

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

October 27, 2016

Members Present

Jeffrey Bond
Susan Stilwell
Robert Weir
Michael Nicholas
Robin Crews
Sean Davis

Members Absent

Robert Stowe

Staff

Renee Burton
Anna Levi
Tracie Lancaster

Vice-Chairman Crews called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000266, filed by Paul Liepe to complete the following at 820 Green Street:*

- a) *Rebuild and install upper porch railing*
- b) *Replace porch skirt with wood lattice*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Crews entered at 3:31PM.

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Paul Liepe. Mr. Liepe stated as I mentioned the side bar at the meeting last month. That was the same day I acquired this property. We have been fortunate to move along quite quickly on it. The roof has now been patched, painted and stabilized. The porch has been lifted up and rebuilt and sit back down. So it is moving along well. I have two items before you today. One is in the upstairs bedroom. We found a set of railings and after measuring them and looking further at the house we concluded that they were originally along the top of the porch or on the porch roof. I personally think it will make the house much more attractive to have those original railings in place since they have at least been there since the seventies. We think that they have been down for a long time. We would like to put those back in place as they were. The second item that I am asking about is what to do under the porch. Basically, there was trap under there and my proposal is to replace it with lattice. Although, I am open to any suggestions that the Commissioners might have. There is lattice under the porches all over town including on Green Street. It seems to me that would be the most appropriate.

Mrs. Stillwell stated what kind of lattice? Will it just be a pre fold or the square lattice?

Mr. Liepe stated I am going to do the wood lattice diagonal.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bond stated what is staff's recommendation?

Mr. Nicholas staff recommends that they do meet the guidelines. We have been giving staff recommendation as well as several pictures submitted by the applicant.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to approve items 1 and 2 as submitted they do meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

2. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000297, filed by David Stanton to remove the second story porch at the rear of 119 Broad Street. The first floor porch will remain, but lattice will be removed and square, wooden pickets and rails added. Gutters, lower level stairs in rear and damaged siding will be repaired in kind.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Mr. Charles King. Mr. King stated as you can tell from the picture up here we have a serious problem with this deck area. It is very dangerous up there. We are proposing to remove the roof where you see the rails at the top and we will bring it down to the bottom half of the rails where you see the little pickets drawn in. The second deck would be removed and the roof would be removed. It would match both sides of the renovated buildings on the left and right. It will have a much cleaner effect and eliminate the stairs underneath. As you can see they have been blocked up the whole place is pretty much in lieu of renovation.

Mrs. Stillwell stated you are going to take the top roof off and the top porch off?

Mr. King stated yes ma'am.

Mrs. Stillwell stated are you taking the second porch off?

Mr. King stated no ma'am. We will eliminate the bottom stairs underneath and that will be turned into a balcony.

Mrs. Stillwell stated that is just a balcony no rear exit?

Mr. King stated there is a rear exit it connects to the house so that you can get in. I don't know what room is adjacent to the balcony maybe a bedroom but you will be able to access the bedroom from the balcony.

Mrs. Stillwell stated but you won't be able to exit the property.

Mr. King stated no you will not.

Mrs. Stillwell stated there is not second fire escape. I'm thinking of fire safety and it is really not in my purview but I am curious.

Mr. King stated no ma'am there is not.

Mr. Davis stated doesn't that fall under the City?

Mrs. Burton stated that would be a building code question.

Mr. King stated so they would have to continue the stairs out?

Mrs. Burton stated we can't speak to that, that would be under the purview of the Building Code Official.

Mr. Weir stated is this porch an original addition to the original plan building? Or was this added later?

Mr. King stated I believe this is the original it's pretty old. I took a look at the property it is very hazardous in the area of the second deck. You can see the area where some stuff is covered up they actually have a second stairway that is going up to nowhere. So you can't even access the third floor under the roof up there. The reason why is because it is hazardous. I think they have screwed the door closed from the inside so you can't access the top of that second store door.

Mrs. Stillwell stated this have been in a very deteriorated state for decades. I am amazed that it is still standing. It needs some work.

