the location, the grade or pitch, but wanted to see a design used for the railing and balusters that are more of an asset to the building instead of something that is put there. She stated that the project would still have to meet code with regard to ramp location, grade and pitch.

Mr. Tucker stated that the project comes close to meeting ADA requirements and the building code with the exception of the graspable handrail. Regarding the surface, Mr. Tucker felt it would be just as slippery with a little bit of ice and snow on it no matter the surface type. The slope is in accordance with the code. The 29-foot long run of the ramp appears to be using the 2 x 2 balusters as the structural support of the handrail or guardrail. Depending on how that it is attached to the stringer and how the stringers attach to the underlying structure and the posts that will not meet the code. The Building Official is going to make the project introduce a newel post or something stronger.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked what material would comprise the deck surface.

Mr. Jackson responded the deck would be pressure treated wood with a non-slip adhesive.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the non-slip adhesive would be a kind of paint.

Mr. Jackson explained that it would either be painted on or stuck on.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked the stick on non-slip adhesive would be like bathtub stick ons.

Mr. Tucker stated that there are paint additives made to create a non-slip surface. Paint companies tell you they are effective, but the additives are available. Mixed with paint it results in gritty surface.

Mr. Jackson explained that there are plans to paint the ramp and do non-slip surfaces on the parts walked on. The remaining area would be painted to whatever was suggested.

Dr. Hertz asked the applicant if they wanted the rail to be similar to the one that is on the deck.

Mr. Jackson stated that proposed handrail is wood and the deck has a small cast iron rail.

Dr. Hertz asked if that small cast iron rail could be used because this is an 1890 structure.

Mr. Jackson's response was yes.

Mr. Tucker suggested going with a wrought iron style railing with a wood under structure. The structure would be painted black with a non-slip surface as a middle of the road solution to doing the entire structure in steel. Wood would be used up to the point where you walk, use wrought iron that meets the building code from the walking surface up, and paint it all black.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked that since Mr. Jackson came in as a substitute, could he speak to the design and will the iron railing and balusters meet code.

Mr. Jackson stated yes, but he would have to take it back to his engineer.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the ramp was going to be attached to the existing building in any way.

Mr. Jackson stated that it would not touch the brick but would attach to the existing concrete patio.

Mr. Tucker stated that it is three feet away from the building as it turns, the first 90 degree turn. Otherwise, it is covering the existing concrete porch from the doorway to the end of the first ramp portion which is the existing concrete porch and it is wood from that point down. From that point is not connected to the building.

Mr. Tucker made a motion to approve the application **Certificate of Appropriateness 15-36** for the proposed handicap ramp at the First Baptist Church at 39 Alexandria Pike with the following condition: that the structure presented from the ground to the surface of the ramp way be as presented, the handrail work from the surface of the walkway up be made of what is conventionally known as wrought iron railing, that it be painted black, and a building permit is required.

Mr. Nevill seconded the motion. He asked if there is a stipulation for the design of the wrought iron railing to be similar to what is on the porch, or is it up to the applicant.

Mr. Tucker amended the motion that it be painted black. Mr. Tucker stated that the design should be left up to the applicant to meet the building code. The motion was amended, so that the final configuration of the iron work is the applicants choice. The applicant has to meet the building code regarding spacing, height and strength.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated there was a motion with two amendments; the motion was seconded and all voted in favor. The motion passed.

**Certificate of Appropriateness 15-37 Screening structures for HVAC equipment** on east and west elevations 121 John E. Mann Street, Hinckley, Shepherd and Norden, agent.

Dr. Wiedenfeld moved to the next item on the agenda, COA 16-37.

Mr. Shepherd described the structures the ARB was looking at as having one sole purpose, to protect expensive HVAC equipment units. One of the parameters given for these units was to not be attached to the building. Many parameters came from the HVAC engineer for clearances, building access, air circulation, etc. The exhaust is in the rear of the equipment and exhaust upward. The top of the structure is open and slants at an angle. A solid roof for protection from ice and snow would need to be 3 or 4 times higher than proposed. Many clearances and post locations are for door accesses, access panels for equipment, air circulation, etc. The drawings call for pressure treated. The project hopes to use at least a number one grade pressure treated, rather than number two, depending on the cost. The structure will be painted to match the building.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked Ms. Sitterle if staff had any comments. Ms. Sitterle provided additional information explaining that this project is a substantial alteration requiring board review. The guidelines do recommend screening HVAC units with natural vegetation, wood vertical board fence or vented masonry wall. This is a non-contributory structure within the historic district allowing for more flexibility with the design, use of materials, and compatibility. This screening structure would not negatively affect the surrounding character of the historic district. Staff does recommend

approval and that a building permit is required for the project.

