

**Architectural Review Board
City of Petersburg, Virginia**

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
July 10, 2019 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, City Hall
135 N. Union Street, Petersburg VA 23803

Members Present:

Chair, Joe Battiston
Vice-Chair, Dino Lunsford
Lisa Jordan
Larry Murphy
Celeste Wynn

Members Absent:

Terry Ammons
Mitchell Pradia

Staff:

Secretary to the ARB, Kate Sangregorio

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Joe Battiston called to order a regular meeting of the City of Petersburg Architectural Review Board on Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at Council Chambers, City Hall, 135 N. Union Street, Petersburg, Virginia 23803.

2. **THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Minutes from May 8, 2019 and June 12, 2019 were presented. Ms Wynn motioned to the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr Murphy. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Staff had an addition to the agenda, 30 Liberty Street, to be item 6h. Mr Murphy made a motion to approve the agenda with this change, seconded by Ms Jordan. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **PUBLIC INFORMATION PERIOD**

Chair Battiston opened the Public Information Period to anyone who wished to speak on any subject not on the agenda. With there being no comments, Chair Battiston closed the Public Information Period.

6. **REQUEST(S) FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Regular Agenda:

a. 221 Liberty Street:

Applicant not present. Mr Lunsford motioned to move this item to the end of the agenda, seconded by Mr Murphy. The motion passed unanimously.

b. 316 St Andrew's Street:

Applicant present, Janice Love. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Battiston said for the garage, the board would need additional information about it or drawings. Ms Love said it's falling down so she may just remove it for parking. Mr Battiston asked how visible it was, staff showed photos of the garage partly visible. Mr Murphy asked if it was visible from Fillmore Street, staff did not believe so, and the alley behind the lot was not a public road.

Mr Battiston asked what else needed done, the applicant said the back porch needed work.

Mr Battiston said salvaging elements is preferred unless they are not salvageable, then it's possible to move side windows to the front and get new windows for the sides. Ms Love said the windows on the side were worse than the front, and asked if she could use new windows on the back. Mr Battiston said yes, but they would prefer wood. Ms Love asked about the back porch; since it is not visible from public right of way she could proceed.

No public comment.

A motion was made to approve the application, with the condition that should the windows need replaced, additional information would be provided. The motion was seconded by Mr Lunsford and passed unanimously.

c. 318 E. Washington Street:

Applicant present, Louis Malon. Staff recommended approval. Mr Lunsford recused himself from voting as he would be the contractor for the work.

Mr Battiston noted that with the proposed removal of the existing concrete pad, pea gravel would wash downward since the ground is at an angle, and asked if the pad should be left in place. Mr Lunsford said no, the ground would be graded and made level before the pea gravel is put down, then a boarder or barrier will be added. Mr Malon said he would prefer crush and run, Mr Lunsford asked about recycled asphalt. Recycled asphalt doesn't have a historic look. Mr Battiston continued his concern about gravel washing into the street, and suggested using aggregate concrete in place of the concrete slab. Mr Malon said they want the driveway as maintenance free as possible. Ms Wynn asked about the grading, Mr Lunsford said the driveway would be cleared back to the parking lot and be smooth, with a boarder to retain the gravel. Mr Battiston said in the long run it would be cheaper to use aggregate on strip. Mr Murphy asked about 57 stone. Mr Battiston said 57 with schlag over it would have

good aesthetics. Mr Murphy noted that it would move. Mr Battiston said using crush and run with schlag over it would look like gravel, the schlag is a by-product from making steel. Mr Malon asked if this would be for the driveway or all the parking lot. Mr Battiston said it sticks together but would still roll if on an angle. Mr Battiston said pea gravel would be cheaper but an aggregate with schlag would last longer. Mr Lunsford confirmed that it would be appropriate for the historic district, Mr Murphy said yes, it looks like gravel. Mr Lunsford noted that would keep maintenance costs down. Mr Battiston said there was an example on Grove Ave and Cross Street.

