

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

March 26, 2015

**Members Present**

Michael Nicholas  
Sarah Latham  
Robert Weir  
Robin Crews

**Members Absent**

Susan Stilwell  
Jeffrey Bond  
Sean Davis

**Staff**

Renee Burton  
Clarke Whitfield

Chairman Nicholas called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

1. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an accessory structure in the rear of the house at 926 Main Street. The structure will mimic the original carriage house.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Liepe.

Mr. Liepe stated my name is Paul Liepe and I'm the applicant. I'm here to tell you the honest to God's truth. I'm now too old to mow my backyard with a push mower. I need somewhere to put a riding mower so I'm requesting approval. If you have any questions, I can answer them.

Mr. Nicholas asked are there questions for the applicant by the Commission?

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

2. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Remove the rear storage building. The building was approximately 18' x 30' was removed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or building permit. The structure was located behind the house and could be accessed from the public alley.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Ms. Marcy Keigler.

Ms. Keigler stated I'm Marcy Keigler and I'm the owner of 165 Holbrook Avenue. We've purchased this home to convert it from the four unit multi-family to a single family unit for resale. It's not something that we're working on to move into; it will be for sale. So I've had a request with six options. I understand that I've been allowed to create a driveway with pavers, which I will not be doing. I'm allowed to pour concrete sidewalk- that seems like that's been approved already?

Mr. Nicholas stated nothing has been approved yet. The staff is recommending that we do approve.

Ms. Keigler stated okay, well when we got there we had a little storage building that was dangerous- it was a hazard- so we had it torn down and we have graded it out and put the City mulch down right now.

Mr. Nicholas stated so that's request number one.

Ms. Keigler stated yes that's the number one and I'll just go through it. I didn't realize that I needed a demolition permit so I need to get a demolition permit for that even though it's already been removed. I removed two of the three buildings. There's still one left up for storage and I will maintain and keep that one.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me stop you and address the Commission. Do you guys want to handle these one at a time? Or do you want to do an entire presentation?

Mrs. Latham stated I think we need to separate them.

Mr. Nicholas stated handle them one at a time. So dealing with number one, this is the rear storage?

Ms. Keigler stated that's the rear storage that was taken down, graded out, and put mulch on so you can use that alley now for parking in the rear of the property if you chose to do so. So I do ask permission for that to have been done and forgiveness since it's already done.

Mr. Nicholas asked are there any questions for the applicant on number one?

Mrs. Latham stated just a comment- bless you for taking this house. And since that is my mother's house sitting right there now in full view and that's just been taken down. I for one, happily forgive you for tearing down that building without permission. I complained even to the City about all that there. I'm glad to see that gone. It certainly looks better.

Mr. Nicholas asked any other questions for the applicant? Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this?

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Edward Vance at 169 Holbrook Avenue.

Mr. Vance stated I'm at 169 Holbrooke Avenue next door and it's great that they tore that down because I've been through that building and you could go right through the floors on that. It was just a total disaster and there's no way you could rebuild it. I'm going to probably speak on all of these.

Mr. Nicholas asked is there anyone else here to speak on item number one?

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas asked does the demolition meet the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated no the demolition does not.

Mr. Nicholas stated I suggest saying that the request does not meet the guidelines then doing a motion on whether or not it detracts from the property.

**Mrs. Latham made a motion that the request did not meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

**Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the request because it has no adverse effect on the structure of the property or district. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

*3. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Remove the staircase in the front of the house and repair the floor on the second story porch. The conversion to a single family structure eliminates the need for this staircase.*

Mr. Nicholas stated number two is to remove the staircase from the front of the house and repair the stairs on the second story porch that conversion to a single family structure to eliminate the need for the staircase. Tell us a little bit about the staircase.

