

Historic Preservation Commission
Minutes of June 17, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Erquiaga
Shanda K. Horner
Emmett Lifsey
Richard Morris
Shaun Spencer-Hester

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mark Little, Vice-Chair
Christopher McSwain, Chair

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Anne Nygaard, Secretary to the Historic Preservation Commission; Ms. Victoria Glasgow, Neighborhood Planning Coordinator; and the public.

ROLL CALL:

After a quorum was established, Commissioner Horner called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

1.a. CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Erquiaga made a motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Spencer-Hester, to accept the consent agenda, which passed by a unanimous vote.

2. New Business:

- a) **ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Morris): Request of Evelyn Dickey-White for an after-the fact COA to replace a standing-seam metal roof and change the color from red to gray at 712 Hancock Street. This was tabled without discussion at last meeting because the applicant was not in attendance. (HPC1903-0002):**

Ms. Anne Nygaard noted that Ms. Evelyn Dickey-White attended the May meeting where there wasn't a quorum and was unable to travel to this meeting but was comfortable with the commission speaking about her application without her being present.

Commissioner Morris asked to see the pictures of the property and noted that the roof needed to be replaced. He did not think the changes in color and ridge gap were issues.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lifsey and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

b) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Morris): Request of Stuart Johnston to remove asphalt siding, restore wood siding, and paint in submitted color scheme that varies from the guidelines at 816 Rivermont Avenue. Per discussions with owner, other façade work will be done in-kind and can be approved administratively. (HPC1903-0011):

Mr. Stuart Johnston was not present to represent the application. Removing the asphalt siding is a change from what is visible and the colors submitted differ from the guidelines and could not be approved administratively by staff.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that removing the asphalt siding and restoring the wood siding that is underneath is essentially an in kind repair and he supports it. He also voiced approval of the color palette.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Spencer-Hester and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

Discussion about the roof ensued.

c) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Little): Request of the City of Lynchburg to alter the turret at 805 Court Street by adding asphalt shingles to a decaying membrane roof. The original slates fell off years ago and pose a safety issue. (HPC1904-0007):

Mr. Clay Simmons, the Deputy Director of Public Works for the City of Lynchburg, was present to represent the application. The main spire of the property has been damaged for "some time" and was struck by lightning, making it necessary to remove the original slate shingles. The shingles were replaced with a membrane roof as an emergency measure but now the membrane roof has begun leaking and needs to be replaced to prevent further damage. The City proposes replacing the original shingles with a slate looking asphalt shingle due to the height of the spire, the weight consideration, and the overall cost. The shingles will not be able to be identified as asphalt from ground level and the cost of slate or imitation slate is much higher than asphalt shingles.

Commissioner Morris noted a similar case on Rivermont Avenue where the property had a roof with asbestos tiles and the owner wanted to replace them with a metal roof. The Commission recommended that they use Grand Manor shingles by CertainTeed. Grand Manor simulates a slate look and is an asphalt shingle. He noted that this shingle, in either black pearl or gatehouse slate, would be the best option for this structure as well.

Mr. Simmons noted that the product the City had proposed initially was Stateline but there is no preference for brand or color and installation of different asphalt shingles is likely to be similar. The main concern is the weight on the roof.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the stipulation that a Grand Manor shingle by CertainTeed, in either a black pearl or gatehouse slate color, would be used. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lifsey and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

d) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Erquiagua): Request of Rodney LaPrade for COA approval to replace windows at 839, 841, and 843 Belmont Street. This is an after-the-fact COA for 839 Belmont Street. A COA to replace these windows in-kind was approved approximately a year ago by city staff. It was discussed at that time that the windows needed to match the existing ones, specifically the existing divided lights, or else be approved by the HPC. (HPC1905-0001):

Mr. Rodney LaPrade was present to represent the application. Initially, he replaced the windows in unit 837 and was under the impression that all following window replacements should match that style. The window style of each unit did not match when the property was bought so they were trying to make it uniform with their window replacements.

Ms. Anne Nygaard noted that staff is limited in what is able to be approved administratively and work in kind is able to be approved, so it needs to match what was existing. Due to inspections, the variation from the approved COA was noted and is why it is before the Historic Preservation Commission again.

Mr. Rodney LaPrade noted that the first unit has one over ones.

Ms. Nygaard noted that the first unit has always been one over ones and that the first two units already have approved COAs to be replaced in kind but the second unit was a one over two and was not replaced in kind. The Commission is discussing the second unit as an after the fact and two other units to match the one over ones.

Commissioner Morris asked Mr. LaPrade if he was keeping the existing trim around the windows and noted that when he visited the property, he could not tell that there was a difference.

Mr. LaPrade confirmed that he was keeping the trim.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Erquiaga and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

e) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Horner): Request of Victoria's Inventory LLC for an after-the-fact COA for 1) demolition of an outbuilding 2) the grading (and future construction) of a parking lot and 3) painting in gold on building. The site (not the main building) is under stop work order. (HPC1905-0005):

Mr. Tony West and Mr. Casey Servis were present to represent this application. Mr. West began work on the site before the full review process was complete. There was an outbuilding that was demolished. There is an existing parking lot in poor shape. The civil engineer has an application to submit to TRC but the staff wanted them to go to HPC first. They are working with the City to vacate the Branch Street right-of-way. Overall, the site was in poor shape. The parking lot was supposed to be asphalt but was more grass and gravel, so it will be replaced with a parking lot that meets current city standards. The outbuilding was in rough shape. It was backed up to a retaining wall that had been part of a previous building that was torn down. This building prevented significant parking on the site.

Commissioner Morris asked if the out-building was listed as non-contributing.

Mr. Servis confirmed that it was listed in the register as non-contributing. He also noted that they listed the material of the building incorrectly.

Ms. Anne Nygaard stated that between 1941 and 1972 the outbuilding was either shortened or completely new. The building seen in 1941 was much bigger than the building that Mr. West tore down. She also noted that regardless of whether a building is contributing or not, demolition requires a COA in a historic district.

Commissioner Horner asked if the two items mentioned could be dealt with separately from the painting and the ADA ramp.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that the outbuilding would most likely have been approved for demolition if they had gotten approval before actually demolishing it. He also said that demolition without going through the City sets a bad precedent, particularly when multiple things are going on without approval. It shows a high disregard of regulations.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to approve the demolition of the non-contributing outbuilding. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morris and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

Commissioner Horner asked if the grading could be approved while Victoria's Inventory LLC is working to vacate the Branch Street right-of-way.

Ms. Nygaard answered that the grading was only happening on their property, so yes.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if the City had approved the site plan for the parking lot.

Mr. Servis answered that HPC needs to approve the concept and material, which is supposed to be concrete, before TRC will review it.

Commissioner Morris asked how many parking spaces there would be.

Mr. Servis answered that there are 11 spaces on one parcel and the civil engineer has designed it so that there will be 9 spaces on the other parcel regardless of whether the right-of-way is vacated.

Commissioner Morris asked what the material for the Bridge Street parking lot would be.

Mr. Servis answered that they are not currently proposing any material until the vacation is completed but it would be continuous concrete.

Commissioner Horner asked where the other parking lot is.

Mr. Servis replied that it is just up the street, additional spaces would be leased and some will be purchased.

It was clarified that there is a parking lot at the back of the building.

Mr. Servis noted that the parking lot that exists is parking for the future redevelopment of another building but it has a bus stop which gives a variance and reduces the number of parking spaces required. He also owns several other buildings where he will create some sort of parking with lots behind the end driveways. It will not be parking for the current units permanently.

Commissioner Morris asked to see the design again.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester noted that it is hard to consider a parking lot design when there aren't enough parking spaces for the living units.

Mr. Servis responded that there are twenty out of the required thirty already existing. There is also street parking.

Ms. Nygaard stated that the Commission's focus is on the design and material, not the number of parking spots.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked if the parking lot would be concrete and about the lighting.

Mr. Servis responded that there are light poles to provide light.

Mr. West added that the parking lot is currently broken asphalt but will be concrete when they repair it.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked where the entrance and exit were.

Mr. Servis described the entrance and exit.

Commissioner Morris asked if there were any curbs.

Mr. Servis stated that there is only one sidewalk.

Commissioner Morris asked if the smaller parking lot was also going to be concrete.

Mr. Servis replied that it would be in areas that needed to be repaired.

Commissioner Morris asked how cars would enter the smaller parking lot.

Mr. Servis replied that the right-of-way would be vacated and it all would become concrete but until the City approves the vacancy, they can't officially propose that. Currently, the right-of-way is dirt. The concrete will allow for a continuous hard surface and cover the dirt to tie into the existing asphalt. To enter the smaller parking lot, cars will have to drive on Bridge Street.

Commissioner Morris asked if there was any specific landscaping and if they would be used to screen the parking lots.

Mr. Servis replied that the landscaping was the required landscape islands from the City Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked about the lighting again and if it would meet the City Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Servis replied that he believed so and that the Commission had purview over the aesthetics of the light fixture.

Commissioner Horner asked how many light fixtures there were.

Mr. Servis replied that there just two that cover that area. There is one next to the building and one next to Bridge Street.

Mr. West stated that there's also a lot of street lighting.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester stated that two lights for thirty parking spots is concerning.

Requirements for lighting were discussed.

Commissioner Lifsey asked where the light fixture design was from.

Ms. Nygaard responded that the light fixture was approved for the parking lot at 2001 Rivermont, the old Seven Hills School.

Mr. Servis stated that it was minimal and not obtrusive.

Mr. West stated that he was putting cameras on the outside of his building, in case it was of concern to the Commission.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that concrete, as a material, is within the guidelines.

The curves of the lot, specific landscaping, and screening were discussed.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the parking lot design for layout and lighting as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lifsey. Further discussion about the lighting ensued. The motion passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

Mr. West stated that the green color chosen to paint the building was similar to the green color already on the trim of the building. He chose to add the gold color. The area that is now gold was painted previously.

Commissioner Horner and Commissioner Morris both asked what color the area with the gold paint was previously.

Mr. Servis replied that it was a dark green color.

Mr. West stated that he only painted areas that had previously been painted and was testing the gold color.

Commissioner Morris stated that the gold color is much brighter than what was previously there and was unaware that it was previously painted.

Mr. West stated that he was trying to make people notice the building with his color choice but kept the lighter green.

Commissioner Morris asked what color the shutters were.

Mr. West responded that they were the same light green.

Discussion about the painted areas ensued and the color palette was reviewed.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked Mr. West if the painted areas were the final product.

Mr. West responded that they were but he didn't like the blue front door and would change that to a different tone of green.

Commissioner Horner asked if the Commission had to approve each paint color.

Ms. Nygaard responded that normally staff would administratively approve paint colors provided that they meet the guidelines. The colors Mr. West chose did not fit within the design guidelines. The light green would be approved as in-kind replacement because it was already on the building except for where Mr. West added it on the windows.

Mr. Servis asked if the painting could be tabled until a different paint palette was chosen.

Commissioner Horner stated that the existing palette on the building did not look appealing.

Commissioner Lifsey suggested painting the sash and the trim different colors as would have been common historically.

Ms. Nygaard stated that the colors staff can administratively approve are white, off-white, and cream and in this case, the existing green.

Commissioner Horner pointed out that the brick should not have been painted.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that the brick was probably painted because it was dirty but Mr. West may want to paint it back to a brick color and allow the woodwork to stand out.

Ms. Nygaard noted that the nomination form defined the building as both a Colonial Revival and Georgian Revival. She then asked Mr. Servis and Mr. West if they would be resubmitting paint colors.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that the guidelines were not the only options in terms of paint colors.

Mr. West stated that he did not want to use only white, off-white, or cream to paint this building.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to table the discussion until Mr. West and Mr. Servis returned with a color palette for the whole building. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Spencer-Hester. The motion passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

f) ACTION (Advocate - Commissioner Horner): The previously tabled request of Victoria's Inventory LLC to modify the front entrance to make it accessible at 301 Rivermont Avenue. (HPC1903-0010):

Mr. Tony West and Mr. Casey Servis were present to represent this application. Because the property is over twenty dwelling units, code requires one accessible apartment. The only feasible spot to make a handicap accessible entrance is the front entrance. The porch is currently about twelve to fourteen inches above the sidewalk with two steps. The proposal is to

build a concrete ramp, landing, and step that is parallel to the sidewalk that provides handicap access to the building. There is also an area behind that provides access and light to the level below that is in dangerous condition. A forty-two inch high picket metal guardrail will be placed on the existing retaining wall and on the new ramp. There will be a handrail without pickets on the front side of the new ramp.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if there is a stair at the edge of the building on both sides.

Mr. Servis responded that there is only a stair at the edge of the building on one side.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to approve the application as submitted as long as building officials approve code requirements. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Erquiaga. The motion passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

g) ACTION (Advocate - Commissioner Lifsey): Request of Michael Farnsworth to install a 6' pine, dog-eared, privacy fence in the back yard of 914 Harrison Street. (HPC1905-0007):

Mr. Michael Farnsworth was not present to represent the application.

Commissioner Morris asked where Mr. Farnsworth planned to install the fence.

Ms. Anne Nygaard responded that Mr. Farnsworth applied to install the fence in the rear yard along the property line.

Commissioner Morris stated that the dog ears meet the guidelines.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted for the rear yard only. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lifsey. The motion passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

h) ACTION (Advocate - Commissioner Lifsey): Request of Roberta Grooms for an after-the-fact COA for the replacement of two windows and approval to replace four additional windows with vinyl on the house at 810 10th Street. (HPC1905-0009):

Ms. Roberta Grooms was present to represent the application. The windows on the carriage house are being replaced and two windows were replaced before a stop work order was placed.

Ms. Grooms noted that she did not believe that 810 10th Street is on the historic register and is a separate piece of property. There are no signs denoting historic and there is a habitat house about five hundred (500) feet from the carriage house.

Ms. Anne Nygaard confirmed that the property is in a local historic district.

Ms. Grooms noted that she owns and pays taxes on four different properties. She then passed around pictures of the windows.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked Ms. Grooms if the new windows would match the vinyl windows already replaced.

Ms. Grooms responded that they would.

Commissioner Morris noted that vinyl windows with grilles between the glass are not permitted in the historic district. The windows to be replaced need to be reviewed to see if they are restorable. The first priority is to restore instead of replace. If it is determined that the windows need to be replaced, the options for replacement are aluminum clad windows with either true divided light or simulation to provide light. He also noted that three sides of this building are visible to the public.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to deny the application as submitted because vinyl windows do not meet the historic district guidelines. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Spencer-Hester and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

Ms. Nygaard explained that Ms. Grooms may appeal to Council or submit a new application for a different material and that she will be getting a notice of denial with further instructions.

- i) **ACTION (Advocate- Commissioner McSwain): Request of Richard Morris to add board and batten shutters to the carriage house windows at 208 G Street (parcel address 205 F Street). The carriage house is new construction, replacing a structure that originally existed on site. Previous COAs have been approved that included shutters without specifying the design. (HPC1905-0011):**

Mr. Morris asked to be recused from the Commission. Mr. Richard Morris was present to represent this application. He then stated the shutter design was not specified in previous COAs but he wants to do board-and-batten. He noted that accessory buildings usually had a less expensive shutter design that was typically used to shut and protect the building from the elements. He wants to give this building character and noted that it is not a historic building. This building replaced a building that had very different elements from the main house. The main house has no shutters at the moment but he plans to put slat shutters back on at some point.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if there was originally another building there to clarify what Mr. Morris said.

Mr. Morris stated that the previous building was similar to the one that exists now and displayed images of the previous building noting the brackets, gable, and Victorian posts. He also noted that the previous building may have been the original carriage house and an archeological survey was done showing that whoever built Rivermont house also built the previous building. The lot for this building sold for \$7,000.00 in 1917 and had an accessory building that was eventually converted to a house. The previous building was torn down a few years ago with HPC approval.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester clarified that Mr. Morris wanted to put shutters on his historic home and a different style of shutters on his carriage house and then asked what his reasoning for this was.

Mr. Morris responded that he wanted different styles of shutters to differentiate that one building is historic and the other is not but more so because accessory buildings would have had different, less expensive shutters than the main house and he likes the look of it.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Spencer-Hester and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, and Spencer-Hester | 4 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: Morris | 1 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

j) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Morris): Request of TJ Kuczewski to replace three windows that were destroyed in a fire at 1129 Rivermont Avenue. Repainting in-kind will be administratively approved. (HPC1905-0013):

Mr. Jaysn Schaener from Derbyshire Real Estate, LLC was present to represent the application. He distributed images and then stated that on May 14 there was a house fire and the first unit, a quad flex, was totally destroyed. They are trying to replace the windows with like kind from the opposite side of the building and will be using Harry Skoldal. Mr. Skoldal restores windows and is located on Kemper Street. Some of the windows in the building look like they had been replaced before the current owner purchased it. The windows being replaced now will match the original windows.

Commissioner Morris asked if the windows were single glazed or double glazed.

Mr. Schaener responded that the windows are single glazed. There are storm windows on the opposite side but the windows being replaced now will not have storm windows at this time.

Ms. Anne Nygaard stated that all window replacements need to go to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Commissioner Morris asked if it was just the sashes or if it was the jams too.

Mr. Schaener responded that the jams are still in place.

Commissioner Morris made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Erquiaga and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

k) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Little): Request of Jonathan Baker to add steps and railings to the rear porch of 1004 Court Street. An administrative COA has been approved for the addition of storm windows and repairs in-kind to the porch and masonry. (HPC1905-0015):

Mr. Jonathan Baker was present to represent this application. He already has approval to restore the existing porch in kind. The staircases, located in the rear of the building, need to also be repaired. He plans to build new staircases, similar to the neighbor's, with railings.

Commissioner Morris commented that based on the neighbor's staircase and railings, it looks like there is a specific handrail and basin. He then asked if there was a bottom rail.

Mr. Baker answered that there is a bottom rail. There will be railings on the porch and spindles.

Commissioner Morris noted that the repairs need to meet code, have a bottom rail at least four to six inches, and spindles that are very plain. The rail on the stairway needs to have a certain grip to meet code so the stair rail may not be able to be the same as the one on the porch.

Mr. Baker stated that the builder will meet both the historical guidelines and modern code.

Commissioner Morris stated that if the stair rail deviates too much from the porch rail, Mr. Baker may need to come back to HPC and explain how it is going to change.

The previous porch and need for specific types of spindles was further discussed.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the stipulation that the bottom rail be built to the specifications discussed. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morris and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

I) I) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Erquiagua): Request of Michael Craig to construct an addition to complete a master suite at 300 Harrison Street. (HPC1905-0016):

Mr. Michael Craig was present to represent this application. The house currently has one full bathroom and none of the bedrooms have closets or are attached to a bathroom. He would like to convert one of the rooms into a traditional master suite that has the bathroom and closet.

Commissioner Horner asked if there were drawings.

Mr. Craig discussed the images displayed. The space for the master suite would take the place of an existing patio. The footprint of the existing house is not rectangular so the addition would not protrude out from the house. He would like it to be wood or Hardie Plank.

Commissioner Lifsey asked what would be done with the roof.

Mr. Craig replied that the roof would be uniform with the existing metal roof. The roof line would likely come under the second story window but the plans are not settled. The existing gutter might be tied into the gutter for the addition.

Commissioner Morris stated that in concept, the addition should not be a problem but the Commission needs to see what it will actually look like. A set of drawings showing details of the elevation, roof, eaves, foundation, siding, windows, and other information is needed.

Mr. Craig stated that the existing windows would be removed and used in the addition.

Commissioner Morris reiterated that more details are needed.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that the roof underneath the existing window might be too tight. The Commission needs to know that Mr. Craig can actually use the materials he's listed and that they will work in the actual construction of an addition.

Mr. Craig asked Commissioner Lifsey to expand on his concerns about the roof and the window.

Commissioner Lifsey replied that depending on where the roof fits underneath the existing window, flashing will be needed. A certain slope needs to be maintained also. He then supported Commissioner Morris' statement that Mr. Craig should submit a drawing. The drawing should be one from his contractor, like one that he would submit to apply for a building permit, which he will have to do anyway.

Commissioner Morris noted that the roof pitch and elevation might need to be adjusted based on the need for headroom. This would be seen in the drawing. Mr. Craig will not need to adjust the material.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to table the application until more details about elevation and roof slope are submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morris and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

m) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Spencer-Hester): Request of Antoine Davis to modify two windows to accommodate interior renovations to the kitchen and bathroom at 850 Rivermont Avenue (HPC1906-0001):

Mr. Antoine Davis was present to represent this application. He has owned this house for about a year and it is currently vacant. Previously, it was being used as a rental. It only has one bathroom, which is located upstairs. The current configuration of the bathroom contains a small claw foot tub. He hopes to renovate the bathroom and the kitchen. The window location in the bathroom currently doesn't allow a standard tub/shower, toilet, and vanity. The window location in the kitchen doesn't allow a sink, refrigerator, and stove with the reconfigurations he has in mind. The sink will be moved to the current window location and a dishwasher will be added. The window in the kitchen also has mold because the hidden gutters on the house have been leaking. The gutters need to be replaced and the trim and faces have disintegrated.

Commissioner Morris met with Mr. Davis at his property. He noted that low windows are a typical problem in older houses. The current windows are about seventy inches tall and are the only windows, aside from a triangular window, on that side of the house. He recommended to Mr. Davis that he put windows in at the height of the ceiling and bring them down to the height of the counter, using the counter as a sill. This would keep a similar dimension and would not need to line up with other windows.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if the windows on the side were on the same plane as the front windows.

Commissioner Morris said that the front and side windows were on the same plane but based on the window location on the side it wouldn't really affect the aesthetic.

Commissioner Horner asked about the bathroom window.

Commissioner Morris said that he and Mr. Davis came up with a layout that would allow Mr. Davis to keep the window since moving that window would alter the appearance too greatly.

Mr. Davis stated that the clearance for the toilet might not work with the layout Commissioner Morris was discussing.

Commissioner Morris noted that it was likely the building inspector would give leeway in this circumstance and if the inspector did not, Mr. Davis would have to come back to HPC with other plans.

Commissioner Horner asked Mr. Davis if he was comfortable with Commissioner Morris' recommendations.

Mr. Davis replied that “yes”, he was comfortable with it.

Commissioner Morris noted that the layout of the kitchen is difficult to navigate.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester noted that Mr. Davis might want to put the sink in front of the window and create a window well. He would not need to move the window in that case.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that he would rather see a window well than raising the window.

Commissioner Morris stated that the window is really low and the well would be really deep. It would not be easy to access.

Commissioner Lifsey replied that he would agree and would be amenable to a higher sill but keeping the head the same. Raising the head of the window would mean completely reworking the framing inside the wall. The one in the bathroom needs to remain.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion that the application be approved and the kitchen window become a shorter version with the same width and the same head height and the window in the bathroom be maintained at the same size with a different inside layout planned. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morris and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

n) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Spencer-Hester): Request of Jackson III LLC to install a sign at 2244 Rivermont Avenue. The sign will use existing uplighting available from Virginia School of the Arts. (HPC1906-0005):

Mr. Mitch Namrow and Mr. Scott Brooks were present to represent this application. He wants to put a sign back up that contains the address and uses the same material as was previously used. The wood screws previously used will be used to put the sign up and will be drilled in silicone. A matte black color will be used but it was previously brown. The new sign would be bigger at twenty-four inches to contain the letters that weren't originally in there.

Commissioner Morris asked for clarification on the sizing of the signs and letters.

Mr. Scott Brooks replied that the “R” and the “A” would be twenty-four inches and the other letters would be smaller. It would still be the same scale but the wording of the sign has changed.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if there were size restrictions from the City.

Commissioner Morris noted that the new sign is in kind.

Mr. Namrow noted that there is a grate in the middle restricting the height but the sign is similar to the previous one.

Ms. Anne Nygaard noted that this is not in-kind because the previous sign is no longer there. This is a change.

Commissioner Lifsey stated he has no issue from a historic standpoint he is just concerned about other city restrictions.

Ms. Nygaard explained that the applicant had filled out a sign permit application and Kevin Henry, the Zoning Administrator, will review it for compliance.

Commissioner Morris made a motion that the application be approved as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Erquiaga and it passed by the following vote:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| AYES: Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, Morris, and Spencer-Hester | 5 |
| NOES: | 0 |
| ABSTENTIONS: | 0 |
| ABSENT: Little and McSwain | 2 |

o) INFORMATION: Chimney at 314 Harrison will be removed per court proceedings and building official orders. This has become a property maintenance and a safety concern beyond the purview of HPC to review. (HPC1906-0004):

Ms. Anne Nygaard stated that the property sustained storm damage and the chimney has been gradually losing bricks. The building official has declared it unsafe. The chimney needs to come down. The owner has also been in court for this matter. This is not subject to HPC approval because it was deemed a safety issue.

Commissioner Erquiaga noted that his property has been empty for over thirty years.

Commissioner Lifsey asked for clarification on if the chimney would be repaired or taken down.

Ms. Nygaard replied that it was being removed.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked what happens to the space the chimney occupied once the chimney is removed.

Ms. Nygaard replied that the building has to be up to code so the void will be closed.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that removing the chimney on a historic building drastically changes the image.

Commissioner Morris asked if repairing the chimney would cost less than removing it and then asked who was responsible for removing it.

Ms. Nygaard replied that the owner of the property is responsible for removing it but if that does not happen the city will remove it. The city does not do repair work on private property.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that issues like this go back to demolition by neglect. He discussed the warehouse on 12th Street that fell into disrepair from neglect and was determined structurally unsound. These demolitions cause blight on the historic district and are not the end result that should be reached. Repairs should be made over demolitions and removals.

Ms. Nygaard agreed and noted that it is very difficult to enforce property maintenance at this level.

Commissioner Lifsey asked how the Commission can become proactive in conversation to change this approach.

Ms. Nygaard recommended that this issue be discussed in future meetings and possibly a committee formed be utilized. She noted that demolition by neglect is not allowed but it can be difficult to enforce.

Commissioner Morris and Horner shared agreement that neglect in historic districts is a problem.

Ms. Nygaard stated that she would bring the Commission's concerns to the City Planner, Mr. Tom Martin, and discuss an appropriate approach.

3. New Business:

There was no new business at this time.

4. NEXT MEETING DAY:

The next regular meeting is scheduled for July 15, 2019.

5. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

ATTEST: _____ ATTEST: _____
Secretary Commissioner