

Historic District Review Board

Regular Session Agenda

February 18, 2014

6:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order; Roll Call
2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance
3. Consent Agenda
 - A. Approval of Agenda Format
 - B. Approval of Minutes
4. New Business
 - A. Officer elections – By-laws Article 3-2 states that the officers shall be elected at the first regular meeting after February 1 each year. The elected officers of the board consist of a chair and vice chair.
 - B. 621 Jefferson Ave – Chimney
5. Old Business
6. Announcements
7. Adjourn



DRAFT
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
Regular Meeting
Town Hall
January 21, 2014
6:00 p.m.

At 6:00 p.m. Chairman David Gay, having established a quorum, called to order the Regular Meeting of the Historic District Review Board. In addition to David Gay, present were John Caton, Joe Fehrer, Sandra Salopek and Terry Strub. Also in attendance were Town Planner Rob Testerman and Assistant Town Clerk Amanda Hurley.

The Board observed a moment of silence which was followed by the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Motion made by Joe Fehrer, seconded by Terry Strub, to accept the agenda as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Historic District Review Board reviewed the minutes of the November 19, 2013 Regular Meeting.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by John Caton, to approve the minutes of the November 19, 2013 Regular Meeting as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. 207 Mason Avenue – Door replacement

Rob Testerman explained that the applicant was proposing to replace the single door with a double door entryway. Previously, second and third floor additions were approved by the Planning Commission and Historic District Review Board (HDRB). Rob Testerman noted that this property was the proposed yogurt bar.

Terry Strub commented that for the purpose, double doors made more sense for the storefront.

Motion made by Sandra Salopek, seconded by Terry Strub, to approve the application for 207 Mason Avenue as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. 500 Tazewell Avenue – Handicap ramp & stairs

Rob Testerman noted that this property was the former Library building and it was proposed to be a meeting place for Town Boards and Commissions. A handicap ramp and entryway was proposed to be installed on the east side of the building to make the building ADA compliant.

There was much discussion on the location and specifications of the ramp.

The Town had opted for Option A of the two drawings and the HDRB questioned the decision for clarification. The Board agreed that aesthetically Option B was ideal, especially for the neighbor. There was much discussion as to why Option A was preferred over Option B.

Motion made by Joe Fehrer, seconded by Sandra Salopek, to approve the application for 500 Tazewell Avenue for a handicap ramp to be constructed using Option B unless the Director of Public Works/Utilities clearly stated in writing why Option A was preferred. The motion was unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

Rob Testerman received a letter from the owners of 621 Jefferson Avenue who stated that they had explored options, but decided that they did not want to construct the chimney that the HDRB approved previously and were asking for reconsideration. In the letter, the owners pointed out that the adjacent homes with chimneys had not been renovated and the majority of the homes on the street did not have chimneys.

Joe Fehrer pointed out that a non-functional chimney could become a liability.

The applicants only had 30 days to appeal from the date the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued. The Board agreed that the applicants could reapply and pay another \$50 fee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

The Board had not been receiving emails from The National Alliance for Historic Preservation Commission so Rob Testerman would be checking on that to get the Board members set up since he had been receiving the Alliance emails. Hard copies of the subscriptions had not yet been mailed to the Town Hall.

Motion made by Joe Fehrer, seconded by Terry Strub, to adjourn the Historic District Review Board Regular Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman David Gay

Asst. Town Clerk

Historic District Review Board Staff Report

From: Rob Testerman

Date: February 12, 2014

Item: 4B – 621 Jefferson Ave

Attachments: Letter submission, Staff report and minutes of May 21, 2013

Background

As the Board will remember, last month, staff mentioned 621 Jefferson Avenue. The Historic Review Board initially reviewed this project in May of 2013, at one of the group's first meetings together. Typically, the Board would not re-review an application, but given that it was a new board at the time, it was agreed that we could revisit the application.

At the May 2013 review, the Board voted to approve the application with the condition that the chimney either be repaired or replaced. It appears from the minutes of that meeting and the approval letter dated May 31, 2013, that this decision was made to maintain compatibility with other homes in the vicinity, and was based in part on a photo presented to the Board which showed neighboring homes that had chimneys in place.

The home is a ca. 1920 Bungalow-style frame dwelling that is undergoing renovations. The previous Town Planner noted that the chimney is typical of the houses in town, but no longer serves a functional purpose. Lack of maintenance led to the deterioration of the chimney and the applicant proposed to remove it entirely for safety purposes. The previous Town Planner recommended approval of the application.

Application Specifics

The applicants researched a replacement plan, and just recently were able to produce one, however they maintain that removal of the chimney remains the best option. Information provided by the applicant illustrates a broader view of the 600 block of Jefferson Avenue than the photo that was viewed at the May 2013 review.

The analysis indicates that seven homes on the 600 block of Jefferson Avenue do not have chimneys. Those homes are all either fairly recently renovated, newer construction, or partially renovated. Eight homes on the block do have chimneys. One of these homes is in disrepair, three have been poorly maintained, three have been somewhat maintained, and one has been renovated.

Recommendation

Due to the evidence presented which indicates that replacing the chimney at 621 Jefferson is not necessary in order to maintain compatibility with other homes in the vicinity, staff recommends the Certificate of Appropriateness be amended to allow the removal of the chimney, with no replacement required.

January 13, 2014

Mary Hunter and Matt Hardison
Sarah and Trafton Jordan
621 Jefferson Ave
Cape Charles, Virginia 23310

Historic District Review Board
Town of Cape Charles
2 Plum Street
Cape Charles, Virginia 23310

RE: Request for Reconsideration – Chimney Removal – 621 Jefferson

Sirs,

We appreciate your consideration of our request from May of last year. While we were disappointed with the denial of our request to remove the chimney, it was our intention to comply with your decision. Unfortunately, due to the constant evolution of our still ongoing renovation, it was impossible produce a replacement plan until just recently. After much deliberation, our position remains that the permanent removal of the chimney is the best option.

As noted in the official letter from the Town as well as in a comment by Mr. Gray on capecharleswave.com, it would appear the analysis of surrounding structures and our conformity with these structures played an important role in the Board's discussion. It is under this premise we urge you to revisit this issue and reconsider our request.

There are 15 other residential structures and approximately 10 vacant, potentially buildable lots on the 600 block of Jefferson Ave. There is enormous variation in the condition of these structures ranging from uninhabitable to completely and handsomely renovated.

The structures at 613, 615 and 637 Jefferson have recently undergone complete renovations including chimney removal. The structures at 606, 631 and 635 Jefferson are newer construction and do not have chimneys. The structure at 624 Jefferson is partially renovated with its chimney already removed. Of the houses that do have chimneys, one, at 623 Jefferson, is in complete and total disrepair. Three, at 620, 625 and 627, are inhabitable but very poorly maintained. The structures at 601, 610 and 633 Jefferson have been somewhat maintained and do still have chimneys. There is only one structure, at 628 Jefferson, that is renovated and well maintained with a chimney.

The pattern is very clear: the overwhelming majority of renovated, well maintained homes (and those recently built) do not have chimneys. Most of the homes with chimneys are dilapidated and poorly maintained.

The chimney that was originally part of our home at 621 Jefferson was scantily constructed and built only for function with no attention to design, proportion or style. In today's terms, the phrase "contractor grade" would seem appropriate. The Town of Cape Charles is filled with magnificently constructed, beautiful chimneys that are worthy of preservation. Our ailing, decrepit chimney was not one of them.

The three structures immediately to the east of our property currently have chimneys. These three structures are some of the worst looking structures on the block. The structure adjacent to ours, 623 Jefferson, has been uninhabited for nearly 10 years. Currently, most windows and doors are broken allowing it to serve as a haven for birds, rodents and other wildlife. It is without a doubt one of the worst structures in the entire town. If you look to the west, you will find a vacant lot (upon which a home with no chimney will likely be built) and two homes that have been wonderfully renovated and maintained. Both of these structures have had their chimneys removed.

As you consider compatibly with surrounding structures, there seem to be two distinct and very different models. To the east, there are chimneys, abandonment and disrepair. To the west, there are no chimneys but you will find renovation, maintenance and pride of ownership. We urge you to allow us to conform with our neighbors to the west and not those to the east.

Respectfully,

Matt Hardison
Mary Hunter Hardison
Trafton Jordan
Sarah Jordan



View looking west



View looking east



601 Jefferson - Somewhat Maintained
Has Chimney



613 Jefferson - Completely Renovated
Does Not Have Chimney



615 Jefferson - Completely Renovated
Does Not Have Chimney



621 Jefferson - SUBJECT PROPERTY
Will Hopefully Be Completely Renovated Without Chimney.



623, 625 & 627 Jefferson
Poor Condition with Chimneys



631 Jefferson - Newer Construction
Does Not Have Chimney



633 Jefferson - Somewhat Maintained
Has Chimney



635 Jefferson - Newer Construction
Does Not Have Chimney



637 Jefferson - Completely Renovated
Does Not Have Chimney



628 Jefferson - Completely Renovated
Has Chimney



624 Jefferson - Early Stages of Renovation (New Roof)
Does Not Have Chimney



620 Jefferson - Poorly Maintained
Has Chimney



612 Jefferson - Somewhat Maintained
Has Chimney



606 Jefferson - Newer Construction
Does Not Have Chimney



*Municipal Corp. of
Cape Charles*

May 31, 2013

Mr. Matthew Hardison and Mr. Trafton Jordan
621 Jefferson Ave
Cape Charles, VA 23310

Re: 621 Jefferson Ave Application

Dear Mr. Hardison and Mr. Trafton:

Thank you for your application for renovations to your property located at 621 Jefferson Avenue. The Historic District Review Board reviewed the application at their meeting on May 21, 2013. The Board approved your application as submitted with the exception of the removal of the chimney. They have requested that you repair or replace the chimney with a false chimney with the existing configuration and similar materials above the roofline only, in order to maintain compatibility with other homes in the surrounding neighborhood, especially the houses adjacent to your property. Please submit your plans for the replacement of the chimney to the Town Planner, Rob Testerman, for approval.

Please contact Rob Testerman with any questions at 757-331-3259 ext. 15. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Libby Hume".

Libby Hume
Town Clerk



New Historic District Review Board denied a request to remove the non-working chimney at 621 Jefferson Avenue. (Wave photo)

By DORIE SOUTHERN
Cape Charles Wave

May 30, 2013

The new Cape Charles Historic District Review Board met May 21, and quickly got to work on a request by the new owners to modify a house at 621 Jefferson Avenue.

Town Planner Tom Bonadeo (who retired May 28) described 621 Jefferson as “located in an area of town where the homes are in the most need of repair. At least two nearby homes have been abandoned for 6-10 years,” he said. He further noted that 621 Jefferson had been empty and for sale for two years.

The new owners, Matthew Hardison and Trafton Jordan, requested permission to extend a dormer; return the porch to its original open style; remove a non-functioning chimney; replace existing vinyl siding; and replace a rear window with a sliding door.

Bonadeo recommended approval of all requests, but the new Board was hesitant. They preferred French doors over a sliding door, but acknowledged that there was not sufficient space. Since the sliding door would include muttons resembling a French door, they approved that design.

The Board also was troubled over removal of the chimney. Even though Bonadeo judged it “badly deteriorated if not unusable,” the Board worried that a house without a chimney was not in keeping with the historic nature of the neighborhood.

The Board voted to deny permission to remove the chimney. The owners may need to repair it to prevent it from falling down, but they were not required to make it usable.

CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE

The Board elected David Gay chairman and Joe Febrer vice chairman. Other members are John Caton, Ted Warner, and Terry Strub.

All are new members with the exception of Strub, who was a recent appointee to the previous Board.

