

**Minutes**  
**April 2, 2009**  
**North End - Huntington Heights Architectural Review Board**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00

**Members present:**

Chip Carpenter, Mary Kayaselcuk, Phil Shook, Robin Stippich, Deirdre Wells, Fred Whittaker.

**Members Absent:** None. Mr. Carpenter noted that the Board now has one vacancy due to the resignation of Tracy Payne (Touchberry).

**Staff present:** David Watson, Saul Gleiser, Sheila McAllister.

**Review of the minutes.** Minutes of the February 5, 2009 meeting were reviewed and approved with modifications

**Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness (COA):**

COA-09-217. 319 65<sup>th</sup> Street. Lane Shea and Ashley Rose. Replacement of the front door that has a nine pane divided light window with a solid wood/fiberglass door.

Mr. Carpenter reviewed the relative section of the guidelines for door replacement. He then read the staff report, noting the staff's recommendation for approval called for allowing the option of installing a fiberglass door rather than wood at the applicant's discretion.

The applicants stated that the current door is in poor condition, and that the new door is more appropriate for their house. Mr. Shook noted that the current door may be original, but that a solid door would not be atypical either. Mr. Whittaker agreed that a solid door was appropriate but he did not think that the curved top design was appropriate on a house characterized by distinct angular features. Houses that have a curved door generally have curved door casings as well.

Mr. Shook made a motion to accept the application as presented.  
Ms. Kayaselcuk provided a second.

Aye: Kayaselcuk, Stippich, Shook, Wells, Carpenter  
Nay: Whittaker

The motion passed 5:1

COA-09-218 344 & 346 56<sup>th</sup> Street. Terry Jones  
This application is for the replacement of windows and the installation of vinyl siding.  
Mr. Carpenter stated that the application would be discussed and voted on in two sections.

Windows.

The Applicant noted that 28 windows would be replaced, and confirmed that the diamond pattern window in the front would not be replaced.

Mr. Carpenter reviewed the section of the guidelines that addressed windows.

The applicant stated that the replacement windows were necessary because the current windows were in poor condition, some are inoperable, and the window weights no longer functioned. Some of the windows were replacements from about 20 years ago and are not uniform. The new windows will be double-hung 6 over 1 vinyl windows. The window in the dormer was replaced within the past six years, and does not need replacement. The Board informed the applicant that his old windows may be of value to either a glazier who can reuse the old style glass, or could be donated to the Habitat Restore for a tax write-off.

Mr. Whittaker made a motion to accept the proposal for replacement windows.  
Ms. Wells provided a second.

Aye: Kayaselcuk, Stippich, Shook, Wells, Whittaker, Carpenter  
Nay:

Motion passed 6:0

Siding.

Mr. Carpenter reviewed the section of the Guidelines relating to the installation of the siding. Mr. Whittaker began the Board discussion by noting that the siding should be lap siding of a similar reveal of the original siding. He noted that the cedar shingle siding on the second floor should remain; either repaired or replaced with in kind material that would allow synthetic. Ms. Wells asked if it would be possible to repair the cedar shakes instead of placing siding over it. The applicant stated that his secondary plan was to order one or two squares of new cedar shakes in order to replace broken or defective shingles on the house, and then paint the whole second story.

Ms. Wells made a motion to approve 8" lap siding on the first floor, and to allow repairs as needed to the second floor shingled area.

Mr. Shook provided a second

Aye: Kayaselcuk, Stippich, Shook, Wells, Whittaker, Carpenter  
Nay:

Motion passed 6:0

New Business

Pamela Shenian from the Virginia Department of Historical Resources gave a presentation about State tax credits for historic restoration.

The Virginia program was established in 1997, modeled on Federal Program. Over 1,200 state projects are certified. It covers 25% of eligible expenses for owner-occupied and income-producing properties. The credit can be carried forward 10 years with no carry back. It can be syndicated. There is no continuing ownership requirement.

Referenced websites:

- Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines [http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/rehab/rehab\\_index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standguide/rehab/rehab_index.htm)
- DHR Tax Credit Page [http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/tax\\_credits/tax\\_credit.htm](http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/tax_credits/tax_credit.htm)
- DHR VLR/NR Signed Nominations [http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/register/register\\_counties\\_cities.htm](http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/register/register_counties_cities.htm)

Saul Gleiser then gave a presentation on Standards for Rehabilitation.

To assist in the long term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features.

The Standards are the most widely used guideline for the rehabilitation of historic structures and new construction in historic districts. They have been adopted by a vast majority of historic districts across the country.

Restoration - Accurately recovering the exact form and details of a property and its setting as they appeared during a specific period of time.

Rehabilitation - Returning a property to a state of utility through repair or alteration making possible an efficient contemporary use. Preserving features significant to its history, architecture, and culture.

### **Standard 1**

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

### **Standard 2**

The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

### **Standard 3**

Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

### **Standard 4**

Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

### **Standard 5**

Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

### **Standard 6**

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

### **Standard 7**

Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials **shall not** be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

**Standard 8**

Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

**Standard 9**

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

**Standard 10**

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

**Continued New Business**

The Chairman discussed the current Board opening, and noted that two more positions will be open in October. Mr. Shook is required to step down, and Mr. Whittaker is up for reappointment.

Mr. Whittaker stated that he would like to take a moment to recognize the time and effort that Phil Shook dedicated to the establishment and development of the North End-Huntington Heights Historic District and Architectural Review Board. He noted his diligence in developing and enforcing the guidelines, and presented Mr. Shook with a plaque and gavel. The Board gave Mr. Shook a round of applause. Mr. Shook thanked the Board and noted that he is willing to be of service even after he steps down in the Fall.

The meeting adjourned.