

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

November 10, 2016

Members Present

Peyton Keesee
George Davis
Sheri Chaney
Jonathan Hackworth
Courtney Nicholas
John Ranson

Members Absent

R.J. Lackey

Staff

Anna Levi
Tracie Lancaster
Ken Gillie
Clarke Whitfield

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 554 Craghead Street to install a 20" x 10" brass directory wall sign beside the Colquhoun St entrance for BB&T Scott and Stingfellow.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Rick Barker, the applicant. Mr. Barker stated this might be the simplest thing you considered this year but I'm available if you have any questions. I know at the last meeting you consider something a little more complicated. This is a detail that I failed to include in that application.

Mrs. Nicholas stated you are good as to square footage? I know there is a limit to how much signage you are allowed and all that.

Ms. Levi stated they are good.

Mr. Barker stated we are approaching the limit but we are still good.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nicholas made a motion to approve as requested. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

2. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 752 Patton Street to install a 1 ¼" pipe railing. The railing be 42 inches tall and would extend 15 feet.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request Calvin Miller. I am the owner of Olympic Tae Kwon Academy and we had some work done there. They put in a new parking lot and on the side of the building I feel that it is a safety hazard for the child. So I would like to put a rail there because it is a kind of steep drop-off. We do have pictures if you would like to see.

Mr. Ranson stated have you ran this by the Building Inspections Department?

Mr. Miller stated yes sir. The contractor that is going to do the work is here with me and he talked to the Building Inspector.

Mr. Oadie Keen stated I am with O.K. Construction and David Cochran and I went out a looked at the site and he said it wasn't any problem I just had to go through you guys.

Mr. Ranson stated so he said the space in the rails was okay and everything?

Mr. Keen stated yes sir.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

3. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 319-321 Craghead Street to update the glass storefront with new windows, double doors, and bronze framing to match the existing framing on the front left elevation.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Corrie T. Bobe. Mrs. Bobe stated I am here on behalf of the IDA that owns this building. The request before you is to update the store front. The previous storefront had quarter inch glass which will be replaced with new one inch thick glass for better efficiency. The framing was wood and if you've driven past or seen the paper recently unfortunately the store front was removed before approval. We would replace that with metal framing such as the one next door and very similar to those that are located on the other side of the block. We also are requesting to add new double doors in front facing the Craghead Street there was a single door. We have shown this building to a number of restaurants, retail prospects including a brewery and the one request was for double doors to be installed to handle inventory and equipment as well as handicap accessibility. Again, we apologize that there was a miscommunication between folks within our contracting firm; it was a mistake for it to be removed so soon. This was planned to go to RDA this month.

Mr. Ranson stated so the intention all along was to remove the storefront and replace it? You just didn't get approval before it was done?

Mrs. Bobe stated the intention was to come to you with this drawing to replace it, yes.

Mr. Hackworth stated reason for replacement was it because it was in such bad shape that it couldn't be fixed or was it just over the years the quality of what was left wasn't up to standard.

Mrs. Bobe stated a little bit of everything, so depending on which part of the storefront. Also, in terms of energy efficiency for any prospect to go into the building. The glass needed to be thicker and more thermal.

Mr. Hackworth stated when they took the storefront out was it completely destroyed in the process of taking it out?

Mrs. Bobe stated if you look at the picture of what it looked like before the windows with the painting it that says 319 and Virginia Refrigeration or Hardware all of that has been saved as well as the doors. We have already spoken with our contractor for instance Virginia Refrigeration will not be going back in but perhaps if approved and new glass is installed there is a way to put the number back over the double doors. So you can still highlight the old historic glass but behind the new glass.

Mr. Ranson stated that's the 319?

Mrs. Bobe stated yes.

Mr. Hackworth stated you said the parts that also have the Virginia Heating and Refrigeration that was salvaged?

Mrs. Bobe stated that was all salvaged and could easily be reused in some interior renovation.

Mr. Hackworth stated so basically the bigger concern is the larger panel windows at the bottom for energy efficiency.

Mrs. Bobe stated sure the initial drawing that was proposed did show smaller windows on the back and after review and conversations with folks in the Community we got Blair Construction to redraw them and that is what was presented in your current packet.

Mr. Hackworth stated I'm assuming that they have to lay brick as a foundation in order to hold the windows up?

Mrs. Bobe stated that's correct.

Mr. Hackworth stated does the City have in storage some brick that could be used that would match the brick from that period versus new brick.

Mrs. Bobe stated absolutely I'm sure.

Mr. Hackworth stated so it wouldn't necessarily be a problem if that was a requirement?

Mrs. Bobe stated as long as it's available.