Ms. Keigler stated it's rotten. It's only there because it's a four unit and the two front doors are upstairs of the building to access those additional two units. I'm going to leave the two front doors. I'm going to have a balcony out there in the section where the staircase is cutting up to the porch right now will be floored to just add a little bit more porch space to that. So where the stairs come up, you take the stairs up and we'll just simply floor that and then they have a little bit more porch area. It just needs to have that floor done and the staircase is a hazard due to the narrowness of it and the turn of it. For the Zoning as well to bring it back to single family, it should be removed. As far as insurance purposes, I can't get any insurance on the property right now and I would not

be able to get insurance in my home with the staircase being in its poor condition as it is.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me ask you this. Is there a staircase inside the home?

Ms. Keigler stated no.

Mr. Nicholas asked so right now the only way you can get into the second floor is through a rotten staircase on the outside?

Ms. Keigler stated right.

Mr. Nicholas asked and even though the Commission has no jurisdiction on the inside, do you intend to put a staircase inside the home?

Ms. Keigler stated yes. The main front door of the home with the side lights on it, when you walk in there it will be a staircase similar to Mr. Ed's. You're going to have stairs starting there, going up the window, and then coming back. It's going to be like a three tier staircase entry foyer.

Mr. Nicholas asked any other questions on this application from the Commissioners?

Mrs. Latham stated the two doors on the second floor you said were there to access the two apartments. Do we have any information either that you have or the City has, was a second story porch always something that was original to the house? A lot of these houses with porches like this do have a second story access.

Mrs. Burton stated the only other information I have is the photograph that's in your packet from 72 and then the fact that I know that it was once a double house, I assume up and down but I don't have anything to verify that. It could be that was the porch that was original then cut a hole in, I don't know. I can only assume that it is an up and down duplex.

Mrs. Latham asked so then all the railings are still in good shape on the second story so it's just a matter of flooring so you have a safe porch?

Ms. Keigler stated yes.

Mrs. Latham asked does this meet the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated it does not. It would be demolition of a portion of a structure itself, so it would fall under that same situation as the storage building would because you are changing that.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request were Mr. Edward Vance and Ms. Marcy Keigler.

Mr. Vance stated my understanding was that the Dibble brothers who built this four-plex to start with. Now whether it became a duplex or not, I don't know. I tried to buy this property and I didn't buy it because of the roof- that was in 1996. This front staircase should go. It doesn't have a historic value. The columns are better than that and then getting rid of that thing and just making a porch for the upstairs where they could come out there from the inside staircase. You guys are requiring that it go to a single dwelling house.

Mr. Nicholas stated not us. That's Zoning, a different board.

Mr. Vance stated oh okay.

Ms. Keigler stated for us to make Zoning happy, if it's gone that's a good thing.

Mr. Vance stated it would be excellent to get rid of it.

Mr. Weir stated you're not adding any porch then, you're just changing the access to the porch.

Ms. Keigler stated yes sir. On the front staircase in that picture you can barely see it, but I'm going to take that out and when you take out the top part where it meets the floor I'm simply going to add porch floor so you can walk out either door from the upstairs and have a cup of coffee.

Mrs. Latham stated you will also have to add some railing to close off because that is not specifically requested in here I don't think. It just talks about replacing the flooring.

Mrs. Burton stated but you weren't going to do that. You're still going to leave that small area accessible, not the greater area. Just the area where the staircase comes up and meets that lower level floor, there's a small little piece there that she will have to fill in. You wouldn't be able to see it. The railings would not wrap around the entire porch.

Ms. Keigler stated where the stairs are coming up, I'm simply going to floor that. The railings going around in the picture do not reflect that.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas stated I have a question. How does this not meet the guidelines? It's hazardous, it's an unsafe structure, and you need it to bring it back in compliance with Zoning, right?

Mrs. Burton stated none of that is part of what you would look at to determine whether or not this meets the guidelines.

Mr. Nicholas asked so if she wanted to strictly comply to the guidelines she would have to repair it?

Mrs. Burton stated correct.

Mrs. Crews stated in 1994 it was clearly a two family dwelling so it did require the stairs.

Mrs. Burton stated I can only assume that it was, but that is an assumption. Unless they went through the back.

