

**Architectural Review Board  
City of Petersburg, Virginia**

Minutes of the Regular Meeting  
April 13, 2022 6:00 p.m.  
Multipurpose Room, Petersburg Public Library

**Members Present:**

Chair, Larry Murphy  
Vice-Chair, Dino Lunsford  
Celeste Wynn  
Bill Hartsock  
Louis Malon

**Members Absent:**

Joe Battiston  
Terry Ammons

**Staff:**

Secretary to the ARB, Kate Sangregorio

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Larry Murphy called to order a regular meeting of the City of Petersburg Architectural Review Board on Wednesday, April 13, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room of the Petersburg Public Library.

**2. THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Minutes from the March 2022 ARB meeting were presented. Ms. Wynn motioned to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Malon seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Malon motioned to approve the agenda as presented, with a second by Mr. Hartsock. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. PUBLIC INFORMATION PERIOD**

Chair Murphy opened the Public Information Period to anyone who wished to speak on any subject not on the agenda.

Bill Irvin came forward. Mr. Irvin passed a printed packet out to the ARB members. He explained that there was a recent Progress Index article that addressed the issue of the city not catching small problems before they get large. Citizens should help identify violations with windshield surveys. He brought up a potential violation at 29-

31 S. Jefferson St. with unfinished columns that didn't seem appropriate. Mr. Irvin asked if the issue would be corrected. The ARB agreed that the work was not approved and looked unfinished and that staff would look into it.

With there being no further comments, Chair Battiston closed the Public Information Period.

**6. REQUEST(S) FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS**

**6a. 35 S. Market Street**

Applicants present, Jeff Mincks and Katherine Campbell.

Mr. Lunsford asked if the Fibrex material was like PVC, Mr. Murphy said not quite. Mr. Minks said it was almost indestructible which would be beneficial to their mission of housing recovering addicts, as well as an issue with humidity in the bathroom that won't cause the Fibrex to deteriorate. He also noted that they found most windows could be repaired so they were only requesting 6 replacements. Mr. Murphy asked if the proposed windows could accommodate AC units, they could.

Mr. Lunsford asked if the windows would be made custom to match, they would. Mr. Murphy noted that approving this would set a precedent. Mr. Lunsford noted that it would have the same look with a non-historic material, but countered that new wood deteriorates faster than old wood if not painted every 6 months. Mr. Murphy compared the Fibrex to a hybrid between wood and PVC. Mr. Minks said you could not visibly tell the difference between the materials.

The board offered three local window repair persons to evaluate the windows, and requested a site visit to more accurately determine the condition of the windows. The board also requested that staff ask DHR if they had made any determination about the material.

Chair Murphy opened the floor for anyone to speak for or against the application.

Michelle Murrills spoke. She noted that the windows were visible, and expressed an interest in making this case a test run to see how the material fairs and if it could be used on other projects.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Lunsford motioned to defer the application until there was a site visit and more information on the material. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wynn.

There was some discussion on allowing the house to be a test case for this window material. A substitute motion was made by Mr. Malon to allow the proposed windows

to be installed on the side of the house. The substitute motion was not seconded and failed.

The motion passed with Lunsford, Wynn, and Hartsock voting yes, and Malon and Murphy abstaining.

#### **6b. 36 Perry Street**

Applicant not present.

Mr. Murphy motioned to move the application to the end of the agenda, with a second from Mr. Hartsock. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **6c. 618 Grove Avenue**

Applicant present via zoom, Dr. Fitzhugh. There were technical difficulties in allowing the applicant to participate.

Mr. Murphy motioned to move the application to the end of the agenda, with the hope that the connection would be restored. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wynn and passed unanimously.

#### **6d. 419 N. West Street**

Applicant present, Isaac Cruz. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Cruz said he would be getting matching siding and that some of the siding would be repaired, although he expressed a desire to use vinyl he understood that would not be approved. He also said the windows would be custom made and they would be keeping the roof as low as possible.

Mr. Hartsock commented that the existing low roof was bad for this house, and raising it would prevent problems in the long run. Mr. Murphy confirmed that the roof would remain three-tab shingles.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Mr. Malon to approve the application as presented based on ARB precedent and the Design Guidelines Chapter 7 Section R, with a second from Mr. Hartsock. The motion passed unanimously.

## **6e. 606 S. Sycamore Street**

Applicants present, Valerie Dingle Parham. Staff recommended approval.

Ms. Dingle Parham asked if the door could be wood or fiberglass. Staff's opinion was that wood would be preferable, however, since the front door was missing, a fiberglass door would not have a negative impact.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hartsock motioned to approve the application with staff's opinion on door materials, based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section B. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wynn and passed unanimously.