Mr. Davis stated well they used new brick on the Palmers Meat Market.

Mr. Hackworth stated yes on the Palmer's Meat Market they used new brick but the guidelines weren't in place at that time that was done.

Mrs. Chaney stated you are not redoing these columns here that was already redone are you? Which was the same brick that was underneath the store front of the meat market as well; so they should be able to match those bricks.

Mr. Hackworth stated from reclaimed brick from a similar period.

Mrs. Chaney stated well from what are on the columns between the sections.

Mrs. Bobe stated those are still there.

Mrs. Chaney stated that's what I'm saying unless they are re bricking them completely they could find a brick that will match those instead of trying to take brick from the second floor.

Mr. Hackworth stated the only issue is that if you go over where Palmer's Meat Market is that wasn't attempted at all. So the brick looks entirely different if you go and look at it in person. It is a completely different texture it was treated different. So that would be my concern. Not necessarily replacing the lower windows with thermal windows but when you look at it and drive by it the brick isn't going to match and it's going to be very noticeable. The whole purpose is that you are trying to keep it blending well so that it's not something that is really noticed.

Mr. Ranson stated another thing there are hundreds of bricks you can usually find a brick that will match.

Mr. Hackworth stated if the City already has it available why not use what you have available versus making them go buy brick.

Mr. Whitfield stated trust me we are not going to buy brick if we have brick available.

Mr. Hackworth stated that was my point.

Mr. Whitfield stated I understand. What if we don't have brick available? That's the thing you have to consider, maybe you know I don't know.

Mr. Ranson stated I think if we stipulate that the brick match the color and texture as closely as possible that give them the option if they have got some to reuse it. We wouldn't be recommending the source necessarily but it would be nice if they had some.

Mr. Hackworth stated I'm not necessarily opposed to that if we can specify that if they have reclaimed brick to use that then they try to match texture and color.

Mr. Whitfield stated I would say if they have brick available that matches the texture and color use that and if they don't then move to something that does match in texture and color. You don't want to have some historic brick that doesn't look right.

Mr. Ranson stated old brick is like new brick there are thousands of different colors.

Mr. Davis stated I think Corrie probably has the idea of what we are looking for. What was your question about the Virginia Heating sign?

Mr. Hackworth stated the transoms whether they were salvaged or not and whether they could be reused?

Mrs. Chaney stated you are not talking about putting them back into that store front you are just saying they save them for historic type purposes.

Mr. Hackworth stated I think Gentry, when he redid the Lindsay Lofts, they kept the original transom but then they used a thermal barrier on the back side in some cases.

Mrs. Bobe stated I think the request would be to not go back with Virginia Heating and Refrigeration just the number.

Mr. Keesee stated especially if a restaurant was to go in there.

Mr. Ranson stated that would be a little confusing.

Mr. Keesee stated yeah maybe.

Mr. Whitfield stated maybe you can use them inside as part of the design.

Mr. Davis stated yeah that would be good.

Mr. Rick Barker stated first if I could join the conversation about the debate of the matching brick. I will tell you the driving philosophy of the Department of Historic Resources and the Department of the Interior would not be to blend it. I am looking at a current photo and how it existed a few weeks ago. If you look at the space that has the aluminum store front and as it is noted there is a brick bulk head below it. That does not match the brick on the rest of the building. The Department would probably regard that as appropriate because it was not a brick bulk head originally. It was added. If you add something in 2016 it shouldn't match something that was built in 1900 you should use a 2016 material. The concept is that one does not wish to fool the eye. If it is not antique it a gimmick to make it look antique and if a repair is made the repair should be made obvious so that you are not tricking the eye. Then there wouldn't be any confusion about what it original and what is not. Now to the broader issue of what should be the outcome of store fronts. I could agree or appreciate that when you look at this store front one is already aluminum store and to create two more would certainly create a uniformity that does not have today. The difference is between the time that this first aluminum store front went in and the consideration of the two on the right, this body has been created and the City has adopted these guidelines. To imagine that the guidelines would allow for an antique façade to be removed to replace with modern materials and consider that appropriate seems to be a stretch. So I just offer the opinion that while we are trying to maintain the integrity of the antique facades and we have two antique facades here that were taken out by mistake that something might be recreated to replicate the antique façade rather than to replace.

Mr. Ranson stated the intention was to take it down anyway they just didn't get approval so if they would have brought it to us previously there might be the same discussion.

Mr. Barker stated I would say if the façade had not been approved and the same application was in front of you I would have the same opinion. The antique wood façade would be more appropriate on Craghead than the new modern storefront especially when that storefront exists and I'm assuming can't be replaced but be recreated. If there needed to be an allowance for a wider doorway for equipment I think you could be flexible on that.

