

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
April 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
Celeste Wynn
Larry Murphy
Mitchell Pradia
Terry Ammons

Members Absent:

Lisa Jordan

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, April 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 March 13, 2019 were presented. Mr Murphy motioned to approve the minutes as presented, with a second from Ms Wynn. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Staff had an addition to the agenda, 332 St Andrews Street as item 6h in the Requests for Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr Pradia made a motion to approve the agenda with this change, motion was seconded by Mr Ammons and 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. 1103 McKenzie Street:

Applicant present, Rodolfo Reyes. Staff recommended approval of the application with alterations.

Mr Battiston asked if the roof sample was for the whole roof or just the addition. Mr Reyes explained that the roof panels that match what is on the house now have to be ordered specially; the sample provided was one type in stock. Mr Battiston said it would be OK on the addition, but the main house has to match what's there; Mr Battiston explained that there are a lot of companies that make that type of roof. Mr Ammons thought the sample looked too industrial. Mr Reyes agreed to use the matching style roof.

Mr Ammons requested to see the windows, they could be wood or aluminum clad and they're covered with storm windows now. Mr Reyes confirmed that the front and sides are more important, and the back is less important. The board confirmed this.

Mr Ammons said he did not want the roof sample on the addition; it would be more cost effective to do the whole roof at once.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to approve the application with the roof to match existing 16 inch panels. Mr Ammons amended the motion to include that the three existing windows would be restored. Mr Pradia seconded the motion with its addition and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr Reyes asked about repairing the window glass, Mr Battiston said there were several places in the area.

b. 420 Cross Street:

Applicant present, Kim Davis Potts. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Ammons asked if the proposed roof would be higher than what's shown in the photo, Ms Potts said yes. Mr Ammons said they would need to see the details, Ms Potts said she had provided them. Ms Potts showed a photo of the railings on the house across the street that she would like to use on her house, Mr Ammons said he would like to see a cross section. Mr Battiston suggested 2 by 2 pickets.

No public comment.

Ms Wynn motioned to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr Murphy and passed unanimously.

c. 419 N. West Street:

Applicant present, Audel Alverado. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Battiston asked about the siding. Mr Alverado said he would match the wood on the main house, he will also repair the windows and shingles. Mr Battiston asked if they would be the same shingles, Mr Alverado said he would use the same on the addition as well. Mr Ammons asked if the windows would match in size, they would. Mr Ammons said they could be one over one double hung so they're not exactly the same. Mr Alverado agreed to this.

No public comment.

Ms Wynn motioned to approve the application. Motion seconded by Mr Murphy and passed unanimously.

d. 137 Liberty Street:

Applicant present, Marion Cake. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Mr Cake reiterated that all the siding would be wood and the plans specified hardiplank in error. Mr Battiston asked for placement of a door, Mr Cake explained. Mr Ammons asked if it would be used as a single family residence. Mr Cake said it is zoned for two families and they intend to leave it as such, potentially as an in-law suite.

Mr Ammons clarified if the new door would serve the rear unit or the back of the main house. Mr Cake said it's so you won't have to walk through the back unit to get outside. Mr Murphy asked if you couldn't get through that door what would happen. Mr Cake said they would leave it there inoperable. Mr Ammons asked if right now the two units were not completely separate. Mr Cake said it would be good to leave it so there is an option to close it for the separate units, to be used as the owner chooses.

Mr Murphy commented that the roof should match, Mr Cake said it will. Mr Ammons said he would prefer flat lock metal rather than membrane on the porch roof. Mr Ammons also said he would prefer to see windows repaired rather than replaced when possible.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to approve the application with the change that a flat lock roof be installed on the porch and that windows should be repaired when possible. The motion was seconded by Mr Pradia and passed unanimously.

e. 439 Third Street:

Applicant present, James Hartle.

Mr Battiston commented that the sign was similar or the same to the one on Sycamore St. Mr Ammons expressed agreement with shortening the long “Beer and Wine Market” sign. Mr Battiston suggested aligning the sign with the center windows. Mr Ammons said the size of it should relate to its placement. Mr Lunsford asked if it could be cut short, Mr Hartle said it could be.

Mr Ammons said 50 square feet is the maximum amount of signage allowed in the historic districts, and said that he had measured the window paintings for the percentage they cover, and said we don’t want to see Old Towne covered in ads. Staff was unsure how the paintings should be classified since they’re not permanent and can be changed.

The board compared the hanging and wall mounted signs, Mr Battiston said some of the black should be removed from the "Beer and Wine Market" sign, and it should be aligned with the windows in some way to fit the space well. Mr Hartle suggested centering it under the three windows on the right, Mr Battiston agreed that could be a better placement.