Mr. King stated he is also painting the house and keeping it all the same color. So he is updating that and he wants to conform to the area.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve *PLCAR2016000297* as submitted they meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

3. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000275, filed by Two Crows, LLC to complete the following at 1009 Main Street:*

- a) *Construct addition to north elevation*
- b) *Construct canopy addition and outdoor dining area*
- c) *Construct dumpster enclosure*
- d) *Install new parking design*

Mr. Nicholas stated before we open the public hearing staff has made a recommendation that items B, C and D do meet the guidelines and that item A doesn't meet the guidelines.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Steve Delgiorno and Rick Barker. Mr. Delgiorno stated just to give everyone an update Rick and I had the tanks professional removed by a licensed company about two weeks ago. We are waiting on the final test samples to come back from the state. But everything looked okay not any potential issues. To address the point A question that came up I think the application stated hardy board siding on that it's not going to be hardy board. We are going to go with stucco. So if you want to make a note of that. We are seeking your approval today for the exterior of the addition to be in stucco.

Mrs. Stillwell stated that is just the bathroom?

Mr. Delgiorno stated it's the new enclosure so that we can enclose the bathrooms. That is the main thing we wanted to get cleared up today and we are both here to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me start off with asking staff if stucco is the siding as opposed to hardy board does that meet the guidelines in the opinion of staff.

Mrs. Burton stated yes.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Weir stated so would the inculcation of stucco item A now meets the guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated yes it was the substitute material that was being used.

Mr. Nicholas stated so stucco is a approve material according to the design guidelines.

Mrs. Burton stated that's right.

Mr. Weir stated just out of curiosity is this real stucco or the dry?

Mr. Delgiorno stated this is the real stucco.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to approve items B, C and D as submitted. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Bond stated will there be any detailing on the stucco?

Mr. Delgiorno stated just a flat surface.

Mrs. Stillwell stated is there a window in that addition?

Mr. Delgiorno stated in the hallway to the bathroom.

Mr. Davis stated that is going to be wooden correct?

Mr. Delgiorno stated correct.

Mr. Davis stated the lights are they going to be like that or as they are pictured here?

Mr. Barker stated it's actually if you look at the building today there is a window on the side we would make some attempt to use that window if that fails we will replicate it.

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve item A with the condition that they use stucco. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

4. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000276, filed by Micah Robinson to construct a wooden, pressure treated exterior staircase in rear of building at 1021 Main Street. Railings will consist of beveled 2" x 4"s with square 1.5" pickets. Staircase will be stained.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Burton stated the applicant has requested that this item be proposed.

Mr. Nicholas stated carried over until next month? Can I have a motion to that fact?

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to table the item until the next CAR meeting. Mr. Bond seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

5. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000277 filed by DRHA to complete the following at 814-816 Pine Street:*

- a) *Install new wood windows*
- b) *Install new siding*
- c) *Install new architectural shingle roof*
- d) *Demolish rear single story addition*
- e) *Construct pressure treated, wood 8x10 exits in rear with simple rail and pickets*
- f) *Remove chimneys from roof line*
- g) *New conventional gutter system*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present to speak on behalf of this request was Mrs. Burton. Mrs. Burton stated I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Davis stated is there architectural shingles already up?

Mrs. Burton stated currently this is a metal roof in desperate need of attention.

Mr. Davis stated the siding is it going to be cement?

Mrs. Burton stated we are looking at both options the current request is that it be a substitute material with the same profile as the existing or the original that is most existing. It's about an 8 inch simple type of siding.

Mrs. Stillwell stated with a new roof they are going to remove the concealed gutters correct?

Mrs. Burton stated if approved.

Mrs. Stillwell stated I have a problem with F and G. I have a problem with removing the chimney from the roof line. They are architectural significant to the façade of the building.

Mr. Nicholas stated in that case let me make a suggestion. If the Commission feels that there are items that are not in dispute let's look at those first.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to approve A, B, C, D, and E.

Mr. Davis stated I have a problem with item C they are removing a metal roof. Where is the history of removing a metal roof and putting a metal roof back?

Mr. Nicholas stated A, B, D and E is there any dispute or discussion in regards to those?

Mrs. Stillwell modified her motion to include approval on items A, B, D and E. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0-1 vote (Mr. Bond abstained due to conflict of interest).

Mr. Nicholas stated okay let's look at item C.

Mr. Davis stated I had been to several meetings before I got on this Board where installing architectural roof shingles was always denied and turned down.

Mrs. Stillwell stated well it was taking out metal and putting in shingle.

Mr. Davis stated isn't that what we are doing here.

Mrs. Stillwell stated that is exactly what we are doing here.

Mr. Davis stated I think following the history of the past record of the CAR is something we need to really think about.

