

**STAUNTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**January 22, 2019**  
**5:30 p.m.**  
**Council Chambers**

**PRESENT:**           **David Brown, Chair**  
                  **Deneen Brannock, Vice Chair**  
                  **Alexander Avery**  
                  **Michael Brown**  
                  **Dennis Blanton**

**ABSENT:**           **Terry Holmes, Council Liaison**

**ALSO PRESENT:** **Rodney S. Rhodes, Senior Planner**  
                          **Linda Nesselrodt, Zoning Technician**  
                          **Frank Strassler, Historic Staunton Foundation**  
                          **Suzanne F. Simmons, Clerk of Council**

The Chair opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE**

A moment of silence was observed. Mr. Blanton then read the preamble of the Historic Preservation Commission.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Brannock moved to approve the minutes of the December 18, 2018 Meeting as presented. The motion was seconded and carried at 5-0.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- a.       **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS****  
          **William Kingsley**  
          **119 Points Street**  
          **Construct Fence**

William Kingsley, 119 Points Street, stated he is proposing to construct a wood Gothic Spear picket fence to be painted white to match porch railing. He stated he was open to suggestions or recommendations from the Commission.

Ms. Brannock stated in Mr. Strassler's review he'd suggested placing the pickets closer together than 4". Mr. Kingsley asked if there was a recommended spacing.

Mr. Strassler stated he would recommend half the width of the standard 4".

**HSF Recommendation** – HSF recommends the approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

The design, including materials, and location of the picket fence is compatible with the historic district. As proposed, the project meets the local guidelines in terms of design, materials, size, scale, and location. All wood elements should be stained or painted.

Consider spacing the pickets closer than 4", especially on the gate.

Mr. Avery moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the fence be approved with the stipulation that all of the wood elements be painted or stained.

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 5-0.

**b. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
EMPC Properties LLC  
103 West Beverley Street  
Install Gutters and Downspouts**

Adrian Stamer, representative for 103 W. Beverley Street, stated the applicant proposes to install copper gutters and downspouts on the front façade to mitigate the moisture damage.

Materials:

- 2 10 foot pieces of 5" copper gutter
- 80 feet of 2" by 3" copper downspouts
- 4 end caps on the gutter
- 2 outlets for the downspouts
- 8 copper straps for the downspouts

Ms. Brannock asked Mr. Stamer if they were proposing to use copper. Mr. Stamer replied that copper was in their proposal. Ms. Brannock questioned if the gutters would go into a drainage hole in the sidewalk. Mr. Stamer stated that was correct.

**HSF Recommendation** - HSF recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. Removing the flow of water from the stone façade of this building is very important for the preservation of the historic façade.

The application does not specify the shape of the proposed gutters and downspouts. Following the guidelines, it is recommended the use of half round gutters and round downspouts. Downspouts can be corrugate if preferred.

Ms. Brannock moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness to install half round copper gutters and round downspouts on the façade of the building be approved as submitted.

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 5-0.

**c. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
Charles Nolley  
108 North Central Avenue  
Install Exhaust on Rear of Building**

Charles Nolley, owner of Big Red Barbeque, located at 108 N. Central Avenue, stated he

proposes to install a commercial exhaust fan behind the building. The location is viewable from the alley way on Frederick Street and is the entrance to a historic garage and rehabbed condominiums. He noted his contractor stated the duct work and fan can be painted to reduce visibility.

Mr. Michael Brown asked if the fan would be visible through the archway. Mr. Nolley stated it is visible.

Ms. Brannock asked Mr. Nolley if he was proposing to remove the existing window sash and install the exhaust fan. Mr. Nolley stated it is the large return air system to be installed outside.

Ms. Brannock asked if the framework of the window itself would be retained. Mr. Nolley stated he thought that would be removed as well as the sash. He noted it would be saved if need be. Ms. Brannock stated the Commission would definitely encourage him to save any elements that might be removed.

Ms. Brannock stated if the applicant could retain the wood framework of the window and just remove the sash that would be preferable. She stated if any elements are removed, they should be labeled and kept in storage.

**HSF Recommendation** – HSF recommends the commission carefully review the guidelines and standards considering the view from Frederick Street and relationship of buildings.