## **6f. 420 Grove Avenue**

Applicant present, Kyle Tucker. Staff recommended denial.

Mr. Murphy noted that the porches on the building had metal roofs. Mr. Hartsock asked if the main building had a metal roof when the Old Towne Historic District was established; staff said the records indicated as much. Mr. Hartsock said that HPF would have had the cedar shingles approved before they were installed, and noted that they were now in bad shape. Mr. Malon noted that there was precedent for both roofing materials on this building.

Mr. Murphy opened the floor for anyone to speak for or against the application.

Michelle Murrills spoke. Ms. Murrills said that the building was made a church in 1908, and that when it was constructed it would have looked different with only one and a half stories; so it won't look exactly like it did with wood shingles anyway.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Tucker explained that they were asking for a metal roof because of the durability and felt that it would fit with the street more. Mr. Tucker said the color would match the color of the existing metal roofs on the porches.

Ms. Wynn said that either wood shingles or a metal roof should be appropriate, and noted that the ARB had just approved the alteration of an entire roof form elsewhere. Mr. Hartsock said this was a question about what era of this building's history we wanted to present.

Mr. Murphy motioned to approve the replacement of the wood shingle roof with an appropriate metal roof. The motion was seconded by Mr. Malon. The motion passed.

Voting yes: Mr. Lunsford, Ms. Wynn, Mr. Malon, Mr. Murphy; voting no: Mr. Hartsock.

**6g. 106 S. Market Street**

Applicant present, Ally MacLean. Staff recommended approval.

Ms. MacLean explained that the rear handicapped entrance was not actually up to code, and the proposed new one would look lighter. The current ramp is hidden by bushes and the supports go directly into the ground, while the new ramp will have concrete supports with new cable railings to look more modern. She also mentioned replacing the rear addition's tin roof with steel.

Ms. MacLean said that the proposed railings on the front porch were designed to match the proposed rear ramp. Ms. Wynn noted that the existing stair rails on the front were simple and not historic. Mr. Malon said that he was fine with the modern rail on the rear and not mimicking a historic rail on the façade; however Mr. Murphy had a problem with having too modern on the façade. Ms. MacLean said they would not attach the rails to the columns. Mr. Murphy suggested using glass panels. Ms. MacLean said they could match the railings that were already on the stairs. The board was fine with this.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to approve the application as submitted based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, with the note that the façade porch railings should be as unobtrusive as possible. Mr. Murphy seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**6h. 215 Henry Street.**

Applicant present, Taiwo Onadipe. Staff recommended denial.

Mr. Onadipe explained that he had intended to leave the door as it was, but while they were working it was broken into by breaking the glass and tools were stolen; so the door was changed for safety. He said he was aware of the process but made an emotional decision, and thought he had a COA from the former owner. He intended to paint the surround the same color as the rest of the building.

Mr. Lunsford said he understood the need for security, but the historic integrity of the building was compromised. He suggested using a security door over the existing door like a screen door; but the board disagreed as this would change the look of the house. Mr. Hartsock commented that the rest of this row of buildings have their doors and now 215 looks horrendous. Ms. Wynn asked if there was anything left of the original door. There were still side lights behind the opening, however the way the new

surround was installed, with nails, meant that the entire thing would probably need replaced.

Mr. Murphy opened the floor for anyone to speak for or against the application.

Mr. Bill Irvin spoke. He said he was on the Planning Commission, and that this property had gone through a change in zoning. He said that historic elements could not be removed and things should be made custom to match existing.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to deny the application as installed based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section B. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hartsock and passed unanimously.

#### **6i. 217 and 219 S. Jones Street**

Applicant present via zoom, Ephraim Goodman. There were technical difficulties in allowing the applicant to participate.

The board motioned to postpone the application to the following meeting due to time constraints and the applicant not being present in person. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **6b. 36 Perry Street**

Applicant still not present. The board motioned to postpone the application to the following meeting due to time constraints and the applicant not being present. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **6c. 618 Grove Avenue**

The board motioned to postpone the application to the following meeting due to time constraints and the applicant not being present. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **7. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **8. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Applications for discussion:**

#### **8e. 416 Second Street**

Applicant present, Basim Mansour.

Mr. Mansour said that the building was great but narrow; apartments couldn't be done there and a rooftop bar seems ideal, but there would need to be access with an elevator and stairs. Mr. Murphy notes that the building was very historic and visible. Mr. Mansour also mentioned using the ground under the bridge as a wine garden, and that since they may not need the loading dock they might try to replace the doors with glass. He added the railings on the roof could be iron or glass panels.

The ARB was amenable to the project and said they would work with the applicant.

**9. WORK SESSION**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Hartsock to adjourn the meeting, with a second from Ms. Wynn. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.