Mrs. Crews asked how does it not have somewhat of an adverse effect on the structure in as much as it was a two family and clearly depicted in 1972 it had exterior stairwell and it has an exterior entrance from the second.

Mr. Nicholas stated it's a change for sure, and it's a change from the original. I think we decide does that change adversely affect the house or does it not adversely affect the house. My personal opinion is it's not adverse to the house because I look at what is the homeowner trying to do and what she's trying to do with this house is definitely a good thing for the structure.

Mr. Weir stated and for the historical district to get rid of a four unit apartment basically and make it a single one.

Mr. Nicholas stated I personally don't think it's adverse.

Mr. Weir stated you really don't see the staircase that much. The angle on the 1972 picture you see it the best, but the 1990 coming in from the south side you don't see it much.

**Mrs. Latham made a motion that the request does not meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

**Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the removal of the stairs and replace the flooring as needed because it does not have an adverse effect on the structure or the district. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 3-1 vote.**

- 4. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Remove the lower level front door that is present on the right with a window. The window will vary from those throughout the house. The applicant has provided a photo with this application.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Ms. Marcy Keigler.

Mr. Nicholas stated tell us about this window.

Ms. Keigler stated it's on the left of the house, not the right. The right's the main front door with the side light and the transom on it. I'm keeping that there. To the left of the property as you walk up the front porch is another entrance to the downstairs unit. It is an ugly door. It has no need to be there being a single family home. What I've done is I've found a nice antique window that has some period ornate maintenance to it. It's a black, glass panel. It is old but it is a period designed for a time that this home was built. I was going to build a wall up from the ground and have a window there just as a different thing.

Mrs. Latham asked what is the size credentials of the window?

Ms. Keigler stated don't know. I stood it in there in the doorway and I have about this much to fill in. The width of it when I stand in the doorway with my window, I have about a two finger width that I can frame that window in. So I have a really good fit. Those are 82 inch windows I have type wise. So it's going to come down and put just where it needs to be low enough because I still have a transom on that window on the outside, so I'll come down maybe about six inches and put the new window in and then build the house up with a wall.

Mrs. Latham asked is this the door you're removing?

Ms. Keigler stated no that's another.

Mrs. Latham asked do you have the original front door that's still there on the right?

Ms. Keigler stated on the right it is but it is like shot. It has rot on it, it is awful. It doesn't shut properly, it doesn't seal, it doesn't do anything. That's part of my four.

Mrs. Burton stated you'll need to vote on them separately.

Mrs. Latham asked so first of all in the motion we could amend that to say that it is the lower left door that is on the left?

Ms. Keigler stated yes that door gets removed and the window goes on the left of the front of the house and then I have another door that I found in that shed that would be the front door on the right side of the house. I have to replace hinges and do a lot of work to that door anyway so I want a nice looking period door to go in replacement of it. It's a brown door.

Mrs. Burton stated on the very back page.

Mrs. Latham asked so this other picture of the door just ignore it?

Ms. Keigler stated that's right. I changed my mind on that door, I don't like it. It's too new looking.

Mrs. Latham asked we're still on number three?

Ms. Keigler stated yes number three is the window replacing of the door and number four is the front door to be replaced with the dark brown door which would be sanded, stained, and finished.

Mrs. Burton asked so you do plan to stain that?

Ms. Keigler stated yes. My color pattern changes every morning when I wake up.

Mr. Nicholas asked Mr. Vance, anything on this one?

Present in favor of this request was Mr. Edward Vance.

Mr. Vance stated I agree. Get rid of it and get the window in its place.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Stephen Wilson.

Mr. Wilson stated can you refresh me on what number three is?

Mr. Nicholas stated it is the request to remove the lower level front door that is present on the right with a window. She's saying it's actually on the left.