Mr. Nicholas stated why are we looking at an architectural shingle roof instead of a metal roof?

Mrs. Burton stated in this particular situation that center area that you see between the gables there is not a great deal of slope. So we also felt that the material assisted with that especially with the shedding of water. Also, as many of you know we must be budget conscious. So we were looking at that as a factor as well. That's not something you guys consider of course but that is always a factor. But given this house and the style we were looking to do the architectural shingle would make it a little bit easier maintenance wise and hopefully prevent the deterioration that we are seeing right now.

Mr. Davis stated but the center that slope is actually less than a 4x12 right?

Mrs. Burton stated if I was a building contractor I could probably answer that but I don't know.

Mr. Davis stated that would have to be. You couldn't use shingles on that you would have to use asphalt or membrane on that.

Mrs. Burton stated I'm going off guidance of others.

Mr. Nicholas stated you meaning DRHA, but in your on analyze here under the roof the recommendation is that it would be advised to have a metal roofing professional with thorough evaluation of the roof since our firm has suggested rebuilding the roof. Has that been done?

Mrs. Burton stated the evaluation from the architect yes.

Mrs. Stillwell stated the architect recommended it.

Mr. Nicholas stated the architect recommended that you have a metal roofing professional do a thorough evaluation.

Mrs. Burton stated no that has not been done.

Mr. Nicholas stated the roof will be replaced with either a new standing seam roof or a composite roof. The composite roof might be cost effective but it will not qualify for historical tax credits. It is being suggested that the front porch be redone in the standing seam metal roof regardless of what is done on the main structure.

Mrs. Burton stated we have not had a specialist come out.

Mr. Nicholas so do you all have an idea of how much the cost would be for a standing seam metal roof? Would the current conditions of the roof effect the cost? In other words would you necessarily have to replace the entire roof or could you do it in

sections? If this 5x5 section of the roof is in good condition can you leave it alone and replace the rotten parts around it. Is that something that can be done or if you have a metal roof do you have to tear it all off and start over.

Mrs. Burton stated there are opportunities for replacement in areas of damage. The particular situation that we have on this roof is that the entire roof is very visible when coming off of Jefferson and behind it. So we were kind of weighing the odds of that patch work look on the roof. Also, the chimneys are very unstable so we have that issue as well. So we are not exactly sure when we start tearing off things how that is going to affect the chimneys. So we have the concern of the stability of those.

Mr. Nicholas stated but you are going to have that concern regardless of what kind of roofing material is used.

Mrs. Burton stated you will.

Mr. Nicholas stated because you are going to have to tear it up anyways.

Mrs. Stillwell stated they can take the chimney down and rebuild it. I think the chimneys are important. When I lived at the Booth house on West Main I mansion roof and then the rest of my roof was flat with almost no slope. Jerry Bracket and I went up there every time we had a problem and we would do a 20x20 area. If we had a problem the next year we would do that area. We just repaired and replaced the standing seams as needed until I think I did about 90 percent of the roof. I know they don't have that luxury this is not an owner occupied trying to do this. We do need to save the house. Pine Street really needs that.

Mrs. Burton stated this particular house is in a critical position as well given the location to Five Forks. It is highly visible. That is one thing that brings it to the attention of needing the work sooner rather than later.

Mr. Nicholas stated saying the Commission agrees with Mr. Davis that an architectural shingle doesn't meet the guidelines. The second question would be the aesthetic effect on the structure and the neighborhood. Do we have a picture of the architectural shingle to be used?

Mrs. Stillwell stated yes one was provided.

Mr. Davis stated it's a three tab system. That is pretty modern and well actually dated modern shingle.

Mrs. Burton stated that can be altered this wasn't set in stone this was just for a color analysis. If there is something on an architectural shingle we could look at that further.

Mr. Davis stated have you looked at the shingles that are designed to look like slate?

Mrs. Stillwell stated slate would be more appropriate.

Mr. Davis stated yeah slate would be. They do have asphalt shingles designed to look like slate. They are a little bit more expensive. So with some of the new metal standing seams that are out it seems like the cost is not prohibited as the true folded standing seam.

Mrs. Burton stated the last house that we had a quote on the 240 Jefferson that came before you to do the screw down system that system was actually 20,000 more than a traditional standing seam roof. So that is why we went to a completely different venue and then went back to a standing seam. We thought we would go the opposite direction and that turned out to be harmful to our budget. So we ended up with the other. This was going to be a substitute that we thought we could possibly look at as an option for the rehab of this house. After this there is a great deal of work to be done to the interior of the structure.