Mrs. Chaney stated if I understand you correctly you are basically suggesting that they recreate the wooden storefront just with the new tempered glass or one inch thick glass for insulation purposes and keep the wood with no aluminum storefront.

Mr. Barker stated yes. Which is essentially would make this consideration that the storefront has already been removed because the application should arrive to you before the occurrence.

Mrs. Nicholas stated are you advocating for the retention of the Virginia Heating and Refrigeration sign and the other sign knowing that could cause confusion for another business coming in?

Mr. Barker stated I don't have a problem removing the text and if the sign could be saved for interior display I think that would be great. I would not necessary advocate returning it because it will be a new modern use with the new modern tenants that has the right to advertise their business.

Mr. Davis stated have they decided Corrie what to do about the windows on the top are they going to try and keep them as original as possible?

Mrs. Bobe stated yes.

Mr. Barker stated my thinking is more limited to the structure than the signage. I just think that is important with keeping with the spirit of the guidelines and the neighborhood.

Mrs. Susan Stillwell stated I live at 301 Craghead Street. I anchor this block. I was the first person to move to Craghead and live there for many, many decades. I am quite familiar with the storefront that was demolished. In fact, I was beyond shocked. The reason that I am in favor of rebuilding this storefront with wooden bulk heads with appropriately sized display windows is because in the 300 block almost all of the storefronts on the South side of Craghead have been changed to modern. The building in which I live has modern display because it was a wholesale grocery it was not a retail business. This is one of the very few storefronts left that was historically accurate in terms of a façade and it is gone.

Mr. Ranson stated when you say appropriate size what do you mean?

Mrs. Stillwell stated pretty much what it looked like before it was taken down.

Mr. Ranson stated you thought that was appropriate.

Mrs. Stillwell stated yes it was appropriate because that is what was built there.

Mr. Ranson stated I understand that I just wanted to make sure that was the reference point.

Mrs. Stillwell stated the reference point is to rebuild what was there with wooden bulk heads. The proposal when I look at it looks like a vacant storefront in Coleman Marketplace. It is totally and completely inappropriate. This is such a rare storefront and in the 400 block of Craghead you have got the Richmond Seedworks, the old Car dealership and a couple of windows that have been installed there are modern which was prior to the design guidelines. Then Thank God for Rick Barker when you get to the 500 block he has a great sense of design and aesthetics and preservation and he is coming everything that he can to maintain the integrity and the ambience of where you are. Poor Acree's Warehouse has had a rough time. In 1947 the City had a high rise plan which most of you probably don't know. They were trying to connect the farmers of Caswell County with route 41 and they came through and tore down all of the buildings on Craghead now where Wilson Street is on both sides. They took down the tower and torn down a whole chunk of Avery's Warehouse all the way back to Bridge Street. They wanted a bridge that connected Pittsylvania County with Caswell County and make it easier for the tobacco farmers to come in every direction. We lost a lot that that was in 1947. But this storefront is really; really important because it is the only storefront in the 300 and 400 blocks that retains the historic fabric of the community. You just cannot let them go back in with this ridiculous Riverside Shopping Center, Coleman Market Place concept.

Mr. Keese stated Susan, I understand everything you said but what are you recommending as a compromise knowing that the storefront has been taken out versus what they want to put back. What are you saying that they do?

Mrs. Stillwell stated I think there should be wooden bulk heads.

Mr. Keese stated so not the brick but the wooden bulk heads?

Mrs. Stillwell stated not the brick I think the brick would be terribly inappropriate.

Mr. Keese stated okay so the wooden bulk heads and what else?

Mrs. Stillwell stated the transom windows not to look like little squares like they look in this proposal. The proposal is all wrong if you look at the upper there are two windows here and two windows here and one window there. It is completely inaccurate it some generated concept that doesn't even reflect the building, which you are considering.

Mr. Keese stated Susan I heard everything that you said but unless you have a drawing I don't know what you are saying.

Mrs. Stillwell stated let me get my picture. This is the original store front do you have a picture of the original?

Mrs. Nicholas stated are you talking about the second floor?

Mrs. Stillwell stated I'm talking about the second floor is completely wrong.

Mr. Keesee stated oh okay I'm sorry. I thought Corrie said they are going to leave it like it is on the second floor.

Mrs. Stillwell stated with this proposal if you approve this you are going to lose to windows in the upper storefront.

Mr. Keesee stated I understand the drawing doesn't show but I thought Corrie said they were going to stick with that.

