

RIVER DISTRICT DESIGN COMMISSION

MEETING OF

May 14, 2015

Members Present

Peyton Keesee
George Davis
Sheri Chaney
John Ranson
R.J. Lackey
Courtney Nicholas

Members Absent

Justin Ferrell

Staff

Ken Gillie
Shanta Hairston
Scott Holtry
Clarke Whitfield
Corrie Teague

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete upfit to current to accommodate 14 apartments and 3 retail spaces at 326 Main Street. Work includes new walls, windows, skylights and floors, as well as exterior removal of non-historic facade.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Ms. Corrie Teague from the Economic Department for the City of Danville.

Ms. Teague stated I am Corrie Teague from the Danville office of Economic Development. I just want to explain what you see in the diagrams. 326 Main Street is what we know as the Wise Hundley building but is now called Pace on Main. The developer is now converting it to 14 residential units and three retail spaces. The first page shows you what the renovated storefront or front façade would look like. Of course this is a Historic Parks Project so all of their drawings and plans have been approved by DHR and parks service, so all of it would be historically relevant to the building. On the top floor there are not original windows to the building so they will be replaced with windows that are similar to the second floor. They are refurbishing the second floor windows. On the front floor, the main floor where the storefront windows are as you can tell they've removed quite a bit of that storefront during construction, but they do plan to replace it with something similar aluminum and glass retail store frontage and then the glasswork detail above the doors will be restored similar to this look of the building. The second page is the rear of the building which is not seen from street level. You actually

have to go down to the alleyway in the rear to access the building. This is the residential entrance so they do plan to restore windows and add doors for the residential entry.

Mr. Lackey entered the meeting at 4:04 pm.

Mrs. Chaney asked just curious where are they going to put parking for all these 14 apartments?

Ms. Teague stated they actually have an agreement with First State Bank so all the residential access is through the rear. It's about half of a block away from the entrance.

Mr. Ranson asked were the photos of the original building based off the drawings?

Ms. Teague stated I believe they based it off the historic drawings.

Mr. Lackey stated it looks like the front.

Ms. Teague stated that is the front.

Mr. Davis stated it says specifically 326 Main Street. There are three different entrances. Does it encompass all three?

Ms. Teague stated it encompasses all three. I believe they are predesignating the address number to 326. So then it will be A, B, and C for commercial use and it will have certain suite numbers for the upper floors.

Mr. Lackey asked and there's no access on Main Street for the residential is that what I heard?

Ms. Teague stated that is correct.

Mr. Lackey asked so the residential is going to be 326 and the commercial will be 324 or 328?

Ms. Teague stated the commercial will be 326 A, B, C from my understanding and then you'll have 326 for the rest that go upstairs.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

Mr. Lackey stated I have a question. We do worry about the changing of paint colors at times; with this new construction when paint is not designated is that something that you all have designated?

Ms. Teague stated actually looking back at my notes from the contractor and we were talking about the façade and the cast iron façade. So from my understanding it's an existing cast iron we painted one color. It could be white. Then the missing cast iron would be replaced.

Mr. Lackey stated I just asked question for procedure, not on this specific issue. Should staff or should we be requesting designated colors? I think we should try to keep a unified look and it wasn't on their application. I'm just curious if we should have that protocol.

Mr. Gillie stated we can ask that question of applicants. Again I usually don't think of colors because I'm color blind. I'll be sure to put a note to ask people for colors. It's not high on my priority, but I'll make sure it gets covered from now on.

Mrs. Chaney stated I would assume since this one has the historic tax credit that would have already been processed through them as well.

Mr. Gillie stated yes they have to take care of that.

2. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish portions and expand 202 Boatwright Ave. The work includes renovations to the parking lot on site, as well as brick additions to the existing structure.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Mrs. Lauren Mohart.

Mrs. Mohart stated my name is Lauren Mohart. I really just wanted to be here in case you guys had any questions you need answered. I think you guys have seen the site plans. The addition will match the existing. The existing building is 6,700 square feet and we're adding 3,000 square feet on to that so the total will be 9,700 square feet. We'll be redoing the parking lot layout as you can see from the submittal. We'll be reducing that total number of bricking spaces on our side and then like you see on the following proposal, the adding brick across the street from the center as well to make up for the lack.

Mr. Davis stated so for right now we just concentrate on the building itself. I am interested in where it says demolishing portions of the building.

