



**Minutes**  
**Architectural Review Board**  
May 9, 2022  
Council Chambers

You may view and listen to the Architectural Review Board meeting in its entirety [here](#). The time of each presentation is in brackets below [00:00:00].

**Members Present**

Karen Irvin (Chair)  
Laura Galke  
James Jarrell IV  
D.D. Lecky  
Kelly Penick  
Adriana Moss

**Members Absent**

Helen P. Ross (Vice Chair)

**Staff**

Kate Schwartz  
Caroline Hieber  
Chuck Johnston  
John Schaffer

---

Chair Irvin called the Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**OPENING REMARKS**

Chair Irvin determined that a quorum of 6 members was present, both virtual and in person, and asked if public notice requirements had been met. Mr. Johnston confirmed that they had and that a copy of the notice was provided to the Board.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA** [00:02:00]

Ms. Schwartz shared that the applicants for item COA FY22-0054 – 307 Princess Anne Street asked to withdraw their application. Ms. Schwartz also stated that the draft minutes from the April meeting were not ready and should be removed from the agenda. Ms. Galke motioned to approve the amended agenda. Ms. Lecky seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS & REPORTS** [00:02:48]

Ms. Adriana Moss provided an overview of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions training sessions and each board member highlighted useful information from the sessions.

**DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST** [00:12:12]

Mr. Jarrell disclosed a conflict of interest for COA 2020-04 at 1005 Sophia Street as he is the applicant for the project. He confirmed that he previously submitted a disclosure form to staff and will refrain from participating.

**CONSENT AGENDA** [00:14:50]

- A. COA FY22-0050 – 1004 Prince Edward Street – Sign Installation
- B. COA FY22-0051 – 710 Princess Anne Street – Sign Installation
- C. COA FY22-0056 – 1103 Princess Anne Street – Sign Installation
- D. COA FY22-0057 – 321 William Street – Sign Installation

- E. COA FY22-0058 – 203 Ford Street – Sign and Awning Installation
- F. COA FY22-0059 – 1211 Caroline Street – Sign Installation
- G. COA FY22-0060 – 1501 Caroline Street – Fence Installation

Mr. Johnston provided an overview of the consent agenda items. Ms. Moss motioned to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING [00:19:35]**

**Continued Applications**

- A. COA 2020-04 – 1005 Sophia Street – James E. Jarrell IV requests approval of the detailed architectural design of a new three-story commercial building on this property. Demolition of the existing building and the site planning, scale, and massing of the new construction was approved by the ARB in February 2020.

Mr. Johnston provided an overview of the revisions to the design. Jeh Hicks, Jarrell Properties, was present as was the project architect Andrew Moore. Mr. Moore provided a brief history of the building and an overview of the narrative of their design process. He reviewed the changes made since the April review, including changing the cupola into a clerestory monitor, reducing the number of windows, increasing the space between them, and modifying the detailing of the headers. They also reduced the number of steps on the parapet and widened the top step. He stated that the parapet was important to the overall composition and functionality of the design. They believe the design is contextually appropriate for downtown Fredericksburg and that it would be unique and interesting while at the same time being informed by the established architecture of the area.

Ms. Moss agreed the change to the cupola is much more appropriate. She cited section 9J2 of the guidelines which states to avoid combining disparate elements of architectural styles. Ms. Moss stated that these changes are closer but that work is still needed. It appears too institutional in style instead of matching the industrial area. The Neo-Classical designs are just not appropriate and it should be simplified. Ms. Moss suggested altering the cornice or architrave on the two-story portion and possibly utilizing more brickwork which would be appropriate for the area.

Ms. Galke agreed with Ms. Moss regarding the scale of the industrial elements that have been incorporated. Ms. Galke was very pleased with the responsiveness from the applicant and was in support of Ms. Moss's suggestion of the use brick on the front. Ms. Lecky was also in favor of the modifications. Ms. Lecky was prepared to support arched lintels on the top of the windows; however, she agreed with the Board regarding the stepped parapets.

