

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

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
May 11, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.
Multipurpose Room, Petersburg Public Library

Members Present:

Chair, Larry Murphy
Celeste Wynn
Bill Hartsock
Louis Malon

Members Absent:

Vice-Chair, Dino Lunsford
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, May 11, 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 April 2022 ARB meeting were presented. Ms. Wynn motioned to approve the minutes as drafted. 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. This motion approved item 6a. on the Consent Agenda.

5. PUBLIC INFORMATION PERIOD

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

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

6. REQUEST(S) FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

6a. 830 West High Street

Approved in consent agenda.

6b. 36 Perry Street

Applicant not present.

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

6c. 618 Grove Avenue

Applicant present, William Fitzhugh. Staff recommended approval.

After reviewing an old photograph of the structure to evaluate it against the proposed front porch, Ms. Wynn asked if the applicant would also be adding a roof over the porch since it used to have one. Dr. Fitzhugh explained that he was just going off his architect's recommendation for a more historically accurate porch. Mr. Hartsock noted that the porch in the photo looked more Victorian in style than what the originally Federal style house might have had.

Dr. Fitzhugh said he would have the porch roof added to his plans and bring it back to the ARB.

Dr. Fitzhugh withdrew his application.

6d. 217 and 219 S. Jones Street

Applicant present via Zoom, Ephraim Goodman. Staff recommended approval.

The ARB agreed that the applicant had considered the comments made about his new construction project and altered the plans to reflect them.

There was no public comment.

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

6e. 132 E. Fillmore Street

Applicants present, Mike and Theresa DeHart. Staff recommended approval.

Mrs. DeHart presented a third screen door option which the applicants preferred over the others. The ARB found it to be appropriate.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hartsock motioned to approve the application for the third screen door option based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4 Section E. The motion was seconded by Mr. Murphy and passed unanimously.

6f. 520 Harrison Street

Applicant present, Ivy Pearson. Staff recommended deferral.

Ms. Pearson sent staff photos of one of the windows on the house which had broken glass. She explained that the glass would be replaced on that window and the others would be repaired. She continued that the metal porch roof would be replaced with new metal, and that the existing front door would be restored.

Mr. Murphy commented that the applicant's clarifications from the application were within the Guidelines. He added that if the applicant found any windows that could not be restored, the ARB may be able to conduct a site visit to determine the level of deterioration. Mr. Hartsock asked about the composite deck, Ms. Pearson said it would be wood.

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

Drew Wiltshire spoke. Mr. Wiltshire said he was in favor of the application.

Ramon Esparza spoke. Mr. Esparza asked about the siding and why vinyl was being allowed. The ARB explained that vinyl siding was only allowed as an in-kind replacement if the building already had vinyl siding.

There was no further public comment.

Ms. Wynn motioned to approve the application as amended as per the Design Guidelines Chapter 4. The motion was seconded by Mr. Murphy and passed unanimously.

6g. 215 High Street

Applicant present, Dan Robbins. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Robbins brought samples for proposed materials. The applicant confirmed that there would not be stairs and what the railings would look like. He also offered his services as a craftsman.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to approve the application as submitted, based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 7 Section R. Mr. Hartsock seconded the application and passed unanimously.

6h. 209 High Street

Applicant present, Bill Nicholson. Staff recommended approval.

The ARB was supportive of the application.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Murphy motioned to approve the application as submitted based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 8 Section G. Mr. Hartsock seconded the application and it passed unanimously.

6i 130 N. Jefferson Street

Applicant and owner present, Joseph Yates and Leo Martinez. Staff recommended partial approval.

Mr. Yates thought the porch was low enough to not require a railings. He also said it would be fine to an install a metal roof on the porch. The composite decking was being requested because modern wood doesn't last. Staff noted that the online information listed the material as PVC rather than a composite. It was requested by the ARB that a sample of the material be provided. Mr. Murphy asked if the material was installed anywhere nearby, Mr. Yates said he has used it in Richmond. He also said that once the material was painted it would look like wood.

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

Ramon Esparza spoke. He asked for clarification in that the concern of the ARB didn't seem to be visual in that PVC looks like wood, especially if it couldn't be seen. Mr. Murphy explained that there was importance in material integrity.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Malon thought it was good for the ARB to see new materials that might be appropriate. Mr. Yates noted that there was no existing porch floor to retain material integrity, and that when these buildings were constructed they used heart pine wood which lasts longer than any wood we have available now. Mr. Yates said a sample would be provided.

Mr. Malon motioned to approve the application as submitted based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, with the exception of a conditional approval for the use of a composite porch floor until a sample could be reviewed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wynn and passed unanimously.

6j. 107 N. South Street

Applicant present, Ramon Esparza. Staff recommended denial.

Mr. Esparza explained that the stone used in the original construction of the office building had been discontinued. He also said that he used thicker frames for the glass than the originals. Mr. Murphy said that there were similar options to the old stone available. Mr. Esparza explained that he presented a 1950s style gas station tile which didn't have the same look as the original stone but had a modern vintage feel. Although the construction date of the building was 1956 he thought that the stone details were added in the 1970s, and didn't look historic. Mr. Murphy said subway tile was an interior look. Mr. Esparza thought that the stone would look outdated but the tile was timeless, and that getting someone to install the stone would be difficult. Mr. Murphy asked if the subway tile would hold up outside, the applicant said yes.

There was no public comment.

Staff's opinion was that the most important part about the wall was that stone be replaced with stone. The ARB agreed. Mr. Esparza countered that if stone of a different color would be allowed, why couldn't tile be allowed.

Mr. Murphy asked about the windows on the inside walls. Mr. Esparza said he wanted to keep the interior walls and use a privacy film instead of window tinting. Mr. Murphy suggested the use of shades, Mr. Esparza said that he was previously told no to using blinds. He added that you couldn't get between the interior walls and glass, and the eventual goal was to remove the interior walls.

Ms. Wynn motioned to approve the installation of stone on the knee wall and columns, to be reviewed by staff, based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, with a second from Mr. Malon. The motion passed unanimously.

6a. 36 Perry Street

Applicant still not present.

Mr. Malon noted that the plinth on the replacement post was too tall compared to the railing, and that the owner's neighbor might have an appropriate post. Mr. Murphy said that the applicant could lengthen the top and cut down the bottom to match the original posts.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Malon motioned to deny the application as installed based on the Design Guidelines Chapter 4, and that staff should share the ARB's thoughts with the applicant. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hartsock and passed unanimously.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

Application for discussion:

8b. 510 High Street

Applicant present, Andrew Wiltshire.

Mr. Wiltshire explained that the current proposal was for duplexes along High and Lafayette Streets, and later proposal would include additional housing behind these buildings. Mr. Wiltshire explained the floor plans and similar projects he'd done.

Mr. Malon noted that the sides of the two corner buildings; one would prominently face Lafayette and High Streets, the other would face Lafayette and Commerce Streets, and said the sides of those buildings should be brick rather than siding. The applicant agreed with this suggestion.

Mr. Murphy commented that the buildings would complement 526 High St. Mr. Hartsock thought the project was good historic infill.

Mr. Murphy opened the floor for public comment.

Michelle Murrills spoke. She was excited about the project since the old building on that lot had been lost.

There was no further public comment.

9. **WORK SESSION**

Appeal for 215 Henry Street

Staff informed the ARB that the applicant for 215 Henry Street would be appealing the ARB's denial of his project.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

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