



Minutes
Architectural Review Board
June 13, 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 7:00 p.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Chair Irvin determined that a quorum of 7 members was present, and asked if public notice requirements had been met. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that they had.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA [\[00:01:43\]](#)

Ms. Moss motioned to approve the agenda. Ms. Ross seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

ANNOUNCEMENTS & REPORTS

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [\[00:02:10\]](#)

Ms. Lecky motioned to approve the April 11, 2022 minutes as written, Ms. Galke and Ms. Moss seconded. The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Lecky motioned to approve the May 9, 2022 minutes as written, Ms. Moss seconded. The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Moss requested that staff include more information from the discussion on the conditions for approval and additional documents requested from the engineers, contractors and builders in the minutes of the May 23, 2022 meeting. Ms. Schwartz said they would revise the minutes and provide them for review at the next meeting.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

None.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST [00:05:05]

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 not participate in the discussion or vote for that item.

CONSENT AGENDA [00:06:12]

A. COA FY22-0062 – 918 Caroline Street – Sign Installation

Ms. Moss made a motion to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

RECONSIDERATION OF COA FY22-0046 AT 1107 PRINCESS ANNE STREET (DEMOLITION COMPONENT) [00:07:45]

The Board was advised by the City Attorney to reconsider the motion for the demolition component of the application at 1107 Princess Anne Street because it contained the condition that the applicant provide additional information after the fact that is relevant to the vote. Mr. Jarrell made a motion to reconsider item COA FY22-0046 at 1107 Princess Anne Street. Ms. Moss seconded, the motion carried 7-0, and this item was opened for discussion.

Chair Irvin clarified that this is not a public hearing item. Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application and reviewed the criteria for demolition. All professionals associated with the project were in attendance, including project architect Charles Aquino, contractor Dallas Barnes, and City-hired engineer David Bronson.

Ms. Ross, Ms. Galke, Ms. Lecky didn't have questions. Ms. Penick asked Ms. Schwartz where the value number for the accessory structure originated. Ms. Schwartz said that the number was the assessed value from the Commissioner of the Revenue. Ms. Penick asked Mr. Bronson to elaborate on his recommendations for the structure. He commented that Ms. Schwartz covered his recommendations thoroughly and didn't have much to add, but that he tried to provide an objective condition assessment of the site. He provides the assessment and leaves the means and methodology to the contractor. The six-inch concrete walls are unreinforced and the change in use would impact the stability of the structure. Ms. Penick verified that he was not commenting on constructability for this project. Ms. Penick asked if he was asked to test the strength of the concrete or did a visual survey. He confirmed that he performed a visual assessment. It was difficult to see some areas because a lot of it was covered with wood siding. There are big cracks which were a major concern.

Mr. Jarrell asked Ms. Schwartz if they had any back and forth with Freeland engineering or if the document in the packet was the only report. Mr. Jarrell wanted a representative from Freeland to respond to Mr. Bronson's suggestions and explain why it would not be feasible to do the underpinning. Mr. Aquino responded to item two on the City's engineering report. Mr. Aquino said it would not be feasible to perform underpinning because there is no bearing for the underpinning to go to. If they attempted to save this, they would do the same thing they did for the addition to the main house, which would mean putting screw pilings in below the surface and the soil for the existing retaining wall. That is the most feasible way to create a foundation for the building. Even if they attempted this, it's possible to lose pieces of this wall while they were doing it. He said it would be almost impossible to perform because these screw pilings are like a drill. They can't go in the wall at an angle, in this situation they would have to go in next to the walls, which would support the side thrust. The walls would not be able to provide that stability and may fail due to the lack of reinforcement.

Mr. Jarrell asked Ms. Schwartz about the alternatives of relocation or selling the property. Ms. Schwartz shared that the applicant did pursue subdividing the land and allowing the accessory structure to be on its own lot; however, it was not permitted by City Code. She also explained that it would be extremely expensive to relocate the structure based on similar projects the City has explored, and would surpass the building's assessed value. Ms. Moss asked if there were any grants or funding they could explore. Ms. Schwartz said there was none she was aware of.

