

TOWN OF ABINGDON
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
CONTINUED MEETING
OCTOBER 10, 2000 - 1:30 P.M.

This Board of Architectural Review meeting was held on Tuesday, October 10, 2000, and was *continued* from Tuesday, October 3, 2000. The meeting was held at 1:30 P.M. in the Municipal Building, Downstairs Meeting Room.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Charles R. Day, Chairman.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Mr. Charles R. Day, Chairman
 Mr. Fred H. St. John, Vice-Chairman
 Mr. E. L. Gardner

Comprising a quorum of the Board

Members Absent: Mrs. Lois H. Humphreys

Administrative Staff: Mr. Albert C. Bradley, Director of Planning/Zoning

Visitors: Mr. Charles "Sam" E. Woolwine
 Mr. John Sullivan
 Mrs. Jan Hurt
 Mr. James Moore
 Mr. Martin Wegbreit
 Mr. Andrew Boyles

* * * * *

- (2) Certificate of Appropriateness – C. E. Woolwine Construction Co., Inc., (Charles E. Woolwine), P. O. Box 1202, Abingdon, Virginia 24212; **third submittal** of plot plan for construction of one (1) residential structure to be constructed at **135 West Valley Street. Tax Map No. 12 (1) 9.**

Following the last meeting held Tuesday, October 3, 2000, it was recommended by the Board that the applicant, Charles E. Woolwine and immediate neighboring property owners see if negotiations or agreements could be made concerning the referenced project.

Mr. Woolwine stated that on Friday, October 6, 2000, he met with Mrs. Price, Mr. & Mrs. Boyles, Mr. Moore and Mr. Wegbreit. He further stated that there was no conclusion at that meeting regarding this project. However, since that meeting, through his attorney, it was proposed that if he would agree to add eight (8) additional feet to the width of the building, this would be satisfactory. This means adding eight (8) feet to the porch, leaving the garage the same width, with windows on front of building to meet guidelines. With these changes, the applicant and property owners could be in agreement.

Mr. Wegbreit stated that they did meet on Friday, October 6, 2000, for approximately 2 ¾ hours. Mr. Woolwine met with each of the other plaintiffs (households) for approximately 30 – 45 minutes each with his attorney present, without the presence of Mr. Wegbreit, upon request of Mr. Woolwine. Mr. Wegbreit spoke with each family immediately after their discussion with Mr. Woolwine and again during the weekend. Mr. Wegbreit further stated that he met with Mr. Woolwine for approximately 45 minutes after the negotiation session.

Upon Mr. Woolwine's request, Mr. Wegbreit asked each of the plaintiff households to rate on a scale 1 to 10 on the follows suggestions:

1. leave building where it is and not widen it; an average of 8.25
2. leave building in place but widen it; an average of 5
3. move structure and leave current width; an average of 5
4. move structure and widen it; an average 1.75

As a result of these ratings, Mr. Wegbreit contacted Mr. Woolwine's attorney on this date, October 10, 2000 at approximately 8:15 A.M. and indicated that if was felt that the most promising avenue to explore was to leave the structure where it is but to widen it 8 to 10 feet; however, Mr. Woolwine was not being required to strictly comply with the Design Review Guidelines, including:

1. windows visible from Valley Street, both side and front windows should be rectangular
2. all roofs should be no flatter than a 45° angle and could be steeper
3. matching vertical slats on each side of front porch

After further discussion, motion was made by Mr. St. John that approval for the structure to be extended eight (8) feet be granted and subject to review of the **fourth submittal** plot plan on Friday, October 13, 2000, at 1:30 P.M., other recommendations will be considered for approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. St. John, with unanimous approval.

* * * * *

There being no further business, motion was made by Mr. St. John, seconded by Mr. Gardner, and unanimously approved that the meeting be adjourned.

Charles R. Day, Chairman

Albert C. Bradley, Secretary