City of Danville
427 Patton Street, Suite 208
Danville VA, 24541
Phone: (434) 799-5260

Commission of Architectural Review

January 26, 2017
3:30 P.M.
FOURTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

AGENDA

I. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

IV. ITEM FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2017000008, filed by Hope for Tomorrow Counseling to install a new projecting sign on the north side of the building The sign is metal, 21.25" x 24", and advertises "Hope for Tomorrow Counseling"*

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 8, 2016

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

VII. ADJOURNMENT

City of Danville
427 Patton Street, Suite 208
Danville VA, 24541
Phone: (434) 799-5260

Commission of Architectural Review

Commission of Architectural Review
Meeting of January 26, 2017

SUBJECT

753 Main Street
VDHR # 108-0056-0127

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

The applicant, Sandra Lewandowski on behalf of Tope for Tomorrow Counseling, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to install 21.25" x24" projecting sign at 753 Main Street. The sign is a metal projecting sign on a black background with white letters and is erected on the north side of the building. The sign was erected without a COA or a sign permit.

The sign does meet Zoning Code requirements.

STAFF EVALUATION

Submitted with this application is a photo of the sign at its present location at 753 Main Street.

Section 7 of the Old West End Design Guidelines addresses Signs. Section B Item1f states:

***Projecting signs between the first and second floors**:*
These signs can add great visual interest to the streetscape. Their size is limited to 4 square feet per side, or 8 square feet total for a two-sided sign. This does not include the bracket. They should project no more than 4.5 feet from the building, and the bottom of the sign may be no lower than 10' from the sidewalk. Only one such sign is permitted per business. These signs may not include neon or internal illumination.

Based on the Design Guidelines excerpt above and photographs, Staff believes that this request does meet the Guidelines and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued to install a projecting sign at 753 Main Street.

of Architectural Review. The Commission meets once a month on the fourth Thursday of the month at 3:30 P.M. in the fourth floor City Council Conference Room located in the Municipal Building. All questions or applications should be submitted to the Planning Division, located on the second floor of the Municipal Building, 427 Patton Street, Room 207, Danville, VA 24541; (434)-799-5261. As of July 1, 2009 a $25.00 fee will be required for each application submitted for review.

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY APPLICANT

Important-Please read before completing application

a) All questions on this application must be fully answered
b) The application must be signed by the property owners or representative with written authorization by the owner
c) A drawing, photo, plan or sketch of proposed project with dimensions

Have you read and understand the Design Guidelines for the Historic Overlay District of Danville, Virginia? Yes

Are you aware of the federal/state tax credits and Real Estate Abatement program available for potential reimbursement/credit of money used during substantial rehabilitation projects? NO

Would you like more information about these programs? No

Which one(s)? No

Property Location: 753 Main Street, Suite 1B, Danville, VA 24541

Name of Applicant: Hope for Tomorrow Counseling Attn: Sandra Lewandowski

Applicant's Address: 1621 Enterprise Drive, Lynchburg, VA 24502

Applicant's Phone Number: 434.239.4949 ext 518

Email Address: slewandowski@patrickhenry.org

Work Proposed (please circle one): Alteration/addition/rehabilitation/new construction/sign

Type of material(s) to be used: Metal

(x) James C. Jones, Manager
Signature of Property Owner (if not applicant)
Piedmont Professional Bldg LC.

Sandra Lewandowski
Signature of Applicant
Office Manager.

TOWNESTAX
SSIONAL BUILDING

21.25" wide x 24" L.

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

December 8, 2016

Members Present	**Members Absent**	**Staff**
Jeffrey Bond		Renee Burton
Susan Stilwell		Clark Whitfield
Robert Weir		
Michael Nicholas		
Robin Crews		
Robert Stowe		
Sean Davis		

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

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *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.

Present on behalf of this request was Micah Robinson. Mr. Robinson was available for questions

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Stillwell made a motion to approve *PLCAR2016000276* as submitted as it does meet the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

2. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness, PLCAR2016000303, filed by Danville's Parks & Recreation Department, to install a sculpture on the museum lawn at 975 Main Street.*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Emily Ragsdale, Facility and Services Planner with Danville Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Nicholas stated what is the sculpture?

Mrs. Ragsdale stated I think it was submitted in the packet. There is a picture.

Mr. Weir stated this is replacing the existing one?

Mrs. Ragsdale stated yes. The first phase of the Danville Art Trail has ended. That was an 18 month phase. All of those pieces were on loan except for the piece at the library and the piece at the fountain. So all of the pieces are in the process of being taken out by the artists and the new pieces will be installed between January 20th and January 27th with the trail reopening on January 27th. This is the piece that the committee selected to go at the art museum.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nicholas stated why did you come to us? We are not an art board or an art critic. It's not a permanent structure right, because they rotate them out?

