

The Smithfield Board of Historic and Architectural Review held its regular meeting on Tuesday, November 17th, 2015. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Members present were Mr. Roger Ealy, Chairman; Mr. Trey Gwaltney, Vice Chairman; Mr. Ronny Prevatte, Ms. Julia Hillegass, Mr. Gary Hess, and Mr. Jeff Yeaw. Mr. Russell Parrish was absent. Staff members present were Mr. William G. Saunders, IV; Planning and Zoning Administrator and Mr. William H. Riddick III, Town Attorney. There were three (3) citizens present.

Chairman Ealy – I would like to call the November 17th, 2015 Board of Historic and Architectural Review meeting to order. The first item on the agenda is the Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – Thank you, Chairman. I have two items on my report tonight. We granted administrative approval to remove a damaged chimney. It was leaking because of structural disrepair and did not have any relevant historical contribution to the district. I have an update on the Cary and Main or Pierceville future land use change and rezoning application. It was before you all last month. It went to Town Council at their November 3rd meeting. At that meeting, the future land use change was tabled until January 5th, 2016. The rezoning application and public hearing were continued until January 5th. In the committee meeting that I just left, they have tentatively scheduled a work session between the developer, the applicant, and the Town Council for Monday, December 7th at 6:30 p.m. Thank you.

Chairman Ealy – We will now move to Upcoming Meetings and Activities. You have a list of those. Next we have Public Comments. Is there anyone who would like to speak? Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Braunhardt – I am R. B. Braunhardt. I live at 101 Goose Hill Way. I have spoken before several times. I know you are probably tired of hearing but bear with me please. What I would like to address was some comments I made at Dr. Cook's Public Buildings and Welfare Committee meeting in October. I did a presentation on what I call an informal walkabout survey of the historic district. I looked at one hundred and six homes. I am not going to bore you with the streets but the gist of it was Cary Street, Main Street, Grace Street, and several of the connecting streets between them such as Cedar, North Mason, Institute, etc. The purpose of my walkabout survey was to be able to approach you and ask you to reconsider your comments where you said that you thought the developers proposed twenty four elevations, pictures, drawings, that they

had scattered around the room during your last BHAR meeting, were appropriate. I do not think they are appropriate. The purpose of this survey was to try to show you in a very, very quick, unscientific survey of the main features that I saw out of those one hundred and six homes. I think that based on the ordinances that are there and the responsibility of the Town Council. I recognize that you advise the Town Council. You make recommendations to them but that recommendation should include very specific things, reminders in some cases, and in other cases you tell the builder that he has to do certain things to keep the same type of character of the houses he is proposing building which I think, by definition and Ms. Venable's comments included part of that definition, that they are tract homes. By their very nature, they do not have the historical, architectural details, and features that are predominate in the one hundred and six homes that I did in my survey. Without beating you up with tons and tons of data, let me just hit a few of the items that I looked at. Roofs - ninety of the roofs of the one hundred and six homes had the composition but a full thirty percent of them had a metal roof. The builder proposes no metal roofs. They do talk in the proffers about possibly having a porch with a metal roof or a bay on the side with a metal roof but no metal roofs. When you have thirty percent of the homes in the town with metal roofs don't you think the subdivision should carry that theme through so that it still has that historic flavor to it? Porches - ninety-eight of the one hundred and six homes have porches. Forty-five of those porches had significant gingerbread. It is a term I use but I found it in the ordinances. It is a pretty standard one apparently. Another term used was detailed or decorative millwork. Gingerbread works for me. Twenty-five percent of those ninety eight homes had two and three sided wrap around porches. The developer proposes only a small little porch but he promises that it will not be less than six feet deep. An interesting fact, that I saw the other day when I walked around and looked, is that a lot of porches on the very narrow homes or the bungalows as we might call them there is still a lot of gingerbread or fish scale decorative items on it but the porch went from left to right. It went all the way across the front of the house. It is not what the developer is showing that he is going to put in the housing. Garages - every house had a garage. Most of them were attached in the developer's plans. He even says that in his proffers. Fifty-four percent of the houses have no garages in the historic district. I am not proposing that you do not let people have garages. I would not even buy a house that did not have a garage, of course, I am a car nut. The garages they do have, thirty-four