Mrs. Mohart stated it's really a small portion that's getting demolished. We didn't send drawings because it would be cumbersome for you, but it's really just a small little section that's getting removed to then create an expansion in a similar area. The footprint will look almost identical to the way it is except for the addition you see on your site plan.

Mr. Ranson asked are you going to do anything to those trees in the parking lot?

Mrs. Mohart stated it would be minimal. The survey I believe it would be more kind of cleaning them up so we could get a retaining wall that we've got on the site plan and to get the dumpsters back on the enclosed area.

Mr. Ranson stated it looks like a couple of nice sized trees.

Mrs. Mohart stated our intention is that it will be maybe one, but I don't think it would be dramatic just to get that drive in because they have a pretty large truck that comes in that parking lot that comes in to deliver and take out what's been donated so this would help circulation for that. For that second drive in there would be a one way. There would be a very small effect on those existing trees coming down the hill.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Chaney made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

3. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a parking lot across from the facility at 202 Boatwright Ave on Patton Street. This parking is to be constructed on parcel ID#s 20688, 25414, 20439, & 25287 on Patton Street.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request is Mrs. Lauren Mohart.

Mr. Davis stated I just have a question. That is mostly the area right across the street where they used to have multiple housing and tore all of that down?

Mrs. Mohart stated yes. That's a separate engineering firm that's doing that work, however it is in conjunction with the additions we are doing to the building itself.

Mr. Gillie asked do you remember when the houses were torn down you asked to make sure anything came back so we were making sure the parking lot came back.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mrs. Nicholas seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

4. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new wall signage at 312 Main Street. The signage will be for Bobby Carlsen Photography, Inc.*

Mrs. Nicholas exited the meeting at 4:15 pm.

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis asked are there any questions that Mr. Gillie or our wonderful staff can answer?

Mr. Lackey asked is this an application for the installation of one sign or two signs?

Ms. Teague stated two.

Mr. Gillie stated we'll issue one permit and have both of them on it so that's why we only listed it as one. It's for the BC top and the other.

Mrs. Chaney stated I have a question. Since you're putting in stairs to access in, does that mean it's going to access any others?

Ms. Teague stated yes.

Mr. Lackey stated I'm glad you asked this question because that's where I was headed. There's going to be signage availability for the tenants on the second floor is that what you're thinking?

Ms. Teague stated from my understanding in working with Renee- she calculated the signage square footing of each building- but he's not taking up what's left of available signage. So whoever goes on the three tenths side will have the certain amount of square footage that they would be working with.

Mr. Keese asked so is that two floors Corrie above the base floor?

Ms. Teague stated yes.

Mrs. Chaney asked and he's taking both of them?

Ms. Teague stated yes.

Mr. Keese asked and this entrance is through the old atrium is that correct?

Ms. Teague stated it would be through 310. It's the wood door. The original entrance where Chestnut Lane is.

Mr. Lackey asked you know Dell'Anno's? That's what they've done between Chestnut Lane and Village's.

Mrs. Chaney stated you have to go in to the door at Chestnut Lane.

Mr. Lackey stated not anymore. They fixed it. I'll ask Kenny instead of the good staff. One of our tasks is to keep up with the historic nature of the area. Staff believes that giant BC is keeping with the historic nature of the area?

Mr. Gillie stated if you look next door, we didn't feel it was any more detrimental than what that is. I know that's the name of the building but it's still fitting that kind of same period type so no we didn't feel it was detrimental.

Mr. Keesee asked so when are these people talking about moving in Ken?

Ms. Teague stated there's still construction on the second and third floor so this summer.

Mr. Gillie stated about a month or two or so at least.

Mr. Lackey stated my personal opinion is I don't believe that BC fits the historic nature and relative age of the River District.

Mr. Keesee asked but you're okay with the bottom for Bobby Carlsen?

Mr. Lackey stated I believe the bottom looks nice.

Mrs. Chaney stated I know he's taking both floors but what if he comes back and says I only want the bottom floor and I want to rent out the second floor, then you're going to see it taken down.

Ms. Teague stated he's in a long term lease so it'll be alright.

Mr. Lackey asked is molded plastic keeping with the historic nature of those buildings?

Mr. Gillie stated with the painting over top it's a material that most of the buildings are going to. You won't really notice. It's not the real plastic looking thing. Our architect could probably talk more about the materials going up but no you don't really notice the difference.