Mr. Davis stated I think before looking at whether we have to consider an architectural shingle I think having it reviewed by a professional metal roofer I think that is something that needs to be done.

Mrs. Stillwell stated I agree is there any way that the Housing Authority can get a professional evaluation done before our December 8th meeting?

Mrs. Burton stated I can try.

Mr. Nicholas stated my concern is I am more cost conscious so I get wanting to save money. I would love to approve a less expensive option before I do that I want to see what it is going to look like. I mean that is colored. What are the shingles themselves going to look like that's the aesthetic that we have to consider.

Mr. Davis stated that's exactly what they are going to look like that's the three tab system.

Mr. Nicholas stated I thought you said this was just for analyze.

Mrs. Burton stated that's the main reason I have this I wanted to look at the color. It is an architectural shingle. If there is a different style that is preferred we can look at that as well.

Mr. Davis stated I think the other thing is the fact that we are mandated in support with the City and then you are asking us to do something that falls outside of the CAR guidelines. I think that kind of forms like a double standard.

Mrs. Burton stated what's outside of the guidelines?

Mr. Davis stated the asphalt shingles. But you know it's kind of like well if the City can do this why can't I?

Mrs. Stillwell stated and I as a private homeowner can't.

Mr. Nicholas stated do architectural shingles meet the guidelines?

Mr. Davis stated no.

Mrs. Burton stated no they do not.

Mr. Nicholas stated so why is the City asking for an exception to its own guidelines?

Mrs. Burton stated it's a substitute material and substitute materials can be approved by the secondary vote. That is completely up to the Commission. It is been given as an alternative.

Mr. Davis stated I think we need to get an evaluation done. There are other designs out there ones that look like slate that from this height that the house is at that would look like slate. I think that's something we would have to seriously concern.

Mr. Nicholas stated the first question is does this meet the guidelines.

Mr. Davis stated no it does not.

Mr. Nicholas stated the second question is does it have a negative effect on the aesthetic of the building or the district? If the answer to that is binding that there might be a better option out there but we can't compel someone to do a better option if the option they want fits the second criteria. In my opinion we delay for an evaluation if the applicant is willing to do that. If they are not willing to do that then we will put it to a vote and see what happens.

Mr. Weir stated if we vote then it is locked for a year right if we vote it down?

Mrs. Burton stated if this particular request. But certainly another request for a different material can be brought before you.

Mrs. Stillwell stated can we possibly table that part?

Mrs. Burton stated you certainly can.

Mrs. Stillwell stated we can table it and ask for a professional evaluation to come for the December 8th meeting.

Mrs. Burton stated regardless of the professional evaluation though would that change your idea on the material proposed?

Mr. Nicholas stated what if the professional evaluation comes back and says the metal roof can be saved for 15,000 which is their budget. The applicant is still entitled to what they want.

Mrs. Stillwell stated at that time we can vote. If the metal roof is 30,000 and the comp shingles are 15,000 then we have to look. It is important to save these houses on Pine Street.

Mr. Nicholas stated the other thing is we can't compel anyone to get anything or spend any money. We can't force them to get an evaluation done. What does the applicant want does the applicant want time to get an evaluation to satisfy some concerns of the Commission members or does the applicant want their case heard this month?

Mrs. Crews stated they submitted it for this month knowing that a recommendation was made.

Mrs. Burton stated I think the request would be to have a vote taken on this particular item with winter coming quickly something needs to be done or this may not be the same shape come spring. That is where we are at. If the architectural shingle is not a material that is approved than we would look at alternatives.

Mrs. Stillwell stated and they could come back next month.

Mrs. Burton stated yeah because it would be a substantial different applicant coming back with some other kind of product.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion that Item C does not meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0-1 vote (Mr. Bond abstained from the vote).

Mr. Davis made a motion to deny the application that the three tab architectural shingle would have a negative effect on the ascetic of the building. Mrs. Stillwell seconded the motion. The motion failed with a 2-4-1 vote (Mr. Bond abstained from the vote).

Mrs. Crews made a motion to approve as submitted that it will not negatively impact the ascetics of the neighborhood. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved with a 3-2-1 vote (Mr. Bond abstained from the voting).