percent of them are set back off the front line of the house back in the back of the property. They are half way back or all the way at the back of the property. I think we need some more work on the garage issue than simply allowing a front facing garage attached to the house. It certainly does not match the rest of the historic district. There are zero chimneys in the developer's plans. Of the one hundred and six houses in this town, one hundred have a chimney which is ninety-four percent. Not only that, thirty-one have two chimneys and ten have three chimneys. I think there were actually a couple more chimneys but I could not see far enough in the back of the house. Chimneys are a predominant feature and it should keep on throughout this proposed subdivision. I have not even talked about the siding. They talk about structural manmade lumber. The ordinances call for Hardiplank. It says 'cementitious board such as Hardi plank.' I think we should be telling the developer when we meet with him that what they are offering is not appropriate and that they need to have these features. I could go on about dormers. I could go on about fence material, bay windows, and the number of turrets. Have you looked at the number of turrets in this town? It is one of the things that is so cool. You are walking around, you look up and there is a turret. How many people have turrets in their homes these days? If you are going to keep the historical district theme or the feel you cannot put up one hundred and fifty-one houses that are four walls and a roof. There is no historical, architectural detail to that at all. Hopefully, you get the idea here that there are some things, I think, that give us and give the review Board the power to do what I am asking you to do and that is compatibility. E.2.B says that 'compatibility with similar features of buildings or structures within the area/district.' 'Harmonious with and architectural incompatible with historic buildings within the subject overlay districts' was in section E.2.D. The public necessity of the proposed construction. The general compatibility of the site plan and the exterior design arrangement, texture, and materials proposed to be used. I think it is well within the purview of this Board. I think it is really what you are supposed to do is to protect this town. People come to Smithfield because it is not York County. It is not Newport News. It is not Virginia Beach. Nobody ever said anything that I am aware of I certainly have never said anything about Hearndon, his homes, his construction, or the quality. I think that is a red herring; it is not the issue. He may build great houses as I told Dr. Cook at his Public Buildings and Welfare Committee. I think the phrase was "hell, I bought those kinds of houses when I moved around for thirty years in the military." I have only ever had one rental house in thirty

years. I bought houses. Those houses are tract homes that are not in keeping with the historic district. I have this little survey and if you want I can crank out more because I have all of the data. I just did not want to make your ears bleed listening to me talk about the rest of the features. These are not the right houses and the appropriateness of those; I call in question. I am not impugning your integrity. I am not attacking you about this or that. I am just urging you to rethink these designs that the builder is asking to build are not appropriate for the historic district as I have demonstrated here. There is one last point that I would leave you with please. I think the danger is not making the developer do the same thing. I am not saying that you will tell him that he will have a metal roof on every house or that they will all have two sided porches. I think there should be some percentage of those that are in keeping with the historic district and the numbers and the percentages. What I really think the danger is, if you do not do this, anybody in the last twenty years and I picked that date because 1990 was when the historic district ordinances were first generated. We can argue about the timeline but when people had been told that they had to change this or knock this down and put this up to fit with the historic district. You have not got a leg to stand on. They can tell you to pound sand. I am not trying to be disrespectful but that is what they are going to do. Some of them may even turn to lawsuits. They will say you made me do this when you let that guy build one hundred and fifty-one homes that do not have the historical flavor and architectural details. Like some of the things I have mentioned here. I think the real damage is that you run the risk of destroying the reason people come to Smithfield. It is not like their home. It is not like their suburbs and their nice little houses. It is different. It is different by design, by luck, and by hard work by you and some of your predecessors. I would like you to keep doing that and tell this developer that you are glad to let him build but that he has to have these features. Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

Chairman Ealy – Thank you. Next we have Board Member Comments. Are there any Board member comments? Hearing none, we will move to Color Change, Window Removal Awnings & Shutters – 25 E. Main Street – (Contributing) – Lee Duncan, applicant.