No public comment.

Ms Wynn motioned to approve the application with the options of using gravel, schlag, or aggregate with grading. Motion seconded and passed unanimously, with Mr Lunsford recusing himself.

d. 107 N. South Street:

Applicant present, Lisa Capek. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Lunsford liked the fence. Mr Battiston asked if it was ok by the guidelines to use this fence, staff said there wasn't anything specific against this fence, and the materials were appropriate. Ms Capek said the height was listed as 9 feet originally because that was the height of the previous chain link fence.

Mr Murphy asked if the lights that were removed were public or private. Staff said they were on the private property of 107 N. South St. but their removal should have been reviewed. Ms Wynn was surprised they were removed. Ms Capek said they were going to try and buy the land adjacent to their property with the burnt house on it, and if they're able to, the fence would be extended.

Mr Murphy asked about the 20 foot addition, Ms Capek said it would be to work on commercial trucks. Mr Battiston questioned if it would be similar to the Leete Tire building, and asked what treatment the applicant would use on it. Ms Capek said paint. Staff asked if the existing building would also be painted, Ms Capek said yes if it was approved, the old and new would be painted to match. Ms Capek also said the previous lights were in the middle of the lot, Mr Battiston said she would need to apply for the new lighting before it is installed. Ms Capek said it would probably be lights on the building rather than light posts. Mr Battiston said bright blue lights aren't good, a warm LED is preferred, between 2700 and 3000 is warm, 6000 is cold. Mr Battiston also noted that lighting is good for security, and mentioned that Dominion might install lights on telephone poles if they won't impact any residences.

Ms Capek asked about signage, and said it would probably be similar to what's there. Mr Battiston said it could probably be approved administratively.

No public comment.

Mr Lunsford motioned to approve the application with the change that the fence would be 7 feet in height, and the note that signage should be approved by staff and zoning. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

e. 315 E. Washington Street:

Applicant present, Dino Lunsford. Mr Lunsford recused himself from voting. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Lunsford said the roof was the same as the one previously approved on the Southside Depot. Mr Murphy asked the color, Mr Lunsford said dark green.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to approve the application with a second from Ms Jordan. The motion passed unanimously.

e. 225 High Street:

Representative for the applicant present, Mr Tholand. Staff recommended partial approval.

Mr Battiston asked about the alterations to the back, staff said the wrap around porch didn't seem appropriate.

Mr Tholand explained some of the history of the house, once owned by famous African American furniture maker Thomas Day. Mr Battiston asked about the materials to be used on the back of the house, Mr Tholand said wood. Mr Battiston confirmed there would be no plastic, Mr Tholand said the goal was to restore the house to original as much as possible, with the exception of the back porch. Mr Battiston commented that it was pretty modern, but that would distinguish it from the historic fabric of the house. Staff noted that it would be very visible from Low Street. Ms Jordan said she was not a fan of the wrap around design, and might suggest something shorter. Staff said the goal of the porch was to connect to a side kitchen door. Mr Murphy commented that it was a hard call since the change would be so visible.

Mr Battiston asked if the kitchen door was existing, Mr Tholand said it was a window now. Mr Murphy asked if the kitchen door could be moved back, Mr Battiston countered that they wouldn't want a whole new rough opening punched in. Ms Jordan asked if the applicant would consider obscuring the view, Mr Tholand agreed. Mr Battiston said that if the kitchen door existed then the rear porch might be more acceptable. Mr Tholand said the kitchen door would probably be the primary entrance. Mr Battiston said the ARB has denied turning windows into doors in the past. Mr Battiston asked if the rear deck could more closely match the front porch, Mr Tholand though this would be OK.

No public comment.