Mr Battiston asked, if the applicant was limited to two windows to be painted, which would he use? Mr Hartle said he would use the two center most windows. Mr Ammons asked what would be changeable on the paintings, Mr Hartle said they could add new items because the paint isn't permanent. Mr Battiston asked if you can see through the windows, Mr Hartle said no, and that they needed shades to protect the beer anyway. Mr Lunsford clarified that the applicant would reduce the size of the black sign, but questioned how much needed to be taken off the windows. Mr Ammons said, by his calculations, there should only be two window panels with paintings on them, not including the door as part of the windows. Mr Hartle said with those stipulations he would keep the flags and list because that shows what the business has for sale.

Mr Battiston commented that this is a much less visible location, so he would lean towards allowing more signage and visibility, and suggested allowing 40% of the building's windows to be covered. Ms Wynn agreed it's not located in the heart of the city or a main corridor. Mr Ammons commented that the business name should be pedestrian level, and said that he would accept this application as-is, as long as nothing is added to make it denser. Mr Murphy commented that the board would be setting a precedent and they should stay consistent at 20%.

Ms Wynn asked about the window shades, would they be in the upper windows; Mr Hartle said yes. Ms Wynn said she would prefer to see two windows with paintings. Mr Lunsford said he supports as much branding as possible.

Mr Ammons clarified that square footage in this case is calculated by measuring the box that could be drawn around the words that make up a sign. Mr Battiston asked about frosting the glass, Mr Hartle said there's already four windows blocked inside by a freezer and stuff. Mr Ammons said frosting didn't count as signage, and that probably 3 and a half window panels were being used now. Mr Murphy commented

that if this building was on Sycamore St they wouldn't even be discussing it. Mr Ammons said this application would need to be closer to the guidelines, but this could be an exception. Mr Murphy said the board has been strict on signage in the past.

No public comment.

Mr Ammons motioned to approve the reduction in width of the long sign to meet the 50 square foot maximum requirement, to be aligned with the windows or some other element to fit the space well; and to table the painted windows for the next meeting. Motion seconded by Ms Wynn. Mr Battiston said not to make any changes until then. The motion passed unanimously.

f. 818 W. Washington Street:

Applicants present, Josie Emery and her son. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Battiston asked if the windows would be repaired, Ms Emery said yes, Mr Battiston asked if they would be reglazed and painted, Ms Emery said yes. Mr Battiston asked what else was planned, Mr Emery said the house was sagging on both ends, the foundation would need lifted, and the roof has issues too. Mr Battiston asked if it was standing seam metal, it was, Mr Battiston explained the applicants should get 1 inch or $\frac{3}{4}$ an inch seam height on new panels, and asked if it would be the same color. Ms Emery said yes the red color.

Mr Ammons commented that it was a great and very unique building, Ms Emery agreed, she likes that it has a storefront. Mr Ammons said he would like to see the storefront restored and asked if the windows were still there, they were. Mr Battiston asked if these would also be repaired, they would. Mr Ammons commented that there are similar buildings on Grove Ave.

Mr Murphy asked about the sagging. Mr Emery said they would lift the house and shore it with 6 x 6 timbers on the ground.

No public comment.

Mr Murphy motioned to approve the application as submitted with a second from Mr Lunsford. Staff questioned replacement of the doors, Mr Emery said the right side door was metal. Mr Ammons said they could replace it with the same or use a new wood door, Mr Battiston said a wood door would fit the house better. The motion passed unanimously.

g. 1209 W. High Street:

Applicant present, William Maku and his associate. Staff recommended approval.

Mr Maku said they didn't have a change to change the plans ahead of the meeting, but brought forth the amended plans. He explained that the roof on the addition had been lowered from the main house, and the bump out on the east side would break the

plane. Mr Ammons clarified that the bump out on the east side would be an entrance, and said that the older existing addition wasn't present in 1877, but it was by 1890; the siding and windows on the older addition match the house. Mr Ammons said the big question was massing; does this preserve the character of the house, making it two family when it was one family. Mr Ammons also said the changes were good, but the scale was too big to fit. Mr Battiston asked what was next to it; there are similar style houses. Mr Murphy said he didn't think the issue was going from one to two family, it's more the aesthetics. Ms Wynn asked how visible it would be, Mr Ammons said it would be visible from the front and a side street. Mr Ammons said he would like more time to look at it, Mr Battiston said he wants it saved but he needs a good look at the plans. Mr Maku said he was flexible.

Mr Battiston asked if the siding repair was in-kind, Mr Maku said yes and the addition was proposed as hardiplank. Mr Maku expressed a need to move forward with the project quickly. Mr Ammons said he would need a COA first. Ms Wynn suggested a site visit between now and the next meeting. Mr Murphy asked if they were going to decide yes or no by next meeting. Mr Ammons said there's usually a discussion period they need to work through. Mr Murphy asked about the timing, so as not to penalize the applicant for having more detailed drawings. Mr Ammons said they need comments to get updated plans. Ms Wynn said a site visit should help.