Consideration for approval may be addressed on the basis that installation is on a secondary or rear location as noted in the guidelines. Due to the building location, this is the only wall available for the exhaust.

However, locating the equipment on the roof would mitigate the view of new mechanical equipment and the intrusion of the equipment in relation to the drive and surrounding historic buildings. Is an existing chimney flue available that can accommodate the duct and exhaust outlet? Can the duct be framed on the interior and brought up through the roof?

The Staunton Guidelines refer to the addition of mechanical equipment on roofs and at the rear of buildings. However, this is also an addition of a new element to the building and site. See attached.

Does the addition of mechanical equipment adversely affect the historic character of the building and site?

- The west façade of the building is a secondary location.
- The metal can be painted to help reduce the contrasting appearance of aluminum and brick.
- There will not be room between the properties to screen the view.

In this situation the Secretary of Interior Standards should be reviewed carefully:

**The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:**

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic

materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Historic window sash should be saved and stored for reinstallation in the future. Associated trim work should be not be removed.

Mr. Strassler asked the Commission to carefully look at the guidelines and consider the view from Frederick Street. He noted he'd also asked questions about whether there was any possibility that the system could be mounted on the roof through an existing flue in a chimney, rather than being viewable from the alleyway, which leads back to historic garages. He noted there are several rehabilitated condominiums back there and to think about that whole setting in general.

Mr. Nolley stated the fan could be painted, but if it were to be installed higher than proposed, financial issues would be involved.

Ms. Brannock asked Mr. Nolley if his contractor looked at venting the system through the roof. Mr. Nolley stated it could go approximately 10 feet higher, but that would cost more. Mr. Nolley noted if it was painted the same color as the building, it would be less visible.

Mr. Avery asked Mr. Nolley if he was aware if there was an existing chimney, flue, chase way or any other way it could be ducted up to the top of the second floor. Mr. Nolley replied there was not and new duct work would have to be installed.

Ms. Brannock asked who occupied the floor above his space. Mr. Nolley replied it's an office space, but he didn't know if it's currently occupied.

Mr. Michael Brown moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the installation of the exhaust on the rear of the building with the unit and materials to be painted to match the brick. The historic sash unit of the window to be saved and stored and the other window parts and trim to be retained.

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 5-0.

Ms. Nesselrodt informed Mr. Nolley that she would inform the permit technician that the COA had been approved so that the mechanical permit can be processed.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

- a. **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**Henry C. Bayne**  
**622 Stuart Street**  
**Replacement Windows, Already Completed**

Ms. Nesselrodt referred to the briefing and stated that the owner was going to get estimates for the replacement windows. She stated that hopefully by next month this can be reviewed and discussed.

A representative for Mr. Bayne stated that the person they'd contacted in Harrisonburg quoted a higher price since the windows have to be pre-made. The representative stated Mr. Bayne cannot agree to do a certain amount as prices could change. She noted they were looking to other businesses to contact for estimates. She had a question regarding the bathroom window located on the left-hand side of the house. She asked if they could purchase a six-pane window instead of a four-pane window as it is less expensive and would help bring the cost down somewhat. She noted that type was originally installed.

Ms. Nesselrodt stated a meeting could be held to discuss this and that way they would have a proposal to present to the Commission to be reviewed. Ms. Nesselrodt noted if they had photo evidence of what was previously installed the Commission could use that.

Mr. Bayne's representative stated all of the windows were different sizes and that was their main problem. Mr. Bayne stated the bathroom was an add-on after the fact.

Ms. Nesselrodt stated a meeting needed to be held with them, so that they could discuss what they want to propose to the Commission for them to review and approve.

Ms. Brannock clarified that Mr. Bayne was requesting an extension until next month.

**Staff Comments:**

Planning staff supplied Mr. Bayne with an information packet about wood window construction and local suppliers. At this time, Mr. Bayne has not provided staff with any information on the window details or installation. Staff requests that the Commission table this item to allow staff time to continue to work with the applicant on a corrective plan of action.

Ms. Brannock moved that the Commission table the application request for an additional month.

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 5-0.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Rhodes stated he had no additional business.

Mr. Rhodes noted at City Council's last meeting on January 10, 2019 they upheld the Commission's denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for 325 Institute Street. He stated that was on a 5-0 vote.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

---

Suzanne F. Simmons  
Clerk of Council