

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

JUNE 25, 2015

Members Present

Michael Nicholas
Sarah Latham
Robert Weir
Robin Crews
Susan Stilwell
Jeffrey Bond
Sean Davis

Members Absent

Staff

Renee Burton
Clarke Whitfield
Shanta Hairston

Chairman Nicholas called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Nicholas stated we have an add-on request that you all have been provided too. At this point I would like to entertain a motion to either place it on the agenda or to consider it at the next meeting.

Mrs. Stilwell made a motion to consider the additional request and add it to the agenda. Mrs. Crews seconded the request. The request to add the additional item to the agenda was approved by a 7-0 vote.

ITEMS TABLED FROM MAY 28, 2015 FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the structures located at the Five Forks intersection; 254 Jefferson Avenue, 400 Jefferson Street, 806 Pine Street and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Earl Reynolds, Director of Community Development for the City.

Mr. Reynolds stated my name is Earl Reynolds, Director of Community Development. Thank you Mr. Chairman. This matter as you pointed out was on the agenda for the last meeting. Considering the amount of materials to vote on this matter if it is acceptable to the Chair, I would like to introduce Allison Blanton who is a member of the project team studying Five Fork area. She just has some remarks for the Board.

Present on behalf of the request was Mrs. Allison Blanton with Hill Studio.

Mrs. Blanton stated thank you Earl and Mr. Chair. Again I'm Allison Blanton with Hill Studio and we wanted to express to you all that we certainly understood the significance of the Five Forks area to the neighborhood. We recognize it is a very important commercial node for that neighborhood and the Danville Historic District mentioned two

commercial areas in the district and that is one of them. We recognize the significance as far as the sighting from downtown looking up, it kind of sticks out there like a beacon in the neighborhood from one direction. It's very important historically for the future of the neighborhood to have that activity there. We realize that the buildings there some of them are extremely historic and go way back. The corner building which is the old drugstore which was known first as Central Drug and I think that was listed in 1899. Then by the 1920's it was known as West End Drug. Then the beginning of 1937 it was bought by the Joneses family and at that time I think it was a grocery store downstairs and maybe a salon. Then they built a boardroom upstairs and some offices. This is a very complex grouping of buildings and you have at least two residences there along Jefferson Avenue as well. I think if I'm remembering correctly, by 1951 they were listed as stores where they had been listed as residences until then. The third residence where the one story storage building - you know the back side had the garage - there was a residence at that location too. Around 1950's the Jones family consolidated all those buildings to become Holsum Bakery. We originally thought it was around the 1950's that they might have enveloped all that with the permastone. The first point, we recognize the importance and historic significance of that commercial activity in the neighborhood. We approached this initially, but I think you all would like to try to save the whole complex; we looked at it very closely to see how that could be done. There's a lot of back and forth about whether or not they're contributing to the district and if they had been contributing to the district - which prior to the recent update to the district they were considered contributing and mostly that was because the significant had not been defined - the problem with rehabbing them then and using historic tax credits, we met with the Department of Historic Resources and they were going to require that they keep those that we keep those hip roofs of the original residences. We went up on the roof and it was just an amazing compilation of different roof heights and a large, massive area with different roof heights and with water draining on to those. Then the water couldn't be drained off the buildings. You can see from some of the pictures where the water has been draining inside of the buildings. The other thing about the conditions was that I would have expected to walk into those residences and be able to understand now I'm in the original front room where I was standing out where the porch of the yard was and there was an addition there and you know when you're in the living room and the dining room; but instead, back in the 50's and 60's the insides on the first floors of those residential were entirely gutted out so that they were one entire room across there. So they did not read on the interior's residences anymore at all. Upstairs, one of the two does have its old staircase in it with railing and balusters and everything. When you get upstairs, some of the two over two windows were intact on the side elevations and you still could read the corner bed frames. You could read the plan on the upstairs on one of the houses more so than the other. The condition of them, we looked at trying to renovate them all and if you're going to do that with tax credits -