Mr. Keesee asked it's not going to be lit is it?

Mr. Gillie stated no. If you don't like the BC, you guys can vote for part of it and not the other part.

Mr. Lackey made a motion to approve the request for signage on the second floor, but not on the third floor. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion failed by a 2-3 vote.

Mr. Davis stated he does have the BC in the sign on the second floor.

Mr. Keesee stated the same thing goes up, it just gets bigger. I have a question. Do you think this will be a game changer for Bobby Carlsen in terms of not doing the sign at the top?

Ms. Teague stated I don't think he would be happy if that were taken off. I think that was a part of the appeal of the building especially with not having a storefront on Main Street.

Mr. Lackey stated to me it doesn't comply with something you would see in the River District at the period time. It's supposed to be appropriate for the style and character of the building.

Mr. Ranson stated it's sort of jarring. I don't know what the procedure is and I'm sure Mr. Carlsen could come back and be here to explain it.

Ms. Teague stated also keep in mind this is his logo and his brand identity. We can't ask for him to change his logo; he's had this ever since he opened.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 3-2 vote.

5. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a portion of 549 High Street to secure the building from further structural failure.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

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

Mr. Rigney stated I'm Jerry Rigney with the Inspections Division. I'm here to answer questions.

Mr. Ranson asked is this just a natural occurrence?

Mr. Rigney stated sort of.

Mr. Ranson asked is it due to exposure from the weather or something?

Mr. Rigney stated yes it's deterioration from over the years is from leakage and weather. It's unable to stand on its own two feet and collapsed in. We do have a developer renovating the right hand side of the building. There's two buildings. He wants to put in upscale apartments. The left side we will take down and level. The red line will be absolutely great; the white line will be the line that we have to come down to the stable part of construction. Parking would be in that part of building.

Mrs. Chaney asked so it would be just a façade basically and have parking inside of it?

Mr. Rigney stated yes. The property entered from this side and may if possible be exited from the back side.

Mrs. Chaney stated so it's just the walls, no ceiling.

Mr. Lackey asked can you clarify what happened to this building due to natural occurrences?

Mr. Rigney stated well it leaked for many years.

Mr. Lackey asked who owns it now?

Mr. Rigney stated Danville Redevelopment and Housing Authority owns it now.

Mr. Lackey asked how long have they owned it?

Mr. Rigney stated good question. Maybe six months to a year.

Mr. Lackey asked do you know who owned it before?

Mr. Rigney stated yes, Mr. Cooke.

Mr. Keese asked what was that building before? I can't hardly read the sign on it.

Mr. Rigney stated it was Schewel's Furniture warehouse at one time.

Mr. Keese asked so you're going to take the left side off and put a wall up? You said it's two buildings but I can't see that.

Mr. Rigney say the building that you're facing, the sign on front actually goes down Floyd Street. The parking spacing on High Street is the parking he's trying to get taken down to a certain level.

Mr. Ranson asked so if we approve the motion, they're just going to take it down to the red line?

Mr. Rigney stated if it's still safe at that point.

Mr. Ranson stated potentially it could go over the white line if you feel it's unstable?

Mr. Rigney stated we feel like it's more to the white line essentially because it's a lot of structural damage on that particular corner. Once you start taking the top off, it's probably going to collapse anyway.

Mr. Ranson stated I assume the desire is to keep everything above the red line because if you take it to the white line, you won't have much left.

Mr. Rigney stated that's correct but stability over top the red line would have to be reinforced structurally to hold it.

Mr. Keesee asked really the truth is the white line is where you're going to?

Mr. Rigney stated there are severe cracks all the way in it.

Mr. Davis asked are they going down to the white line simply because they don't think anything would pass here if we said just take the whole building down? I wouldn't buy it today. I can't believe any of it is still standing.

Mr. Rigney stated tax credits. For the tax credit process they want us to leave up as much as possible if it's safe.

Mrs. Chaney asked but they're going to have to alter the exterior to do the entrance so they're going to be basically enlarging one of the doorways to create the entrance into the parking area?

Mr. Rigney stated right. We will come back with the design.

Mrs. Chaney stated if you leave up that wall, you've got protected parking for those apartments.

Mr. Davis asked what kind of protection would they be if it's just a façade?