Mr. Wilson stated I wanted to speak in favor of this. I'm Steve Wilson and a resident of Danville. I had something I forgot to say last time. There was a conversation about the house and the old experts of Danville haven't been able to find a picture of it. Mr. Liepe has also done research on the ownership of that house and the people who lived in that house back until 1890. Whenever it existed, it was built almost certainly as a duplex. There was a person who lived on the bottom floor and rented out the top. There's no evidence for sure but probably they went up the stairway and that person was well known in Danville. I have the open data at home. There were two entities living in the home and she died in 1944 and it was actually somehow connected with executive rental of a company. In any case what happened after '44 the historian expert imagined it was purchased and renovated into a four-plex. So in any case it was owned certainly, but I was trying to find out if it was ever single family. All the evidence as I said from the very beginning there were two families living there.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas asked discussion or more questions for the applicant?

Mrs. Latham stated I have a question for staff. This does not meet the guidelines so what are the issues? In order to turn it into a single family home, obviously one is not going to want two front doors.

Mrs. Burton stated right, the guidelines state that it is not recommended to alter openings be it windows, openings or door openings so therefore it does not meet the guidelines specifically because of that.

Mrs. Latham stated I have no objection to the window because those kinds of similar decorative windows are often used especially in the front near the foyer. I would feel more comfortable if I had the dimensions and knew exactly how it would fit and what it would look like filling in that doorway space. But that may be neither here nor there depending on how other people feel about it.

Mr. Nicholas stated let's get a motion on whether or not it meets the guidelines.

**Mrs. Latham made a motion that the request does not meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

Mr. Weir stated I don't have too much of a problem. It's going to be the width of the door minus four fingers right?

Ms. Keigler stated yes and it's a nice height. It's larger than this picture here. In this picture my window comes out to about right here and it goes up to right here.

Mr. Nicholas stated the window is a good window for the house. I would share your concern Mrs. Latham if we didn't have a picture of the window. The fact that we know where the window is going in gives me some comfort.

Mrs. Latham stated yes. Here is my concern but remind me. I was at a neighbor's house last night and drove by and being able to see my mother's house from Holbrook Street, this is sort of a bay is it not? You've got the angle there, this is out, and then it angles back in is that correct? That second doorway is in kind of an angle. This would be my only concern. That is a beautiful window; my mother has windows almost identical to this. They are frequently smaller than some of the other windows and they go into the foyer is one of three window openings that creates a bay affect inside one of the interior rooms. As it would have been originally constructed I imagine before it was turned into a four-plex with a second entryway, I'm willing to bet - and I wish our architect was here - that they had identical height and width window as the other two on that bay.

Ms. Keigler stated I agree. The way the windows are built out with that huge panel out front with a little bit here and a little bit here for the door before they chop it up they had

to put a door in place. You can't find another window like that unless you want me to special order something new.

Mrs. Latham stated I know we can't deal with the interior look but it's just.

Ms. Keigler stated I wouldn't ask for this window to be the replacement of that door if I personally didn't think it wasn't going to go with my house. If I could find another window that would work with the size and width that was there; I even looked at my other windows that are the same size width as far as replacing the windows for somewhere else and it doesn't work for any of my rooms. I have more bay over my second room on the right than anywhere else. I can't do anything there. I have a front window on my front room except on those two six panels on the side. These windows where they are - say great room, dining room, whatever- I can't replace anything existing of that size with this window other than right there on the entrance to the house. It just shouldn't be something different.

Mrs. Latham stated right again no objection to the style of the window, I think it's fully appropriate for the age of the house. I don't feel in this particular case this would be faithful to the original design of the house.

Mr. Nicholas stated that's not the question. The question is not if it is faithful to the original of the house, the question is whether it is adverse to the structure or the district.

Mr. Weir stated I can't imagine it being any worse than that old door.

Mr. Nicholas stated if you see the forest through the trees there, if the question is do they have to restore it as close to the original as possible then we should deny probably all of these. My thing is I think it's an appropriate window for the space and it may result in something a little different, but again it might and this is just me personally but I don't see how it's adverse. It's definitely not adverse to the district.

Mrs. Latham stated again I'd be more comfortable if I knew the dimensions and I would personally like to see the same size. That's it.

Mr. Nicholas stated let's get a motion anyway.