Mrs. Stillwell stated I do not have a problem with accommodating a double door because in restaurants you need a good exit doors to move in and out equipment. I don't have a problem with adding that.

Mr. Ranson stated Corrie, are you changing the second floor?

Mrs. Bobe stated no not the ones that you see here.

Mr. Davis stated the second floor is going to remain the same? Let's just concentrate on the storefront right now.

Mrs. Stillwell stated on the storefront I mean what happen over there at Palmer's Meat Market is very unfortunate it doesn't fit in but if you allow another storefront to go that way you have just ruined my block and that is how I think of it because that is where I live. I walk by that storefront every day at least twice a day with my dog. The storefront was not in bad condition at all it was wooden. There may have been a little bit of trim that needed to be replaced. Gary Grant came and got me out of my building when he came down and it had just been torn out. We both stood there and mourned what had happened to that block because it is an original historic façade and we don't have any other ones in the 300 block. We have none in the 400 block and only because of Rick are we going to have historic facades in the 500 block. It is just a giant mistake.

Mrs. Sonya Ingram stated I want to strongly agree that you should look at the application as if the demolition had never occurred. I also really encourage you to abide by the River District Guidelines, your own Guidelines, to restore this as it was. I think it was an unfortunate oversight that this happen. I don't see any reason why it couldn't be restored to the way it was just as Susan and Rick mentioned. I am in this line of work and really strongly encourage you to look at your guidelines when you have an application. If you just look at the Secretary of Interior Standards which are in your guidelines and I'm not going to read them but you can go through there and read those and refer to those when you are looking at this case. Under the general guidelines where it talks about existing windows the types of materials with window replacement, commercial buildings with many of the original details of the buildings were to be restored have been lost it is recommended that the owners try to find photos of the building. We have photographs we know exactly what this looked like. Significant features such as transom lights, recess entries and original sign board details, entry

way paving should be reserved or restored. So I just wanted to mention that to take a look at the design guidelines for this.

Mrs. Nicholas stated are you advocating against the replacement of glass at the one inch thick for efficiency sake; if the wooden storefront were preserved but the glass was changed to one inch instead of quarter inch thick?

Mrs. Ingram stated do you guys have a material sheet that we can see what that looks like? I don't know if there is a staff report what did the staff recommend on this? Sometimes you will have a list of materials I'm not really sure because I don't know what that would look like. I would probably say yes that would be okay but I can't really answer that because there isn't enough information.

Ms. Levi stated the guidelines don't specify on the glass. They do say that you should repair rather than replace. Staff's recommended approval and our thought behind that was that the one side had already been done before the Commission was here to say otherwise. So just for consistency sake that was our thought behind approval but you certainly have the authority to require the wooden bulk heads and to go back to the original look. We did go through our documents and files and tried to determine whether these were absolutely original. We obviously think that they are old but we don't know that these are the windows that were in there when the building was built. We just don't know.

Mr. Gillie stated section 3 regarding windows as with roof form and materials, window types change with the architectural styles of the period. The size of the individual panes in historic windows was a result of the size of glass available to the builder. The pane sizes in window sashes typically increase from the Georgian and Federal periods, where smaller panes of glass set in muntins were used to make up a sash, to the Modern period where sashes were typically made from a single large pane of glass. It changes depending on the situation that's why the guidelines didn't make a specific recommendation on the glass type.

Mrs. Ingram stated they are guidelines, they are not going to be specific and I'm not saying that you guys don't abide by them I'm just saying this is an important issue. Yeah I think that you are right about the window. The width of the windows I think is probably fine. But the general configuration the bulk heads, the door, making the door a double, I think that is against the guidelines. Certainly the transom windows.

Mr. Keese stated you think the door is against the guidelines? How are you going to have a restaurant without a double door and get the equipment in and out?

Mrs. Ingram stated I don't know what the regulations are for a restaurant.

Mr. Keese stated you've got to be able to get the stuff in somehow. It's not going through a single door.

Mr. Davis stated there are two other entrances to the building. There is one right on the corner and there is also one further back. Where they took a lot of deliveries of equipment and we would have the same problem with that because it's a single door.

They would have to come back and ask if we could make that double wide in order to get equipment in.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I am more worried about ADA access than the equipment.

Mrs. Ingram stated is there an entrance in the rear or anything? Typically they have some kind of rear entrance that they could move equipment in.

Mr. Hackworth stated well there is a side entrance but it is elevated and it's only a single door.

Mr. Ranson stated one three foot wide door is ADA accessible.

Mrs. Chaney stated I don't think its three foot.

Mr. Keesee stated I don't think so.

Mrs. Chaney stated that is existing I don't think so.