Ms. Penick agreed with the Board's comments and she cited section 9J2 in guidelines. She suggested that the applicant consider using masonry details to appear less formal. There is a disconnect between the front and back of the building and she would like to see some changes before approving it.

Ms. Irvin said she had concerns with the Neo-Classical front which is in conflict with the rest of the building and area. She said she appreciated the changes that have been made, but that some additional revisions were still needed.

Mr. Moore shared a new drawing that showed some changes to the detailing at the front. The Board spoke in support of the revision; however, they said they would need more time to consider this

design and recommended that the applicants attend a work session. The applicant requested to continue the item to the June 13, 2022 meeting and attend the May 23, 2022 work session.

New Applications [\[01:04:50\]](#)

- B. COA FY22-0046 – 1107 Princess Anne Street – Loretta and Brian McDermott request to demolish the accessory structure on the north side of this single-family residence and construct a new two-story accessory structure on the same footprint.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the staff memorandum. Project architect Charles Aquino and property owner Brian McDermott were present and available to answer questions. Mr. Aquino stated that he has been looking to implement the recommendations from the City-hired engineer. The engineer found that the walls were six-inch-thick unreinforced concrete with no footer beneath. The recommendation was to install a grade beam beneath, but their contractor won't attempt this work because of the risk of failure during the work. He said that pilings would have to be installed from inside the structure.

Rebecca Light, 207 Pitt Street, submitted a written public comment in objection to the proposed demolition of the accessory structure.

David James, 213 Princess Anne Street, President of the Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, Inc., spoke in opposition of the proposed demolition, discussed demolition by neglect, and said that the engineer's report said the structure could be repaired.

Danae Peckler, 1410 Prince Edward Street, spoke in opposition of the proposed demolition and provided a brief overview on the history of the structure which may have been a servant's residence.

Mary Ellen Wheeler, 1201 Princess Anne Street, spoke in support of the demolition. She spoke to a former resident of the property and said the building was very unsafe and that there was a history of structural issues with the retaining wall on Lewis Street. She said she was in support of the new design.

Ms. Moss was concerned for the safety issues and asked for clarification on how demolition would aid repair of the retaining wall. The applicant said they will build a new retaining wall behind the existing retaining wall which will stabilize the hillside. Ms. Moss said the engineer's report does lay out possibilities to stabilize the structure and said they should try to pursue those options. Mr. Aquino said that all of those suggestions must be done at once to stabilize the building; however, it could collapse at any point while under renovation. There was some discussion on the materials for the proposed new construction.

Ms. Galke stated that whether the structure was a domicile for African American servants or a garage, its orientation to a secondary street makes sense. The nature of the construction and the condition of the structure is poor. The engineer's report cites serious concerns about safety and she agreed that it would be extremely difficult to save the structure due to its many issues. Ms. Galke asked for clarification on the new wall behind the old retaining wall. Mr. Aquino said the old wall may be able minimally visible but it would be preserved. Ms. Galke suggested that archaeological monitoring would be appropriate and Mr. Aquino said that would be feasible as the structure would need to be deconstructed by hand due to the site. Ms. Galke agreed with staff recommendation to continue the consideration of the new construction to the June 13 meeting.

Ms. Lecky stated that the report gave her concerns for safety and she agreed that rehabilitation is not feasible. If possible, she would like to see a letter from the engineering firm or contractor that came on site that made the determination that driving the pilings within the structure would be detrimental to life and limb. She said she would like to continue the new construction discussion to a later meeting.

Ms. Penick inquired about the retaining wall and the property line. The owner, Dr. McDermott, provided clarification. The historic wall is technically on the neighbor's property; however, they are both impacted by its failing so they are collaborating on these improvements. There was discussion on the damage and the owner provided context on the photos. Ms. Penick stated that because the walls have no structural integrity, unfortunately demolition seems to be the best option. She also requested more time to consider the new structure.