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the request with the window on the left, not the right as stated in the staff report, because it has no adverse effect on the structure or district. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

- 5. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Replace lower level front door on the*

*left with a new wooden front door. The applicant has provided a photo with this application.*

Ms. Keigler stated it is rotten. It doesn't close properly; I have to kick it. It has so many doorknobs in it, it's not funny. It has six screws and four whole hinges holding it together. It needs to be replaced. I found a wooden door in the back shed and I had them take it. The 162 Sutherlin man took that door and wanted it and I said no I need to get my door back; that's my front door. So he did. I like the old wood door.

Mrs. Latham asked and you've got the transom and two side lights there?

Ms. Keigler stated yes.

Mrs. Latham asked is the current front door solid?

Ms. Keigler stated yes, that's why it has such problems hanging on its hinges because it's as heavy as it is.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas asked Mr. Vance, we got anything on this one?

Mr. Edward Vance was present on this case.

Mr. Vance stated nope, I agree with her.

Mr. Nicholas stated very good sir.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Latham asked is it just section three that you said didn't meet the guidelines?

Mr. Weir asked that would meet the guidelines wouldn't it?

Mrs. Latham stated it seems to me it would.

Ms. Keigler stated it's pretty much like for like. It's not exact to exact.

Mrs. Burton stated I think that was the only thing. It's almost, so you could determine that. It could go either way.

Mr. Nicholas stated the applicant provided a picture of the door. The door is in much better condition than the one that she describes. She's not replacing like for like which means she needs our approval, but the door that she's proposing to put in there I do think is on that meets the guidelines for the district.

Mrs. Burton asked are there any specifics on the door whether it should be painted or stained?

Mr. Nicholas stated it's the specific door that she's presented and that it's on the right side.

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the request to reflect the door located on the right as it meets the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

6. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Pour new concrete for the front sidewalk in a pattern that would widen the existing sidewalk so that planters and landscape areas can be created along the sidewalk.*

Ms. Keigler stated the front steps are concrete and falling apart. You kick them and concrete busts loose. It's a hazard right now, so what I'd like to do is repour and the post facing the house on the left has settled into the ground a bit. We're going to probably bust up the entire concrete, pour new concrete steps; but where you come up from the street and up the sidewalk, rather than just a straight sidewalk I want to put another five foot way by maybe two foot bench for seating perhaps with flower pots so when you walk up you do have something there that's a little bit decorative for your house. Bench seating will be pretty, that's a beautiful magnolia so I don't know.

Mr. Nicholas stated you don't need approval to replace like with like so maybe fixing the sidewalk is it.

Ms. Keigler stated I'm expanding the sidewalk a little bit just to put in those iron benches that I have.

Mr. Nicholas asked do you have the exact dimensions of that expansion?

Ms. Keigler stated no. I'll go like for like

Mr. Nicholas stated the like for like means that you can fix what's there now if you weren't expanding it.

Mr. Keigler stated I can do that and put in my little provisions then.

Mr. Nicholas stated right you can do that. I'm saying the part that you want to widen, how much addition are you wanting to put on?

Ms. Keigler stated two by five on each side.

Mr. Weir asked just down by the steps at the front end by the sidewalk?

Ms. Keigler stated well about halfway up to the house. While you're coming up to the house, halfway up I would have two rectangles - one on each side – just for a bench seat or some pretty flower pots. Something.

Mr. Nicholas asked and if I read this correctly staff, you don't object to the new sidewalk?

Mrs. Burton stated that's correct.

Mr. Nicholas asked so you find that this does meet the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated correct.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Edward Vance was present on behalf of the request.

Mr. Vance stated I support it.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Keigler stated I needed to interject here because there's been an issue that popped up in the last week or so. Neighbors went out of town so we were able to use the driveway which we hadn't been up the driveway before. Well the driveway's not wide enough for the car. So it's missing about a foot or so of space. It's not made for the cars nowadays. This is a shared driveway.

Mr. Nicholas asked is this brand new?

Ms. Keigler stated yes.

Mrs. Burton stated we can't hear this today.