Mr. Ranson stated you can't have two doors without ADA accessibility.

Mr. Gillie stated the original door is not ADA, you can scale off and measure the door and compare it to the door installed in the revised storefront which was an ADA door. The door is about four inches short in width if not more.

Mr. Keesee stated so you couldn't put that door back on anyway for a business?

Mr. Gillie stated it would need Handicap Accessibility.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Keesee stated can we table this until we get some better drawings of what is going to be more appropriate. What we are trying to do here. The picture that we have is not what we think needs to be there. Is that feasible? I don't think this is going to fly we don't have enough information what we are trying to do here.

Mr. Davis stated if we are going to try and preserve the integrity of the building then we would have to have new drawings to show what it would look like with a wooden frame and if we have a door way with ADA accessibility.

Mrs. Chaney stated so you are talking about just having one single door instead of a double door?

Mr. Keesee stated 32 inches.

Mr. Ranson stated I was just saying that ADA accessibility is an issue you have to have a 3 foot door you don't have to have two doors.

Mrs. Chaney stated I know that but I'm saying what they are talking about if we reserve the wooden store front with the new insulated glass and still only have an single door wide enough for ADA accessibility. Then the drawings need to be changed completely.

Mr. Davis stated correct to be able to see that.

Mr. Ranson stated well the glass has been preserved has the storefront materials themselves been preserved?

Mrs. Bobe stated the wood is no longer available.

Mr. Keesee stated I think he is talking about the glass windows Corrie.

Mrs. Bobe stated the glass with a painting on it?

Mr. Keesee stated you ripped out all of the glass so I think he is referring to that and putting in a new door I think.

Mr. Ranson stated that's a good point if you are going to put that 319 back and it was a certain width and it was less than three feet you would have to adjust the details but you could do that.

Mrs. Nicholas stated I think the request wasn't with ADA in mind but they were asking for the double door for the equipment so would ADA door allow for that kind of equipment to be moved back and forth?

Mr. Keesee stated it depends on what they bring in. I don't know what kind of restaurant they were talking about.

Mrs. Chaney stated if you are talking about a brewery the still isn't going to go through there.

Mr. Keesee stated it won't do a brewery that is for sure. You could build a cooler and bring it in sections. But they don't know what it is going to be that is what they are saying and they have got to have something.

Mr. Whitfield stated I think the point is that several people that have looked at it have asked to change it to a double door in order to be able to accommodate both equipment and human traffic.

Mr. Davis stated if we are going to table it I think we have got to make some sort of recommendation as far as people needing a double door if they want to put it on the corner or on the back end where the receiving door is for that building. We are going to have the same questions come before us that we are having right now.

Mr. Keesee stated they could probably handle it better if it is on the side I think im hearing this right. What do you think Corrie?

Mrs. Bobe stated it is your recommendation.

Mr. Davis stated can we ask questions?

Mr. Whitfield stated yes you can ask questions of anybody that has spoken that you wish too.

Mrs. Nicholas stated since the storefront is down I assume the front of the building is sitting open?

Mrs. Bobe stated it is boarded.

Mrs. Nicholas stated if we wait and extra month is there a danger to the building?

Mr. Davis stated no unless you get a tornado in there.

Mrs. Bobe stated no unless someone comes and tries to tear it up. But as is it's boarded and somewhat secured.

Mr. Keesee stated it's nothing in there of any value so I don't know why anybody would try to get in there.

Mr. Davis stated Susan can I ask you a question?

Mrs. Stillwell stated yes.

Mr. Davis stated you said that part of Acree's was torn down in order to make that Wilson Street.

Mrs. Stillwell stated the buildings that were between Craghead, Lynn and Bridge were torn down to make that connect when they did Industrial Avenue.

Mr. Davis stated but you don't think part of Acree's itself right there on the corner of Craghead and Wilson a part of Acree's itself was demolished?

Mrs. Stillwell stated no Gary Grant said when they demolished that part that's when they added the corner entrance because they lost so much of the building. I would like to make a comment about the rear door. The problem with the rear door is that you have to step up and when you step inside probably two to three feet away is a stairwell. So that would not be a very good access for anything, maybe bringing in supplies but not equipment.

Mr. Davis stated unless you were willing to shift the door over or widen right there at that area. But I know exactly what you are talking about.

Mrs. Stillwell stated that is a design problem none of these things were considered when they were planning whatever they are doing there.

Mr. Davis stated my asking that was is if part of Acree's building was torn down then this probably won't the original storefront.

Mrs. Stillwell stated it was the original storefront but the side going down Wilson Street you will see that a lot of that brick was replaced. When you get down to Bridge and look back you actually see a gable roof line on the back of this building. So I think that part was gabled at one point I know there was a tower there on the corner.