Mr Maku said they weren't breaking the footprint other than the bump out. Staff commented that the setbacks were fine for zoning. Mr Battiston asked if the historic addition could remain. Mr Maku said a tentative yes, but it separates the two units and they would run into challenges on the interior. Mr Murphy commented that it was in bad shape. Mr Battiston clarified that Mr Ammons was concerned with the loss of the historic addition, Mr Ammons said yes and the size and massing of the proposed addition. Mr Battiston suggested voting by email. Mr Ammons said they would all need to make comments, the applicant would respond, make new plans, and then the board would vote. Mr Battiston posed to have comments within two weeks. Mr Ammons said it's the big picture right now, details can be changed or discussed.

No public comment.

Mr Ammons motioned to table the application to the next meeting or to the soonest point the board would be able to vote. The motion was seconded by Ms Wynn and passed unanimously.

h. 332 St Andrews Street:

Applicants present, Kimberly Zarate and Christian Rexach. Staff recommended changes.

Mr Battiston suggested the columns were originally 10 or 12 inches wide, but 6 inches now, and asked if the applicants were aware that they are not the correct columns. Ms Zarate said yes, and explained that one of them broke and it would have needed to be special ordered; the only 9 foot tall columns they had in stock were the

ones they used. The other columns were failing too so they replaced all of them except the half columns attached to the wall.

Mr Battiston asked if the applicants got the measurements of the original columns would it be ok to use fiberglass, because that would be sturdier. Staff was unsure. Mr Ammons said they would probably need to be special ordered anyway so it was worth shopping around, fiberglass or fiber composite. Mr Battiston said the ones up now can't stay, they need to be an appropriate size. Ms Wynn asked if staff could give a list of places for the applicant to look.

Mr Ammons suggested a temporary COA to give the applicants time to find more appropriate columns. Mr Battiston asked how long it would take them to find or save up for better columns, Ms Zarate was unsure, they don't live in Petersburg yet but estimated a year. Ms Zarate also said her neighbors have the same columns, staff explained that sometimes these violations aren't caught in time. Mr Battiston said that staff does issue Stop Work Orders and violation letters.

Mr Murphy asked if the deck and piers were secure, Ms Zarate said they were. It was suggested to give the applicants 18 months on a temporary COA. Mr Ammons said they're trying to help people do the best for the whole neighborhood, and don't want the people who are doing the right thing to bear the burden for everyone.

No public comment.

Mr Ammons motioned to issue a temporary 18 month COA, in which time the applicants should replace the columns to match what was originally there. Motion seconded by Mr Murphy. Mr Battiston asked if they had to match the material, Mr Ammons said fiberglass or wood, and suggested somewhere the applicants could look, Mr Battiston made some suggestions as well. Motion passed unanimously.

6. **OLD BUSINESS**

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

Dymichael Gordon, 315 E. Fillmore St came forward. Mr Gordon said that he had gotten a letter from Code Compliance and asked where to start. He said listed on the violation was paint, soffit damage, repointing, a broken window. Mr Ammons said general maintenance is OK, if there are any changes they need reviewed. Mr Gordon said 30 days to do all that is extreme. Staff explained the Code Compliance process and said he should speak to them. Mr Gordon asked about insulated foam, Mr Ammons said that would damage the house, Ms Wynn explained that old houses were built to breathe and the foam prevents that. Mr Ammons asked if it was plaster, it was, he said to seal off airspace with caulk. Mr Gordon said the door was damaged and he didn't like it, Mr Battiston said it would be hard to find a door to fit.

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS**

9. **WORK SESSION**

Mr Ammons asked if the Consent Agenda was ever used, staff said sometimes. Mr Battiston said staff was given more administrative powers so it cuts down on consent agenda items.

Mr Murphy asked about the board's stance on windows; were they advocating more for repair over replacement now? Mr Ammons said pieces can be replaced if they're too damaged, a caulked window with a storm window over it is protected, and added that windows are an important character defining feature on a building. Mr Murphy said more manufacturers are doing wood windows now. Mr Ammons said they're expensive and less people are making sashes, more people going to Home Depot and Lowes. Mr Murphy confirmed that windows should be repaired and they would allow aluminum clad wood. Yes. Mr Ammons said people think that windows are hard to fix; they aren't but you need a skilled carpenter. Mr Ammons said a replacement window would always be a replacement, and said it takes about 12 hours to fix one.

Staff asked about email voting. Mr Ammons said to ask the City Attorney. Ms Wynn said only for special occasions. Mr Battiston said it had been used before. Mr Ammons didn't want to undermine the public process. Ms Wynn suggested that if it's an issue that has been presented and reviewed but more information was requested.

Staff asked if signs could be administratively approved as long as they fall within the guidelines. The board agreed to this.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

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