



Minutes
Architectural Review Board
November 14, 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
Adriana Moss
Laura Galke
Kelly Penick

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 [00:01:27]

Ms. Moss requested to remove COA FY23-0026 - 904 Caroline Street from the consent agenda and add it as item 10. B. on the Public Hearing agenda.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS & REPORTS

Ms. Galke provided a brief presentation on quoins.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [00:06:28]

Ms. Moss motioned to approve the September 12, 2022 minutes as written, Ms. Lecky seconded. The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Galke motioned to approve the September 26, 2022 minutes as written, Ms. Moss seconded. The motion carried 7-0.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

None

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST [00:08:05]

Ms. Penick disclosed a conflict of interest regarding item COA FY23-0024 - 400-402 William Street. Her employer provided construction services to the applicant and she will refrain from participating on the motion to approve the consent agenda. She submitted a disclosure form to Ms. Schwartz.

CONSENT AGENDA [00:09:27]

- A. COA FY23-0021 – 715 Caroline Street – Sign Installation
- B. COA FY23-0023 – 318 Charles Street – Sign Installation
- C. COA FY23-0024 – 400-402 William Street – Sign Installation
- D. COA FY23-0025 – 1017 Sophia Street – Sign Installation
- ~~E. COA FY23-0026 – 904 Caroline Street – Minor Alteration~~
- F. COA FY23-0027 – 1011 Caroline Street – Sign Installation

Item COA FY23-0026 - 904 Caroline Street was removed from the consent agenda by Ms. Moss. Ms. Schwartz provided an overview on the applications. There were no public comments. Ms. Lecky motioned to approve the amended consent agenda. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING [00:11:44]

New Applications

- A. COA FY23-0022 – 503 Sophia Street – William LaPointe requests to replace the rear patio roof covering with a new wood structure with polycarbonate roof panels.

Ms. Schwartz provided an overview and listed the staff recommendations. The representative, Todd Sullivan with JON Properties, was present and brought in sample PVC for the board to examine. He explained that the arched windows will have minimal visibility from the street and the infill is necessary to achieve fire rating between the existing building and the canopy. The existing wall is masonry. The windows are not functional because they have been covered by a film for over twenty years. The window will be covered on the canopy side. Ms. Schwartz read the public comment from the Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, Inc. (HFFI) into the record [see attached].

Ms. Moss was concerned that the roof slope was too steeply pitched and said that the character-defining arched windows should not be blocked. Regarding the PVC siding, Ms. Moss asked them to clarify if that material was approved in the June meeting. Ms. Schwartz said that it was not and was presented as wood at the time. Ms. Moss said that wood was preferred and asked the applicant to elaborate on the height of the structure. Mr. Sullivan said that they brought the height down and the span requires them to have a truss with a certain pitch.

Mr. Jarrell asked Mr. Sullivan to clarify how the design meets the fire separation safety requirements. Mr. Sullivan said that it was a recommendation from Mr. Jeff Bragg in Building Services that in order to approve a building permit they need a fire separation. Mr. Jarrell asked if the awning will be attached to the existing building. Mr. Sullivan explained that there will be only flashing to the existing building because the canopy is self-supporting. The canopy will not be attached to or supported by the garage either. If the structure is ever taken down in the future, the changes to the windows can be removed and will not be permanent. There was a discussion on the visibility of the windows. The new structure will be taller than the single bay garage. Mr. Jarrell requested that they revisit the code and propose an alternative solution to meet the fire rating. Mr. Sullivan said they don't have to fill it all the way up to the arch of the windows, and can do it up to the canopy. They could leave the visible part exposed.

There was a discussion concerning the PVC material. The June ruling for the previous Certificate of Appropriateness required the use of a wooden material for the framing and truss, and not the PVC wrap which is currently present. Mr. Sullivan stated that the posts will be wrapped but everything else will be exposed wood. Mr. Jarrell asked them to clarify why they need a PVC wrap at all. The applicant explained

that the wood will dry overtime and could result in customers getting splinters. He said they will still get two coats of white paint. Mr. Jarrell said he couldn't support PVC wrap if they previously approved wood.

Ms. Penick said that the rendering of the new canopy appears visually overpowering and asked why they are renovating the patio. The owners think that the current canopy is worn and would like to update it to match the new roof structure. Mr. Sullivan said the current structure is constructed by metal posts with a canvas. Ms. Penick said that the proposed structure doesn't take any queues from the existing building and is very large. She recommended that the architect explore another truss system that is not as steeply sloped. There was a discussion on the roof slope. Ms. Penick reiterated her concerns.

Ms. Lecky shared the same concerns as her board members. The new structure doesn't seem to be subservient to the main building which is a violation of the guidelines. Ms. Lecky expressed her displeasure that there is vinyl cladding on the existing front structure which was not permitted in the Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Lecky said if they do fill in the windows it needs to be done with preservation in mind. Mr. Sullivan explained that they wanted to avoid having three different roofline heights, so they tried to match with the existing structures. They weren't aware that a second roof would come before the board at the time of the previous approval. Ms. Lecky understands why the canopy needs to be replaced and requested more information prior to approval.

Ms. Galke visited the site and shares concerns with the Board. The proposed PVC wrap is not consistent with the Historic District Guidelines which state a preference for wood materials. Ms. Galke cited pages 40, 60, and 61 of the guidelines. Ms. Galke asked about the plans to infill the windows. Mr. Sullivan said that the infill can be removed without damaging the character-defining windows. Ms. Ross asked for more information regarding the windows and how they are obscured. Mr. Sullivan elaborated. Ms. Ross asked if they can achieve the fire rating by using glass block. She strongly discouraged the use of EIFS. The mass and scale is overpowering to the original structure. It would be better if they could align it to the existing garage. Additional work is needed to make it compatible with the space.

Chair Irvin agreed with most of the comments from the board. Wood is a preferred material listed in their guidelines and the applicant should avoid PVC. Chair Irvin suggested they achieve a fire rating without having to infill the windows. She suggested that they explore other options with the Building Official. Chair Irvin recommended that they continue the application to the December 12, 2022 meeting and utilize the work session on the November 28, 2022 meeting if needed.

Ms. Lecky motioned to continue COA FY23-0022 – 503 Sophia Street to the December 12, 2022 meeting and to meet with the applicant on November 28, 2022 for a work session. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

B. COA FY23-0026 – 904 Caroline Street – Minor Alteration

Ms. Schwartz provided a brief overview on the application. Ms. Moss pulled the application from the consent agenda to clarify two details before approval. Ms. Moss asked if the chimney would be reconstructed to its original height. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that it would and that there is documentation of the original height on file. Ms. Moss inquired about the material the applicant intends to use. Ms. Schwartz confirmed that the chimney will be reconstructed using the original brick and slate which is located on the property. Ms. Penick inquired about the cap on the roof. The plans don't show if there is a slope or not and expressed concern that a flat surface could result in water damage. She suggested a condition that the half inch of treated plywood be sloped at a minimal quarter inch to foot.

Ms. Moss motioned to approve the application with the condition that the chimney should be reconstructed to its original height using the existing brick on site. Additionally, the ½ inch plywood cap be applied with a slight slope at least a quarter inch to a foot and the slate roof should be repaired using the existing slate material on site. Ms. Galke seconded and the motion carried 7-0.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OTHER BUSINESS [00:54:58]

Ms. Schwartz informed the board on the history of the Mary Washington Monument Property and provided an overview of the development plans. The City is working with Washington Heritage Museums who will be taking over this property.

STAFF UPDATE

None

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Irvin adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.



Karen Irvin, Chair
Adriana T. Moss, Vice Chair



14 November 2022

To: Kate S. Schwartz

ksschwartz@fredericksburgva.gov

cc: Planning@fredericksburgva.gov

The Historic Fredericksburg Foundation has reviewed the upcoming agenda and related COA documents for the November 14, 2022 meeting of the Architectural Review Board and submits the following comments on select projects.

Public Hearing

COA FY23-0022 – 503 Sophia Street

The current COA for 503 Sophia Street builds upon a project approved at the ARB meeting of June 13, 2022, where staff recommended approval on the condition that metal roofing including "galvalume or standing-seam" be used instead of the proposed plastic polycarbonate material. The meeting minutes indicate that the applicant was concerned about heat absorption from the use of metal roofing, so HFFI thinks it important to reiterate the fact that metal roofing is one of the most energy-efficient materials, depending on its level of emissivity, and typically qualifies for Federal energy tax credits in residential and commercial construction. Such roofs, sometimes called "cool roofs," usually have a zinc-based coating that comes in a variety of colors, which have been tested and rated based on how it reflects the sun's rays and how much heat it emits, ideal examples have both "high solar reflectance (SR) and high thermal emittance (TE)." Other such "cool roofs" include membranes, coatings, stone, tile, and green roofs. More info available via the Federal Energy Star website (Source: https://www.energystar.gov/products/roof_products/cool_roofs_emissivity)

It is commonly said that what was approved at one ARB meeting does not hold sway for another, and it seems that the June 2022 COA is not the only one to have recently impacted the built environment in this location. The current COA indicates that the existing structures covering the bar and "check-In" station shall remain in place, both of which feature stained wood posts, weatherboard siding, and standing-seam metal roofs--all materials commonly approved for porches and sheds in the historic district. Their design and condition suggests a fairly recent construction date and ARB review. While the origins of these structures do not appear in the current COA, images supplied in the application reveal them as being less readily visible to passersby in contrast with the proposed new construction.

As one of the more prominent architectural features of this early-20th-century industrial building, the window openings and surrounds provide a greater sense of its style and character. Therefore, HFFI agrees with the Staff recommendations to preserve the existing fenestration pattern and architectural features around the 2nd-floor windows of the primary building.

Further, we also wonder why the roof slope is so steeply pitched when compared to the flat and low-pitched roofs of adjacent contributing buildings. Metal-panel roofs can be installed at pitches as low as 0.5:12, and even the polycarbonate material proposed by the applicant notes a minimum slope of 1.5:12. With more than 13' between each pre-fabricated truss, it seems that ample space is available for adding overhead fans and lighting. Reducing the height of the truss and roof slope would retain greater visibility of original fenestration details from Sophia Street but also the neighboring railroad passenger platforms.