Mr. Nicholas stated moving on to Items F and G. Mrs. Stillwell you wanted to discuss the chimneys.

Mrs. Stillwell stated you can't see the chimney that well in this picture but the gables and the attic on the third level I just think those are important. I know it's not cheap to take a chimney down and rebuild it. But there is plenty of brick here in Danville.

Mr. Bond exited at 4:00PM.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion that item F doesn't meet the guidelines. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Weir stated how many chimneys are there?

Mr. Nicholas what are the guidelines on removal?

Mrs. Stillwell stated it does not meet the guidelines to remove a chimney I'm sure.

Mrs. Crews stated there are architectural drawings that show the chimney.

Mr. Weir stated so they are quite higher on the drawing than they are here.

Mrs. Stillwell stated right from the evaluation of the slope. I just think the chimneys are very important to the distinguish of what this house looks like; this property has been terribly deteriorated and abandon my slum lords.

Mrs. Burton stated I did not specifically state that in the staff report but I believe since you are removing an architectural feature that it would not meet the guidelines.

The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Weir made a motion to deny item F that it has a negative impact on the house and the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion.

Mr. Davis stated did the City look at reappointing it? Is the chimney deteriorated that bad?

Mrs. Stillwell stated it is very deteriorated.

Mrs. Burton stated they are in very bad shape. We would way the option of trying to repair them versus a complete rebuild. They are not anything that is necessary for use. They are strictly ascetics at this point nothing is venting from them or anything like that.

Mr. Nicholas stated you have in the cost estimate two chimneys repair and rebuild. Why are you asking to remove them?

Mrs. Stillwell stated that is the architectures suggestion.

Mrs. Burton stated that is what they architecture suggested.

The motion was denied by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Nicholas stated we are moving on to item G, the conventional gutter system.

Mrs. Stillwell stated this is all depending on what they do with the roof. If they change the roof to comp shingles they can probably add conventional gutters. If they stay the standing seam metal they are probably going to stay the concealed gutters.

Mrs. Burton stated with the conversations that I am aware of that would probably be the route. The conventional gutter system would be the preferred with the shingle roof.

Mrs. Stillwell stated made a motion that item G doesn't meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion.

Mrs. Crews stated I guess that was my question. If we deny it out right instead or proponing it until next month when the roof comes for discussion we could take them both at once.

Mr. Nicholas stated you approved the roof. So the roof is not coming back.

Mrs. Burton stated not to speak out of turn but because of budget reason it is likely the alternative that is chosen.

The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mrs. Stillwell stated if they wanted to come in with hand round gutters or something that is more period appropriate but not brand new conventional gutters.

Mrs. Burton stated I do not have a problem with half rounds.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion that we approve half round gutters with round down sprouts that they will not adversely impact the neighborhood. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

6. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000278 filed by DRHA to complete the following at 136 Chestnut Street:

- a) Remove existing skylights*
- b) Repair roof over existing kitchen area with EPDM roofing material*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Stillwell said what is EPDM?

Mrs. Burton stated rubber roof. This area is flat. The skylights were put in improperly and the interior has just been destroyed from the water damage.

Mr. Nicholas stated staff's recommendation is that A meets the guidelines and B is a change of material where we would have to consider the second question. Does anyone dispute item A?

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve item A as it meets the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The vote was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Nicholas stated moving onto item B. Staff recommends that it doesn't meet the guidelines. Does anyone think that a rubber roof does meet the guidelines?

Mrs. Stillwell stated I know this house very well it's the Boatwright house isn't it?

Mrs. Burton stated yes.

Mrs. Stillwell stated I don't think that rubber roof is really going to be visible.

Mrs. Burton stated not much of it.

Mrs. Stillwell stated it may be if you are standing on the deck on the back of Sutherlin Avenue.

Mr. Nicholas stated that would be public right of way.

Mrs. Stillwell stated I know but there is whole lot of trees in there.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion that item B does not meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion that item B will not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood or the house. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

7. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000279 filed by DRHA to complete the following at 221 Jefferson Avenue:

- a) Install new architectural shingle roof*
- b) Remove second story shutters*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas stated staff recommends that both of these items meet the guidelines.

Mr. Davis stated this is the one that already has the three tab roof?

Mrs. Burton stated yes it has a three tab shingle roof now.

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the application as it does meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to approve the September 22, 2016 minutes. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Approved