which is probably going to be required to help with financial feasibility of it – DHR said actually you’re going to have to keep the permastone on there and you’re going to have to keep those hip roof configurations and try to drain the building with some extra gutters or something. We just really felt like that was irresponsible. That was just a condition that was kind of going to continue and be hard to fix if we had to keep those grouped. So then we started looking at if it was not in a period of significance; and in a separate project we looked at updating the Historic District and recognize that truly almost 80-90% of the district had been built out by World War II so any period of significance for the first time was in 1940 right before World War II. That now made the Five Forks area in its existing condition non-contributing which would allow for the demolition of the two residential buildings. So our second approach to this was to keep the corner drugstore because we felt like that was an important commercial building. Of course we have an old photograph showing what it would look like. We then went and looked at that and had a contractor come down and look at it. That’s where we walked through. I guess if you went through with that strategy of keeping the drugstore, I guess you have the question of could the permastone be removed and could you return it back to what the photograph showed. There is some extensive water damage there and that water has been draining off the roof of the corner drugstore as well. There was a lot of mold in that building. I should’ve started out by saying I renovate older buildings all the time, so I’m not easily scared by these. Most of the buildings we are able to turn around, but we got in there and were saying there’s tremendous mold problems, the structure has a lot of areas in the floors you could fall through and there’s actually a swimming pool on the floor to catch water from. There wasn’t much integrity left on the other floors either, so you’re kind of in a position probably spending close to \$300 a square foot which is extremely high. Of course it’s going to be conservative from his end, but it is going to be a very expensive renovation and you wouldn’t know until you got into it whether or not that permastone could be removed. Although I’ve been told by the City they sent someone out there this week that said permastone is either applied on top of mesh that’s tied into the brick, in which case the permastone is adhered to the mesh which basically protects the original building; or it’s been applied directly on to the brick without having that intermediate layer of mesh. I’ve been told by the City – I have not seen it myself – that they’ve went out and removed some of it. Not only is it applied directly on to the brick, but also when they took parts of it off that brick has become so soft. That may have something to do with the water that’s coming in and seeping into the walls and brick. We really felt like you are taking a great risk taking the permastone off and you don’t know if there are architectural features that were left. It didn’t look like anything had been bumped out - and you all have seen my cornices or whatever the siding has been added on to where you know something’s underneath that – but we didn’t know if there would be any other architectural features under the permastone. We knew the interior condition of the building was very poor, and it’s going to take a lot to

be able to renovate it. You may end up with a blight element that costs way more than it's worth, so our recommendation at that point was to go ahead and demolish it. We've always said the one on the opposite corner at 406 I believe should be kept and it can still be a stand-alone tax credit; but definitely to keep that as a commercial corner of the neighborhood, that use is the most significant part about it. Mostly I just want to get across to you all that we the City are fully aware of the significance of the building through evolution, but with the existing condition we feel it's best to keep that commercial in some way. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mrs. Stilwell asked Allison were you aware that the Danville Redevelopment and Housing has owned that entire complex for two and a half years and has really done nothing to prevent water penetration?

Mrs. Blanton stated well I will say that I do know that they've owned it that long. They've talked to us about some intermediate things that they could be doing, and I will say they looked at if they could spend the money just temporarily to make it water tight. While they were doing all these studies it was continuing to deteriorate. I have not been in it in almost two years; it would've been Fall 2013 that I was in it. It was in very bad shape. Then I was in it in May 2014 and it obviously had continued to deteriorate. Obviously our recommendation for it initially based on that - I think was October 2013 of looking at the building - I feel like it was to a point even at that time.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I have one more thing I would like to say while I have you there. About the time the roof collapsed on 402, I was in the real estate business and I had a contract on the building on the corner at 406 with delightful, energetic people from Asheville, North Carolina who were trying to buy 406; but from the inside of 406 you could see that the roof had already collapsed. The City removed it and we asked at that time - I worked with Jerry Rigney - that the façade at 402 be left because if somebody were to put a restaurant back at the downstairs at 406, we would be crazy not to put a door through the wall and have an iron gate in the opening and create a courtyard. If that façade is torn down then that's gone forever. There's no opportunity to do anything like that in that area. Don't you think that would be an addition to the value at 406?

Mrs. Blanton stated yes and you know it extends the historic streetscape and I think as much of that as you can do would be great. I don't know if when you tear down between 402 and 400 - the one that's got the aluminum siding - I don't know when you take that down if that façade at 402 can still be stabilized.

Mrs. Stilwell stated if the party wall between 400 and 402 were left, that courtyard could remain intact and could be beneficial for the future development of 406 even if it was developed with something on the first floor. There are two large apartments upstairs. This couple, I think he had graduated from Haywood School of Furniture Design in

Nashville; she had a quilting business. That's what they were trying to put in there and they wanted to keep the courtyard. The person that owned 402 flew the coup and the City couldn't get the building; these people couldn't get the building, so they just finally went back to Asheville.

Mrs. Blanton stated I would definitely say I think the City did the right thing at the time in keeping that façade, but that definitely is something that is good for the block instead of just a vacant lot. With the rest of the block if it is demolished, I think it's worth considering. I can't really speak for the City because I'm just here to answer questions about the conditions of the other buildings, but I think that's worthy of discussion.

Mr. Nicholas asked other questions?

