

**MINUTES
HILTON VILLAGE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 2009
HILTON LIBRARY
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: J. Roger Hamilton, III; Chairman, Douglas Nunnally, Vice-Chairman, Connie Keator, Katie Stodghill, David Chappell

ABSENT: Robert Saunders, Ryan J. Frantz

STAFF: Johnnie E. Davis, Executive Secretary

(1) Mr. Hamilton called the meeting to order, and welcomed Mr. David Chappell to the Board.

- (A) **Application No. CA-09-1539 – CRP, LC, 98 Hopkins Street, requests to replace all of the original windows in the first-story and dormer in the front of the house, replace the jalousie windows in the addition on the right side of the house, and replace the original window on the left side of the house. The original windows will be replaced with thermal-paned windows with a style that matches the original window. The jalousie windows will be replaced with six-over-six, double-hung, thermal-paned windows.**

Mr. Oliver Carrithers represented the application. He stated the width of the grids is 7/8", and the grids have a profile that is not as flat as the previous window that he presented to the board. The Board briefly discussed the details of the request. Mr. Frantz moved that the application be approved as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stodghill and approved with a unanimous vote.

- (B) **Application No. CA-09-1540 – Joseph P. White, 310 Piez Avenue, requests to erect a 6' dog-eared style fence to replace an existing chain-link fence to run from the left rear corner of the original house with a gate to the left side property line and to run along the left side property line to the rear property line with a gate to extend across the rear property line, and extend 3 feet along the right side property line. The fence will be constructed with pressure-treated wood.**

Ms. Doreen Knowles, the realtor, represented the application for Mr. Joseph White; the owner. She reminded the Board that the request had gone through Preliminary Design Review at the last meeting. After some discussion, Mr. Nunnally moved that the application be approved as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Keator and approved with a unanimous vote.

- (C) Application No. CA-09-1541 – Katie Stodghill, 231 Palen Avenue, requests to erect a 6’ stockade style fence to run from the left rear corner of the house with a gate along the left side property line to the storage shed in the rear yard. The fence will be constructed of wood, and painted.**

Ms. Stodghill stepped down from the Board. Mr. Hamilton stated he may possibly have a monetary interest in the construction of the portion of the fence that will be installed along his property. Mr. Hamilton stepped down from the Board. Mr. Davis informed the Board that there were not enough members present for the Board to take action on the request. Mr. Nunnaly moved that the application be deferred to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Keator and approved with a unanimous vote. Ms. Stodghill and Mr. Hamilton rejoined the Board.

- (D) Preliminary Design Review – Ms. Mary Ellen O’neal, 220 Ferguson Avenue, requests to replace the windows in her house.**

Ms. Mary O’Neal told the board that she had been trying to find a window that she could afford, so that she could replace the windows in her house. She said she has received prices from Mr. Rogers Windows, Goodman, and Lowe’s. Ms. O’Neal said Lowe’s have the best deal on windows. She showed the board a brochure of the window from Lowe’s that she would like to install. Ms. O’Neal said the grids are not flat and they have a profile. Mr. Hamilton informed Ms. O’Neal that the board had just approved a window for the first application that did not appear to be an expensive window, and he suggested that she might want to compare the cost before she decides on which window to use. Ms. O’Neal thanked Mr. Hamilton and she said she will compare the cost before she submits her application.

- (E) Preliminary Design Review – Ms. Jennifer McFadden, 54 Main Street, requests to install a cupola on the roof of the garage in the rear yard.**

Ms. Jennifer McFadden showed the Board a brochure of a cupola that she would like to install on the roof of the garage in the rear yard. Ms. Stodghill said she did not have a problem with a cupola, but she did not think that this particular style would fit the roof that she would like to install it on. She suggested that she find a different style, and submit drawings with dimensions that show the size of the cupola. Ms. Stodghill asked Mr. Davis if this is something that the board can review as an application, since there

is nothing in the guidelines concerning cupolas. Mr. Davis said he regarded a cupola as being a character defining feature that should be incorporated into the guidelines before the Board should take action on it. He stated whenever the board is interested on acting on something that is not a part of the guidelines, that it is better to wait and incorporate it into the guidelines before acting on it. Mr. Davis said this will avoid the board from having the appearance of being arbitrary or capricious. Mr. Saul Gleiser said he regarded cupolas as being an addition and as such the guidelines for additions would apply. He said that the board should look at the appropriateness of the feature, its scale, size, and form. After further discussion, it was the consensus of the board to review the request. Mr. Hamilton told Ms. Mcfadden to submit drawings with her application. Mr. Gleiser told Ms. McFadden to go through the Village and take photographs of other cupolas in the Village and submit them with her application. Mr. Davis said the board should include cupolas as part of their consideration for the next revision to the guidelines. The board agreed with Mr. Davis.

(F) Preliminary Design Review – Joseph Epstein, 10247 Warwick Boulevard, install a wall sign on the facade of the building.

Mr. Joseph Epstein submitted a drawing of a 3' – 4" x 12' – 0" wall sign to board that he said he would like the board to consider for their approval. He said the letters will be individually attached to the wall, and that according to his calculation the sign is 40 square feet. Mr. Epstein said he has a 42-foot frontage, so he thinks that he would be within his allowable signage according to Codes Compliance. The board discussed the type of letters and the size of the sign. Ms. Stodghill asked Mr. Davis if this request is something that the board could approve. Mr. Davis said that Mr. Epstein's building is considered a non-contributing building, and it does not relate to any of the original structures in the Village. He said non-contributing buildings are treated somewhat differently than original structures, since they do not relate to the original architecture or size of the original structures. Mr. Davis said the "Hilton Village Commercial Area Master Plan" has guidelines for these types of buildings, and he showed the board a copy of the plan. Mr. Epstein saw a rendering of his building in the plan and he said he would like to submit a request for his sign according to the drawing in the plan. Mr. Hamilton informed Mr. Epstein of his submission requirements.

- (2)** Mr. Saul Gleiser, Senior District Planner, said he would like to update the Board on the progress of the reformatting of the guidelines, and also get some input from the board concerning the revised outline. The following

categories from the guidelines were discussed. Under shutters, the board discussed whether shutters should be allowed, and decided that the consultant could propose some new language for their review. Under “New Construction”, the board determined that any new structures would have to meet the guidelines for the existing structures, and new language was not needed. Mr. Gleiser asked if the board wanted new language for decks. The board determined that deck design should be left to the homeowner, and new language was not needed. Mr. Gleiser asked about doors in the appendix. The board determined that the drawings for doors in the appendix could be revised. Mr. Gleiser asked about hot tubs. The board determined that no additional language was needed. Mr. Gleiser said he did not understand why the board required board review for a 6 foot privacy fence. Ms. Stodghill asked Mr. Davis what was the rationale for that type of fencing. Mr. Davis said there are many lots that are narrow in the Village and a privacy fence in the side yard may possibly block light and air. He said board review gives the adjacent property owners an opportunity to comment on the request, especially if there are unusual circumstances that they may want to bring to the board’s attention. The board determined that this section did not need changing.

- (3) The meeting ended due to a power outage at 8:45 P.M.

Johnnie E. Davis
Executive Secretary, HVARB

JED/
HvarvminJuly01