

APPROVED MINUTES

JOINT MEETING of the STATE REVIEW BOARD and HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

10:00 a. m. December 10, 2015

Halsey Lecture Hall, Virginia Historical Society, 428 N. Boulevard, Richmond, VA 23221

State Review Board Members Present

Dr. Elizabeth Moore, Chair
Dr. Laurant Lee, Vice-Chair
Dr. Sara Bon-Harper
Joseph D. Lahendro
Dr. Carl Lounsbury
John Salmon

Historic Resources Board Members Present

H. Edward “Chip” Mann, Chair
Clyde Paul Smith, Vice-Chair
Ashley Atkins-Spivey
Eleanor Weston Brown
Drew Gruber
Terri Hauser
Margaret T. Peters

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

Julie Langan, Director
David Edwards
Marc Wagner
Melina Bezirdjian
Michael Pulice
Elizabeth Lipford
Crystal Castleberry

Stephanie Williams, Deputy Director
Aubrey Von Lindern
Jennifer Pullen
Lena Sweeten McDonald
Jen Loux
Blake McDonald

Guests present (from sign-in sheet) – Anne Stuart Beckett (Natural Bridge Historic District); Norman Burns (William Byrd Park); Kim Chen (City of Richmond); Rosemary Green (William Byrd Park); Mary Ruffin Hanbury (Riverside Farm); Davyd Foard Hood (Jerman Residence); Bobby Junes (William Byrd Park); Debra McClane (Carillon Neighborhood Historic District; William Byrd Park); Larry Miller (William Byrd Park); Elizabeth O’Leary (Carillon Neighborhood Historic District); Marcus Pollard (Talbot Hall); Turk Sties (William Byrd Park)

Guests from State Agencies – Catherine Ayres (Office of the Attorney General); Ryan Ramirez (Department of Planning and Budget)

Historic Resources Board (HRB)

Chair H. Edward “Chip” Mann called the HRB meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and welcomed everyone in attendance. Chair Mann explained the role of the HRB and invited the HRB members to introduce themselves. He then presented the September 17, 2015, meeting minutes and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Peters requested a correction to the minutes regarding her recusal from discussion about the Rockland Rural Historic District, for which she co-authored the nomination. Ms. McDonald explained to the Board members where this correction had been made (page 3 of the September 17, 2015, minutes, under the Comments Made heading for the Rockland Rural Historic District presentation). With a motion from Vice-Chair Smith and a second from Mr. Gruber, the HRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

State Review Board (SRB)

Chair Elizabeth Moore called the SRB meeting to order and explained the role of the SRB and the process of designation, and invited the SRB members to introduce themselves. She then presented the September 17, 2015, meeting minutes and requested a motion to approve the minutes. With a motion from Dr. Bon-Harper and a second from Vice-Chair Lee, the SRB voted unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

Director’s Report (DHR)

Director Langan welcomed everyone and thanked the Board members for their service. She explained her report would be brief in light of today’s heavy agenda. She recognized the presence of Catherine Ayres of the Office of the Attorney General and Ryan Ramirez of the Department of Planning and Budget, and introduced DHR staff members Crystal Castleberry, Blake McDonald, and Elizabeth Lipford. She asked Board members to contact DHR staff if they need assistance with the Statement of Economic Interest. Director Langan announced that Vice-Chair Laurant Lee is retiring from the SRB as she has recently been appointed to the board of the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities. She invited the Board members to make suggestions for new appointees to the SRB. She reminded Board members of the Virginia Legislative Reception and the Board Training day, both of which are scheduled to take place in February 2016. Director Langan stated DHR does not have any updates to report regarding the budget. The General Assembly session will begin January 13, 2016. DHR has no legislation that will be introduced concerning this agency, but will be monitoring legislation that could affect historic preservation in general in Virginia. At the federal level, legislation has been created to reauthorize the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and reform the federal tax credit program. Director Langan invited the Board members to

contact Virginia's congressional delegation about signing on to sponsor these bills. Virginia once again ranked first in the country for the number of tax credit projects completed in FFY 2014-2015. DHR completed its comprehensive plan update on schedule.

Director Langan yielded the floor to Vice-Chair Smith, who informed the Boards about his involvement in efforts to preserve underwater archaeological resources in Virginia. A group has been formed and met yesterday in Newport News. Reports on future progress will be made to the Boards.

Chair Mann noted that Director Langan has been appointed by President Obama to the Captain John Smith National Historic Trail's advisory board.

Vice-Chair Lee spoke about her service on the SRB and thanked everyone she has worked with over the years. She offered her assistance to future DHR projects.

Chair Moore read a resolution recognizing Vice-Chair Lee's contributions to the SRB, DHR, and the Commonwealth, and the resolution's reading was followed with a round of applause.