Mr. Hackworth stated there was a bell tower.

Mrs. Stillwell stated there was a bell tower on that corner. Rick was suggesting to me a minute ago why don't we go back to the Palmer's Meat Market and while we are there fix that storefront. It really sticks out like a sore thumb.

Mr. Davis stated well sorry but it was the cheapest way I could do it at the time.

Mr. Ranson stated that would require another presentation.

Mr. Whitfield stated since it was done prior to the guidelines we would not have jurisdiction over that. It would actually be something that the IDA would consider on their own.

Mr. Ranson stated yeah but someone could fix that if they wanted too.

Mr. Keese stated I think they should put the windows back in.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve but the IDA has to replace with storefront with replica material that matches with two 3 foot doors and that would include the area below the windows and the windows themselves, with one inch insulated glass. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion.

Mrs. Nicholas stated just so that I know what I am voting on can you repeat the motion or clarify the motion.

Mr. Ranson stated I move that the storefront be replaced with new storefront that matches the existing materials including the area below the windows and everything. With the expectation that we will allow two three foot doors to be used in a central area and with one inch insulated glass.

Mr. Keesee stated so basically everything would be the same as the original except the two doors is that what you are saying? And you would put the 319 back up?

Mr. Ranson stated well we talked about that but I don't know how you do.

Mr. Keesee stated I don't know how you put it up there where it would look good with two doors.

Mrs. Chaney withdraws her second to the motion.

Mr. Ranson stated I think the best design for the 319 would be to center it above the doors and then have equal panes on either side.

Mr. Davis stated my question with that is without a drawing in front of us and I'm looking at the one that has a car right in front of the curb. My question is if we put two three foot doors there then that is going to make an odd shape as far as the glass that is beside the second door. I would have to really have some drawing or something to show me.

Mr. Ranson stated as I look at it, it would be very much like it is now because the area below the Virginia Heating and Refrigeration sign would essentially where the doors are. Then you would have two spaces on each side that are approximately the same size as the existing.

Mrs. Nicholas stated except you are going to mess with the proportions if you do that.

Mr. Ranson stated maybe what we need is another drawing then.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to table this item until the IDA brings a drawing back for review. Mr. Hackworth seconded Mr. Keesee's motions. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Keesee stated who is going to help Corrie with what she is going to get drawn up? How is she going to know what to do?

Mr. Gillie stated I guess we are going to work with her on that. We have got what he said we have that in the record.

4. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 109 Bridge Street to install an 9' x 24" ground sign and a 4'8" x 5' freestanding directory sign.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Levi stated this is what your additional information is regarding.

Present on behalf of this request was Dodie Hudson with Dewberry. Mrs. Hudson stated we are working with the owners on 109 Bridge Street which is the Dan River Research

Building. We need a sign on the street so that when new patients are coming to the location it states 109 Bridge Street. The owners wanted something to mimic the River District sign with the green and Danville. So we took that and you will see our little rendering there we basically scaled it down half the size. We are going to do backlighting on it so at winter nights when they are still working you will be able to see it. The other option was we need something once they get in there to tell them what is on the first, second, and third floors because there will be several tenants on the floors. At the time when we submitted this the question hadn't come about well what are you doing with the existing signs? My first response was that we can't remove them. DHR is not going to let us do that. We had submitted the drawings to DHR and they had approved them with the sign there and the evaluations. Renee was like do you have a letter that states this? No because we really showed them staying and we didn't ask for them to be removed so they didn't address it. So I contacted our Historical Architect and she was like well they are cast aluminum so they are probably after the period of significance so we could take them down. It was never really our intention to remove them because they all say Dan River Research building which is what the building has always been. So she was like let me write you a letter because it shows that briefing that the National Park Service gives that signs should remain usually based on that period of significance. So when I told the owners that they were like well if we can remove them we would like to put our River District Tower letters on that back toward the river so when you are coming across the river you see that and it identifies it that way and then you will have the little tower sign that mimics the River District on Bridge Street. So I guess the question is with the additional information I don't have a letter from MPS or DHR that specifically states yes we have to keep them or no we can't remove them. That is what that last elevation is at the back showing you if they allow us to remove the sign this is what we would like to put up there.

Mr. Keesee stated so Dodie tell me this sign that you have got sketched that is going to be on the side facing the bridge?

Mrs. Hudson stated no the one that is hand sketched that will be in the parking lot. Do you have the site plan?

Mr. Keesee stated yes.

Mrs. Hudson stated that is sign one. There is an island as soon as you drive in and it will be right there. The tower sign which is sign two is actually up near the entrance between the building and the Fire station.