Mr. Nicholas stated it's not before us. You can make another request and come back.

Ms. Keigler stated alright I'll have to do that.

Mrs. Burton stated you can vote to accept it, but I recommend you get through this first.

Mr. Nicholas stated we're on number five. If you have additional things say like to number seven, the Commission can vote to hear it today but let's get through your numbers first. Any discussion on number five?

Mrs. Crews stated yes she said pouring concrete for the front sidewalk in a matter that would widen the existing sidewalks. What is the pattern in distinction from what's there now?

Mrs. Burton stated that's my language. It's just a two by five addition with no decorative patterns or anything like that.

Ms. Keigler stated I was going to go about halfway up and just do this. That's it.

Mr. Nicholas stated I see what you're saying. I'd ask that whatever motion you make include the dimensions.

**Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the installation of 2' x 5' concrete additions to the existing sidewalk parallel to one another. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

*7. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Install pavers in the rear to create a patio area to access a parking area in the rear that is to be created with the addition of rock or gravel.*

Ms. Keigler stated we can delete that. I can't afford that. I'm withdrawing number six. I'll change it to my driveway. How about that?

Mr. Nicholas asked before I correct it, staff do you agree that this meets the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated with the driveway, yes. We have not yet seen an example of the pavers she wished to propose.

Mr. Whitfield I think what they're going to tell you is if they approve it you don't have permission to do it.

Mr. Nicholas stated that permission would last for one year.

Mr. Nicholas stated tell us about number six. If you don't have the details I believe you should withdraw the request because if it's denied and gets appealed, she has to wait the year.

Mr. Whitfield stated or she can request that you all postpone this to the next meeting. Then she could bring the dimensions in and you would hear that one single issue.

Ms. Keigler stated I'm going to withdraw it.

Mr. Nicholas asked if she withdraws it then she doesn't have to wait the year?

Mrs. Burton stated right.

Mr. Nicholas stated here are your options. If you're not sure about the dimensions and because of that this goes to a vote and it's denied, then you have to wait a whole year before you can bring it back. If you want to just withdraw it, then you could bring it back at any time. The other option is if you'd like to have that option but you want to wait until the next meeting in April to present those dimensions, then I think that we would entertain that request.

Ms. Keigler stated she doesn't want those pavers so let's withdraw the number six?

**Mr. Weir made a motion to hear a new request from Ms. Keigler. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

*8. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 165 Holbrook Avenue to make exterior changes to the structure. The applicant is converting this previous multi-family dwelling to a single family dwelling. Expand the width of the driveway with 15" pavement to widen the driveway and subject to Zoning Code.*

Ms. Keigler stated when Michael and I were driving our cars down the shared driveway next to our neighbors - my car is an SUV – and when I back out of that because of the gutters he has coming down and out into the driveway, he said he's lost several mirrors on his vehicles because of the narrowness of this. There is an area that's already trenched out that's about this wide and to the existing driveway.

Mr. Nicholas asked when you say this wide what are we talking about?

Ms. Keigler stated maybe 14 or 15 inches to give more space to the driveway. That way when you back up or pull in, you're not running over the existing yard.

Mr. Nicholas asked so your request is to expand the width of the driveway into your property line by 14 to 15 inches?

Ms. Keigler stated correct.

Mrs. Latham asked the shared drive we're speaking of is here to the left of your house?

Ms. Keigler stated yes.

Mr. Nicholas stated 14 inches isn't that big. Does that bring up any Zoning issues?

Mrs. Burton stated maybe. Are you proposing to increase the curb cut along the roadway as well? Or simply just pave additional on the grassy area?

Ms. Keigler stated nope, just straight through my grass.

Mrs. Burton asked so the small concrete wall in front of your home would stay the same?

Ms. Keigler stated the little thing out in front, yes.

Mrs. Burton asked so you're going to go back a little ways before you begin additional paving?

Ms. Keigler stated yes.

Mrs. Burton stated then no Zoning issues.

Mr. Weir asked so she's not paving it all the way back down to the street then?