Ms. Moss asked Mr. Bronson how they could determine the concrete walls were unreinforced if they are covered by siding and if there was no invasive testing performed. Mr. Bronson said that there are some tests they can do. In terms of his evaluation, he said that the north side wall next to the retaining wall is exposed underneath the weatherboard siding. There are enough cracks that are wide enough and there's enough displacement to reasonably conclude that there is a lack of sufficient reinforcement. He said that there may be some reinforcement, such as bars; however, it is failing and may have corroded. Ms. Moss asked Mr. Aquino about the timeline of the previous work on the retaining wall, which was done in 2019. Mr. Jarrell asked if they plan to demolish the retaining wall on Lewis street along the sidewalk. Ms. Schwartz said that is not a part of the application.

Ms. Schwartz read three general public comments from Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, Inc. (HFFI) members David James, Danae Peckler, and Scott Walker into the record. These comments were in opposition to the demolition.

Ed Sandtner, 132 Caroline Street, stated that he was concerned about a large-scale pattern of demolition approval instead of preservation. The City needs to be proactive about buildings in poor condition.

Mr. Jarrell motioned to approve the demolition of the accessory structure at 1107 Princess Anne Street due to its poor structural condition as evidenced in the public hearings and work session on the condition that the structure is documented prior to removal. The documentation should be consistent with HABS Level III documentation as defined in the Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 139. Ms. Moss suggested two amendments, the first being that the Board would accept digital photography instead of large format photography. She also added that a Secretary of the Interior qualified architectural historian or archaeologist be present during demolition and that documentation of demolition occurs. Mr. Jarrell accepted those amendments.

Mr. Jarrell motioned to approve the demolition of the accessory structure at 1107 Princess Anne Street due to its poor structural condition as evidenced in the public hearings and work session contingent on the three following conditions: the structure is documented prior to removal consistent with HABS Level III documentation as defined in the Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 139; digital photography meeting Virginia Department of Historic Resources standards is acceptable in place of large format photography; and there must be a Secretary of the Interior qualified architectural historian or archaeologist present during demolition and that documentation of demolition occurs. Ms. Galke seconded the motion and the motion carried 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARING [01:03:15]

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.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. Mr. Andrew Moore was present via GoTo Meeting to answer any questions. The representative, Jeh Hicks, was also present. There were no written nor public comments on this item. Ms. Ross was pleased with the changes and the use of brick. Ms. Galke was also pleased with the changes as discussed during the May 23, 2022 work session and was in favor of approval. Ms. Lecky concurred and believes all their concerns were corrected. Ms. Penick had nothing to add and shared appreciation with the applicant for working with them. Ms. Moss and Chair Irvin agreed.

Ms. Galke motioned to approve this item in accordance with the revised drawings dated June 13, 2022. Ms. Moss seconded and the motion carried 6-0-1 with Mr. Jarrell abstaining.

- 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 proposed new accessory structure after demolition of the existing structure. There were no public comments. Mr. Charles Aquino was present to answer questions.

Ms. Ross requested clarification on architectural details and said she wasn't sure that fish-scale shingles were appropriate. Mr. Aquino clarified that the design would mimic the existing diamond shingle pattern. Ms. Ross asked what the proposed material in the gable would be. Mr. Aquino confirmed the siding would be hardie plank. Ms. Ross inquired about the barn doors. Mr. Aquino said these would not be visible from any public space; they would be sliding doors to a storage space. Ms. Ross was concerned with the mix of architectural styles and suggested something less utilitarian such as paneled doors. Ms. Ross said the new structure would be a nice fit for the neighborhood.