Mrs. Burton stated they will rotate them out, yes. But during the last vote, which was last year, the decision was made at that time that when it was changed the Commission wanted to visit the item again. So we have done so.

Mr. Bond made a motion to approve *PLCAR2016000303* as submitted as it does meet the guidelines. Mrs. Crews seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

Mr. Weir made a motion to approve the October 27, 2016 minutes. Mrs. Stilwell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

The first item that we look for and Emily if you want to address that. You have in front of you schematics and a color photo of playground equipment and Emily will speak to that.

Mrs. Ragsdale stated this is going at Thomas Doyle Park. We are replacing the existing playground equipment there. This will be done with a CDBG grant that we were awarded.

Mr. Bond stated where is this park?

Mrs. Ragsdale stated it's on Green Street, right by the police precinct.

Mrs. Stilwell stated Green St Park.

Mrs. Ragsdale stated the color photo in front of you is what it will look like except we went with a different piece on the top. They kind of look like fans that turn different directions and are very colorful. We did a public input period. We talked to a couple kids that were playing at the park and then we did an online survey. Out of the 14 that

responded, this was the design that they liked the best. However a majority of them liked the top piece from the other one so we combined the two. The other piece of paper that you have, the black and white one that shows the top design, which might give you an idea of what the top will look like. It shows the fan pieces a little better.

Mrs. Stilwell stated where is it going to be located?

Mrs. Ragsdale stated it'll be at the same location. The musical piece that is to the side, that will not be there. That will actually be in the circle where the sidewalk is. We're going to take up the grass and put play mulch down and put that in the middle so it will be handicap accessible. Adults, or anyone, would be able to use the exercise equipment which will be located around the outside so it will be a total family experience.

Mrs. Stilwell stated has anyone ever given any consideration to tether balls? It's a pole with a rope with a ball and we stand opposite and someone starts the ball and you try to wrap it your way and they try to wrap it their way. They're not expensive and they're so much fun and even adults play.

Mrs. Ragsdale stated that's not something that we considered. We met with Gametime. We received a grant from Cunningham Recreation as well as CDBG money and they gave us a couple of different designs and that wasn't included.

Mrs. Stilwell stated well I'm going to keep pushing for them.

Mrs. Ragsdale stated it's something that we can talk about in the future.

Mr. Nicholas stated next item 221 Jefferson.

Mrs. Burton stated the first item of W Main St real quick. That survey should begin by mid-December. It was postponed due to some budget issues but now has been resolved so that will begin. Hill Studio will be doing that work so you'll likely see them out and about. They'll be going down on Mt. Vernon, Stuart, and Montague. That area. So it will be a reconnaissance survey. They'll be photographing and capturing those particular structures.

Mrs. Stilwell stated is this for designation?

Mrs. Burton stated no not at this point. It's just specific data collection.

Mrs. Stilwell stated because decades ago I think W Main and Schoolfield were recommended eligible for designation.

Mrs. Burton stated that's correct. At this point we're not looking for add any districts but we want to make sure that our records stay current and we do capture the structures.

The 221 Jefferson Ave is an update to the work being done there. I don't know how many have gone by there. The roof is now complete. They are working on painting and some finishings on the front porch. There are some windows on the rear of the house that will be changed out because they were so heavily damaged from fire and those are due in the third week of December. So next week hopefully. Other than punch list, we should be finished by Christmas.

Mrs. Stilwell stated and you replaced the windows in the front?

Mrs. Burton stated yes we just did those. There are only three windows, a triple that is in the very back that had to be completely replaced and two that are in the back kitchen area where the fire had begun. We couldn't salvage those unfortunately. So those are to be replaced. From there then the projects will begin. A new project in, I hope, mid to late January will be 814-816 Pine St. that came before you last month. The price difference in the budget to go from the shingle roof which you approved to the metal was very small actually, surprisingly. So we are going to do the metal roof. So you will see the metal roof and the hidden gutters unless something changes and we find something unforeseen at this point. But the way the budget stood we were able to do that so that's the way the contract was written. And other than that, there is the Five Forks update. You have the Hill Studio report. I sent that out to everyone. There are printed copies in front of you. This is for your information and is a basic update on the structure. So at this point I just want to get any feedback from you. Any comments, recommendations, ideas.

Mrs. Crews is the inclination to do the build-out phase instead of a building replacement phase? Or is there an inclination?

Mrs. Burton stated we do not have an inclination at this point.

Mr. Bond stated do you have a timeline for the work?

Mrs. Burton stated we do not. We have a VHDA grant potential of $200,000 that we had hoped to utilize. At this point looking at these numbers, $200,000 is very very small in comparison with what is necessary to do the work. So of course that is something that we are taking into consideration.

