



Minutes
Architectural Review Board
May 23, 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)
Helen P. Ross (Vice Chair)
James Jarrell IV
D.D. Lecky
Kelly Penick
Adriana Moss
Laura Galke

Members Absent

Staff

Kate Schwartz
Caroline Hieber

Chair Irvin called the Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Irvin determined that a quorum of seven members was present, and asked if public notice requirements had been met. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that they had.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA [00:01:32]

There were no changes to the agenda. Ms. Ross moved to approve the agenda as written. Ms. Penick seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

None.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST [00:2:45]

Mr. Jarrell disclosed a conflict of interest for COA 2020-04 at 1005 Sophia Street as he is the applicant of the project. He confirmed that he previously submitted a disclosure form to staff and will remove himself from the meeting for that discussion as recommended by the City Attorney.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION FOR COA FY22-0046 [00:3:23]

Ms. Schwartz spoke on the email sent by the City Attorney, Kathleen Dooley, in regards to the decision on the demolition component of this application. The previous condition requesting additional documentation, while clear in their intentions, gives the appearance that the Board is looking for staff to evaluate something that they don't necessarily have the authority or criteria to evaluate. The City Attorney advised that the board could reopen the item and vote to reconsider the motion to make a new vote that takes all the information into account and makes it clear what information is being used to make a decision on the application. Ms. Schwartz explained how the procedure works as stated in the bylaws. Ms. Schwartz asked if there is any additional information that they would like Ms. Schwartz to collect from all parties involved in the application prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Ross said she was not present at the meeting where the motion was made and was in support of reconsideration. The remainder of the Board agreed. Ms. Penick asked if they are going to receive the requested documents to review before the next meeting. Ms. Schwartz said that the architect plans to submit in time for the June packet. Mr. Jarrell said he would like to run through the guidelines with the Board before they make another vote. The Board concluded the following:

- An Informal site visit: members visited the site from the public right-of-way on their own prior to the meeting for review and the Board decided that a group visit to view the interior of the building was not necessary.
- Qualified professionals involved with the project must provide a documents containing background on their experience working with historic buildings such as a CV or resume for the records.
- Standards for documentation: Ms. Schwartz said that documentation before demolition typically consists of measured drawings, ground plans, and photo documentation. Mr. Jarrell referenced the Historic American Buildings Survey standards for documentation which list three different levels. He believes they should do a low to mid-level based on the significance of the building. Ms. Moss agreed stating that surrounding communities call for level three documentation for demolition of a historic resource within a historic district. The large format photography is very expensive and may be unnecessary and digital photos are acceptable and the Board agreed.
- Provide additional documentation for the application that shows the applicant explored alternatives to demolition (adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, or relocation) and argue why none of those options are feasible.
- As-Built requirements: Mr. Jarrell suggested requiring measurements of the trim, wood details, and window locations as well as digital photographs prior to demolition. Ms. Schwartz suggested photo documentation throughout the deconstruction process. The Board agreed that digital photographs are an acceptable alternative to large format negatives pictures. Instead of full written data, short form would be acceptable. Ms. Moss asked if there are existing measured drawings from the applicant. Ms. Schwartz said potentially as Mr. Aquino does hand drawings for all of his work. Ms. Moss said that was something that they can accept in the motion. Ms. Ross would like to request measured drawings with initial dimensions, window spacing and doors.

Mr. Jarrell asked Ms. Schwartz if staff has previous cases that can serve as a standard they can use as a guide. Ms. Schwartz said that there are few examples and this item can function as a model in the future. Ms. Schwartz wanted to mention from a zoning perspective any new structure built here would be an identical footprint and must be similar in terms of size and scale. Ms. Schwartz will be sure to include that in the next discussion as an item in the public hearing. Ms. Moss asked if they could provide the additional documentation they are requesting to the public. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that it would be distributed in the meeting packet.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS [00:40:21]

- 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.

Jeh Hicks, Jarrell Properties, was present as was the project architect Andrew Moore. Mr. Moore provided a number of design alternatives for the Board to review. Ms. Moss shared some examples of historic industrial masonry buildings in downtown Fredericksburg. The group focused the discussion on the detailing of the Sophia Street facade. The Board was in support of a design alternative that used brick detailing consistent with other historic industrial buildings and eliminated much of the classical detailing seen in previous iterations. Board members agreed that the revised design was in accordance with the District guidelines.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

STAFF UPDATE

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Irvin adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.



Karen Irvin, Chair