

**STAUNTON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION****April 23, 2019****5:30 p.m.****Council Chambers**

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

**ALSO PRESENT:**   **Rodney S. Rhodes, Senior Planner**  
                          **Linda Nesselrodt, Zoning Technician**  
                          **Terry Holmes, Council Liaison**  
                          **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 March 26, 2019 Meeting as presented. The motion was seconded and carried at 5-0.

**NEW BUSINESS****a.       **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS****

**Duffy Pappas**  
**134 East Beverley Street**  
**New Entry**

Ms. Brannock recused herself as she is a member of Frazier Associates, architect for the project. She stepped down from the dais.

Mr. Pappas stated he is proposing to install a new entrance on the storefront leading to a set of stairs going up to the second floor. He noted currently there is no access to the second floor of the building from the outside. Mr. Pappas stated he is planning to build an apartment on the second floor.

Mr. Michael Brown asked if the materials, finishes, etc. being proposed are per the Virginia Mainstreet documents included the packet. Mr. Pappas stated that was correct.

Mr. Avery asked what material would be used in the entry way floor. Mr. Pappas replied it would most likely be tile which was specified by the architect. Mr. Avery asked what type of flooring currently existed in the entry way. Mr. Pappas stated it was a red tile.

Chairman Brown asked if a wooden door would be installed. Mr. Pappas replied it would.

**HSF Recommendation** - HSF recommends the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as designed.

*1. When designing new storefronts or elements for storefronts, conform to the configuration and materials of traditional storefronts.*

Mr. Michael Brown moved the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as designed. The adaptive reuse of the building requires a new entrance and the proposed design utilizes "*simplified new elements that respect the character, materials, and design of the building.*" and is sympathetic to the existing design and establishes a good hierarchy of form

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 4-0.

Ms. Brannock returned to the dais.

**b. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**Dain Hammond / Heather Flynn-May**  
**5 East Beverley Street**  
**Replace Stairs on Rear**

Ms. Flynn-May, 5 East Beverley Street, stated their proposal is to reconfigure the exterior entrance from the second floor, remove the existing steps, and implement smaller steps to accommodate room for cement steps to come up from the ground floor. The wide pressure treated steps will be removed and replaced with narrow steps and rail made of Trex composite materials.

Ms. Brannock asked Ms. Flynn-May if what had been submitted to the Commission was a revised version of the steps. Ms. Flynn-May stated that was correct.

Mr. David Brown asked for clarification regarding the steps next door and the material used.

Ms. Flynn-May confirmed the steps on the adjacent property is a trex material.

**HSF Recommendation** - HSF recommends that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with design considerations.

The proposed changes are compatible with the guidelines for additions and rear of buildings.

- Consider using lumber or composite materials that reflect the dimensions and joinery of traditional porch and stair materials.
- Use a contemporary railing design that may reflect elements of traditional railings without mimicking a historic stairway.
- Provide a pargeted finish for concrete block that is viewable from the public access.

Mr. Avery moved that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as proposed. The changes are compatible with the guidelines for additions and rear of buildings.

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

**c. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
Stuart Hall School  
107 West Beverley Street  
Storefront Changes, Add Windows in Rear**

Joe Bandy, representative for Stuart Hall School, 107 W. Beverley Street, and Barry Moss, architect, stated the school is proposing to add two windows to the rear wall at the ground level, updating the front entrance, and adding a screen on the roof to hide HVAC equipment being installed on the roof.

Mr. Bandy stated there is pink granite on the front storefront and the current door opening is not large enough to accommodate panic devices in order to lock the door. He stated they are proposing to remove the granite portions above and below the display window and install doors and sidelights to fill in the space. He noted the perimeter element of the granite would be maintained, but remove the items above and below the display window.

Mr. Avery asked if all of the glass below that element, around, and to the side would be on the same plane. Mr. Bandy stated all of the glass in the new doors would be in the same plane as the existing glass.

Ms. Brannock asked if the design was basically flipping the doors to where the display window and lower panel currently is. Mr. Bandy stated that was correct. Ms. Brannock asked if the proposed doors were frameless or would they have an aluminum frame like the existing doors. Mr. Moss stated they were hoping to install frameless doors, but due to hardware, they will need to install a framed aluminum door in order to accommodate the panic devices.

Discussion ensued regarding the current window materials at the rear of the building and what the Commission would recommend for the new windows. Commission members stated wood windows should be installed. Also discussed was size and placement of the new windows.

Mr. Michael Brown asked for clarification regarding changing the doors. Mr. Moss stated the doors would not be wide enough to allow for the panic devices and two doors would be needed. Mr. Brown asked if anything was being changed regarding the terrazzo paving and the terrazzo base. Mr. Moss stated it would not be changed nor the plaster ceiling of that recessed area. Mr. Moss noted there is also a horizontal mullion on the storefront and would not be replaced.

Mr. Michael Brown asked why the left window box would be removed. Mr. Moss stated it wasn't needed, but it could stay if needed.

Ms. Brannock asked for clarification regarding changes on the rear of the building. Mr. Moss stated it would be the two new windows and the roof screen that would be made out of perforated metal. He noted a dark color metal would be their preference.

Mr. Strassler asked for clarification regarding the piece of granite over the top of the door. Mr.

Moss stated they are planning to leave it in place if possible, but noted it is deteriorated. Mr. Moss stated they were trying to comply with the spirit of the guidelines.

Mr. Michael Brown stated the stone is a pink marble from Georgia. He noted he felt the storefront is unique and the loss of the marble would have a major impact. Mr. Brown stated he felt more work should be done to see if there was another way to make the egress work as far as panic devices, etc. Mr. Bandy stated he had researched this for a year since purchasing the building. He noted he had gone to every supplier that he could find. In order to put in panic devices, a jamb would be needed. He stated by putting a jamb in that opening it makes the door smaller than what is allowed by code. Mr. Bandy stated he would prefer to leave it as is. Mr. Brown stated in that case a code modification from the City's code official should be requested. Mr. Moss stated that approach was possible, but they felt this would present a safety issue from a legal liability point of view in case of an emergency. Mr. Moss stated they were trying to comply with Virginia State Building Code.

Mr. Bandy stated they wanted to maintain the vertical piece of marble as an element, but wanted to move it. He noted it would need to be supported. Mr. Bandy noted the old display box on the far right would be removed.

Mr. Blanton stated he wanted to explore the question of significance regarding renovation of the building over the years. He asked if there was a way to argue that the existence of documentation effectively mitigates any changes that are made today from a historical standpoint.

Mr. Strassler stated there is clear photographic evidence of what was done to the building sometime after World War II. He noted he could not specifically document when that took place. He noted Commission members would need to weigh decisions regarding the level of integrity of the whole building.

Ms. Brannock asked if there was a way to retain some of the existing elements and the proposed placement of the doors. Discussion ensued regarding different options of the proposed design and maintaining existing elements of the storefront.

Chairman Brown asked what the timeframe was for the project. Mr. Bandy stated documents were being finished to send out for bids and would need to start construction by July 1, 2019 in order to be completed by June, 2020.

Mr. Michael Brown asked if the other window box is affected by any of the egress. Mr. Bandy stated it would not be a problem if it were left in place.

Mr. Holmes asked about the proposed design of the reception area.

Ms. Brannock asked about proposed exterior lighting plans.

Discussion ensued regarding proposed project designs and existing elements of the storefront.

**HSF Recommendation:** HSF recommends Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as designed.

Ms. Brannock stated she felt it was important to either keep the granite whether it was retained on the outside where it currently is or possibly used inside.

Mr. Michael Brown stated he felt once it was removed, it should be used inside. Mr. Bandy stated they could amend to also maintain both of the vertical granite elements.

Ms. Brannock moved that the Commission approve the application as presented with the understanding that the granite elements framing the entranceway, the vertical and strong horizontal support, will be retained. The new doors will be aluminum frame and not frameless glass.

The new windows on the rear will be of wood, one over one.

New metal screening on the roof.

Retain the left window box.

Mr. Michael Brown asked if there was another vertical stone element. Mr. Bandy stated there are stone elements on either side of the door. Mr. Bandy stated the vertical elements could be maintained. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Avery stated he wanted to add if any of the lower window granite could be incorporated into the entryway desk or element that would reflect what was there.

The motion was properly seconded.

Mr. Blanton stated that he hoped in the spirit of education, that Stuart Hall School consider sharing the architectural history of the building to visitors and students.

The motion carried at 4-1, with Mr. Michael Brown voting nay.

**d. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**Ronald Rammelkamp**  
**325 Institute Street**  
**Replace Windows (Result of Violation)**

Ronald Rammelkamp, 325 Institute Street, stated he is now proposing to install four wood windows on the front façade and sides of the house as a result of a violation.

Mr. Rammelkamp stated he is now working with the window restoration firm, O'Byrne Contracting, that provided specifications for wood windows. He noted if approved by the Commission, he is asking that he be allowed to only install four windows due to financial hardship.

Mr. Strassler stated O'Byrne Contracting is very familiar with the restoration, rehabilitation, and design of historic windows. He noted he had full confidence in their ability to manage the project. Mr. Strassler stated the Commission needed to make sure the specification is four over one as documented in the historic photographs and to decide whether restoration of those four window openings restores enough character of the house to proceed.

**HSF Recommendation:** HSF recommends approval for installation of 4 windows as proposed provided the wood replacement windows replicate the historic windows removed from the house.

Again, the clearly stated Staunton Residential Historic District Guidelines and Secretary of Interior Standards do not support removal of historic windows. Restoration of the four windows is an appropriate measure; the remainder of window openings viewable from the street are not being restored.

The HPC should consider if partial restoration of the removed windows will satisfy the zoning requirements and if the remaining replaced windows affect the architectural character of the property.

Mr. Blanton stated since he was not part of the original deliberation, he asked for clarification on which windows had been replaced. Mr. Rammelkamp referred him to photographs.

Ms. Brannock thanked Mr. Rammelkamp for his willingness on trying to reach a compromise.

Ms. Brannock stated she felt this was a good compromise and noted Mr. Rammelkamp had made other improvements that the Commission had required to be in compliance with the ordinance. She noted it was previously suggested that if the windows on the primary floor be restored, then that would at least be something.

Chairman Brown stated that the other windows are partially hidden anyhow.

Mr. Avery stated with the landscaping falling away from the lower windows, that helped mitigate the visibility.

Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Rammelkamp about possible landscaping. Mr. Rammelkamp stated for one of the lower windows on the south side, he would be willing to landscape that area.

Mr. Blanton stated he liked the concept of compromise and liked Ms. Brannock's suggestion that four windows was a good compromise, but voiced concerns as to what extent this might be precedent setting.

Ms. Brannock stated she was very concerned about that and definitely did not want to set a precedent. She noted this should be stated in the motion; however, the Commission had been working with Mr. Rammelkamp for over a year on the issue and had made a good faith effort to correct other modifications that were made to comply with the guidelines. She referred to another case in the city where replacement windows had been installed and the Commission allowed replacement of windows visible from the street. She noted this case was a little bit different regarding the lower windows being visible, but in some ways, it was also similar.

Mr. Michael Brown stated there was a logic chain as to why that exception was given to the other case. He noted in this instance that the windows on the primary elevations at the street level are being replaced.

Mr. Avery asked if the original windows were also four over one. Mr. Rammelkamp stated he didn't think two of them were, but was unsure.

Mr. Brown stated that might be a way to isolate this rather than set precedent.

Mr. Blanton stated under the principle of reasonableness, there is a place for this, but if the recommendation that is on the table now is approved, the motion should not imply in any way,

shape or form that the process is somehow flawed and that residents aren't properly informed, etc.

Mr. Rammelkamp stated he appreciated Mr. Blanton stating that and is making the effort to comply.

Mr. Avery moved the Commission approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for changing the four windows on the main elevation to be wood, four over one sashes, as documented in the historical photographic evidence, without setting a precedent given that the lower basement windows were likely not four over one and not highly visible from the street.

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

e. **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**Sally P. Walton / Michael C. Brown, Architect**  
**207 Church Street**  
**Rear and Side Additions**

Mr. Michael Brown recused himself as he is the architect for the project. He stepped down from the dais.

Sally Walton, 207 Church Street, stated they are proposing to construct an addition to the rear and enclose a porch area on the side of the house for the purpose of a master bedroom, bath, and laundry area, as well as a sunroom.

Ms. Brannock asked what the material would be on the lower panels in the sunporch area. Mr. Brown stated they were looking into a hardi panel and would be painted. She clarified if the screens would be wood framed elements.

Mr. Brown clarified the change in the roof ridge for Commission members.

Mr. Blanton asked how close would the addition be to the retaining wall. Mr. Brown stated it would still be over 25' due to the setback requirements.

Mr. Avery asked what type of material would be used on the sides of the addition. Mr. Brown stated it would either be wood or a composite that would be similar.

Mr. Strassler stated he felt the proposal met every guideline for an addition to a historic building, especially one that has a very limited view.

**HSF Recommendation:** HSF recommends the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as designed. The view of the changes is very limited.

The project meets the guidelines – in terms of location, and it is *“differentiated from the old while being compatible with its massing, form, scale, directional expression, roof forms and materials, foundation, fenestration, and materials.”*

Ms. Brannock moved the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented. The project meets the guidelines in terms of materials, design, and form.

The motion was properly seconded and carried at 4-0.

Mr. Brown returned to the dais.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**a. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
Virginia Building, L.C. / Boyce Brannock  
25 North Central Avenue  
Change Out Exterior Doors**

Chairman Brown stated that this item had been withdrawn and an extension had not been requested.

Ms. Brannock returned to the dais.

**b. Discussion on Small Cell Towers / 5G**

Rodney Rhodes, Senior Planner, stated the City Attorney sent information to Commission members regarding the new technology as well as implications of that. He noted if members had any comments those could be sent back to the City Attorney. He noted Planning Commission is also reviewing this item and at their meeting on May 16, 2019 the City's Director of IT and one vendor would be present to answer questions. Mr. Rhodes noted HPC members were welcome to attend.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

**a. Discussion of Notification to Contractors / Vendors**

Ms. Nesselrodt, Zoning Technician, asked Commission members if they had any questions regarding the notification sent from the City Attorney. Chairman Brown asked if it was possible to notify any contractor with a business license.

Ms. Brannock asked who would receive the letter and if this was a proactive movement to inform contractors / vendors. Mr. Rhodes stated this is a proactive letter.

Ms. Nesselrodt stated the letter is directed towards window vendors. She noted she would inquire whether local contractors and outside contractors would also receive a letter.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:42 p.m.

---

Suzanne F. Simmons  
Clerk of Council