BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. Graham called the meeting to order about 7:30 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Charlie Graham, Brad Thorp, Edward Ross, Chris Von Handorf, Jaime Garrett and Frank Holloway. Also present: City Planner Andrew Rodney, Planner Mark Yandrick and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver.

Absent: Richard Hoback had notified staff that he would be absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No changes were requested for the minutes of the BAR meeting of May 5, 2015.

MOTION: Mr. Thorp made a motion to approve the minutes of the Board of Architectural Review meeting of May 5, 2015, as distributed. Mr. Holloway seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0-1, with Mr. Garrett abstaining, because he was not present at that meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P-2015-0037: Fence for Dayton International School, 235 W. Franklin Street
Applicant: Alison Allport

Mr. Yandrick gave the staff report for the request by Ms. Alison Allport for a vinyl fence in the front yard for a recess area at the Dayton International School, 235 West Franklin Street on the western entry to the Architectural Preservation District. He located the property on a map and stated that fences under 42" of wood, iron or aluminum were permitted in the front yard in the APD. Vinyl was a material the Board of Architectural Review could review and approve on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Yandrick showed the picture of the type of fence proposed as provided by the applicant, a plot plan with the general location of the fence, photos from various vantage points and a computer-generated rendering of an installed white fence. He said this house was not historic; it was probably constructed in the 1940's or 1950's. He presented the Standards of Approval, before recommending denial of vinyl fence at the gateway to the historic district.

Mr. Graham asked for comments from the applicant.

Ms. Allport gave background concerning the Dayton International School, explaining it offered Spanish immersion for toddlers through adults. She said the only equipment to be used in the front yard would be a portable table for outside activities. She showed photos of the surrounding neighborhood and stated the school currently had no safe set-up for outside activities. Using an aerial view of the site, she noted that no alternative location for outdoor use was available. Donors had generously offered to help with cost and installation of picket fence in the school's front yard. She showed a mock-up of the fence and stated the white picket fence would protect the children while enhancing the school's image. Vinyl was a lower price alternative with lower maintenance costs and greater longevity than wood.

Mr. Thorp asked if she had brought a sample or a brochure concerning the fence. She replied in the negative. He asked how glossy the fence was, because, in his opinion, glossy fence looked less like wood and would be less acceptable.

Mr. Ross asked for clarification of staff's objections. He wanted to know if the main factor was the material and look of the product or the prominent location in the front yard at the entry to the APD.

Mr. Rodney responded the concern was the use of a non-traditional material in such a prominent location. The fence was in the front yard at a gateway to the APD. A vinyl fence surrounding a rear yard would have been less objectionable. He agreed that the vinyl fence would be more durable and look better for a longer period. However, he felt one of the hallmarks of the Architectural Preservation District should be the use of traditional, natural materials.

Questions and comments from the Board followed. Mr. Thorp asked if the white horse park fence in its prominent location along Yankee Street was vinyl. Mr. Rodney answered in the affirmative. Mr. Thorp also inquired about the wood fence at Benham's Grove. When Mr. Thorp questioned the timing for installation, Ms. Allport said she wished to have the fence in place as soon as possible, because school would be starting shortly. Mr. Thorp stated he wanted a product with matte finish, and Mr. Rodney volunteered to work with the applicant to ensure the use of an acceptable material. Mr. Garrett requested details concerning the specifications for the fence—the distance between the pickets and the distance from post to post. Ms. Allport did not know these details. Mr. Thorp recommended a locking device for the gate, because of the presence of young children, and stated that the installation needed to be professionally pristine. Mr. Holloway stated he had looked at the property earlier and felt that white fence would enhance the building, because the trim on the house was white. Mr. Von Handorf asked about setbacks, and Charlie Graham stated that one of the roles of the BAR was to keep good businesses in the community.

MOTION: Mr. Thorp made a motion to approve Application P-2015-0027 for vinyl fence in the front yard at 235 W. Franklin Street, with the fence material to be reviewed and approved by staff according to the guidance given during this meeting. Mr. Ross seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rodney shared updates concerning the following properties in the Architectural Preservation District.

- 78 E. Franklin recently had been sold for rehab. The new owner, though encouraged to use wood or vinyl clad windows, may request vinyl windows. BAR would review that request.
- 36 W. Franklin Street was in the process of expanding with a salon on the second floor.
- Deb Teeters' building at 27 W. Franklin was being prepared for use as a pet boutique.
- The contractor was making progress on the remodeling of the dentist office at 2 E. Franklin Street.

- Nelly's Chicken at 79 S. Main Street should open soon. Mr. Santillan may add a pergola and patio along S. Main Street.
- 39 W. Franklin Street sold at auction.
- Centerville Coin and Jewelry, 38 W. Franklin Street, was being renamed to Pi Boutique.
- 18-22 S. Main Street was purchased for rehabilitation.
- The owner of the Marathon at 215 N. Main Street recently asked questions about converting the building to a café.
- In response to a question from Mr. Ross, Mr. Rodney said no activity was seen for the Dewey's site on N. Main Street.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Garrett made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Von Handorf seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

The next meeting of the Board of Architectural Review was scheduled in the Council Chambers at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 1, 2015.

Charles M. Graham