A motion was made to deny the application as it stood, but other options should be proposed. Staff offered a suggestion to change the motion to approve the front porch but provide other options for the rear. The motion was amended as such, and it was added that the design of the rear deck was acceptable but the footing should be changed to not wrap around the house. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr Battiston clarified that the catwalk was eliminated and the window could not be changed to a door. Staff added that the garage should come back.

g. 127 – 129 W. Bank Street:

Applicant not present. Ms Wynn motioned to move the item to the end of the agenda, seconded by Mr Lunsford. The motion passed unanimously.

h. 30 Lafayette Street:

Representative for the property owners present, Zak Mathews. Staff recommended denial.

Mr Battiston said no, the roof would have to be metal; some of the original tin probably wasn't in that bad of condition and could have been repaired with a sealant, which could fix any pin holes but not major holes. The rear one story portion of the house still has its tin, Mr Battiston continued that replacing metal with anything else on the main house wouldn't be under allowed by DHR or the NPS, it's a very solid rule for historic districts.

Mr Mathews explained that there was limited funding from the insurance and more than half the shingles were already installed, and there was already interior water damage when the property was purchased. Mr Mathews apologized for not doing his due diligence. Mr Lunsford commented that this happens a lot, people not knowing about the historic districts. Mr Lunsford suggested checking into tax credits, and acknowledged that asphalt shingles are cheaper, but it has to be metal. Mr Mathews claimed they hadn't had this roof issue before in Richmond, and noted that the roof on this house was barely visible, staff stated anything visible from public right of way is under purview of the ARB.

Mr Battiston sympathized with the property owner not knowing, and said the seller or realtor should make buyers aware. Mr Battiston also said the ARB couldn't allow asphalt shingles additionally because then everyone would want to use them, and the City could lose its historic designation, so ignorance isn't a valid reason for approval.

Mr Lunsford recommended roofers, and said seam height should be around 1 inch to $\frac{3}{4}$ inch, and again suggested looking into tax credits. Mr Mathews said the roof was the main issue, and possibly door repair. Mr Battiston said repair is better because replication is expensive. Mr Battiston asked the expected cost, Mr Mathews said the expected investment was \$5,000; which would not be worth the tax credit process.

Mr Mathews confirmed that the already installed asphalt shingles can be left until a metal roof is put on, the board agreed.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to deny the application as submitted; with the allocation that the asphalt shingles could remain only until correct metal roofing is proposed, which could be administratively be approved by staff. Mr Lunsford seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

a. 221 Liberty Street:

Applicant still not present. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Murphy said the window sill could be shortened on the inside while retaining the window as it is. Mr Lunsford commented that window to door applications have been denied. Mr Murphy noted the plans also changed the width of the opening.

No public comment.

Ms Wynn motioned to deny the application as submitted, seconded by Ms Jordan. The motion passed unanimously.

g. 127-129 W. Bank Street:

Applicant still not present. Staff recommended approval.

Ms Wynn commented that it may look like a parking lot, and wondered why the applicant wouldn't include landscaping. Staff said the applicant might put plants in later. Mr Battiston commented that anything would be an improvement.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to approve the application with a second by Ms Wynn. Mr Battiston added that the changes must be maintained over time. The motion passed unanimously.

6. **OLD BUSINESS**

a. 227 St. Andrews Street

Staff informed the ARB that the decision to deny the application to demolish would be appealed to City Council. Mr Battiston said he could come to the meeting to explain the board's reasoning, and inform Council that the decision was to support the City's Zoning Ordinance. This was also a case of not allowing demolition by neglect.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

9. **WORK SESSION**

a. Administrative approval for in-kind roofs.

Ms Jordan motioned to give staff the authority to approve in-kind roof replacement if it meets the guidelines as established. Mr Murphy seconded the application and it passed unanimously.

b. 404 N. Sycamore Street:

Mr Lunsford expressed displeasure in the colors. Mr Battiston explained that in the past people did use brighter colors. Mr Battiston also expressed displeasure but said the colors weren't offensive.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr Murphy to adjourn the meeting seconded by Ms Wynn, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.