Ms. Keigler stated no.

Mrs. Latham stated it doesn't look like you've got much grass there between the current driveway and that bay. Are you basically going to pave all the way up?

Ms. Keigler stated it's just a straight line next to the existing driveway that's been trenched back.

Mrs. Latham asked I'm just wondering how close does that bring it to this bay here?

Ms. Keigler stated it's not even to that. It's back right here. They left a little bit of yard for the gas meters and stuff that are there and that left a little room because that's higher up.

Mrs. Latham asked you also have access to parking through the public alley behind?

Ms. Keigler stated yes. There's a pool back there though.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Edward Vance was present on behalf of the request.

Mr. Vance stated I approve the request. I used to mow that lawn when they took foreclosure and it was just a mess. It was up like this and then lowering it down and stuff, it's going to be a real improvement.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas asked do we have an opinion on the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated staff believes it meets the guidelines.

**Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the request to expand the existing driveway by 15” pavement to widen the driveway providing that all Zoning Codes are met. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote.**

*9. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to locate public art at 975 Main Street. The art piece is to be located at the corner of Sutherlin Avenue and Main Street so that it is visible from Main Street.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Burton stated with the new agenda that you have in front of you, I just want you to be aware that there are two maps attached to that so that you can identify where the proposed location is.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas asked why isn't anybody here?

Mrs. Burton stated I'm here. The determination has been made that with that original location that was submitted to you last month that the art once exhibited would not be highly visible or would not get the visibility that we would like to have had.

Mr. Nicholas asked where would it be?

Mrs. Burton stated go to the next one. There's a little small, blue square.

Mr. Weir asked is that the little blue dot?

Mrs. Burton stated come up to the next page, right there. It's a small area, still a four by four pad concrete area. It's the same four by four that was presented to you before and the same two pieces of art. It's just the location itself so we can increase the visibility.

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the motion subject to requirements of the previous decision. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion.**

Mrs. Latham stated I'm not wild about this new location. Looking at it, I don't see anything wrong with the visibility. It's plenty visible. That draws attention and therefore it would draw attention to the sculpture there. This is getting mighty close to the front of the museum and the historic streetscape of this mansion, granted the Confederate flag issue but that's a different issue. But I'm glad we got very specific because all we had was this map.

Mr. Weir stated but this is the Danville Museum of Fine Arts and History and so I think that the fine arts side of this building needs to be brought out on Main Street too. That's why I had no problem with it.

Mrs. Latham stated it's just as a historic home in a historic district with a historic landscape.

Mr. Nicholas stated remember it's still subject to the two motions. We can find that it doesn't meet the guidelines.

Mr. Weir asked didn't we vote last month that it did not meet the guidelines?

Mr. Nicholas stated let's consult on this. We can make a more specific finding now. There's a motion and second on the floor so we need to deal with that. If you would like to find it doesn't meet the guidelines but give the approval anyway, then we need to ask Mr. Weir to withdraw the motion and Mrs. Crews to withdraw her second and make that new motion. Or we could vote on Mr. Weir's motion.

Mr. Whitfield stated and if it doesn't pass then you can make a new motion.

**Mr. Weir's motion failed on a 2-2 vote.**

**Mrs. Latham made a motion that the request does not meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 3-1 vote.**

**Mrs. Latham made a motion to deny the request because it has an adverse effect on the historic streetscape. There was no second.**

**Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the request with conditions from previous decision because it does not have an adverse effect on the structure or the district. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 3-1 vote.**

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes will be revisited at the next meeting due to discussion about the windows at 734 Main Street not being included in the minutes.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Wayne Byrd discussed the sign at the museum. He proposed to make a sign to use at the museum. Mr. Nicholas informed Mr. Byrd to speak with Mrs. Burton when he is ready to make the sign.

Mrs. Burton discussed the High Street Baptist Church Historic Highway Marker Program.

Mrs. Burton informed the Commission that there would be a Civil Rights exhibit in October to be presented at the High Street Baptist Church.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

---

Approved