Mrs. Stilwell stated but $200,000 would stabilize the building? Or pretty close to it, wouldn't it?

Mrs. Burton stated potentially yes depending on what numbers we get from a contractor. But yes. The only problem with that is that even when we do that stabilization, we did not prepare anything; it did not touch windows or repair the

brickwork. There's a lot of brick damage that took place with the removal of the façade. All of that has to be addressed as well. So stabilization would just be that.

Mr. Bond stated there is a line for repair pointed brick.

Mrs. Burton stated it will be the parapet area. We will have to rebuild part of the parapet wall. It is very unstable at this point so we would go through and do that.

Mrs. Stilwell stated well that was $34,000 and repairing the brick was $50,000. It's got to have the roof. It's not worth doing if there's no roof on it.

Mrs. Burton stated well I just wanted you to be aware that even with stabilization there is more to do of course.

Mr. Bond stated yes I understand. It seems like they should do some brick work when they do the roof.

Mrs. Burton stated I know there will be some included.

Mrs. Stilwell stated did someone break out that storefront window?

Mrs. Burton stated the storefront was broken out with the façade removal.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I'm glad to hear it wasn't vandalism.

Mrs. Crews stated tell me what LS stands for as a unit of measure.

Mr. Bond stated lump sum.

Mrs. Stilwell stated and you will keep us advised of the grant possibilities?

Mrs. Burton stated I will let you know as we move forward and then what has been determined, nothing at this point on where we will go from here. That's why I wanted to bring it before you and see what your thoughts were once you saw the numbers and see kind of what we are looking at.

Mr. Davis stated so in the end if you tear it down and put up new construction that is long term, we're looking at a minimum of $868,000?

Mrs. Stilwell stated which is a total waste of money.

Mrs. Burton stated well this rebuild, the rebuild that we have here is to be a replication so to speak of the historic façade. So it is not a ranch 1970's design.

Mrs. Stilwell stated period appropriate.

Mrs. Burton stated that is the plan yes.

Mr. Davis stated so basically for another $100,000 there'll be a renovation of the building.

Mrs. Burton stated yes.

Mr. Davis stated and if we get a $200,000 grant then that decreases it to $100,000 less about?

Mrs. Burton stated roughly.

Mr. Davis stated so what is the City's idea? Are they leaning more towards tearing down the building and going long term to replace it with new construction or the favor of keeping it and redoing it stronger now?

Mrs. Burton stated we have not discussed that fully at this point. These numbers have come in just recently. The first is when we got the report so we still have to try to balance that. We also have to be able to say when we get in there that it's a million dollars. It's a million dollar project and that's just to keep the building as it is now. And what potential clients you would have that would want to go into a building with that particular set up? Currently there is no access to the second story or the basement in the actual pharmacy building so we have to figure out how to address all of that too as well as the construction.

Mrs. Stilwell stated originally there was a stairwell on the side just like the Ferrell building.

Mrs. Burton stated and it appears that the basement access was enclosed or filled in with the demolition so we do have to figure out that as well and what that would do to the square footage versus what tenant or owner would want to occupy the building.

Mrs. Stilwell stated would they sell it as is now?

Mrs. Burton stated I believe that would certainly be entertained.

Mrs. Stilwell stated do you have any idea the price?

Mrs. Burton stated I think we would be open to proposals.

Mrs. Stilwell stated but cannot demolish without coming back to us, correct?

Mrs. Burton stated that's correct.

Mr. Nicholas stated do any members of the public have anything to bring before the Commission?

Mr. Liepe stated about ten weeks ago, at this meeting I informally announced that I had acquired 820 Green Street. About 6 weeks ago I asked you for permission to put some lattice on it and fix the porch railings, etc. I wanted to tell you that that was all done and that the property is now for sale. I have a sale brochure here for you if anyone would like to help sell it. But my reason for bring that up is to thank you again for being here. I certainly would have never taken this risk if it wasn't for the protection of the Commission of Architectural Review. I greatly appreciate what you. I thank you for your work this year and now I will sit down so you can have the world's shortest meeting.

Mrs. Stilwell stated you know he has a very viable prospect but it's very difficult to get a loan at your purchase price. Did you know that? It's crazy.

Mr. Liepe stated well the only way that I can concede on the terms of a loan on this type of thing is the 203K type of mortgage because there has been no work done on the interior. Its exterior stabilization but with the FHA 203K program I think it might be possible. Or maybe there'll just be somebody who thinks it's a great house and they have lots of money.

Mrs. Stilwell stated there is someone who thinks it's a great house but they don't have lots of money yet.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

_____

Approved