Mrs. Chaney stated basically like a fenced parking lot. It's just brick all the way around.

Mr. Lackey stated protected from those passersby.

Mr. Ranson stated I've seen this done many times. They can reinforce it from the back so it won't be dangerous.

Mr. Davis stated I'm all for it but the cost to me of supporting that one front wall.

Mr. Ranson stated it goes back to tax credits. So yay tax credits.

Mrs. Chaney stated otherwise you'd be paying for it out of your pocket or the City's pocket or whatever.

Present on behalf of the request was Mr. Ken Larking, Deputy City Manager for the City of Danville.

Mr. Larking stated I'm Ken Larking, the Deputy City Manager. I can add a little bit of background to this. Both buildings at Five Forks Intersection were slated for demolition by the previous owner, but we worked out something where we could possibly save it. So the City is working with the Housing Authority to save a portion of the building

instead of demolish all of it. Unfortunately that does mean the part that's half collapsed has to go anyway, but we're doing the best we can to save buildings in the River District. This is very close to having to be a total loss. We're just hoping to be able to move forward with that.

Mrs. Chaney asked the tax credits are on the whole building, not just the part that's being demolished.

Mr. Larking stated my understanding is that tax credits will be applied on the other building.

Mrs. Chaney stated the building with the apartments.

Mr. Larking stated they may go across both spaces but the ownership will transfer after this demolition is complete.

Mr. Davis asked and the better building is at least substantial enough where it can be saved?

Mr. Larking stated it can be saved. Now in a month or two months or three months that may change, but right now it can be.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

6. *A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install banners along Main and Craghead Streets using the new River District Logo and color scheme.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of this request was Ms. Corrie Teague from the Economic Development Department of the City of Danville.

Ms. Teague stated as you may know on May 1st we launched the new brand for the River District and of course the new logo is on the new Davis Water Tower down on Craghead Street. As part of that we would like to continue to implement the brand throughout the River District including banners along Craghead Street and Main Street. So this goes along with the logo, the color scheme, and the recommendations from our consultant. They are made of vinyl versus the umbrella type of fabric but they are just as durable and you can get those exact colors that were recommended by the consultant.

Mrs. Chaney asked will these stay up permanently or are they temporary?

Ms. Teague stated they are not temporary but they will be taken down depending on holidays.

Mr. Davis asked did I not notice some already up on Craghead?

Mr. Gillie stated maybe.

Ms. Teague stated we're trying to give you just a visual.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lackey stated you said those would be taken down seasonally. Do those banners have to come before us as well?

Mr. Gillie stated the seasonal don't. Like Averett came for permission for their homecoming, but you gave them permission for every year. The seasonal ones don't have to come back. These are new so yes, but as they come down and we put others up unless it's a company or something putting something new up then those may have to come back. It just depends on the situation for the banners.

Ms. Teague stated I believe they put up American flag banners for Memorial Day.

Mr. Keesee asked how many of those are you putting up?

Ms. Teague stated I think there are somewhere between 36 and 42 due to the banner brackets that are on the poles.

Mr. Keesee made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mrs. Chaney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

- 7. A request has been filed for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a concrete patio to the side of 610 Craghead Street.*

Mr. Davis opened the Public Hearing.

Present on behalf of the request was Ron Port with Rehab Builders.

Mr. Keesee stated tell me where that building is.

Mr. Port stated it's at 610 Craghead across from the Community Market; straight across from the parking lot.

Mr. Keesee stated you mean the one with all the construction going on.

Mr. Davis asked of the 20 foot area in between 610 Craghead and 618 Craghead, how much area will this concrete cover?

Mr. Port stated eight foot out from the building and 52 foot long.

Mr. Davis stated it'll still be approximately 12 feet open beside that area.

Mr. Port stated that's correct and it'll be a one way drive coming down.

Mr. Ranson asked is this going to be a restaurant?

Ms. Teague stated perhaps. We're working with a prospect for that.

Mr. Davis Closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Davis read a statement expressing a conflict of interest in this item; therefore, he would not be voting.

Mr. Lackey made a motion to approve the request as submitted. Mr. Keesee seconded the motion. Mr. Davis read a statement abstaining from voting due to a conflict of interest on the property. The motion was approved by a 4-0-1 vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The April 9, 2015 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Gillie informed the Commission that there will be cases on the agenda next month.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Approved By: