

Historic District Review Board

Regular Session Agenda

June 17, 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. 209 Jefferson Ave.– Siding
5. Old Business
6. Announcements
7. Adjourn



DRAFT
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

Regular Meeting
Town Hall
March 18, 2014
6:00 p.m.

At 6:00 p.m. Chairman Joe Fehrer, having established a quorum, called to order the Regular Meeting of the Historic District Review Board. In addition to Joe Fehrer, present were David Gay, Sandra Salopek and Terry Strub. John Caton was not in attendance. Also in attendance were Town Planner Rob Testerman, Assistant Town Clerk Amanda Hurley, owners of lot 368 Tazewell Avenue and owners of 403 Tazewell Avenue.

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

CONSENT AGENDA:

Joe Fehrer stated that an additional application had been received for 403 Tazewell Avenue, The Bay Haven Inn, regarding removal of a chimney and asked if the Board would like to add the item to the agenda for review.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by David Gay to add 403 Tazewell Avenue - chimney removal to the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

Motion made by Sandra Salopek, seconded by David Gay, to accept the agenda as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Historic District Review Board reviewed the minutes of the February 18, 2014 Regular Meeting.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by David Gay, to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2014 Regular Meeting as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. 218 Randolph Ave -Dormer Addition

Rob Testerman stated that the application was received from Mr. John Wengler for the addition of a dormer on the front of the house located at 218 Randolph Avenue. The home was listed as a contributing structure circa 1890's gabled ell frame dwelling. The applicant was proposing to construct a dormer on the front of the house in the center and it would include a single window. The roofing materials would be built to match the existing and white "scaloped" vinyl siding would be used. Many surrounding homes had dormers.

Motion made by David Gay, seconded by Terry Strub, to approve the application for a dormer addition at 218 Randolph Avenue as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. Lot 368 Tazewell Avenue - New Home

Rob Testerman stated that an application had been received from Mr. Tim Krawczel for a new home and Mr. Krawczel was in attendance if the Board had any questions.

The proportion of the proposed house was consistent with zoning requirements, the Historic District Guidelines and surrounding homes in the neighborhood. The house would have a gable roof with a pitch of 10/12. The house was proposed to have a full width one story porch. The

plans depicted a bay window; however the applicant was proposing to keep the front of the first floor flat. There would be a square bump-out to mimic the second floor. The applicant was proposing vinyl or fiber cement siding, PVC or vinyl for trim and brick or concrete block with stucco finish for the foundation. The Historic District Guidelines stated that synthetic siding that simulated wood may be used on new construction only if real wood trim was used for windows, doors, cornices, cornerboards, soffits and other decorative features. The applicant had provided an attached table showing existing newer homes in the Historic District that had synthetic siding and trim.

Joe Fehrer asked if the applicant had made a decision on the siding and Mr. Krawczel stated that it would depend on the outcome of the meeting. Mr. Krawczel explained that he had rehabilitated a house at 409 Nectarine Street and hardy plank siding had been used, but he was interested in using a vinyl that had a polar wall which had a Styrofoam thermal bridge inside for the new home.

The house would have architectural shingles, wide exterior door and window casings and the gables would be a different color from the siding and would have a shake appearance. The elevation above grade at first floor level would be about 4' in height which would be above base flood elevation. There would not be a chimney as the plans depicted.

Sandra Salopek asked about the sliding glass door and Mrs. Krawczel commented that the back door would be a storm door as she was not partial to a sliding glass door.

Rob Testerman pointed out that photos of neighboring homes in the 500 block were included.

Motion made by David Gay, seconded by Sandra Salopek, to approve the application for construction of a new home on lot 368 Tazewell Avenue as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

C. 403 Tazewell Avenue – Chimney Removal

Rob Testerman explained that the application was a late addition from the Holloways, owners of the Bay Haven Inn. There were three existing chimneys; two functioning chimneys fronted Tazewell and the other was a non-functioning chimney located on the North side of the house in the rear which was not visible from the front of the house. Heading eastbound on Tazewell, the chimney was visible. The chimney had become a liability as leaks had developed and concern that it could collapse. Staff recommended removal of the chimney as it would not detract from the historic character of the neighborhood or architectural character of the structure.