Mr. Shepherd explained that the visual screening will be done with vegetation, in the 8ft range.

Dr. Wiedenfeld wished that Mr. Shepherd had put directions on the documents as she drove by the site of the project and wondered if there was space for the plantings.

Mr. Shepherd concurred by explaining that is why the plantings are somewhat limited. On the west side, where the equipment is close to the sidewalk, they can only screen it with plantings from the sidewalk, from John E. Mann Street because there is not enough room between the machinery, the post, and the sidewalk for plantings. There are plantings on the south and east side, approximately four feet off the post of the structure.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if that would be enough space for air circulation around the equipment.

Mr. Shepherd replied affirmatively.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the structure was going to be 10ft by 8in.

Mr. Shepherd described that the size would vary because the grade varies from one side of the building to the other. The best measurement would be to go by the top of the equipment to the top of the structure, which is going to be 3 feet plus the depth of the structure.

Dr. Wiedenfeld inquired about the species that can used that will go to 10 feet and screen, but speculated that since they do not do landscape they may not know species.

Mr. Shepherd confirmed that he could not name a species, but there would be some sort of edge going up to the top of the machinery.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that this should be called a pergola and make it fancy. She added that it is rather plain and asked if it would be painted pressure treated wood and painted metal brackets.

Mr. Shepherd clarified there would be no metal brackets, but there would be wooden diagonal bracing

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if they would use 2 X 8 slats, which seem big, but make sense to stop snow.

Mr. Shepherd replied affirmatively, it is a distance from the eave of the building to the top of the machine and are willing to lose a 42in 2 x 8. They want to protect the new machinery below.

Mr. Tucker asked the existing building had a standing seam metal roof and if falling ice/snow has damaged the equipment previously.

One of the architects said yes.

Mr. Tucker stated from the guidelines, unsympathetic additions erode historic integrity and the architectural significance of structures (the termite factor described earlier). Mr. Tucker professed that although this is a non-contributing structure, it is not insignificant. Noted exceptions are

structures adjacent to/surrounded by contributing structures. Poor handling of the non-contributing structure could compromise the adjacent buildings or adversely influence the neighborhood. Similarly, non-contributing structures part of the district context, contributing to the neighborhood, would require attention in the preservation of those sites or architectural features in the district.

Mr. Tucker went on to state that the building has an arched roof and as the presentation shows, a few arched roof entrances. The main building with an arched roof is one of only two in the historic district. There are two minor entrances with arched roofs and the proposed knee braced treated wood structure to protect the heating and air conditioning equipment from falling ice and snow. Mr. Tucker did not feel that there was enough investigation to determine if there were other, more architecturally and aesthetically pleasing, solutions. Mr. Tucker passed an emphasized copy showing the three entities on the side of the building, two arched entrances, and this knee braced entrance was passed around at the meeting.

Mr. Tucker stated that the two designs are different and that the protection structure is contrary to the existing building. He felt that there are other possible solutions, like an arch. He suggested a solution that mimics the entrances to the building, which is a little different but still sympathetic to the arched nature of the building. Mr. Tucker's opinion as an ARB member was that the structure could be designed out of wood or steel and serve the same function, but be compatible with the nature of the structure and not contribute the termite affect. He suggested Mr. Shepherd go back, rethink, and come back to the ARB with a solution that goes with the building. He would like Mr. Shepherd to address the unique character of the building instead of using a treated wood, knee braced structure.

Mr. Shepherd felt that the current proposal has the least intrusive impact on the building, while not conflicting with the other building elements. He felt Mr. Tucker's solution said "here is my entrance, now walk into a huge piece of HVAC equipment."

Mr. Tucker replied except for the shrubbery.