Mr. Duncan – I am Lee Duncan. I am the owner of Wharf Hill Brewing Company on 25 Main Street. I am here to request approval for blocking a window that faces northeast. It is located on the side of the building over the rooftop which also faces the

blocked up windows of 17 Main Street which is the old shoe shop. The building windows on the opposite side of the building have two of those windows that have been blocked up in previous years. The purpose for blocking the windows is that the northeast winds penetrate the windows and then they leak down the inside of the wall. Also, I am requesting permission to keep a sealant called Drylok. I have put on the side of the building on the same side as the window that was blocked. The sealant is white. I would like to cover it with a brick red paint. I have used clear sealant on that wall. Unfortunately because of some of the pitting and deterioration of the mortar, although we did extensive repointing of that mortar, I still have water penetration when a nor'easter blows. The last storm we had fried our modem. It poured down our bar onto bottles and so forth. It is not very attractive. Also that wall, the same wall I am discussing, has a chimney built into it. Whereas most of the wall is solid brick, three bricks thick, where you have the chimney you have a hollow so there is only one brick thick. Water especially penetrates through into the flue and down there and out the opening in the wall where the stove pipe used to penetrate. For reasons which are purely practical, I sealed the wall. I did so because winter was coming and I wanted to do something before we get into the regular period of harsh weather. To follow that, I would like to do an exterior paint over the white using a roller which will not necessarily penetrate into all of the mortar joints. Hopefully, the white will still be somewhat visible giving you kind of an effect as if there was still mortar but the bricks will be red. I would also like to put wood shutters which I have collected over the last year. They are wood shutters from the Victorian period which is the same period as the building. They would be on the second floor front facing windows and the window that I blocked up to give the appearance of a window but it will be closed and then do a faux painting of the trim around the sill and the window. They would be painted dark green which matches the shop fronts downstairs like the first story of the restaurant. Then I would like to replace a torn and blackened vinyl gray awning that is over the opening of the doorway of the brewery itself. It is at 19 Main Street. It will be a dark green fabric awning which will also match the front of the main part of the building. So I would be repainting side of the building, adding second story non-functioning but original wood style shutters, and then an awning. I believe you have a picture of the building from the early 1900's which shows the original shutters that were in place.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – I would like to add something, Mr. Chairman. I think you were also going to paint the awning over the window at 19 Main Street.

Mr. Duncan – Yes sir that is correct. There is an aluminum awning over the window of the 1953 structure of the brewery. It is aluminum and structurally sound. I would like to keep it but paint it the matching dark green. The awning over the front doorway, the awning over the window, the shop fronts, and the upstairs shutters will all be the same dark green.

Chairman Ealy – Are there any comments or questions?

Ms. Hillegass – Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to approve as presented.

Mr. Hess – Second.

Chairman Ealy – A motion has been made and properly seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Chairman Ealy voted aye, Vice Chairman Gwaltney voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Hess voted aye, Mr. Yeaw voted aye, and Mr. Prevatte voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Ealy – Thank you sir. Next we have Approval of the October 20th, 2015 Meeting Minutes.

Town Attorney – Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the minutes. I made some minor corrections and revisions and would recommend the minutes be approved as revised and corrected.

Vice Chairman Gwaltney – So moved.

Mr. Hess – Second.

Chairman Ealy – A motion has been made and properly seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Chairman Ealy voted aye, Vice Chairman Gwaltney voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Hess voted aye, Mr. Yeaw voted aye, and Mr. Prevatte voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Ealy – Is there any other business? We are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Roger Ealy
Chairman

Mr. William G. Saunders IV
Planning and Zoning Administrator