Mr. Ranson stated so neither one of these two signs will affect the Historic tax credits?

Mrs. Hudson stated correct the one on the back of the building facing the river.

Mr. Ranson stated that's the directory sign?

Mrs. Hudson stated no the directory sign is in the parking lot.

Mr. Ranson stated so you are talking about this one that is a whole other issue.

Mr. Keesee stated Dodie I have a question that has nothing to do with what you are asking how come the windows on the side where the bridge is those windows weren't replaced but the ones on Bridge Street were?

Mrs. Hudson stated all of the windows were replaced except for seven which needed DHR would not allow us to remove because they were in good condition.

Mr. Keesee stated but when you are at the fountain and you look straight up at the building the side at the bridge that whole side doesn't have replacement windows and the other side they are all new.

Mrs. Hudson stated all of them should be I don't know you are looking at. They may be the steel windows is that what you are talking about?

Mr. Keesee stated no the original Research Building that was right at the bridge that whole side has not been replaced.

Mr. Davis stated the Bridge Street side has been replaced.

Mr. Gillie stated the ones on Main Street Bridge where the walking trail is and stuff. Some of those have been replaced.

Mrs. Hudson stated all of those have now. The steel have not been replaced. We are keeping those and just beefing them up.

Mr. Gillie stated they just have done a really good job of matching them.

Mr. Hackworth stated on the addendum right here the Dan River sign where you are wanting to replace the aluminum letters have you considered an alternative replacement on the building for those or are you just doing away with them entirely?

Mrs. Hudson stated if we are not allowed to replace them at all we are going to leave Dan River Research building up there like they are.

Mr. Ranson stated I'm sorry I know you probably said this, this sign you are going to put it there if you can remove it. Are you asking us if you can remove it?

Mrs. Hudson stated if DHR allows us to remove it the owners want to put that up there.

Mr. Ranson stated so this really is a whole different thing.

Mrs. Hudson stated if we have what I call the mini tower sign and the directional sign there is also the three wall signs that are existing. I was all along going to keep because I didn't think we could remove them. Well when Renee asked I couldn't find where it said no you have to keep the sign but maybe they didn't say that because we didn't ask to remove them. This transpired this week so I have been trying to get in touch with NPS and DHR to ask them their opinion and they should be able to tell me yes you can keep them or no you can't or submit what you want to and that is a two month process. So I would kind of like to find out can we do this?

Mrs. Chaney stated she is wanting to know if they tell her that they can remove the letters she is wanting us to already have permission to say yes you can put them up.

Mr. Ranson stated you have been told that even though they might not go back originally they are part of the building and should be kept.

Mrs. Hudson stated they could be yes. That was her opinion.

Mr. Gillie stated that was her opinion until we hear from NPS or DHR we don't know.

Mrs. Nicholas stated replacing this has no bearing on whether you keep the mini tower and the directory sign?

Mrs. Chaney stated they want to add this.

Mrs. Hudson stated we technically need the address marker which is the mini tower and we need the directory sign so when they pull into the parking lot they know where they are going. That's what the original submittal was but we would like to add this. I know there is a requirement with the max and all that you can do. So we need the directorial and the tower. Can we do the other one later if it is approved?

Mr. Ranson stated so when you say if it's approved who will approve it?

Mrs. Hudson stated well DHR and you guys will have to tell us if we can. Either we submit it again later once we find out or you can tell me now yes or no.

Mrs. Chaney stated if they are allowed to remove the letters and put up the new sign is it still within the amount of square footage that they are allowed for all of these signs on the building?

Ms. Levi stated that would be the only new sign going on the building everything else would just exist as historic.

Mrs. Chaney stated that's what I'm saying if they take down the Dan River Research Building?

Ms. Levi stated it would fit and it also meets the guidelines. It would fit.

Mr. Ranson stated on the drawings that you gave us on the west elevation next to the west you have stuff showing there what is the intention of that?

Mrs. Hudson stated that is an existing sign that says Dan River Inc. Research Building under it.

Mr. Ranson stated If you are allowed to remove the letters you wouldn't put anything back?

Mrs. Hudson stated our intention right now is to now remove those. There is another one on the corner of that building that you can't see.

Mrs. Chaney stated they are just talking about removing the one facing the road.

Mrs. Hudson stated right so when they do come by they will know that is the River District tower.

Mr. Hackworth stated okay so you are only asking permission for that one sign. The one facing the north side of town.

Mrs. Hudson stated I asking for permission for the tower and directional sign if we get those and we are okay with the guidelines and NPS says yes you can remove that sign and the owners want to replace it with the River District tower.

