

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
June 8, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.
Multipurpose Room, Petersburg Public Library

Members Present:

Joe Battiston
Celeste Wynn
Bill Hartsock
Louis Malon

Members Absent:

Chair, Larry Murphy
Vice-Chair, Dino Lunsford
Terry Ammons

Staff:

Secretary to the ARB, Kate Sangregorio

1. CALL TO ORDER

Former Chairman Joe Battiston called to order a regular meeting of the City of Petersburg Architectural Review Board on Wednesday, June 8, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room of the Petersburg Public Library.

2. THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Minutes from the May 2022 regular ARB meeting were presented. Mr. Malon motioned to approve the minutes as drafted. Ms. Wynn seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Malon motioned to approve the agenda as presented, with a second by Mr. Hartsock. The motion passed unanimously. This motion approved item 6a. on the Consent Agenda.

5. PUBLIC INFORMATION PERIOD

Mr. Battiston opened the Public Information Period to anyone who wished to speak on any subject not on the agenda.

With there being no comments, Mr. Battiston closed the Public Information Period.

6. REQUEST(S) FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

6a. 424 High Street

Approved in consent agenda.

6b. 338 Harrison Street

Applicant present, Sandra Cruz Gomez. Applicant representative present. Staff recommended deferral.

Staff explained that the existing siding on the house was not original, so the use of hardiplank was acceptable.

The applicant's representative said that for the porch, 6x6 pressure treated wooden posts would be used. Mr. Battiston advised that they should wait about 6 months before painting pressure treated wood. The applicant said they would be painting the columns white.

Staff asked about the windows that had already been replaced without review. The applicant's representative said that they would be removed and appropriate wood windows would be installed.

Mr. Hartsock asked about the small window on the second floor over the door, which the ARB suspected to have been resized from original. Mr. Hartsock asked if the window could be enlarged to match the others; the applicant agreed. Staff commented that the window had been that size for a long time, so enlarging it would not be required.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to conditionally approve the application based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, after the applicant submitted the siding and window details to staff before installation. Ms. Wynn seconded the application and it passed unanimously.

6c. 38 S. Jones Street

Applicant representative present, Patrick Araya. Staff recommended partial approval.

Mr. Araya explained that the house had a two story main section, a one story addition, and another one story addition off that, and the owner wanted to keep that footprint. The house used to be a two family but was now single family. The owner wanted to add an additional bedroom and windows would need to be resized for egress. Mr. Battiston said that the façade needed to be maintained and that any windows that

needed replaced should be replaced in-kind with the same materials, rough openings, and configuration.

Mr. Araya said that the current siding was vinyl; Mr. Battiston explained that the vinyl could remain, but hardiplank may look better and last longer. The applicant said that hardiplank could be installed.

There was some discussion about the location of new windows. There was also discussion about the roof materials; the main house and front porch had metal and metal should remain, but there were asphalt shingles on the rear sections which could remain.

The applicant wanted to remove the left façade door and replace it with a window. The ARB explained that the house should keep its original duplex look on the façade, and that the left door could be closed on the inside but remain visible on the outside. The applicant asked if doors with lites the same dimensions as the windows could be used, Mr. Hartsock said the closed door and right door should look like they do now.

Staff asked about the proposal to raise the roof, with a concern that it would alter the character of the house. The applicant explained that the owner wanted to raise the ceiling height of the second floor to 8ft and have room for a small attic. Mr. Hartsock pointed out that this would change the character of the house. It was suggested that the roof could be raised without changing the actual roof pitch, the ARB agreed with this.

Mr. Battiston requested that there be some differentiation between the old and new sections, and suggested either using a piece of trim or stepping the addition in from the main house. The applicant said the trim would be doable.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to conditionally approve the application based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 7 Section R, after the applicant presents staff with the updated drawings to reflect the ARB's comments: that the windows be repaired if possible, and that any replacement windows be replaced in-kind, any new windows should be wood or wood with aluminum cladding, siding could be vinyl or hardiplank, main house roof and porch should remain metal, rear addition roof may remain asphalt shingle, the façade doors should remain in place by being repaired or replaced with similar doors, with the left façade door to be closed from the inside, trim should be added to the exterior to differentiate the new addition from original house, roof could be raised but the roof pitch must remain the same.

6d. 933 West High Street

Applicant present, William Fitzhugh. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Hartsock commented that work had already started, staff explained that the applicant was given approval for stabilization of the structure but not for the proposed work.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Mr. Malon to approve the application as presented based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, with a second from Ms. Wynn. The motion passed unanimously.

6e. 225 Liberty Street

Applicant present, Malik Turnage. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Turnage said that the windows had been in bad shape, but removing them was a miscommunication with the contractor.

Mr. Battiston opened the floor for public comment.

Kevin Taylor spoke. He was in support of the application.

With there being no further public comment, Mr. Battiston closed the public comment period.

Mr. Hartsock motioned to approve the application based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section C. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wynn and passed unanimously.

6f. 115 Central Park

Applicant present, Michael Green. Applicant representative present, Joseph Alleyne. Staff recommended denial.

Mr. Green explained that he had owned the property since 2015 and no information was in the deed about it being historic, he never received a notice that it was historic either, or any information on how to maintain it, so he did what he thought was best to upgrade the house. Mr. Battiston explained that there were no laws requiring notice of being in a historic district unlike a homeowners association, which he thought was unfair and should be required. Mr. Battiston also explained that each community has slight differentiations but here things like vinyl windows and asphalt shingles were inappropriate. Wood windows or wood with aluminum cladding would be acceptable, and the ARB has granted up to a year for an applicant with a violation to replace the vinyl windows with an appropriate material, with the possibility to apply for an extension.

Mr. Green commented that his neighbor had replaced all their windows with vinyl, and he would like to replace all of his with vinyl as well. Mr. Alleyne said that the Richmond Commission of Architectural Review allowed for this work, staff and Mr. Hartsock said that was incorrect, and that Richmond was stricter with their regulations than Petersburg.

Mr. Alleyne said that some siding boards on the house and porch were bad and asked if they could be replaced in-kind. Staff said yes, and it might either be considered a repair and not need reviewed, or something that could be approved administratively.

Ms. Wynn said that the remaining windows should be repaired if possible, and if there was a concern for energy efficiency, storm windows could be installed. Mr. Green asked for clarification if the ARB purview was over anything visible from the street or public right-of-way. Staff said it was public right-of-way, which included the public park and sidewalk in front of the house. Mr. Green said the one window in front was actually replaced by mistake.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Wynn motioned to deny the application as per the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section C, with the allowance of one year for the applicant to correct the violation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Malon and passed unanimously.

6g. 618 Grove Avenue

Applicant present, William Fitzhugh. Staff recommended approval.

There was no discussion.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hartsock motioned to approve the application as submitted, based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section B. Ms. Wynn seconded the application and passed unanimously.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

9. **WORK SESSION**

Notification to Properties in Historic Districts

Mr. Malon wished people could be notified of a property's historic district status. Staff explained that there was a project in the works to send out postcards to every property owner once the new fiscal year starts. Mr. Hartsock said realtors don't always understand the districts, and that it should be listed in the contract the way HOAs are. He also said lobbying should be done to require this. Mr. Battiston commented that realtors would not want to include more regulations.

Composite Deck Sample from 130 N. Jefferson

Staff asked the board if they had reviewed the proposed sample for decking that was discussed at the last meeting. The board was not in favor of the product.

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Battiston to adjourn the meeting, with a second from Ms. Wynn. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.