David Gay noted that the brick on the chimney was not the same as the ornamental chimneys. It appeared to have been added later. Mrs. Holloway stated that the chimney did not appear on original blueprints.

The Holloways explained that after Hurricane Sandy, leaks developed and there was breakdown on the Tazewell side of the chimney. Vertical cracks that developed were of concern. The chimney would be taken down below the roofline and sealed off.

Joe Fehrer stated that a non-functioning chimney was a potential liability.

Motion made by Terry Strub, seconded by David Gay, to approve the application for chimney removal at 403 Tazewell Avenue as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Holloways were very appreciative of the Board for reviewing and approving their application.

OLD BUSINESS:

There was no Old Business to discuss.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Rob Testerman stated that he had received an email from Department of Historic Resources regarding a statewide annual report on Historic District Review Boards. The report included how many reviews the Board did in FY2013, how many were approved, denied or appealed, if there were grant programs utilized, etc. Rob Testerman would be compiling information and submitting later this week.

Terry Strub announced that she would not be in attendance at next month's meeting.

Joe Fehrer commented that he was caught off guard by Mr. Krawczel's visit to his house last Sunday. Joe Fehrer did not feel it was an appropriate process to ask questions privately and felt they should be asked at the meeting because if questions had been answered prior to the meeting, the Board members would go into the meeting with their minds already made up.

Sandra Salopek stated that she did not let Mr. Krawczel in her home because she did not know him and had not received any notification from Rob Testerman that the applicant would be coming to Board member's homes. Sandra Salopek commented that applicants should not come to their homes and the Board agreed.

Rob Testerman stated that in the future, if there was conversation between a Board member and an applicant outside of a meeting (ex parte communication), it should be brought up at the meeting.

Motion made by Sandra Salopek, seconded by David Gay, to adjourn the Historic District Review Board Regular Meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Joe Fehrer

Asst. Town Clerk

Historic District Review Board Staff Report

From: Rob Testerman

Date: June 10, 2014

Item: 4A – 209 Jefferson

Attachments: Application, siding sample photo, excerpt from previous approval

Application Specifics

An application has been received for an amendment to a Certificate of Appropriateness from Mr. and Mrs. Drumheller of 209 Jefferson Avenue. The Drumheller's previously were approved for a 32'5"x20' addition to the rear of their home, and an 8'x18" deck. The previous approval permitted hardi-plank siding.

Since that time the applicants have expressed a preference for vinyl siding for both the addition and the remainder of the original structure.

Discussion

- The guidelines state that synthetic material to replace or cover the original materials should be avoided on buildings that contribute to the historic and architectural character of the district, however 209 Jefferson is not listed as a contributing structure.
- The guidelines state that if synthetic siding is used, it should match the size, type, style, and surface appearance of the original material as closely as possible.
- Any moisture, rot, or infestation problems should be corrected prior to covering these areas with synthetic materials.
- The proposed siding is similar to that approved by the Board for the new home on Tazewell Avenue.

Recommendation

Review the proposed siding to be used, discuss whether the Board feels that vinyl siding is appropriate. As this is not a contributing structure, and the proposed vinyl siding appears to closely match the original material, staff recommends approval, pending that any moisture, rot, or infestation problems on the existing structure are corrected prior to covering with synthetic material, per guideline suggestions.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF CAPE CHARLES, VIRGINIA
Application for Historic District Review

Date: 6-9-14 Permit No.: _____
* (Attach plans) Fee: \$50.00

Applicant: Jeremy & Sarah Dankeller Signature: [Signature]
Address: 209 Jefferson Ave. Cape Charles, VA 23310
Telephone: 434-962-6922 Cell: same

Owner(s): Jeremy & Sarah Dankeller
Address: 1065 Hubbard Ct. City: Chville State: VA Zip: 22903

Contractor: Giannini Construction
Address: _____ City: Cape Charles State: VA Zip: 23310
Telephone: 757-678-3413 Cell: same
Town License No.: _____ State License No.: _____

Location of Improvement: 209 Jefferson Ave.
Lot No.: 10613 Block No.: _____ Lot Size: 40 X 140 Lot Area: _____
Type of Improvement: siding installation
Proposed Use: Residential
Estimated Construction Costs: \$5000

Dimension of Structure or Improvement:
Width: 32'-5" Length: 44' Height: 108
Total Square Footage: 1480

Structure of Improvement will be set back:
_____ from front property line
_____ from side property line
_____ from side property line on corner lot
_____ from rear property line
_____ from alley

Town Water Permit: _____ Town Sewer Permit: _____

CERTIFICATION OF APPLICANT

I hereby certify that I have the authority to make the foregoing application, that the information given is true and correct, and that the construction or improvements will conform to the regulations in the Virginia Statewide Building Code, all pertinent Town Ordinances, including fire, sewer, and water ordinances, and private building restrictions, if any, which may be imposed on the property by deed. Furthermore, I certify that the changes to the improvement before or during construction will be provided to the Zoning Administrator and Building Official before such changes are constructed.

Signature of Owner/Agent: [Signature]

CertainTeed

CedarBoards™

With TrueComfort® Siding Technology

MONOGRAM® 46
Siding
CertainTeed

HERITAGE CREAM



Historic District Review Board Staff Report

From: Rob Testerman
Date: September 12, 2013
Item: 5A – 209 Jefferson, Addition
Attachments: Application, Survey, Drawings, and Photos

Application Specifics

An application has been received from Mr. and Mrs. Drumheller for a 32'5"x20' addition in the rear of the house, and an 8'x18" rear deck. The applicant has provided two possibilities that they are considering, both additions would occupy the same footprint. Proposed Floor Plan A shows the full addition being enclosed and a new deck on the rear and Proposed Floor Plan B has a covered deck proposed where the family room was in Plan A, and a new deck on the rear. 209 Jefferson is not listed as a contributing structure.

Items of note:

- a. In proposal A, the applicant is proposing to install four double hung windows, one on the west side of the addition, and three on the rear of the addition; a glass sliding door on the rear of the addition, and side door on the east side of the addition, which will include a window on the upper half of the door.
- b. Proposal B calls for 3 double hung windows, with one on the west side of the addition and two on the rear. This proposal calls for a section of the rear addition to be a covered porch, with a door exiting into the rear yard. Also in Proposal B a side door on the east side of the addition is shown, which will include a window on the upper half of the door.

Discussion

The existing home is not a contributing structure. The proposed roof pitch will match the existing pitch. The windows are proposed to be double pane windows to match the existing windows. The siding on the addition will be hardi-plank to match the existing siding. If the applicant were to choose option A, they propose a standard sliding glass door on the rear of the house. A standard exterior door is proposed for option B.

The Guidelines do not speak much to work on non-contributing structures. No homes in the 200 block of Jefferson Avenue, or the 200 block of Washington Avenue to the rear of the house are listed as contributing structures. The Guidelines do mention the porches should not be enclosed on primary elevations on page 43. However, in the context of the section and the illustrations, it is my interpretation that it is referring to front porches. As this proposed porch is in the rear of the house I do not feel that it conflicts with the guidelines. The Board previously approved an enclosure of a rear porch for 114 Randolph in July. As mentioned above, the proposed roof pitch, siding, and windows are proposed to match those on the existing portion of the house; these items also are consistent with the recommendations in the Guidelines. The proposed doors do not conflict with the Guidelines.

Recommendation

As mentioned above, the applicant has not decided on which floor plan proposal they wish to pursue, I believe the approval or disapproval needs to be looked at as separate reviews. Action should be taken as separate motions for each proposed floor plan. As neither proposal is in conflict with the Guidelines, staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed floor plan A, and staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed floor plan B.