Mr. Jarrell asked Ms. Schwartz if the City or Building Department had looked at life safety concerns. Ms. Schwartz said that Building Official John Schaffer was present and could provide input. Mr. Schaffer said that the inspector and an engineer walked the site. He said that they concluded that the structure is unsafe and that action would need to be taken quickly. Ms. Schwartz said they initially suggested that the applicant should pursue a methodology to first stabilize the wall and then reassess the foundation after, but as they learned more from various professionals this approach was not feasible. Mr. Jarrell requested the applicant or architect or engineer respond to the city's report with their rebuttal so that they have that on record. He agreed that the new construction needs further review.

Chair Irvin noted that extensive demolition of parts of the structure would be needed to even attempt the repair work.

Mr. Jarrell motioned to approve the demolition contingent on the applicant responding to the City's engineer's letter about how it can be repaired with their rebuttals as well as providing an as-built and documenting the existing structure at the Lewis Street address. Ms. Galke seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

Ms. Lecky made a motion to continue the request to construct a new accessory structure to the June 13, 2022 meeting in order to allow the applicant to evaluate incorporating the details from the original building and provide a list of building materials applicable to the structure as its being drawn currently.

Ms. Penick requested the addition of some wording to provide detail on the retaining wall. Ms. Lecky accepted the revision.

Ms. Lecky made a motion to continue the request to construct a new accessory structure to the June 13, 2022 meeting in order to allow the applicant to incorporate the design details from the original building, to provide details for the retaining wall structure, and provide a list of applicable materials for the structure. Ms. Galke seconded. The motion carried 6-0.

- C. COA FY22-0052 – 110 Hanover Street – Hanover Street Project LLC requests to make alterations to this commercial building including replacing paneling in the former garage door opening, reconfiguring the entry on the west side of the building, and altering the chimney.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview. Architect Joel Cropley was present to answer any questions.

Danae Peckler, 1410 Prince Edward Street, representing HFFI, shared that the property is under a restrictive covenant held by the Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, Inc. (HFFI). She expressed support of the current designs and the plans for rehabilitation and adaptive reuse.

Ms. Galke was in support of this project with the recommendation that the proposed tie plates be installed as symmetrically as possible as construction challenges allow. Ms. Lecky, Ms. Penick, and Mr. Jarrell were all in support of the restoration. Mr. Jarrell requested clarification regarding the tie rods and tie plates. Ms. Irvin inquired about the chimney and the architect said that it extends beyond the roof and there are portions that are covered in stucco.

Ms. Galke made a motion to approve with the condition that tie rod plates be installed evenly and symmetrically on the front north façade as structural repairs allow. Ms. Moss seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

- D. COA FY22-0053 – 209 Fauquier Street – Valerie Gomez requests to construct a one-story shed in the rear yard of this residential property.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. The applicant was present to answer any questions. There were no public comments.

Ms. Galke visited the site and noted that the proposed structure would be minimally visible from public right of way and is prepared to support the application. The rest of the Board agreed.

Ms. Penick made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

- E. COA FY22-0055 – 422 William Street – Elisa Bonilla requests to construct improvements to the outdoor seating area for this restaurant including brick walls, steel posts, and a retractable awning.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. The applicant and the project architect, Evan Lawson, were present to answer any questions. There were no public comments.

Danae Peckler, 1410 Prince Edward Street, asked the applicant to elaborate on the height of the structure and asked if it aligned with the storefront.

Mr. Lawson clarified that the proposed structure is 10 feet tall and it wasn't designed to align with any existing elements.

Ms. Moss said the design meets the guidelines and would support staff reviewing the final height of the structure. Ms. Galke and Ms. Lecky agreed.

Ms. Penick asked if the steel was going to be painted and Mr. Lawson confirmed that it was. He said that the awning structure is separate from the steel posts. Tom Rosner spoke to provide clarification and said that the purpose of the awning is to protect against rain, not provide shade. He confirmed that the fabric awnings are like an accordion. Mr. Jarrell asked if they plan to use machine-made brick. Mr. Rosner confirmed they would.

Mr. Jarrell made a motion to approve the application on condition that staff work with the applicant to align the top beam of the structure with a horizontal element on the front of the building. Ms. Penick seconded, and the motion carried 6-0.

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**STAFF UPDATE**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Irvin adjourned the meeting at 9:54 p.m.

---

Karen Irvin, Chair

DRAFT