Deputy Director Williams provided the Boards with an update on the emergency state regulations that govern the property owner objection process for nominations to the Virginia Landmarks Register. She noted the emergency regulations went into effect in September 2015, while the permanent regulations are working their way through the approval process. The Department of Planning and Budget currently is conducting an economic impact analysis of the regulations, and then the regulations will proceed to the Governor's office.

NOMINATIONS

Chair Mann explained that the nominations will be presented in a block and that, if there are no issues with any of the nominations, the Boards will vote on them as a group at the end of the presentations.

Eastern Region.....presented by Marc Wagner

- 1. Jerman Residence, City of Richmond, #127-6736, Criterion C
- 2. Byrd Park Court Historic District, City of Richmond, #127-6755, Criterion C

Comments made:

Davyd Foard Hood, author of the Jerman Residence nomination, thanked the Boards and noted he is pleased to have worked in Virginia again. Claiborne Johnston, owner of the Jerman Residence, thanked City of Richmond staff member Kimberly Chen and DHR staff for their assistance with the nomination.

The Board members had no questions for these two nominations.

Eastern Region.....presented by Debra McClane

- 1. William Byrd Park Historic District, City of Richmond, #127-6067, Criteria A, B, and C
- 2. Carillon Neighborhood Historic District, City of Richmond, #127-6756, Criteria A and C, Criteria Consideration G

Comments made:

Ms. McClane introduced Mr. Turk Sties, president of the Friends of William Byrd Park, which provided extensive support for the William Byrd Park Historic District nomination. The Board members had no questions about the William Byrd Park Historic District nomination.

Ms. McClane introduced Elizabeth O'Leary, co-author of the Carillon Neighborhood Historic District nomination, and noted the support of the Carillon Civic Association for the nomination. Ms. O'Leary said it was a privilege to tell the neighborhood's story and thanked Ms. McClane for the architectural survey.

Chair Mann asked if the three historic districts in Richmond that are being nominated today are contiguous and, if so, why they would not have been placed under the same nomination. Mr. Wagner said that the three areas are thematically diverse and do not have overlapping areas of significance. Chair Mann asked if Byrd Park Terrace residents are interested in a historic district nomination and Mr. Wagner said some discussions have taken place. Ms. McClane noted that she searched for nominations of neighborhoods that actively integrated as the Carillon Neighborhood did but could find no comparable examples in Virginia.

Norman Burns, executive director of Maymont Foundation, spoke in support of all three of the historic district nominations for Richmond, and noted his organization would be happy to see their properties in the Byrd Park Terrace neighborhood included in a historic district there.

Bobby Tunes spoke in support of the three Richmond historic district nominations and asked if the boundaries shown on the maps presented this morning will accompany each nomination. Mr. Wagner said yes.

Bill Loudoun spoke in support of the William Byrd Park Historic District nomination, and thanked Mr. Wagner, Ms. McClane, City of Richmond staff, and DHR staff for seeing the nomination through to completion.

Kimberly Chen, senior preservation planner for the City of Richmond, spoke in support of the four nominations of Richmond properties (one dwelling and three historic districts) that were presented this morning.

Parker Agelasto, Richmond City Council member, spoke in support of the three historic district nominations, all of which are included in the district he represents.

The Board members had no questions about the Carillon Neighborhood Historic District nomination.

Eastern Region.....presented by Marcus Pollard

- 1. Talbot Hall, City of Norfolk, #122-0030, Criterion C

Comments made:

Vice-Chair Smith asked about the property’s current use. Mr. Pollard said it is currently vacant, but is planned to be rehabilitated, eased with a preservation easement, and then sold for use as a residence.

Mr. Wagner noted that the consultant scheduled to present the Dancing Point nomination has not yet arrived. The Boards agreed to move this nomination to the end of the nomination agenda.

Northern Region.....presented by Aubrey Von Lindern

- 1. Ben Venue Rural Historic District, Rappahannock County, #078-5141, Criteria A and C
- 2. Oakham Farm, Loudoun County, #053-0091, Criteria A and C
- 3. Oakwood, Fauquier County, #030-0083, Criteria A and C

Comments made:

Regarding the Oakham Farm nomination, Chair Moore asked about the sequence of construction on the primary dwelling. Ms. Von Lindern explained how architectural evidence was used to establish the sequence described in the nomination. Mr. Lahendro asked about plans for the currently vacant Oakham Farm. Ms. Von Lindern said it has recently been purchased with plans to rehabilitate the buildings using historic tax credits.

Regarding the Ben Venue Rural Historic District nomination, Ms. Hauser asked about the property owner objection letter that was received. She asked about the percentage of the historic district that is owned by the objecting owner. Ms. Von Lindern said the owner has the second-largest parcel within the historic district, and although she has objected to the nomination, she also has asked for more information about her property to be included in the nomination. Using a map of the historic district, Ms. Von Lindern showed the Board members where the two largest parcels within the district are located. Ms. Hauser asked if the objecting owner’s requested corrections to the maps have been made and Ms. McDonald said yes, and explained that the owner had requested two of her private roads to be labeled as such in the nomination and on maps. Vice-Chair Smith asked if a letter of objection stands if DHR staff have addressed the reason for the objection. Ms. McDonald explained that the objection stands unless the property owner withdraws the objection. Vice-Chair Smith asked if the property will remain in the historic district despite the objection and Chair Moore said yes, if the Boards approve the nomination as presented.

Western Region.....presented by Michael Pulice

- 1. Riverside Farm, Nelson County, #062-0096, Criterion C

Comments made:

The Boards had no questions about the Riverside Farm nomination.

Catherine Ayres reminded everyone that the Board members’ microphones are on and a recorder operates continuously during the meeting to record the proceedings.

Western Region.....presented by Anne Stuart Beckett

- 1. Natural Bridge Historic District, Rockbridge County, #081-7147, Criteria A and C

Chair Moore asked if the Natural Bridge Historic District’s period of significance begins in 1700. Ms. Beckett said this is the date provided in the Natural Bridge NHL nomination. Chair Moore asked for an explanation of the period of significance being based on the NHL nomination to be included in the nomination.

Eastern Region.....presented by Bryan Clark Green

- 1. Dancing Point, Charles City County, #018-5108, Criteria A, C, and D, Criteria Consideration G

Comments made:

Mr. Green introduced the property owners of Dancing Point, Betty and Bruce Howard. Vice-Chair Smith thanked Mr. Green for his enthusiasm for the project. Chair Mann asked the property owners to stand for a round of applause. The Boards had no questions about the Dancing Point nomination.

Chair Mann asked for a motion to approve the following nominations as presented: Jerman Residence, City of Richmond; Byrd Park Court Historic District, City of Richmond; William Byrd Park Historic District, City of Richmond; Carillon Neighborhood Historic District, City of Richmond; Talbot Hall, City of Norfolk; Ben Venue Rural Historic District, Rappahannock County; Oakham Farm, Loudoun County; Oakwood, Fauquier County; Riverside Farm, Nelson County; Natural Bridge Historic District, Rockbridge County; Dancing Point, Charles City County. With a motion from Ms. Hauser and a second from Ms. Atkins, the HRB voted unanimously to approve both nominations.

Chair Moore asked for a motion to approve the nominations as presented. With a motion from Dr. Lounsbury and a second from Mr. Lahendro, the SRB voted unanimously to approve both nominations.

Vice-Chair Smith asked where Virginia stands nationally in terms of listings in the National Register. Director Langan said Virginia is always among the leaders. Vice-Chair Smith commended the DHR staff for their work on the program.

Ms. Hauser mentioned that the City of Alexandria is eager to host the joint Board meeting in June 2016.

Director Langan announced that the Quail Haven item on this afternoon’s Easement agenda for the HRB will be postponed, and directed the members of both Boards to the facilities for their lunch break. Chair Moore noted that the SRB will have a working lunch due to several members’ schedule commitments later in the afternoon.

Director Langan noted that David Edwards will be recognized at DHR’s staff plenary tomorrow for his 30 years of service to DHR.

Chair Mann stated that the HRB will reconvene at 12:50 p.m.

The joint meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Register Summary of Resources Listed: Historic Districts: 5
Buildings: 6
Structures: 0
Sites: 0
Objects: 0
MPDs: 0

AFTERNOON SESSION

HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

Halsey Lecture Hall, Virginia Historical Society, 428 N. Boulevard, Richmond, VA 23221

Historic Resources Board Members Present

- H. Edward “Chip” Mann, Chair
- Clyde Paul Smith, Vice-Chair
- Ashley Atkins-Spivey
- Eleanor Weston Brown
- Drew Gruber
- Terri Hauser
- Margaret Peters

Department of Historic Resources (DHR) Staff Present

- Director Julie Langan
- Deputy-Director Stephanie Williams
- Gillian Bearns
- Joanna Wilson Green
- Jennifer Loux
- Megan Melinat
- Jennifer Pullen

Other State Agency Staff present: Catherine Ayres (Office of the Attorney General)

Guests present: Tom Gilmore (Civil War Trust); Alice Higgins (sponsor Surry Lumber Company and Surry, Sussex & Southampton Railway highway markers); Faye Sobel (sponsor of Somerton Friends Meeting highway marker)

C. Edward Mann, Chair, reconvened the Board meeting at 12:51 pm. Chair Mann explained the role of the Historic Resources Board and asked each member to introduce themselves. C. Smith-Vice Chair, A. Atkins-Spivey, M. Peters, D. Gruber, C. Mann-Chair, T. Hauser, and E. Weston Brown composed the Historic Resources Board (the “Board” or “HRB”). All seven members of the Board were present.

HIGHWAY MARKERS

J. Loux, Highway Marker Historian, introduced herself to the Board, and asked that the Board consider the first nine (9) markers en bloc and then consider the one (1) replacement marker, which she presented as follows:

Sponsor Markers – Diversity

1. **Lucile Barrow Turner** (1895 – 1979)
Sponsor: Jane Baber White
Locality: Lynchburg
Proposed Location: 1312 Commerce St.
2. **Beulah Baptist Church**
Sponsor: Beulah Baptist Church
Locality: Alexandria
Proposed Location: 320 South Washington St.
3. **The Rev. Paymus Nutt** (ca. 1817-ca. 1899)
Sponsor: Commemorative Committee for Rev. Paymus Nutt
Locality: Northumberland County
Proposed Location: Route 360 near Callao at eastern entrance to Owltown Road

Sponsor Markers

1. **Surry Lumber Company**
Sponsor: Dendron Historical Society
Locality: Surry County
Proposed Location: SR 31, Dendron
2. **Surry, Sussex & Southampton Railway**
Sponsor: Dendron Historical Society
Locality: Surry County
Proposed Location: SR 31, Dendron
3. **Konnarock Training School** (1924-1959)
Sponsor: Konnarock Retreat House
Locality: Smyth County
Proposed Location: approx. 300 feet from intersection of VA highway 600 (Whitetop Road) and Route 603
4. **Kerr’s Creek**
Sponsor: Blue Ridge Committee, National Society of The Colonial Dames in Virginia
Locality: Rockbridge County
Proposed Location: Intersection of SR 623, SR 850, and US 60
5. **Somerton Friends Meeting**
Sponsor: Somerton Meeting
Locality: Suffolk
Proposed Location: 3801 Holland Road, Suffolk
6. **Col. Samuel L. Slover** (1872-1959)
Sponsor: Norfolk Historical Society

Locality: City of Norfolk
Proposed Location: 236 E. Plume Street

Replacement Markers (Sponsor-funded)

- 1. The Battle of Williamsburg**
Sponsor: Williamsburg Battlefield Association
Locality: James City County
Proposed Location: 6945 Pocahontas Trail

Chair Mann asked for a motion for the 9 new markers.
T. Hauser made a motion to approve the 9 new markers en bloc as presented.
The motion was seconded by M. Peters.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0

Chair Mann asked for a motion for the replacement marker.
Vice-Chair Smith asked D. Gruber if he intended to abstain from voting on the replacement marker. D. Gruber responded that he did.
Chair Mann noted that D. Gruber would be abstaining.
Vice-Chair Smith made a motion to approve the one replacement marker as presented.
That motion was seconded by M. Peters.
Yeas: 6
Nays: 0
Abstention: 1

Update on Marker Retirements

J. Loux presented three (3) markers for retirement:

- 1. V-17** -- Destroyed in a motor vehicle accident. There was no accident report filed.
- 2. Z-162** -- Dates to 1929 and is suffering from cracks and significant rust damage. The text is not very informative and does not meet current standards.
- 3. Z-163** -- Dates to [1929] and is also suffering from cracks and significant rust damage. The text is not very informative and does not meet current standards.

Vice-Chair Smith inquired about the status of the question he raised at the September meeting regarding possibly increasing the cost of the markers to help offset the cost of repairs.

J. Langan responded that there were concerns about the cost becoming burdensome for some applicants. She noted, however, that VDOT has identified an additional source of funding to replace these retired markers. Director Langan indicated that they did not yet have an exact amount of money but that she would be able to provide the actual dollar figure at the next scheduled meeting.

Marker Conditional Donation Policy

J. Loux explained that here are three aspects: the actual policy, the application form and the agreement to be executed by the parties. She noted that the policy would be framed as a conditional donation rather than a loan. There is one remaining procedural item, which is to determine whether the organization seeking a retired marker would merely need to qualify under the Department of General Services' standards for the receipt of surplus state property or would need to apply and be entered into the statewide database as an entity authorized to receive state surplus. The condition requiring that the organization have an indoor facility in which to display the retired marker has been revised to allow for temporary exhibition outdoors, such as at an outdoor public event.

A. Atkins-Spivey asked what the procedure would be in the event that they received multiple applications for the same retired marker, and what criteria would be considered.

J. Loux responded that they would consider the applicants in the order in which they received their applications and then determine which of the applicants actually met all of the criteria. She indicated that it is likely that many organizations will not qualify.

A. Atkins-Spivey asked how groups would be notified that a marker had been retired.

J. Loux noted that she is often contacted when a marker is damaged or removed. She would also contact local groups. VDOT will store the marker for 60 days. DHR also intends to issue press releases the same as is done for new markers. She also stated that it is DHR's goal to solicit local sponsors for a replacement.

E. Weston Brown asked if DHR would retain a photographic record of the retired marker.

J. Loux responded that they would.

T. Hauser inquired about whether the organization would be allowed to transfer a marker to a third party with DHR's express written consent.

J. Loux indicated that the third party would have to meet the criteria and standards established and would have to submit an application.

T. Hauser asked then if the determination of whether the third party met the criteria and standards would happen as part of the review of the application.

C. Ayres, Office of the Attorney General, indicated that a third-party transfer could be done and that the written consent would be the letter from DHR authorizing that transfer.

T. Hauser raised concerns that the six (6) week allowance for temporary removal from display of a retired marker might not be enough time due to construction delays, storage, etc.

J. Loux responded that an extension would be feasible.

C. Ayres indicated that the six weeks was not intended as a legal requirement.

G. Bearns indicated that she had suggested the six (6) week timeframe but that it would be easy enough to allow for extensions with DHR's prior written approval.

T. Hauser asked whether the application would be provided on DHR's letterhead.

J. Loux stated that it would be when finalized.

Chair Mann asked for a motion.

Vice-Chair Smith made a motion to approve the Conditional Donation Policy as presented.

The motion was seconded by T. Hauser.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

EASEMENTS

Administrative Item

G. Bearns introduced a proposed motion to authorize the Director and Deputy Director to execute deeds, agreements and other legal instruments as necessary for overhead to underground conversion utility projects on existing easement properties. T. Hauser moved to accept the motion as written and read by G. Bearns. The motion was seconded by M. Peters.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

Abstentions: 0

Easement Amendments for Consideration

1. **Quail Haven Farm, Kelly's Ford Battlefield, Culpeper County Proposed Amended Deed of Easement:**

Following receipt of an email from the property owner's agent requesting that the issue be deferred to the March 2016 Board meeting, G. Bearns requested a motion to modify the Agenda in order to reflect this request. Vice-Chair Smith moved to amend the Agenda as requested. M. Peters seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

2. **Werowocomoco, Gloucester County Proposed Amended and Restated Deed of Easement:**

E. Tune presented. T. Hauser asked whether other properties under easement with the Board are owned by the National Park Service (NPS). E. Tune replied that the U. S. Department of Justice has a waiver process that allows for the NPS to take possession of properties encumbered by easements, and that this particular situation would be our first experience with the process. She added that this process does not appear to be unusual for the NPS, however. Vice-Chair Smith asked whether the donor planned to take a tax credit on the transfer, and whether the transfer would be a donation or sale in fee. E. Tune replied that the Department understands it to be a sale in fee. T. Hauser asked whether we were comfortable with our ability to work with the federal government as property owner, and E. Tune replied that we were as we had had many such experiences in the past. M. Peters asked whether the Americans with Disabilities Act requirements would result in installation of impervious surfaces on the

property. E. Tune replied that there were previous options that met ADA requirements, and that the Department would advocate for their use. Director Langan explained the collaborative role of all interested parties as the property is developed into a public interpretive park. T. Hauser moved to approve the requested amendment. D. Gruber seconded the motion.

Yeas: 6

Nays: 0

Abstentions: 1 (A. Atkins-Spivey)

3. Green Falls, Caroline County (co-held with Virginia Outdoors Foundation) Proposed Amended Deed of Easement to add 58.12 acres:

E. Tune presented. C. Ayers stated that she had discussed the proposal extensively with Department staff and that the OAG advised acceptance of Option 1. M. Peters agreed, and further explained that she felt accepting Option 3 would imply that we agree no archaeological resources exist on the property in spite of the absence of any survey. E. Weston Brown agreed, stating that there was no advantage to Option 3 and further stating that there was no reason for the Board to proceed with the requested easement or to concur with it in any way. Chair Mann asked whether a motion was still necessary. C. Ayers replied that a statement followed by a motion was appropriate. D. Gruber moved to deny the requested amendment and recommend that the Virginia Outdoors Foundation proceed with an easement independently of the Board. A. Atkins-Spivey seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

Chair Mann left the meeting at 1:57 p.m. and returned at 2:00 p.m.

Easements for Reconsideration

1. Ashe Properties, Buckland Mills Battlefield, Prince William County Property Owner: Ashe Trust Reconsideration of proposed easement terms:

G. Bearns presented. M. Peters stated that historic districts try to avoid the “donut hole” effect, and expressed concern with what might be built in the center parcel if it was left outside of an easement. G. Bearns responded that an uneased parcel would indeed be subject only to local or county ordinances. She stated that the heirs understand the situation and are trying to find the best solution. T. Hauser stated that she initially felt as M. Peters did, but has since come to the conclusion that partial easement of the property would expand the protected battlefield by 4.3 acres. G. Bearns replied that the Board could also split the offer and vote on each individual property separately. D. Gruber asked whether anyone knew where the archaeological site of Buckland Commons was. J. Wilson Green responded that it could extend into the northwest corner of the Ashe Properties but was largely located on the parcel to the west. G. Bearns replied that the location was a map projection and that no formal survey had taken place. Vice-Chair Smith asked whether staff would be comfortable with the offer being split into two separate offers. G. Bearns replied that this was the Board’s decision. She further stated that the Board has taken easements over lots of similar size, but that this offer was still markedly different from any previous offer. D. Gruber asked about ownership and G. Bearns replied that the property was privately owned. E. Weston Brown stated that she shared concerns aired earlier in the discussion, and that the problem appeared to be a financial one for the property’s heirs. She asked whether another buyer was present, or another source of revenue to allow the initial offer of a single easement to be reinstated. G. Bearns replied that staff is unaware of any such. E. Weston Brown asked whether staff had any sense of the monetary value of the donation, and G. Bearns replied that staff did not. E. Weston Brown asked whether the lots to the right of the Ashe Properties were platted, and G. Bearns replied that they were. She also stated that, if the Board wished to accept the offers, working with a trust as Grantor would require consent from all trustees within the document. T. Hauser moved to accept the offer of an easement over Lots 1 and 2. Vice-Chair Smith seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

T. Hauser moved to accept the offer of an easement over Lots 4 and 5. D. Gruber seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

E. Tune stated that staff would continue to look for opportunities to place Lot 3 under easement.

Chair Mann called for a short recess at 2:17. The meeting resumed at 2:21.

Presentation

Steve Wyngarden, Jim Campi, Tom Gilmore, and Adam Gillenwater, all representatives from the Civil War Preservation Trust (dba Civil War Trust), presented an overview of the organization’s mission and approach to preservation of battlefield properties.

Easements for Reconsideration, Continued

2. Benchmark Tracts - Parcel 37A-4-17, Fredericksburg Battlefield, Spotsylvania County Property Owner: Under Contract to Civil War Trust Reconsideration of additional information regarding discontinuous parcel:

J. Wilson Green presented. M. Peters asked what occupied the lot in between the contiguous and discontinuous lots, and J. Wilson Green responded that it was a large church. D. Gruber asked whether the proposed term for the residential lease was consistent with similar easement terms, clarifying that the term was usually 2-3 years but that this property was unoccupied. J. Wilson Green responded that it was consistent with other such proposals. T. Hauser asked whether the Board was being asked to

vote only on the discontinuous parcel, and J. Wilson Green responded in the affirmative. M. Peters moved to accept the offer of easement as presented. A. Atkins-Spivey seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

3. Hobson Tract, Gaines Mill Battlefield, Hanover County Property Owner: Civil War Trust Reconsideration of proposed easement terms:

J. Wilson Green presented. Chair Mann asked whether access and adequate parking was included in the separate parcel, and J. Wilson Green replied that it was. D. Gruber stated that ingress/egress concerns appear to have been addressed. G. Bearns stated that the easement would still require typical public access. Chair Mann informed the Board that independent research had confirmed the presence of the 11th MS on the property during the battle. D. Gruber moved to accept the offer as presented. Vice-Chair Smith seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

4. Shiflett Tracts, Trevilian Station Battlefield, Louisa County Property Owner: Civil War Trust Reconsideration of time frame for demolition and removal of buildings and structures:

G. Bearns presented. C. Ayers asked about the termination date for the proposed residential lease. G. Bearns replied that the tenant had since decided to vacate and was in the process of moving out, and that the rehabilitation agreement would activate upon the termination of the existing lease. D. Gruber stated that the Board should remain flexible, because properties need to be viable in the long term. He stated that he was happy to consider such a request. D. Gruber moved to accept the offer as presented. M. Peters seconded.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

New Easement Offers for Consideration

1. Belroi Road LLC Lots, Adjacent to Walter Reed Birthplace, Gloucester County. Property Owner: Belroi Road, LLC
Acreage: 6.8 acres – G. Bearns presented.

M. Peters asked whether staff would retain review of any reconstructions proposed on the property, as she was concerned with the need for adequate documentation. J. Wilson Green responded that this was standard in all easement documents. G. Bearns stated that staff review was always required, and that a fairly high standard must be met in order to approve any request for reconstruction of a historic building/structure. T. Hauser moved to approve the offer as presented. M. Peters seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

2. Fairfield Foundation Lot, Adjacent to Walter Reed Birthplace, Gloucester County. Property Owner: The Fairfield Foundation
Acreage: 0.82 acre – G. Bearns presented

T. Hauser moved to approve the offer as presented. Vice Chair Smith seconded the motion.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 0

3. Hawthorne, City of Winchester. Property Owner: Howard P. and Joan L. Lewis
Acreage: 4.5 acres – J. Wilson Green presented.

T. Hauser asked what was meant by making “the exterior accessible” to the public. J. Wilson Green replied that this was intended to make the property itself publicly available without requiring public access to the interior of the house, which was a specific request from the donor following several unpleasant experiences with public visitation. D. Gruber stated that he was comfortable with removal of the “at minimum” requirement, but otherwise uncomfortable with the deviation from standard policy. E. Weston Brown stated that the current donors would not be the only owners of the property. Vice-Chair Smith stated that he was unwilling to set precedent, and moved that the offer be approved but that the requested public access revision be denied. T. Hauser seconded the motion. A. Atkins-Spivey indicated that she felt additional discussion was in order, and that she felt staff should be supported in its negotiations with the owner. M. Peters stated that staff has to be able to negotiate, as every easement is individual. G. Bearns stated that staff has deviated from standard template language in the past, when necessary. T. Hauser stated that verification of adherence to easement terms through staff monitoring seemed like adequate flexibility. Vice-Chair Smith stated that “public access” does not necessarily mean the general public. G. Bearns stated that the owners are not taking an IRS deduction for the donation, so there is no legal requirement for public access. The owners will not take a state credit either. M. Peters stated that Hawthorne is a very visible property at the entry to Winchester. D. Gruber stated that it was located across the street from the museum. D. Gruber asked whether staff had any sense of the remaining archaeological integrity of the property given the owner’s admission that relic hunters had been allowed to work there. J. Wilson Green replied that staff did not. D. Gruber stated that the Board should consider the damage done in its deliberations. E. Weston Brown asked what risks were present in the event that the Board declined this offer. G. Bearns replied that the current owners were good stewards, but that the situation could change with future ownership. A. Atkins-Spivey asked what staff recommended, and G. Bearns replied that the revised language (6 consecutive hours, 2 days

per year) was acceptable. A. Atkins-Spivey asked how the owners might respond in the event that the Board declined the offer. G. Bearns responded that she was not entirely sure, but understood that the owners had several bad experiences with public visitation in the past. Vice-Chair Smith moved to accept the offer as presented, with the requirement for access on 6 consecutive hours, 2 days per year. T. Hauser stated that she was still concerned with changing the template language but understood the need to respond to individual situations. M. Peters stated that she would abstain as she had written the National Register nomination for the property. C. Mann seconded the motion.

Yeas: 5

Nays: 1

Abstentions: 1 (M. Peters)

4. Boxerwood Nature Center and Woodland Garden, Rockbridge County. Property Owner: Boxerwood Education Association Acreage: 15.462 acres – J. Wilson Green presented
E. Weston Brown asked whether any existing liens or mortgages were present. G. Bearns responded that staff were unaware of any. E. Weston Brown asked whether the easement would restrict architectural design of future buildings and structures. G. Bearns responded that review and approval was standard easement language. A. Atkins-Spivey moved to approve the easement as presented. M Peters seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0
5. Rives Tract, McDowell Battlefield, Highland County. Property Owner: Civil War Trust Acreage: 126.49 acres – J. Wilson Green presented
T. Hauser moved to accept the easement as presented. A. Atkins-Spivey seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0
6. The Coaling, Port Republic Battlefield, Rockingham County. Property Owner: Civil War Trust Acreage: 8.55 acres – J. Wilson Green presented
D. Gruber stated that he would like to see staff reach out to the owners of the property on top of the hill. T. Hauser moved to approve the easement as presented. Vice-Chair Smith seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0
7. Thornton Tract, Tom’s Brook Battlefield, Shenandoah County. Property Owner: Civil War Trust Acreage: 7.8 acres – J. Wilson Green presented
Chair Mann asked what information staff required with regard to the “county road” referenced on the plat of survey. J. Wilson Green responded that information regarding ownership or title was necessary. T. Hauser asked staff why title work was not requested prior to easement offers being presented to the Board. G. Bearns responded that title work was not requested at all until the early 2000s. Easement policies have since been updated and the application adjusted accordingly, but that applicants have not provided this information up front. She stated that the Board could formally request the information be provided and that staff would try to obtain it. M Peters responded that she did not feel it necessary for staff to spend significant time reviewing legal documents for a property that the Board might not then accept, especially as staff brings all “red flag” issues back to the Board before the easement is finalized. G. Bearns explained the title work review process. Vice-Chair Smith asked whether the Board has declined offers based on title work, and G. Bearns replied in the affirmative. Vice-Chair Smith asked for examples, and G. Bearns replied that owners could not donate what had already been given away, as in utility easements and corridors. Vice-Chair Smith asked whether the Board had turned away properties with large utility easements, and G. Bearns replied yes. T. Gilmore (Civil War Trust) stated that such an easement might later be abandoned and that the Board’s easement might then be primary. G. Bearns clarified that the Board’s interest in easements is not insured, and informed the Board that staff now had remote access to all county land records. Vice-Chair Smith asked whether staff is happy with the current process. E. Tune responded that the more comprehensive the data we receive, the better recommendation we can provide to the Board. Chair Mann stated that perspective on a property can change during due diligence research, and that staff bring the offers to the Board as appropriate during what is a dynamic process. G. Bearns stated that staff would appreciate the Board’s support in requiring that title information be submitted early in the process. T. Hauser moved to approve the easement as presented. A. Atkins-Spivey seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0

Vice Chair Smith left the room at 4:06 p.m. and returned at 4:09 p.m.