Mr. Hackworth stated but it's just that one sign?

Mrs. Hudson stated yes.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to approve with the additional material and to be resized to 16 square foot max for each. Mr. Hackworth seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

5. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 212 N Union Street to install an acrylic wall sign.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Karen Logan on behalf of Mental Health Services Gentlemen of Tomorrow. He is requesting a sign to go over the door of the administrative offices. When we have case managers or clients to come down it is hard to find the building because it's nothing there on the front of the building.

Mrs. Nicholas stated so the building is already occupied?

Ms. Logan stated yes. He wanted me to let you know the sign is 10 inches tall and 27 feet long.

Mr. Gillie stated they used to have a sign lower than that in the area this is a relocation that is why it is in front of you. Usually the placement of a sign doesn't come back that's the only reason it's coming back. It's a different spot on the building.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve as submitted. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

6. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 415 Main Street to install a 2' x 4' vinyl window sign reading Glitz & Glamour Boutique.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Tynesha Breedlove for Kim Wilson to get the sign approved.

Mr. Davis closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Chaney made a motion to approve as submitted. Mrs. Nicholas seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The October 13, 2016 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote with one change to page 3 white washed brick not light washed brick.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Gillie stated I have two things. One, the free clinic of Danville as you saw had their banners were vandalized and they're working on a proposal to possibly move them hopefully to a different part of the building where they would less likely be vandalized. Do you feel that it is necessary to bring them back if they are just moving them to a different location?

Mrs. Nicholas stated we approved them did we put a time limit on them or something?

Mr. Gillie stated they had a year for them and then they were supposed to change them every so often I think they are probably just changing them now. We gave them the okay to put them in that location for up to a year. This will be a slightly different location but still the same concept. They just wanted to know if they need to come back. I told them I would run it by your guys and see what you thought.

Mr. Whitfield stated did we make the other folks come back and they were just moving a sign?

Mr. Gillie stated they didn't have a sign period at that location so it was a new sign. This one they already have the okay that's why I am here to ask. They are not opposed to come back if they could just get them replaced quick they were just going to put them back up. I told them I would ask today.

Mr. Davis stated where would they put them where someone wouldn't be able to vandalize then again?

Mr. Gillie stated they have got that mansard portion that is kind of sloped instead of being this way in between the poles they would be more linear attached to that part up high. Somebody would really have to jump up high to try and get them on that top portion of the roof.

Mr. Ranson stated I think because they are temporary and we have already approved them I don't see a problem with it.

Mrs. Nicholas stated would this change the clock on terms of for a year.

Mr. Gillie stated no I would say it is still running it's the same thing instead of being this way they are now this way but that is up to you.

Mr. Davis stated I'm fine with it.

Mrs. Chaney stated I'm fine with it.

Mr. Gillie stated the other thing we had was they want to put a Christmas tree on the roof well not on the roof where the drive thru portion is. The guidelines really don't say anything on those. Is that something you want to look or are you just going to say that's alright.

Mr. Keesee stated I think it's a great idea.

Mr. Gillie stated does that need to come in front of you? Our take on it was we didn't know so we figured we would ask. So if you don't want to look at we will just tell them to put the tree up and make sure its anchored down.

Mrs. Chaney stated I'm assuming you would put a restriction on that?

Mr. Gillie stated they put a restriction on the time and stuff. They are just doing it as kind of you can buy a string of lights to support someone.

Mrs. Chaney stated that's why they are doing it to raise some funds.

Mr. Gillie stated but it is the holidays and we know people are going to be putting decorations up so since they ask I told them I would ask you guys.

Mrs. Nicholas stated what's the time?

Mr. Gillie stated sixty days the middle of November until New Year's actually probably on 45 but they said 60 days.

Mrs. Chaney stated I don't have a problem.

Mr. Davis stated I'm good.

Mr. Gillie stated one other thing we have been asked to do is have you review the regulations and see if there is anything we can do to stream line the process. So we have had the guidelines in place for about 2 years now. So if there is anything in there you think we should be doing differently or you would like to see changed let us know

now. So staff can start working on it every couple of years we try to go back and try and work on things that worked and didn't work. We will bring it back to you with other changes that are necessary if you think we need to tweak stuff. We do have cases for next month.

Ms. Levi stated there is a meeting going on right now at the Pepsi building. The MPO is doing a bicycle and pedestrian study for the River District and they and their consulting firm are at the Pepsi building now doing an informational session to get feedback from anybody that wants to go. So if you are interested in putting your two cents in on a bicycle and pedestrian study and the River District that is going on until 6pm.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Approved By: