

Historic Preservation Commission
Minutes of August 19, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Erquiaga
Elizabeth Doucette
Shanda K. Horner
Emmett Lifsey
Christopher McSwain, Chair
Shaun Spencer-Hester

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Richard Morris

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Victoria Glasgow, Secretary to the Historic Preservation Commission; Ms. Eve Mergenthaler, Planning Technician; and the public.

ROLL CALL:

After a quorum was established, Chair McSwain called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

1. ELECTIONS:

Chair McSwain noted that he would be happy to continue as Chair if there were no objections.

Commissioner Horner nominated Chris McSwain to be Chair. The nomination was seconded by Commissioner Doucette and it passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

Chair McSwain stated that he had asked the Commissioners if anyone was interested in being Vice-Chair but had not heard an official response. He then asked for nominations or recommendations.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that Commissioner Morris is a senior member of the Commission.

Chair McSwain stated that Commissioner Little had previously been Vice-Chair but was no longer a member of the Commission. Commissioner Morris is the next most senior member of the Commission.

Ms. Victoria Glasgow asked again if there was anyone who wanted to make a nomination.

Commissioner Doucette asked if it would be reasonable to nominate Commissioner Morris for Vice-Chair in his absence.

Commissioner Lifsey asked Chair McSwain if Commissioner Morris had explicitly stated he did not want to serve as Vice-Chair.

Chair McSwain responded that Commissioner Morris had not.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that Commissioner Morris is a consistent attendee and very knowledgeable.

Commissioner Lifsey nominated Commissioner Morris to be Vice-Chair, pending his acceptance of the position. The nomination was seconded by Commissioner Horner and it passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

Ms. Glasgow stated that there were no changes to the Bylaws at this time.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to accept the Bylaws as they are. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horner and it passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

Ms. Glasgow noted that the historic district advocate positions had already been established. It was likely that Commissioner Doucette would assume the advocacy of Courthouse Hill previously held by Commissioner Little.

Chair McSwain asked if there were any requests for changes.

Commissioner Lifsey made a motion to accept the advocate positions as they are. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doucette and it passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

2a. CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Horner made a motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Doucette, to accept the consent agenda, which passed by a unanimous vote.

3. Old Business:

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

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

Ms. Victoria Glasgow stated that this application was originally heard at the June meeting. The Commission requested more details from Mr. Craig, including profiles of the roof. No additional materials have been submitted. Code requires that the Historic Preservation Commission make a decision within sixty (60) days after a meeting. Staff recommends denial of this application because Mr. Craig has not provided the requested details.

Chair McSwain noted that denying the application now would mean that Mr. Craig would be required to submit a new Certificate of Appropriateness application with all of the requested materials.

Commissioner Horner made a motion to **deny** the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doucette and it passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

b) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Morris): Request of Antoine Davis to repair the front porch handrails and pickets of 716 Cabell Street (HPC1907-0001).

Mr. Antoine Davis was present to represent the application. The existing handrails need to be replaced and are not original to the house. In the July meeting, the Commission requested samples to be approved.

Commissioner Doucette requested to see how the handrail would be set up.

Mr. Davis presented the sample of the handrail and demonstrated how it would be set up.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if the height of the sample is similar to the height of the existing handrail.

Mr. Davis responded that it is. The height of the sample is twenty-eight and a half (28.5) inches and the existing handrail is twenty-nine (29) inches.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if the sample shown would be used for the entire front porch.

Mr. Davis responded that it would be used for the entire front porch.

Chair McSwain asked what the spacing between the blocks on the bottom would be.

Mr. Davis responded that the blocks on the bottom are only used for support and would have approximately four (4) to six (6) feet between them.

Commissioner Horner made a motion to approve the application and samples as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Doucette.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked what color the new rails would be painted.

Mr. Davis responded that the rails would be painted the color that was previously approved by the Commission.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

4. New Business:

a) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Spencer-Hester): Request of Steve Lawson to replace his damaged standing seam tin roof with polymer slate shingle at 2800 Rivermont Avenue. (HPC1906-0016).

Ms. Victoria Glasgow stated that Mr. Steve Lawson requested that his application be tabled until the September meeting. He wanted more time to discuss the application with his advocate.

b) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Horner): Request of Nancy Marion for an after-the-fact COA to expand her rear parking lot with pea-gravel at 311 Rivermont Avenue (HPC1906-0023).

Ms. Nancy Marion was present to represent the application. When service to the house was done, trucks would park in the backyard. To accommodate an office in the basement, the existing driveway was repaved with asphalt and parking areas were expanded with pea gravel.

Commissioner Doucette asked to confirm that the gravel was pea gravel.

Ms. Marion responded that it was.

Chair McSwain asked if there was previously curbing that followed the contour of the existing driveway and if it was removed when the parking area was expanded.

Ms. Marion confirmed that there was curbing and it had been removed.

Commissioner Lifsey asked for clarification that an existing asphalt driveway can be replaced as asphalt.

Ms. Victoria Glasgow responded that the guidelines state that blacktop or asphalt driveways are not traditional to Lynchburg's overlay districts and they are discouraged, so administratively such an application would be brought before the Commission.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that if it already existed, it could be considered an in kind replacement.

Ms. Marion stated that there was a concrete driveway under the asphalt. It was probably converted to asphalt in the last forty (40) or fifty (50) years.

Chair McSwain stated that in one of the images of the driveway, some of the concrete was exposed.

Ms. Marion noted that the concrete was exposed in some areas and it was also cracked. It is likely that the concrete has been there since around 1915 or 1920 when the property was used as a funeral home.

Commissioner Doucette made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Erquiaga.

Chair McSwain asked if the landscape changes also needed to be approved.

Ms. Marion responded that she was planning to plant a hedge on the property line.

Ms. Glasgow stated that landscaping can be approved administratively and more often than not, does not require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester

6

NOES: 0
ABSTENTIONS: 0
ABSENT: Morris 1

c) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Morris): Request of Susan Sherwood to paint the siding blue; soffits, eaves, windows, and door trim white; and gables light grey at 1003 Rivermont Avenue. (HPC1907-0005).

Ms. Victoria Glasgow reported that Ms. Susan Sherwood was now considering colors that can be administratively approved for the siding, soffits, eaves, windows, door trim, and gables. The application did not need to be discussed at this time.

d) ACTION (Advocate-Commissioner Erquiaga): Request of Antoine Davis to replace the asphalt shingles on main building with metal roof at 405 Harrison Street. (HPC1908-0001).

Mr. Antoine Davis and his representative from All Phase Roofing and Construction were present to represent the application. The existing roof is a "hodgepodge" of materials. There are currently asphalt shingles, slate, and metal. The materials do not mix well and the lack of continuity is creating issues and shortening the longevity of the structure. Replacing the whole roof with slate is not an option. One (1) inch snap locks will be used in the replacement, which are close to being period-correct. Most of the issues with the existing roof are occurring where different materials meet. Replacing the roof with one material will help it be watertight and last longer. The back half of the house is already metal and metal has to be used for low slopes so the whole roof will be replaced with metal.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if the front porch roof is currently metal.

Mr. Davis responded that it was.

Chair McSwain asked if there was already approval to replace the roof with metal.

Mr. Davis responded that the roof on the front porch and rear addition had already been approved to be replaced as metal.

Chair McSwain asked for clarification that the same material would be used to replace the roof on the main house.

Mr. Davis responded that the same material would be used to replace the roof on the front porch, main house, and rear addition.

The All Phase representative stated that Mr. Davis had contacted him with several roof leaks. The slate installed on the existing roof is an "Amherst slate". There is a lot of lime in Amherst, Virginia so the slate from Amherst is softer and not the best material to use. The existing roof is flaking.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if the roof on the front porch and rear addition had already been replaced.

Mr. Davis responded that they had not.

Commissioner Lifsey asked what the color of the new metal roof would be and asked for confirmation that one (1) inch snap lock would be used.

The All Phase representative responded that one (1) inch snap lock will be used and noted that he had brought a sample of the metal in. Roof striations can come and go and are there to make the metal more

rigid. They help to prevent oil-canning and give the roof a better appearance. The Commission may say that striations make the roof look more commercialized but it tends to make the homeowners happier. Twenty-four gauge metal will be used. The thicker the metal, the less likely it is to oil-can. This type of roof is a common replacement. The pre-painted metal roof has replaced previous designs and this roof comes with a thirty-five year paint warranty. A pre-painted baked on metal is better than having an aerosol or a water-based painted metal. Water-based paint tends to fade over time.

Commissioner Lifsey asked for specifics on the ridge cap that will be used.

The All Phase representative responded that the ridge cap will be a box style but it is the longest lasting style. Combed ridge style is not standard, is not good for the structure because it relies on caulk, and will shorten the longevity of the roof.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that he is okay with the box ridge but the historical guidelines are against striations. Striations are not appropriate for historical structures.

The All Phase representative noted that striations do not look historical but they prevent oil-canning. If there are no striations, there will be dents.

Commissioner Lifsey emphasized again that there should be no striations. If there is oil-canning, it will be historically accurate oil-canning.

The All Phase representative stated that the oil-canning will be immediate and when the temperature is high, the oil-canning will be even more noticeable because when metal heats up it expands. Oil-canning does not affect the roof functionality though, just the aesthetic. Even with striations, the roof will still be a twenty-four (24) gauge snap lock with a thirty (30) year paint warranty.

Commissioner Doucette asked for the Commission's opinion on striations.

The Commission shared agreement that this topic had not been discussed in depth before.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that he doesn't recall striations being suggested before.

The All Phase representative stated that the system he works with is computerized and the striations can easily be removed.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that striations are not a feature of historical structures.

Commissioner Doucette asked for clarification that lack of striations does not affect the integrity of a roof.

The All Phase representative responded that striations are purely a cosmetic feature to prevent oil-canning. Striations on the side are called clip releases and are recommended to prevent the wearing of screws or fasteners through the metal.

Commissioner Lifsey asked if it was possible to make narrower panels.

The All Phase representative responded that it is possible to make narrower panels. The sample shown was a twenty (20) inch panel.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that historical structures typically have panels less than eighteen (18) inches.

The All Phase representative responded that the panel size depends on the length of the house, when the roof was installed, and what was available. During and after the industrial boom, in the 1920s, the panels

made were nineteen and a half (19.5) inches. Too many smaller panels make the structure look "busy" and like an agricultural roof. A longer roof should have longer panels.

Commissioner Lifsey asked what size panels are already installed on the porch. This house is smaller and narrower panels would be more appropriate for it.

The All Phase representative noted that the larger panels would look good from varying viewpoints. If the Commission wanted narrower panels, it wouldn't affect the functionality but it would affect the price.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked when the house was built.

Mr. Davis responded that the house was built in 1885.

Commissioner Doucette stated that if the house was built in 1885, it would have originally had wider panels.

The All Phase representative responded that the roof was originally slate.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked for clarification that if the house had a metal roof in 1885, it would have had wider panels.

The All Phase representative responded that wider panels were installed on one side of the house but the images shown were of the slate roof.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if the slate was tarred slate.

The All Phase representative responded that it was tarred slate. He then restated that narrower panels on the roof would make it "busy" and resemble an agricultural panel. Most of the houses he has worked on in the historical district have used nineteen and a half (19.5) inch panels.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked what the neighbors have on their roof.

The All Phase representative responded that one neighbor had a shingle roof.

Mr. Davis responded that they had a "hodgepodge" as well.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester asked if any of them had a metal roof.

The All Phase representative noted that several neighbors have twenty (20) inch panels.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if the neighbors had striations.

The All Phase representative responded that they did not have striations and restated that the overall look of narrow panels will be too "busy". The wide panels will be a better option.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked for clarification that the request for approval was for a metal roof with striations.

The All Phase representative responded that the request was just for a metal roof.

Commissioner Doucette stated that the motion could specify no striations.

The All Phase representative stated that the sample panel he had with him was just an example.

Commissioner Doucette made a motion to approve the application with no striations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horner.

Commissioner Erquiaga asked if the size of the panels needed to be specified.

Commissioner Doucette responded that the size did not need to be specified but there should be no striations. Oil-canning is what metal roofs do and is okay because it does not lessen the integrity of the roof.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Doucette, Erquiaga, Horner, Lifsey, McSwain, and Spencer-Hester	6
NOES:	0
ABSTENTIONS:	0
ABSENT: Morris	1

5. Roof Discussion:

Ms. Victoria Glasgow stated that the guidelines say "Historically correct commercially available roof coatings may be considered for repairs. The HPC Secretary has information on acceptable materials." Currently, the HPC Secretary does not have information on acceptable coatings or materials so this discussion is to define what the Commission would like to see on a list and would recommend to petitioners.

Commissioner Lifsey noted that the discussion would benefit from having Commissioner Morris present.

Commissioner Doucette noted that she would like to read up more on the topic.

Chair McSwain asked if there were specifics on this topic in the national historic guidelines.

Ms. Glasgow responded that Ms. Anne Nygaard was not aware of any such material lists.

Commissioner Doucette asked if Charlottesville or Richmond had any specific guidelines.

Commissioner Spencer-Hester stated that she thought it would be worthwhile to review the national recommendations on this topic. The national guidelines seem somewhat "forgiving" and allow for the reuse of materials as well as the substitution of lookalike materials.

Chair McSwain shared his agreement and noted that Commissioner Morris is well versed in types of materials, sources of materials, and uses for materials. He would be a great resource to this discussion. The national guidelines and guidelines from other cities should also be reviewed.

Commissioner Doucette noted that she recently replaced the slate roof on her historic home and was not aware that lookalike materials were an option.

Commissioner Erquiaga noted that the City of Lynchburg is using a lookalike slate material on a crumbling tower.

Ms. Glasgow noted that in that instance, the roof could no longer support the weight of real slate.

Chair McSwain noted that there is precedent for approval of composite slate.

Commissioner Lifsey stated that most Commissions are moving to accepting composite slate because of the expense to the homeowner. He also noted that he would like to get more information on the possibilities of using metal as a material.

The Commission shared agreement that more information is needed.

Ms. Glasgow summarized that the discussion is tabled until the September meeting, there will be more information presented to go along with it, and Commissioner Morris will be present to participate.

Commissioner Doucette requested that the additional information be sent out with the agenda so that the Commission had enough time to review.

6. NEXT MEETING DAY:

The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2019.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

ATTEST: _____ ATTEST: _____
Secretary Chair