Mr. Shepherd restated that there would be no shrubbery in front of that entrance because it is against the sidewalk.

A citizen present asked if the roof in the drawing was solid.

Mr. Tucker stated negatively, the roof could be made of bars, wood, pipe, wood slats, etc. He suggested the supporting structure be sympathetic to the original building. He felt that there is a solution more delicate and sympathetic than a knee braced timber structure. The solution could be wood, but he felt it would be easier to make it out of steel, with the same slats made of wood, pipe, or iron. He stated the slates could be made of anything and could be more delicate because they would not require knee bracing and the slats 2" iron pipe.

Mr. Francis, representing St. John's Church, asked Mr. Tucker if his solution would look better than total shrubbery.

Mr. Tucker responded that there would not be total shrubbery as high as the structure.

Mr. Francis stated it would be invisible from the street.

Mr. Tucker stated that is not what the drawings are showing.

Mr. Francis then stated the machinery would not be visible.

Dr. Wiedenfeld confirmed that the vegetation will screen the machinery, but the roof of the structure will be visible.

Mr. Tucker had a photograph from the Winchester Street side where there would no plantings and at it showed air conditioning equipment. He stated the issue is not screening the air conditioning equipment. The height of the structure above the air conditioning equipment can be any height. He felt a complimentary/sympathetic shape with the building is a better solution aesthetically for the historic district.

Dr. Hertz preferred the curved version as more compatible with the structure and of the site.

Mr. Wojcik had no comment except that there are arborvitae and other narrow shrubbery that grow tall and may work.

Mr. Nevill agreed with Mr. Tucker's approach, but wondered, if mimicking the arch would diminish the impact of the existing arches, make it a bit redundant, and reduce the existing architectural elements. Visual impact is important. He felt the architect has tried to make this as minimal as possible. He suggested looking at the vertical/horizontal elements of the buttresses and the windows to see if there is something, instead of a knee brace, which could brace and reflect the grid pattern and tie it more effectively to the building. He suggested, rather than introducing a 45-degree angle, reflect the existing 90-degree angles. He also felt that as presented, the machinery is more offensive than the solutions discussed. He concluded that hiding them through shrubbery or making them less visible is the best solution.

Mr. Wood asked Mr. Shepherd if the existing slats were open.

Mr. Shepherd responded yes.

Mr. Wood asked if Mr. Tucker's design matched the rest of the doors and archways and if they were open.

Mr. Tucker responded yes, the design is similar and can use 2-inch pipe instead of 2 x 8s.

Mr. Wood asked about the cost difference with Mr. Tucker's Design.

Mr. Tucker responded that project architect could answer the question about cost.

Mr. Wood stated that he might decide that this is a termite affect situation because it is a non-contributing structure in the historical district. He felt that Mr. Tucker's design looks a bit better, but, with proper shrubbery, the proposed design may also work.

Mr. Tucker stated that there would not be any shrubbery on the western side, leaving the AC unit in view.

Mr. Wood stated that Winchester Street would see the AC unit, but not John E. Mann Street.

Mr. Tucker affirmed Mr. Wood's statement.

Mr. Wood asked if it would be Mr. Tucker wants to see equipment or if he wants to try to hide it.

Mr. Tucker felt no objections with having equipment on Winchester Street, but did want something an aesthetically sympathetic structure over a knee braced timber structure. People will walk past this structure on their way to the door at the northern end of the building, where screening will be absent.

Mr. Wood questioned Mr. Shepherd, if there was a reason they could not have a meeting of the minds on a design similar to Mr. Tucker's design.

Mr. Shepherd responded that there could be a meeting of minds, although he did not currently agree. He stated that there would be a considerable cost difference, which is a church decision.

Mr. Tucker stated that there are two suggestions.

Someone asked about the view coming down John E. Mann Street.

Mr. Tucker explained that you would see shrubbery and two posts with a slat or two across the top.

Mr. Shepherd described the design as having the larger arch face on the shallower west side, 12 ½ feet off the gym, and that the deeper east side would be 16 feet to the machinery.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that she did not quite understand.

Mr. Shepherd explained that the front, on the west side, is 12 ½ feet off the gym and on the east side, it is 16 feet to where the machinery was placed. He stated that Mr. Tucker's drawing does not show the same current depth for the little arches over the door, which 3 ½ to 4 feet off the building, making the distance 12 ½ feet of the east side.