Ms. Galke asked if the archaeology ordinance applied here and she said it would be a good way to mitigate the destruction of the original structure. She said that they had discussed monitoring but they should explore their options. Ms. Schwartz said that given the scale of the project the owner wouldn't be required to pursue that but the City does have archaeologists on call that they can work with. Ms. Lecky had the same concerns with the barn doors and the columns because they are mixing styles. Mr. Aquino said he could skip the columns and add brackets. Ms. Lecky said that the barn doors would be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Aquino said that they could change the doors to be single or double paneled.

Mr. Jarrell asked how they would achieve a fish scale or diamond shaped pattern with hardie plank. Mr. Aquino said they plan to use painted cedar. Ms. Moss had similar concerns about the barn doors. Ms. Moss cited a section of the guidelines on page 98 regarding the roof and said that their proposed asphalt shingles don't match the surrounding buildings. Chair Irvin asked Mr. Aquino to provide more information for the blacked out windows. He confirmed that they would be regular windows, and that they would blackout the view from the interior. Mr. Jarrell asked if standing seam metal is something that the applicant would consider. Ms. Schwartz was able to provide a history of the previous roof on the main house that received a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Jarrell motioned to approve the accessory structure with the following conditions: the barn doors must be changed to panelized doors of some type, determined by the applicant and staff on the panel count; in lieu of Tuscan columns, the applicant must use box columns or a bracket that would be more in

line with the structure; and hardie Artisan siding must be used. Approval of the retaining wall as submitted is additionally included with the motion. Ms. Moss seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

New Applications

C. COA FY22-0061 – 301 Charles Street – Dale and Gay Galyen request to construct a one-story shed in the rear yard of this single-family residence.

The applicant was present and ready to answer any questions. There were no written comments. There was a public comment from Mr. Michael Adams who is the developer of the adjoining property who spoke in support of the application. Ms. Ross said that it was a pleasant design and supports the application. The rest of the Board agreed and supported the application.

Ms. Lecky motioned to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Moss seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

D. COA FY22-0063 – 1501 Caroline Street – Mala Kline requests to install two new windows on the north side of this single-family residence by creating one new opening and replacing the attic vent.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. The applicant's representative, Chris Huie, was present. Ms. Ross asked about the 1927 photograph in their packet and is curious about a chimney on the furthest elevation that seems to no longer be there today. Mr. Huie said that the masonry structure is an addition to the lap siding structure, which is the original part of the house, and that he couldn't answer her question. Ms. Ross said she hesitates to pierce an end gable that was never intended to have windows in it, and can't support the request to create new openings. She may be able to give leeway to replacing the vent and turning it into a window but really discourages removal.

Mr. Huie explained the reason for the window is because the owners would like to add a bathroom on the second floor. Ms. Ross says that she still can't support the application. Ms. Galke said that the Guidelines are very clear about windows. Section 3b page 29 articles 2 and 9 are a particular concern for this proposal. Ms. Galke said she couldn't support the application. She said she wouldn't mind replacing the vent to become a window but discourages new openings. Some discussion of visibility followed. Ms. Lecky was also concerned with the idea of piercing through the brick. She suggested a vent system rather than a window, because a window for a bathroom is not necessary. Ms. Lecky said that she could approve of a window to replace the pre-existing vent. Ms. Lecky said that the proposed changes would be visible from the street.

Ms. Penick and Mr. Jarrell inquired about the use of the attic, the existing building materials, and any evidence of previous openings. Mr. Jarrell said he believes that because this wall is not one of the two predominate sides of the house that the Board may be able to work with the applicant to explore some conditions. There could have been other openings in the past but it's difficult to tell because the brick is painted. Ms. Moss visited the side and said she is not in support of creating a new opening, but she would be in favor of replacing the existing vent with a window. Chair Irvin said she agrees with the Board with replacing the louver with a window. The guidelines do allow for putting windows in secondary walls so she's not immediately opposed to putting a second window in but would find it easier if it was a wood framing instead of a brick wall. Discussion followed on the construction methodology and materials.

Chair Irvin suggested that they split this application into two motions. Mr. Huie went into detail with the methodology of the procedure to construct an opening for a window. Ms. Lecky asked him to verify that

he would be sawing into the brick not removing each one carefully and preserving the brick, which would be a condition for approval. The owner would be expected to store and maintain the brick.

Mr. Jarrell made a motion to approve the request to install a window in the existing vent opening with the conditions that the existing opening is not modified and that a shutter is constructed to the likeness of the existing louvered vent and matching the hardware on the rest of the house. Additionally, narrow 5/8-inch muntins should be used for the new windows rather than 7/8-inch muntins. All trim and sill details should match the dimensions and profiles of the existing historic windows on the masonry portion of the façade.

Ms. Penick requested to amend the motion by removing the condition for a louvered shutter because that was only recommended for the windows on the second floor. Mr. Jarrell said he was proposing a single leaf shutter. Ms. Moss said no shutters may be a better option to match the picture provided. Ms. Lecky and Ms. Galke agreed. Mr. Jarrell amended his motion to strike that condition. Ms. Schwartz stated the amended motion to approve the request to replace the attic level louver with one new window on condition that 5/8-inch muntins are used and the trim and sill detail should match the existing historic windows. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Lecky motioned to deny the request to add a new opening at the second floor. Ms. Schwartz recommended the Board amend the motion to state the standard or condition that the request does not meet. Ms. Lecky amended her motion to deny the request to add a new opening at the second floor at 1501 Caroline because it does not comply with section 3.B.9 of the guidelines which states that such requests should be considered on a case-by-case basis. The penetration of a masonry wall would be detrimental to the historic fabric of that particular structure, and it is unclear that the historic structure could be restored once penetration is made. Ms. Moss seconded. The motion carried 5-2 with Ms. Penick and Mr. Jarrell against.

E. COA FY22-0064 – 503 Sophia Street – William LaPointe and Jason Smith request to reconstruct the patio roof covering using corrugated PVC panel roofing.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. The representative Michael Adams was present and said that he spoke with Ms. Schwartz regarding the polycarbonate material they selected over standing seam metal for the roof for the outdoor patio area. They began work to stabilize the current conditions because it was not safe after damage resulting from a storm. They chose this material specifically for the use as a metal roof would produce a lot of heat which would be difficult to offset even with ceiling fans. The material they chose provides a great mix of durability and minimal heat transfer. He said Ms. Schwartz had mentioned she was concerned about the profile edge and being able to see that from the street. They propose to solve this by the addition of a gutter detail which would cover that and carry water off the roof. Additionally, when standing away from it on the street, the color of the material and the effect of light, it actually appears to be a metal roof. The only way you can tell that it is not metal is when you stand underneath it and look up and see the sky. There were no public comments.

Ms. Ross was concerned that it was made of plastic and asked how long this material has been on the market and how durable the material is. Mr. Adams said it comes with a lifetime warranty against yellowing, a ten-year warranty against hail, and its guaranteed not to fade. Ms. Galke visited the site and is in support of the application based on the presentation. Ms. Lecky was also in support but was also concerned about the vinyl fascia which she believes should be replaced with wood. Mr. Adams said that

the gutter box would cover most of that. Lecky asked if they plan to paint the wood to match the vinyl. He confirmed that the trim will be stained.

Ms. Penick asked to display the current conditions of the work and inquired about the layout. Mr. Adams confirmed it is going to be the same layout and they are mimicking the existing roof shape. The applicant does not plan to install lights or fans, but if they do install lights they would be down-facing. There was a brief discussion on the history of the permitting on this structure. Chair Irvin clarified several details of the trim and roof profile.

Mr. Jarrell motioned to approve the item as installed with the condition that the box gutter and trim detail will be done with ARB-approved materials and conceal the profile of the polycarbonate panels. Ms. Penick seconded the motion. Chair Irvin requested that they amend the motion to include staff's recommendation to require that the wood be painted or stained once weathered sufficiently.

Mr. Jarrell accepted the amendment. Ms. Penick seconded and the motion carried 6-1 with Ms. Moss opposed.

F. COA FY22-0065 – 203 Ford Street – Ed Whelan, Woolen Mill LLC, requests to make alterations to the Washington Woolen Mills building and site including removing exterior stairs, constructing a new elevator shaft, installing fencing, lighting, and retaining walls, and replacing some windows and doors.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview of the application. The Applicant was present and spoke on the vision of the project and provided a brief presentation. There were no public comments.

Ms. Ross shared her previous experience with the windows and the building, which were problematic at the time. However, she encouraged retaining the windows and pursuing rehabilitation and restoration. She is in support with staff's recommendation for approval of a COA for installation of retaining walls and fencing, denying architectural lighting at the moment, and continuing the discussion to the July 11, 2022 meeting as well as a site visit.

Ms. Galke visited the site and was concerned about the proposed landscape modifications and wall construction especially in the yard along Ford Street and southeast corner along Caroline Street. There could be some intact archaeological resources. Ms. Schwartz confirmed there should be a site plan required for this work and the ordinance will apply. Ms. Galke said artifacts could be easily incorporated into an exhibit for the public. She agreed with staff's recommendation regarding the lighting concerns. Ms. Galke spoke in support of a site visit.

Ms. Lecky agreed with the previous comments and was very impressed by the work that's already been done. She agreed with staff's recommendation to approve the installation of retaining walls and fences as shown especially along the river side. She was concerned that the current wall is failing. In terms of the lighting portion of the application, she understands the security concerns and explained that the city ordinance may allow them more illumination if it is downcast, which would prevent light pollution. Ms. Lecky was also in favor of a site visit to see which windows are going where.

Ms. Penick highlighted some inconsistencies in the documentation provided and said portions of the site plan don't seem to match the elevations which are unclear. She said she is not comfortable approving anything at the moment and additional documentation and a site visit would be helpful. Mr. Whelan described some of the current conditions of the property and phases of work proposed. Ms. Schwartz said

that it may be beneficial to submit a site plan view that shows where each of the fences and walls are located in space. Ms. Penick agreed a site plan would help. There was a brief discussion regarding the walls and landscaping.

Mr. Jarrell asked for clarification on the work that was already approved and existing on the rooftop. Mr. Whelan elaborated on the proposed extension and elevator shaft. The terrace wall/ retaining wall will be a cast in place wall with a brick veneer. There was a brief discussion on the stairs and sidewalk. In general, Mr. Jarrell was in favor of the project. Ms. Moss had questions on the retaining wall. She said the fencing around the terrace portion is visually overwhelming. She noted that many industrial buildings have been renovated in Richmond and they were able to preserve windows. She said that if replacement is necessary, the window type should remain the same.

Chair Irvin was also uncomfortable granting approval without more detailed plans and additional documents. They need clarification on some dimensions of the fence and need to explore other options for lighting. The presentation needs to show exactly what is staying and what is being moved. Some discussion followed with Mr. Jarrell on the building code requirements that are driving the request for window replacement. Ms. Schwartz said they could schedule a work session on June 27, 2022. The applicant agreed and said that they can provide additional materials by the meeting.

Ms. Lecky motioned to continue the application to the July 11, 2022 meeting and hold a site visit on June 27, 2022. Ms. Moss seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

[See Attached]

OTHER BUSINESS [\[03:27:23\]](#)

Ms. Schwartz updated the Board on the new City policy that ARB volunteers will now be compensated twenty-five dollars per meeting effective July 1, 2022. They will be sent an appropriate form to complete depending on their preferences.

STAFF UPDATE

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Irvin adjourned the meeting at 10:29 p.m.

Karen Irvin, Chair