Mrs. Latham stated yes 400 Jefferson Street is the one you've not actually been in and has the aluminum siding to the front façade. This says that the old alterations covering the existing façade limit its architectural merit. What prevents the City from removing the aluminum and exposing the historic façade and eventually keeping that part of the streetscape as well?

Mrs. Blanton asked do we know what that building used to look like underneath?

Mrs. Latham stated I believe there are pictures available of it.

Mr. Reynolds stated the industrial plan I think would be helpful with this discussion.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I actually sold the building probably 15 to 20 years ago and it was never used for anything but commercial. It was a large storefront. There was a petition that divided it from the back storage area then maybe one or two rooms upstairs; but the aluminum covered the windows and everything. It was that typical 50's remodeling that went on there. I think that building - unless the roof is beyond help - is also a possibility to be saved.

Mrs. Latham stated Gary Grant is sort of our local architecture historian. He said it was a very handsome façade. I believe he has access to photographs of it before there was aluminum remodeling; and again the possibility remains even if the rest is maintained, he points out that the City currently owns other buildings elsewhere that are facades only, but have been allowed historic streetscape.

Mrs. Stilwell stated there are several on Craghead Street in the River District. Some are on Ridge Street.

Mrs. Latham stated it does say by the way on the 1910 Sanboard map about 402, it was reconstructed. So if it's just aluminum over that, unless you've had the same water

problem, although the permastone was applied directly on the brick and you say the same goes to the 1920 revival style building that was boarded up.

Mr. Nicholas asked is there a question.

Mrs. Latham stated I was just asking what's the condition of that building and why can't the City pursue removing the aluminum siding and protecting these facades.

Mr. Reynolds stated well first of all this is a concept plan and we all know what concept plans are. Once you get down and dirty with the developer and put the numbers together, this is subject to change; but anything goes scrutinized by this board. The idea is to create a courtyard environment. As you all know we do have a young lady on board now with the Danville Regional Foundation who is very interested in health, community gardens, and etcetera. So there is a possibility that we might be able to attract some kind of outdoor farmers' market at this particular location that would not only serve the neighborhood, but also attract other folks who live in the River District. With regards to that specific building, we did go in that building not with the Hill Studio folks. The problem with the entire complex and it's really sad is the cobbling together of the buildings. It created a perfect storm. The deterioration of the roof elements of the buildings which once were residences just rippled throughout the entire complex. Although this building is not a part of the gentleman's holding – he purchased that separately from another individual – and they may not have known it, but what the Joneses did critically damaged their building. So there is significant water damage inside that building.

Mrs. Stilwell asked inside the piano store building?

Mr. Reynolds stated yes. If you take a look at the configuration of the building and its dimensions, it would be difficult in terms of cost benefit to rehabilitate that as a stand-alone building to make it economically attractive to something that you would want to put at that particular location.

Mrs. Latham stated understood but I guess what I'm speaking to is the possibility of removing the aluminum and retaining the historic facades to allow for some of that historic streetscape while still allowing for modern construction behind them.

Mr. Reynolds stated well I would say that if the funds were available to demolish behind that building and then be able to support that façade and then be able to integrate that façade into whatever new building or concept. Just from my own personal experience because we saved a whole block of facades in downtown Roanoke, behind which we built an inter modal transportation center and those funds came from the Federal Government. It added significance to that project to save the facades. As a matter of fact, some of them did collapse during construction and a construction worker was

killed, but we were able to save the remaining facades at an extremely high price; not to the local government but to the federal taxpayers.

Mr. Nicholas asked other questions?

Mrs. Latham stated these buildings I hear have been described basically as public safety hazards. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. Reynolds stated yes ma'am.

Mrs. Latham asked but they have not been condemned by the City?

Mr. Reynolds stated no official condemnation.

Mrs. Latham stated I'm just curious why this is coming to CAR when structures are considered to be so far gone that they're public safety hazards. That's happened before with Jefferson Hospital so I'm just kind of curious why this has come before the Board.

Mr. Reynolds stated a condemnation notice was sent for that. With these particular buildings, we haven't done that. We could but it's before this Board because these buildings are in the Historic District.

Mrs. Latham stated so was the hospital.

Mr. Reynolds stated but we're not talking about the hospital.

Mrs. Latham stated it's just two different ways of approaching what is described as the same problem. So I'm curious.

Mr. Reynolds stated the hospital internally had literally collapsed onto the property.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I would like to ask Allison, can we go back to not this fantasy plan but what is actually there? Would it be possible if the rear building at 254, the addition at 254, the 254 that encompasses the houses that were removed; if those buildings were removed then the corner drugstore would no longer be threatened by water running off the hipped roofs. Could we save the corner of 254, 400, and the façade at 402?

Mrs. Blanton stated that is essentially what our second strategy was to look at doing that and there's some question as to how much the structure of the bakery building that faces 806 Pine and there's an interior building that's accessed through one of the houses has to tie in to the drugstore. Are you going to be removing or pulling away part of that? So that was a question. We went into that with that idea and that was when we came to the conclusion that the drugstore building was in such poor shape and we didn't know if the permastone could be removed successfully; we didn't know what the damage would be caused by removing the surrounding buildings. Our intention was to

save that corner drugstore; it was the idea that it could be a tax credit project and returned to its 20th century appearance. That's when we realized the risk of not knowing if the permastone would come off and the condition of the building seemed to warrant that. I certainly understand wanting to do that because we fought hard to try to do that. We felt like out of all these buildings the corner drugstore was most significant in its location. We felt like it wasn't much architecturally left with the permastone architecturally. It was going to end up costing something that was way out of proportion relative to what you would end up having. That's when we handed in the recommendation to demolish.

Mrs. Stilwell stated the corner building is actually addressed as 260.

Mrs. Blanton stated I think DHR counted them all together as 254.

Mrs. Stilwell stated 806 was Danville Wrought Iron. There's nothing much left of that architecturally.

Mrs. Blanton stated it's a very solid building. Part of our approach was to say if those buildings – what I call the inner block bakery – show that they attach and were associated with the corner drugstore building physically and structurally; then if you save the corner drugstore, you have the option of using the tax credit on those buildings as well to renovate them because they're in fairly good condition just because they are concrete and they have the highest roofs. They were okay but the challenges of renovating them are going to be difficult. Those buildings alone were not considered contributing because that one does not show up as standing on its own. We looked at this all from a tax credit angle but that's because we felt like this would be required to make it even close to financially feasible. If you lost the corner drugstore, then you've lost the opportunity for tax credits on those buildings.

Mr. Nicholas asked any other questions for the applicant before we close the Public Hearing? Does anyone else wish to speak in favor or opposition?

Present regarding the request was Mr. Stephen Wilson, resident of the OWE.

Mr. Wilson asked I'm Stephen Wilson, a resident of the Old West End. I spent some time examining this plan and I just want to say first of all certainly it's brick behind that aluminum. In fact I was very intrigued by the permastone question and the removal and offer to explore that, but no one wanted me to do that. I went there with my team of investigators so to speak to look at what's going on. The theory that I was working on is once we demolish everything - I think its 254 that's the drugstore.

Mrs. Stilwell stated 260 is actually the drugstore. It's wrong.

Mr. Wilson stated of course the permastone goes along the other façade so one would have to demolish a whole bunch of stuff to get to the point of finding out whether or not the drugstore could be saved. I'm 90% certain that there's brick behind the aluminum because one of my assistants who is much taller than me could actually peek in behind the aluminum. One could very easily find out by stripping it down. One could see that the metal behind the permastone; on lower parts near the window we can see the where the brick is. I think that old frame is because the changing of the windows. So it's my guess that it would cost probably three to five thousand dollars to even find out how much could be saved. Certainly the demolition will be more expensive and everyone will not like tearing down a part of that wall. It's not totally clear that it's going to be worth it and even if I wanted to save it which I'm not sure, I had to throw those facts out there because there is investigative stuff that could be done; but there is no guarantee that it could be saved. So I'm not speaking for or against it.

Mr. Nicholas asked would anybody else like to speak on this application?

Present in opposition to the request was Mrs. Marcy Keigler at 144 Sutherlin Avenue.

Mrs. Keigler stated my name is Marcy Keigler; I reside at 144 Sutherlin Avenue. I own 165 Holbrook which is in the process of renovation. My only concern being new to your City is that the City has purchased 395 properties through your development program over the past several years, and there's nothing being done to any of these properties except the grass is being mowed. You put in a little over a hundred thousand dollars in purchasing this lot for property several years ago. You mowed the grass. That's my second problem. You also have a zero value; you took a hundred thousand dollars and threw it away. This is a zero value property at this time because you want to demo it. Now you're telling us for future value there may be some. I've talked to the people over there; they want something fixed on that property. They don't want to see it torn down. I was in that little shop over there, and I was up and down that street on Jefferson and up on Pine, and I spoke to the neighborhood; they don't want it torn down. So I'm asking you to consider what your future value is truly going to be versus your vision that you have.

Mr. Nicholas asked is anyone else wishing to speak in regards to this application?

Mrs. Latham stated I am in receipt of an email from Lawrence Meder, Retired Colonel, who could not be here because he is in Oklahoma but he had some questions that he wanted to have addressed. Probably, Earl, these will be ones that you need to address. He is wondering if there is any economic impact statement for this area.

Mr. Nicholas asked why don't we do them one at a time?

Mr. Reynolds stated no.

Mrs. Latham stated a cab company currently operates out of here. What do they do if you demolish all of this?

Mr. Reynolds stated they are currently leasing space as they did for Mr. Jones previously. That lease has been with Redevelopment and Housing Authority, and like with all the lessees at this property they will be given every consideration in terms of notice to find another location.

Mr. Weir asked may I add something to that? I'm the only one who got a chance because we were only given less than 24 hours to go in this place and I'm the only one that's retired I guess, so I could make it. Now we did talk to the gentleman from the Housing Authority who said the cab company would be leaving by August 12th. That had been decided. There's also in that building the storage facility for the Little Theatre of Danville. Upstairs is full of costumes and stuff.

Mrs. Latham asked that's at 406 isn't it?

Mr. Weir stated that's actually in 254 I think. It's upstairs so somewhere in 254 there are two rooms full of costumes and another huge room full of stage stuff like platforms and all the scenery they've used over all the years. That's got to be moved and there is no deadline on that.

Mr. Reynolds stated Mr. Wasson told me that they talk fairly regularly. Before he even put this on the Commission's agenda, he had already talked with them and they had already told him they located a place that they were going to continue to move to. Their contact with him was to determine how much time they would have to move.

Mrs. Latham stated Colonel Meder continues. He also addresses that there are no statements from adjoining neighbors and Mrs. Keigler stated she spoke with some today about the impact to their properties. One thing that was noted is that the Agenda was not publicized as a part of our Zoning Ordinance in a timely fashion. So has there been any contact with any people who live on that street?

Mr. Nicholas asked what is the requirement for advertising this meeting and was it done?

Mrs. Burton stated we do not have a Public Hearing requirement.

Mr. Whitfield stated this is a regularly scheduled meeting.

Mrs. Burton stated it's publicized at the beginning of the year.

Mrs. Latham asked in terms of posting the agenda?

Mr. Nicholas stated I don't think that's required.

Mr. Burton stated that is not required but it is on the website.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Paul Liepe.

Mr. Liepe asked where? Can you show us?

Mrs. Burton stated if it is relevant to this case and Mr. Chairman would like for me to do that.

Mr. Nicholas stated why don't we keep going and address that in a moment.

Mrs. Latham asked did the City reach out to the neighbors because this is a substantial demolition?

Mr. Reynolds stated no ma'am. We didn't have a formal meeting with the neighborhood.

Mr. Nicholas stated if I can address the previous question, the agenda is online for public review. You go to the City of Danville website, you go to Boards and Commissions, if you click on Commission of Architectural Review there's a tab that says regular meeting agenda; if you click most recent agenda, the agenda for today's meeting appears.

Mr. Liepe stated it was not on there this morning.

Ms. Hairston asked do I have the ability to speak? I put the agenda on the website on Monday I think, so it should have been there this morning.

Mr. Nicholas stated I can assure you it's there now.

Mrs. Latham stated Mr. Reynolds you were speaking about the house.

Mr. Reynold stated my final comment is that this house is owned by the Danville Redevelopment and Housing Authority and of course we all know about the property holdings which are part of the Five Forks holding. This particular property is privately owned. We've had a number of conversations with the family there about assistance to rehab that property because there are some significant issues with it. I don't know if anyone has been in the neighborhood, but at this particular location at the rear of the property there are some serious issues that we have been trying to assist them with. Did we talk to them directly about demolishing this particular complex? No we did not.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me go back. I want to resolve these one at a time. Let me ask legal counsel. Is there a legal requirement that the agenda be made publicly available prior to the meeting in such and such a time?

Mr. Whitfield stated I don't believe so but if there was, it would be three business days prior to which would be met by the posting on Monday.

Mr. Liepe stated I would like to comment on that please.

Mr. Nicholas stated you will. We're still in the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Latham stated Colonel Meder also states there is no environmental impact statement in the packet. Damage will occur with the demolition of the structure with the release of lead, asbestos, heavy metals. How far will it disperse? There are concerns about the creek that runs through there. What are the City's plans in terms of remediating lead, asbestos, etcetera prior to your demolition?

Mr. Reynolds stated as a part of all the City's demolition projects, the asbestos abatement has to be taken care of first. Certification has to be given to the private firm for liability and that will be done with this particular project as well. We do it with all of them.

Mrs. Latham stated ok that's the end of Colonel Meder's questions. I just have one last. I believe the City has already put out for a bid for the demolition. What is the range or if you have selected someone already, what is the cost of it?

Mr. Reynolds stated we have not given an order to proceed to any contractor.

Mrs. Latham asked but have you received bids though?