Dr. Wiedenfeld understood Mr. Shepherd, but stated that there would be a wood structure off the building no matter what.

Mr. Shepherd responded affirmatively.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that Mr. Tucker's proposal suggests using curved end pieces with slats behind them.

Mr. Tucker suggested the architect consider an arched form, sympathetic to the existing building.

Dr. Wiedenfeld asked if the bracing was there to have a certain weight allowance for snowfall or for some other engineering reason.

Mr. Shepherd explained that the bracing is more to keep the structure from racking than vertical snowfall. Part of which is because it is unattached to the cinder block wall of the gym. Mr. Shepherd did not think Mr. Tucker's design had any bracing on the corners.

Mr. Tucker explained that if made of steel, it would not need bracing and can have a sympathetic approach. He suggested Mr. Shepherd forget using 30 inch footings and drill the posts 4 feet in the ground, like a pole structure, to remove the knee bracing.

Mr. Shepherd explained the problem is with timber length, because they were already at 14 feet and did not want to go over 16 feet ideally.

Dr. Wiedenfeld responded that she was sure it becomes a lot more expensive. She asked if there was any further discussion from the board.

Mr. Nevill asked the applicant's stand on the board's suggestions because there were different opinions.

Mr. Shepherd stated that he has already said both elevations are overpowering. That the other proposal would overpower all three existing entrance features because both sides of the building have doors with hoods over them (one side with two the other with one).

Mr. Nevill agreed that too much attention was being drawn to mechanical.

Mr. Shepherd asked the board to keep in mind that the structures are 12 ½ feet (west side) and 16 feet (east side) off the building, whereas the door hoods are 3 ½.

Mr. Nevill stated that he was inclined to agree and that his biggest concern was the suggestion that it would draw too much attention.

Mr. Tucker stated the design has just four legs, no walls.

Mr. Nevill understood.

A church representative hoped for a consensus because winter was near they needed to protect a \$150,000 investment.

Dr. Wiedenfeld stated that the Catholic Church has wonderful landscaping. She suggested adding landscaping around the timbers and parking lot, not just the shrubbery, could minimize the issue. On the west elevation, the structure is visible from Winchester Street, a little bit of which can be seen from the parking lot, but landscaping can minimize that view.

Dr. Hertz made a motion to approve application **Certificate of Appropriateness 2015-37 for proposed HVAC screening structures** at St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church, 121 John E. Mann Street with the following conditions: a building permit is required, and additional landscaping be part of the proposal.

Mr. Nevill seconded the motion. The motion passed with a majority vote.

## **Work Session**

Dr. Wiedenfeld moved the meeting into the work session. She asked Ms. Sitterle if they had anything to cover.

Ms. Sitterle responded no.

Dr. Wiedenfeld suggested setting up a discussion and possibly a power point presentation regarding windows because they are becoming more and more of an issue. She wished to look at window options resolutions. She then asked if there were any more comments.

Mr. Tucker felt that sometimes staff reports say nothing regarding approval or not, and left it up to the board. He did not remember seeing a recommended staff denial and saw no purpose in staff recommending, throughout the staff report, various features that are comments rather than fact of the situation. He went to say that he did not think that staff should have thoughts regarding appropriateness or not of any particular feature. He then suggested that staff reports give facts about the existing situation and the submission, not state any appropriateness, and remain neutral.

Dr. Wiedenfeld felt staff does not recommend the negative and that they leave reports open because it is not in their purview. For example, on the ramp, the guidelines do not recommend the use of pressure treated material for decks and staff differed to the board. Dr. Wiedenfeld wanted to keep the staff analysis.

Mr. Tucker provided an example where staff noted that the window in question is located on the backside of the building facing the interior courtyard of the Baptist Church. Mr. Tucker said that the staff statement was not factual because the window is visible from the street and not an interior courtyard, but a Main Street facing courtyard, which could sway ARB thinking.

Dr. Wiedenfeld agreed to work with Ms. Sitterle on staff reports.

Dr. Hertz made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Nevill seconded the motion. The motion passed. The meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by B. Piszker.

Approved on \_\_\_\_\_