Bonadeo has engaged a consultant to train the new Board in the principles of historic preservation.

The consultant, Paige Pollard, of the Commonwealth Preservation Group, also is employed by J. David McCormack, a developer who has applied to convert the Old School in the Park into a 17-unit apartment building.

Pollard prepared the applications for historic tax credits for McCormack and submitted them to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, where she formerly was a staff member.

The Historic District Review Board, which received a tutorial from Pollard at the meeting, will at some point be asked to decide whether plans to convert the Old School meet the standards of the Historic District.

Unless and until the Board issues a Certificate of Appropriateness, the developer does not have permission to begin construction.

The earlier Board on July 17, 2012, approved by unanimous vote a motion that “the Historic District Review Board did not feel that conversion of the Old School building to apartments was an appropriate use.”

That Board subsequently resigned (with the exception of Strub) after being overruled by Town Council on their decision to require modifications to the glass balconies on the new Hotel Cape Charles.

During her remarks to the Board, Pollard noted that the Town Review Board is authorized under Virginia law to make decisions about historic preservation in the Cape Charles Historic District.

Pollard emphasized that the Board needs to realize that it is dealing with neighbors and friends. In local communities, boards can be a bit more lenient when deciding whether the changes that have already been made to a historic structure may be continued and how to deal with restorations, she said.

The goal is to promote preservation and retention of buildings. Rules should be applied uniformly. “You need to consider what is for the greater good of the community. Pick your battles,” Pollard said.

 Like 5 people like this. Be the first of your friends.

  Share / Save



Comments

13 Responses to “Historic Review Board Denies Chimney Removal”

1. Geneva Smith on May 30th, 2013 7:10 am

I think I would contact the Va. Dept. of Historic Resources or the Committee of Architectural Review (in Richmond since the 1950's) for guidance. Not sure I'd look to someone connected with the old school development problems for advice.

2. Ann Snyder on May 30th, 2013 8:26 am

This response to a property owner's request to remove an unstable and non-functional chimney troubles me a little. Refusal to adapt to changing times and needs often marks the demise of an entity (whether a living creature, a community, or even a house). The property owners' requests would have made for a sounder roof and a very pleasant access at the back, appropriate for the modest style of this house. Is this home truly so historically significant that the community of Cape Charles has a stake in preserving its look during a particular time, at the expense of the desires of the property owners?

3. Daniel Burke on May 30th, 2013 10:09 am

Dear HRB,
Get off your duffs and go take a look at what you've done. There are several houses right across the street that a stiff wind could knock down, half of the older houses don't have chimneys, one has a stainless steel pipe through the roof, and two other houses have been recently remodeled with no chimneys. These people are investing in our town. We desperately need people like this and you are concerned about a broken-down chimney. You made a little mistake. You can fix this for these nice folks. Be big about this. Let them take the chimney down before it falls down. Thanks

4. Mollie Pickron on May 30th, 2013 11:48 am

I agree with Dan. A broken down chimney does not have any historical significance in fact, if the homeowners decide to do nothing about the chimney, it will remain to be a danger to the homeowners and passers-by. We took our chimney down years ago and no one has ever noticed! Let's be reasonable, folks.

5. Randy Gibson on May 30th, 2013 12:42 pm

I agree with everyone. Requiring the chimney is stupid.

6. Mike Kuzma, Jr on May 30th, 2013 1:46 pm

This has nothing to do with chimneys and everything to do with our obeisance to Government.

7. David Gay on May 30th, 2013 2:18 pm

As the new Chairman of the Historic Review Board I welcome all your comments whether you agree or disagree with the decision of the board. I think it is a good thing when members of the community take an interest in our town government. Please be aware that the Historic Review Board's mission is to preserve the look and feel of Old Cape Charles. Keep in mind that almost all of the changes to the structure were approved by the board with the exception of the removal of the chimney and the inclusion of a sliding glass door. There was discussion among the members of the board with regard to the chimney and several options were suggested: 1) Repair the existing chimney; 2) Replace the chimney with a false one that looks like the old one; 3) approve the removal of the chimney. The owners submitted pictures of the surrounding structures with similar chimneys. After much discussion the board decided that we would not approve the removal of the chimney as it would change the look of the street. The owners are welcome to appeal the decision to the board at our next meeting. In the meantime, they have the approval to start their project and do most of the work they requested.

8. Daniel Burke on May 30th, 2013 4:38 pm

The look and feel of that area is abandoned housing and falling down housing. That's what is being preserved. They can do all the work that the HRB so graciously "allowed" and then their chimney can fall down on it. Investors beware!

9. Deborah Bender on May 31st, 2013 7:45 am

So Paige Pollard, who also works for J. David McCormack, is going to be "guiding our Historic Review Board" in matters such as the appropriateness of apartments in our historic Old School? I smell something and it isn't flowers. What is this town thinking, I have to wonder? Can I say CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

10. Mike Kuzma, Jr on May 31st, 2013 10:32 am

We have surrendered our rights, and are allowing the Government to 'sell' them back to us in the form of 'permits'.

Mr. Burke is right.

11. Dana Lascu on June 1st, 2013 12:25 am

The chimney looks like an emaciated middle finger on that darling house. Mr. Chairman, be true to history and bring back the guillotine, but please let us lose that chimney, faux or not.

12. Pete Baumann on June 2nd, 2013 6:57 am

I don't know what the new design and color of the home will look like, but the present look and feel of the sorta ugly vinyl siding and pencil-thin, useless chimney are terrible and awful. Preservation for preservation's sake seems like something future historians will surely second guess. I also don't think that the HRB is the gestapo. I suppose we can eliminate the board altogether unless it's tied to historic district tax credits, in which case I surmise that some of the beleaguered citizenry will prefer to keep their pitchforks and torches in their sheds and their tax dollars in their pockets.

13. Jan Taylor-Day on June 5th, 2013 6:01 pm

I agree with Dana Lascu. Please let the new owners lose the chimney.

Although we are in favor of saving the historic character of a structure, my husband and I had three unsafe chimneys removed when we added central heating. and cooling installed (saving the old bricks for future use in a landscape plan). The removal was done with a town permit.

I can understand not allowing architectural features to be removed from a building deemed to be historically important and significant . But in my view, the house in question doesn't fall into that category.

I am, of course, unaware of the age and history of the house in question and would welcome enlightenment as to the historical significance of the house in particular, and to the neighborhood, in general.

Comments are welcome from readers willing to use their real first and last names. There is also an ANONYMOUS section -- see the tab at the top of the page. Comments may be edited for length, style, and taste.

First and Last Name (Required)

Email Address (Required, but not shown)

Type your comment below:

Submit Comment

Notify me of follow-up comments by email.

• **Eastern Shore Communications (Click for Website)**

Historic District Review Board Staff Report

From: Tom Bonadeo

Date: May 21, 2013

Item: 5D – 621 Jefferson Avenue – Modifications to roofline, window, rear door and porch restoration.

Attachments: Application, project description, drawings and photos.

Application Specifics

The Planner has received a completed application for renovations to 621 Jefferson Avenue. The house is listed as a ca. 1920 Bungalow-style frame dwelling. While it is a contributing structure, the building has vinyl siding and the porch has been closed in and screened improperly.

The applicant is requesting the following changes:

1. Extending the dormer 60" to each side, leaving the gable end roofline intact. This will provide extra room in the upstairs rooms and keep the rear roof line appearance.
2. Remove the filled in porch walls and screens and replace the homemade columns with period columns (craftsman style).
3. Remove the chimney from the center of the house and reroof with architectural shingles. New shingles must meet 110 mph wind load.
4. Replace current vinyl siding and trim with new siding and trim of the same type.
5. Remove the side window in the rear addition per the drawing.
6. Replace the rear window with a sliding door with divided lites. Replace the rear stoop and steps with a small deck and steps to the rear.

Discussion

While this house is inventoried as a "contributing" structure, the house has been modified greatly since its original classification. The house has been covered in vinyl siding and aluminum trim and shutters, the electrical entrance service does not meet code and the front porch has been covered over with vinyl siding and screen. The new owners intend on bringing the house into compliance with code and updating some of the other systems.

1. Dormer extension – The dormer extension will be on the rear of the house and will not change the roof line as visible from the street. The gable end will be maintained and the dormer roof pitch will not change only the length.
2. Remove the porch fill in – Attached are pictures of the neighboring porches showing the open style typical of the neighborhood. The porch deck is only 27" from the ground and will not require railing to meet the building code. The neighboring porches are built in this fashion.
3. The chimney is typical of the houses in town but no longer serves a functional purpose. The chimney is deteriorated between the first and second floor due to the lack of maintenance. The applicant wishes to remove the chimney in its entirety for safety purposes. Repair would require removal of the wall around the chimney as well.
4. Replace the current vinyl siding and trim – The ordinance allow for the repair and replacement of vinyl siding as long as the siding is "double five" or less in dimension.
5. Remove and repair window in addition – The applicant wishes to remove the side window in the most recent addition.

6. Replace the rear window with a sliding door – The electrical system will be brought up to code and may require movement of the panel box. The entrance cable will be moved underground and the window may require relocation. Rather than relocate the window the applicant would like to replace it with a sliding door with divided lites to match the existing rear door. The stoop and steps will be replaced with a small deck and steps.

All of these modifications are on the rear of the house except the porch repair. No original fabric of the house remains visible as it has been entirely covered with vinyl and aluminum. The modifications will retain the shape, mass and character while restoring the bungalow/craftsman design as seen from the street. The home has been empty and for sale for 2 years.

This home is located in an area of town where the homes are in the most need of repair. At least 2 nearby homes have been abandoned for 6-10 years.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the approval of the modification with the requirement of double five vinyl siding or German siding as used in the neighboring home.

Rehabilitation because these were the same standards that were used to evaluate Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit applications. The goal of the Town was to promote preservation and retention of historic properties, but ultimately cause no further harm to the buildings. The main question to ask was what was the existing historic fabric that remained? Paige Pollard explained that the Board needed to know when to pick their battles and added that decisions of the Board could always be appealed. Paige Pollard gave a few examples and noted that buildings created the streetscape that attracted people to the community.

David Gay asked what would happen if someone were to buy an empty lot and build a new structure. Paige Pollard stated that the goal of new construction was to build something that was contemporary, yet compatible and identified that the modern evolution of the Town was just as important as the historic evolution recognizing that the idea was to be able to identify when a home was built and never try to replicate a historic building out of modern materials because it created a false sense of history. Paige Pollard informed the Board that it was important that they understood or had staff who understood new materials that were currently available and the effect those materials had aesthetically and functionally. Examples included siding and vinyl windows. There was much discussion on styles and types of homes and Paige Pollard explained the importance of the evolution of homes and building styles, giving the example of craftsman style homes.

Paige Pollard encouraged the Board to join the membership of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions because they worked specifically with architectural review boards. Paige Pollard shared two articles from that website, emphasizing on a decision tree matrix that assisted in giving a structured analysis for building materials.

There was much discussion on flood elevation in Town.

The Board reviewed the Design Guidelines and Tom Bonadeo explained that the Planner worked with the homeowner during the design phase. The Historic District Review Board would then review the plans and modifications based on the recommendation the Planner gave from the Design Guidelines.

D. *621 Jefferson Avenue – modification to rear dormer, window and door with stoop replacement with small deck:*

Tom Bonadeo gave a brief overview of the property and went on to explain the photos included in the packet, stating that the homeowners were proposing to replace the roof and siding, extend the dormer, remove the filled in porch walls, remove the chimney, remove the side window in the rear addition, replace the rear window with a sliding divided lite door and replace the rear stoop with a deck. Tom Bonadeo explained that window, door and roofline modifications were automatically directed to the Historic District Review Board. One photo depicted neighboring homes to demonstrate similarities and compatibility in the surrounding area. The replacement of the vinyl siding was required to be Double 5 vinyl. The shutters would be removed as they were not compatible with the craftsman style. The existing stoop and the exposed electric wires did not currently meet code and would be removed and a 7' by 8' deck would be added. In order to meet the wind load, architectural shingles would replace the existing roof. The chimney was a danger, not a value and was proposed to be removed.

Ted Warner asked whether the home was a Craftsman style or a bungalow style and Tom Bonadeo explained that the home was referred to as a bungalow style in the historic inventory. However, bungalow style did not exist and Paige Pollard commented that this style originated as a British Empire design in India and they purposely had no hallways to allow air flow. Bungalow was a type of house, not a style, but non-branded homes were referred to as that since they did not have a designated name. Tom Bonadeo stated that he chose to look at neighboring homes to make recommendations as to whether requirements were met or not.

Ted Warner asked if the Board was to exert the same scrutiny for the front of the house as the back. Tom Bonadeo explained that the HDRB reviewed only the exterior of the home, but the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines and Historic Tax Credit process analyzed the front, back, inside and whole house. Paige Pollard stated that it was crucial the Board clarified to the homeowner that even if the

modifications were approved by the HDRB, it did not mean that they would be approved by the Historic Tax Credit. Tom Bonadeo stated that the Board looked at the whole house with emphasis on what was seen from the street and was more lenient on the back of the house. The idea was to encourage re-use and restore the home to today's lifestyle or the homes would not get saved. Part of the Planner's job was to work with the applicant on designs that were not compatible and achieve the same look to meet the criteria. Ted Warner noted that he was not in agreement with the chimney removal, pointing out the photo of the home and two neighboring homes and the symmetry of their chimneys. The existing chimney could not remain and would have to be rebuilt if the Board's decision favored keeping the chimney. One recommendation was to replace the existing chimney with a false one that would be compatible and there was much discussion regarding the options of removal and replacement. Tom Bonadeo recommended that the Board table the modification or approve everything except for the chimney, keeping it as a requirement. The applicant could then appeal the decision if they so chose.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by David Gay, to approve the modifications to roofline, window, rear door and porch restoration at 621 Jefferson Avenue with the exception of Item 3-Removal of the chimney. The motion was unanimously approved.

Tom Bonadeo suggested that the Board make a recommendation to the applicant to repair or replace the chimney with matching material.

Motion made by Joe Fehrer, seconded by David Gay, to accept repair or replacement of the chimney in its existing configuration and materials above the roofline only at 621 Jefferson Avenue. The motion was unanimously approved.

Joe Fehrer asked how modifications on the back of a house were handled when there was an alley behind the house. Tom Bonadeo explained that alleys were not public thoroughfare and gave a brief history about the alleys and went on to state that people shouldn't be driving through the alley criticizing the back of a house since it wasn't a public road.

E. Election of Officers (Chairperson and Vice Chairperson):

Joe Fehrer nominated Terry Strub for Chairwoman. Terry Strub declined and Ted Warner nominated David Gay.

Motion made by Ted Warner, seconded by Joe Fehrer, to elect David Gay as Chairman of the Historic District Review Board. The motion was unanimously approved. Motion made by John Caton, seconded by Ted Warner to elect Joe Fehrer as Vice Chairman of the Historic District Review Board. The motion was unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

There was no Old Business to discuss.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Tom Bonadeo reported the following: i) He was pleased with the new Historic District Review Board and thanked them for applying; ii) He would be retiring in a couple of weeks and Rob Testerman had been hired as the new Planner. He had a degree in urban planning and had worked for Accomack County for seven years.

John Caton requested consideration in moving future HDRB meetings to 5:00p.m. instead of 4:30p.m. since he worked across the bay. There was some discussion regarding this matter.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by Joe Fehrer, to adjourn the Historic District Review Board Regular Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman David Gay

Asst. Town Clerk