Mr. Reynolds stated yes we have.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Jerry Rigney, Director of Inspections Division for the City.

Mr. Rigney stated well we rebid them and we took the demolition part out and just bid for asbestos removal. We had a walk through today for CAR and they've got two weeks to turn the bids in.

Mrs. Latham stated I'm sorry I couldn't hear all of that.

Mr. Whitfield stated they have not received the bids yet.

Mrs. Latham stated okay you have not received the bids yet. Is that just under remediation or is that remediation and demolition.

Mr. Whitfield stated that was just for asbestos remediation.

Mrs. Latham stated okay so that's what's been asked for so far but not the demolition itself.

Mr. Whitfield stated we are going to continue with the Public Hearing unless you have further questions at this time.

Mr. Liepe stated I'm Paul Liepe. There may perhaps be a problem on my end that's not allowing me to receive current information. I looked onto the Zoning Ordinance 3R, F-5A it says the meetings have to be posted on the City's website and effectively that's covered by the calendar, but it also says specific applications must be announced which is not upheld by the calendar. I am unable to receive the current agenda on my computer. I'm glad you can, but I can't.

Mr. Nicholas asked can you read that again?

Mr. Liepe stated paragraph F-5A, it does say specific applications must be announced. I'm not quoting but it says upcoming meetings are to be posted to the website and that specific applications should.

Mr. Nicholas asked is that discussing the Board of Zoning Appeals or is that discussing the Commission of Architectural Review?

Mr. Liepe stated it says specifically the Commission of Architectural Review.

Mr. Whitfield read Article 3R. F. 5A which states there shall be a regular monthly meeting of the Review Commission except that, at the discretion of the Chairman, a regular meeting may be canceled if there is no business pending before the Review Commission and after inquiry of the other members there is no known new business to be presented and that due to the holiday season, meetings regularly scheduled for the months of November and December are to be held jointly on the second Thursday in December. A schedule of the dates of the monthly meetings shall be established annually, and upcoming meetings shall be posted on the City's website. In addition, sign placards announcing specific applications and other important issues before the Review Commission shall be placed on the property subject to the application or issue to be addressed.

Mr. Nicholas asked in your opinion as counsel to the Board was that followed for this meeting?

Mr. Whitfield stated I don't know the facts of that. I don't know the answer to that because that's a factual question not a legal question.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me direct to staff then. Was that followed for this application?

Mrs. Burton asked as far as sign placards?

Mr. Nicholas stated yes.

Mrs. Burton stated we do not possess those. It's not been done.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Stilwell made a motion to deny the request to demolish the corner drugstore building at Parcel ID #22966, the building at 400 Jefferson Street, and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street because it does not meet the guidelines. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion.

Mr. Weir stated I have a question. Now the corner at 260/254, where is the beauty shop that was there in relation to that?

Mrs. Stilwell stated it's part of 260 I think.

Mr. Weir stated well I did tour through the building. I don't know. I've been in a lot of bad buildings before and this is a mess. It really is a mess as far as the real 254 and the 806. We can get into the beauty shop area and the floor is collapsing there. There are areas in both 254 and the beauty shop you can't walk on. You will go through. We could not get into the actual corner because they did not have the key, and 400 we could not get in for the same reason. 402 is empty of course except for the façade, but what we can see through the windows it looks pretty solid.

Mrs. Latham asked what you could see at the corner building or at 400?

Mr. Weir stated the last thing the gentleman told is that it was a florist shop.

Mrs. Latham asked that's at the actual corner of Jefferson and Jefferson?

Mr. Weir stated yes.

Mrs. Latham stated and you said looking through the window, it appeared to be solid but you couldn't get in there?

Mrs. Burton asked are you referring to the permastone structure?

Mr. Weir stated the corner end has the permastone. Now the permastone since we're talking about that, where they've taken it off the top there is no wire mesh. It's applied directly to the brick. It appears that it was done with a mortar that is not compatible with the mortar the bricks were done with. The bricks were ancient and probably were an alkaline based, but they put on cement based. It's going to be a mess to get off, but it is on there; the wire mesh isn't there. But as I said, 806 I have no problems with. They both have holes and huge containers of water overflowing; you've got holes in the floor.

Mr. Nicholas stated let me verify the process of this. An appeal of this goes to City Council correct?

Mr. Whitfield stated correct.

Mr. Nicholas stated the second thing is what I would suggest is whether this is a good idea or not to demolish this is not before us. Does this demolition request meet the guidelines by Council? If we're going to deny the request or approve the request, we should include in our remarks in the minutes specific reference as to how this does or does not meet the guidelines. So whether or not this is a good idea is not for us to decide. If it does meet the guidelines, even if it's a bad idea, it should be granted anyway.

Mrs. Stilwell stated it does not meet the guidelines because it destroys a visual corner that I can see from where I live at 301 Craghead looking up Memorial Street. It totally destroys the urban fabric of that entire city block of Jefferson Street. It does not meet the guidelines to destroy that entire block of buildings.

The motion to deny the request to demolish the corner drugstore building at Parcel ID #22966, the building at 400 Jefferson Street, and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street because it does not meet the guidelines was approved by a 4-2-1 vote. Mr. Bond read a statement abstaining from voting due to a conflict of interest.

Mrs. Stilwell made a motion to deny the request to demolish the corner drugstore building at Parcel ID #22966, the building at 400 Jefferson Street, and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street because it will have an adverse effect on the neighborhood. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. Mr. Bond abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest. The motion failed by a 3-3-1 vote.

Mr. Nicholas asked would anyone like to make a motion the other way? If there is no other motion it would be approved after 60 days right?

Mr. Whitfield stated I believe so but what's approved, I'm not really sure.

Mr. Nicholas state we determined it does not meet the guidelines. Our motion has failed saying it does have an adverse effect. If the Board does nothing further, what happens?

Mr. Whitfield stated if the motion saying that it does have an adverse effect and nothing further happens then the result would be it doesn't have an adverse effect I think.

Mrs. Stilwell asked if we prevent these demolitions of those buildings that were listed at 260, 400 and the 402 façade then it has to be for sale based on the assess value correct?

Mrs. Burton stated if that is the motion made by the Commission. It's not a requirement.

Mrs. Latham stated I have another question. Since we separated the properties and voted only on a selection, do we need to make a motion to approve the demolition of the remaining properties?

Mr. Whitfield stated yes because they are still on the agenda.

Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the request to demolish the remaining Parcel ID's 22967 (806 Pine Street), 22968, and 22969 because it meets the guidelines.

Mr. Nicholas stated since we're splitting it up, I want it to be as accurate as possible.

Mrs. Latham stated the corner is what we're calling 260 but it is identified on here as 254. Is that correct?

Mrs. Burton stated yes. We're going to call these the houses. The block areas that include the front block structure that you see on Jefferson Avenue as well as the garage that is a detached structure.

Mrs. Stilwell asked that's the detached?

Mrs. Burton stated there's one block structure that has a façade and a detached.

Mr. Nicholas asked so those are the properties you're saying you want to approve?

Mrs. Latham asked 22969, is that the same as 806 Pine Street?

Mrs. Burton stated no 806 is the block structure that fronts on Pine Street.

Mrs. Latham asked so we're talking about this detached building right here as being the block 22969?

Mrs. Burton stated it will include this as a block structure that is attached to the former houses and the garage here in the back.

Mrs. Stilwell seconded the motion to approve the demolition of remaining Parcel ID's 22967, 22968, and 22969 because it meets the guidelines. Mr. Bond abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest. The motion to approve the request to demolish the remaining Parcel ID's 22967 (806 Pine Street), 22968, and 22969 was approved by a 6-0-1 vote.

Mrs. Stilwell made a motion to reconsider the denial of the first motion which was to deny the request to demolish the corner drugstore building at Parcel ID #22966, the building at 400 Jefferson Street, and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion. Mr. Bond abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest. The motion was approved by a 6-0-1 vote.

Mrs. Stilwell made a motion to deny the request to demolish the corner drugstore building at Parcel ID #22966, the building at 400 Jefferson Street, and the façade of 402 Jefferson Street because it does not meet the guidelines. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion. Mr. Bond abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest. The motion to deny the request was approved by a 4-2-1 vote.

Mr. Nicholas stated I'll explain I changed my vote ultimately so that we made an action. Any person who disagrees with this will have the chance to appeal to City Council. So if anyone wants to know why my vote changed, that's why.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 975 Main Street to complete the following:*
 - *Install a new interpretive panel at rear entrance*
 - *Relocate existing Civil War panel at rear entrance*
 - *Install a new bench at rear entrance*
 - *Install brick pavers at rear entrance*

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mrs. Cara Burton, Executive Director of the Danville Museum of Fine Arts and History.

Mrs. Cara Burton stated my name is Mrs. Cara Burton; I am the Executive Director of the Danville Museum of Fine Arts and History. Renee are they looking at this?

Mrs. Renee Burton stated yes they are.

Mrs. Cara Burton stated I appreciate you entertaining consideration for this improvement. The intention here is to create an outdoor classroom for program use, to approve drainage at the rear entrance of the building, and to make the handicap and service entrance a more accessible entrance. The short end of it is if you're standing at the back of the Danville Museum there is vegetation on the right and left of the stairs. The vegetation on the right would be removed. There's a retaining wall there that will work perfectly as a bench where the vegetation is. This will enhance the area by allowing some seating area, and people to mingle at the back entrance, and also more importantly the students to assemble there before they enter our museum. Additionally what we would like to do on the other side of this is have an herb garden that would be used to help determine the domestic history of the household. Currently there's the Civil Wars Trails sign; that would be moved over to the left and also we would like to have an interpretive sign that talks about the business role of the library. There's not much else in the museum exhibits that talks about that.

Mrs. Latham asked the request made a couple of months ago to change the sign, is that also supposed to be moved?

Mrs. Cara Burton stated that replaced the existing sign in that location. That's still going to be under the proposed bench.

Mrs. Latham stated the only other thing – and the City of course hasn't weighed in on since it owns the property – the retaining wall that will remain can be used as a bench and hopefully no one would have a problem with that, but you have a ramp that slopes down so there will be a difference in elevation; are there any plans for any kind of rail?

Mrs. Cara Burton stated there is an existing rail.

Mrs. Latham stated you're right there is.

Mrs. Cara Burton stated I asked them about that wall and one of the reasons that they have it is to prevent water flow in front of that doorway.

Mr. Bond asked do you have an idea of what the bench and brick pavers will look like?

Mrs. Cara Burton stated the bench I've discussed with Renee. I kind of like the black benches they've done at the fountain; they're very comfortable. For the pavers, those are the actual ones. Right now, there aren't any bricks. The only bricks are on the steps. The city has recommended that we have pavers.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the request because it meets the guidelines. Mr. Weir seconded the motion. Mr. Nicholas abstained from voting due to a conflict of interest with his wife being on the museum board. The motion was approved by a 6-0-1 vote.

2. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to erect a sign at 742 Main Street.

Mr. Nicholas opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Mal Rorrer with The Estate and Elder Law Center.

Mr. Rorrer stated I'm Mal Rorrer with The Estate and Elder Law Center. You are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to erect a small sign at the top of the window shown in the attachment that you have in front of you.

Mrs. Stilwell asked is the sign going to be metal?

Mr. Rorrer stated yes right now it is going to be metal.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I would highly recommend and I would like to ask that it be considered that to reverse the color scheme on the sign it is very 21st century to have a dark background with white letters.

Mr. Rorrer stated we can easily do that. In our Bassett office we have a reverse color scheme. It was originally proposed that we go with this one to stick with the existing architectural design. We can easily go white on black; not a problem.

Mrs. Stilwell stated I want you to go white letters on a black sign because it increases the clarity of the signage and it is much more attractive in a historic area.

Mr. Rorrer stated we can easily go back to that.

Mrs. Latham asked is this something that in approving the request as written, we could include a recommendation but not a requirement that they could choose between the two?

Mrs. Burton stated it can only be a recommendation because we do not regulate color schemes specifically. If the applicant chooses that he would like to state that now and commit to that, that is his right but as a Commission we cannot require that.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. David Corp from Holbrook Avenue.

Mr. Corp stated I wasn't sure that Susan's recommendation and the applicant were on the same page with her recommendation. Your recommendation is white letters on a dark background. Is that your understanding that this is her suggestion?

Mr. Rorrer stated yes that is my understanding.

Mr. Nicholas closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Latham made a motion to approve the request because it meets the guidelines with a recommendation that the applicant consider using a dark background with white letters because it meets the guidelines. Mrs. Stilwell seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

Mr. Whitfield and Mrs. Stilwell exited the meeting at 4:53 pm due to personal obligations.

APPROVAL OF THE MINTUES

Mr. Nicholas made note of correction to be made on page eight and page 21 in the wording of the motions. Mrs. Crews made a motion to approve the May 28, 2015 minutes with corrections. Mrs. Latham seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mrs. Burton informed the Commission that the approval of adding an enclosure to 944 Main Street at the last meeting is currently being appealed and will be heard by City Council. She recommended that the Commission not discuss or share opinions on the appeal because they would be responsible for whatever is said.

Mrs. Burton discusses the RFP for architectural services. Several proposals were received and there will be a meeting the following week to discuss the proposals.

Mrs. Burton informed the Commission that the State Board and VDHR Board met and the OWE extension was approved. The period of significance for OWE is now established and set for 1880-1940.

Mrs. Burton informed the Commission that the request for a CLG Grant was approved. The CLG Grant is a development project to stabilize and renovate the exterior at 864 Pine Street.

Mr. Paul Liepe made a recommendation that staff present agenda packets on the projector in the meetings so everyone can see what is being voted on. Mrs. Burton agreed to have this done for the next meeting.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Approved