8. Eagle Tract, Appomattox Court House Battlefield, Appomattox County. Property Owner: Under Contract to Civil War Trust Acreage: 0.59 acres – J. Wilson Green presented
T. Hauser moved to approve the easement as presented. D. Gruber seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0

New Easements Recorded since the September 2015 Meeting – J. Wilson Green presented

1. Rector Tract, Rappahannock Station I and II Battlefields & Brandy Station Battlefield, Fauquier County. Date Recorded: 11/03/15. Donor: Civil War Preservation Trust Acres: 1.7605. Grant Funding: American Battlefield Protection Program, Virginia Civil War Site Preservation Fund.
2. Historic Long Bridge Road Tract, First and Second Deep Bottom Battlefields, Henrico County. Date Recorded: 11/04/15. Donors: Mark and Karen Perreault. Acres: 3.6. Full donation.

Chair Mann asked staff how many easement offers the Board had approved that had not yet been recorded. G. Bearns explained that the number was approximately 50, all of which remain open for various reasons. Chair Mann stated that this needed to be a topic for discussion at the Board training in February 2016.

M. Peters moved to adjourn the meeting. D. Gruber seconded the motion.
Yeas: 7
Nays: 0

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

STATE REVIEW BOARD

Collections Study Room, Department of Historic Resources, 2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, VA 23221

State Review Board Members Present

- Dr. Elizabeth Moore, Chair
- Dr. Laurant Lee, Vice-Chair
- Joseph D. Lahendro
- John Salmon
- Dr. Carl Lounsbury
- Dr. Sara Bon-Harper

Department of Historic Resources Staff Present

- David Edwards
- Jim Hare
- Lena McDonald
- Melina Bezirdjian
- Mike Pulice
- Aubrey Von Lindern
- Marc Wagner
- Elizabeth Lipford

Guests (from sign-in sheet): Davyd Foard Hood; Debra McClane (Oceana Historic District); Garrett Olmsted (Archibald Thompson House/ Clyncdale); Marcus Pollard (Imperial Tobacco Warehouse; Virginia National Bank Headquarters); Tom and Susan Ryan (Slusser-Ryan Farm)

Chair Moore called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. for discussion and consideration of the Preliminary Information Applications (informal guidance session).

Preliminary Information Applications

The following proposals were *endorsed*, unless otherwise noted, with the following comments:

Northern Region.....presented by Aubrey Von Lindern

1. Belle Plaine, Madison County, #056-5043, Criteria A and C

Vice-Chair Lee asked if any descendants from the enslaved people who once lived at this property are still in the area. Ms. Von Lindern said that needs to be researched, but a local African American historical society is expected to have some information. Mr. Lahendro asked if log joists with mortise and tenon joinery are all that remains of the original log core; Ms. Von Lindern said the consultant is still analyzing the architectural evidence and some construction dates may need to be adjusted. Dr. Lounsbury said the primary dwelling looks like a ca. 1810 two-story side passage house, with no overt evidence of anything older extant; for instance, the window depths do not suggest log walls. Vice-Chair Lee recommended seeking oral history from descendants of enslaved people who once lived on the property.

2. Firestone Stables, Loudoun County, #053-5059, Criterion C

Mr. Lahendro asked how the construction date was established for the barn. Ms. Von Lindern said a date stone on the barn has this date. Mr. Lahendro asked if the outbuildings are extant, and Ms. Von Lindern said they are, in varying physical condition.

3. Key Boulevard Apartments, Arlington County, #000-2264, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked about the replacement window sash in some places, and for the nomination to include verification that these are similar to the original sash.

4. Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Orange County, #068-0417, Criterion C and Criteria Consideration A

Vice-Chair Lee asked if the church's congregation dates to the Reconstruction Era and Ms. Von Lindern said yes as it was founded in the 1870s; the church building was constructed in 1892. The cemetery associated with the church now is owned by the congregation (it previously had been owned by the person who owns a former school across the road). Mr. Lahendro asked for the nomination to address the church's interior finishes and furnishings that are historic.

5. Old Manassas Water Tower, City of Manassas, #155-0141, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro noted the tower's association with community infrastructure development and how local governments often included modern systems as part of local booster campaigns of the period. Dr. Bon Harper said the tower's connection to urban infrastructure development is important to document, as it contrasts to rural infrastructure development in smaller towns and more rural areas of Virginia.

6. Springdale, City of Winchester, #034-0103, Criterion C

Mr. Lahendro said the anecdotal evidence needs to be substantiated regarding the dates of construction and interior finishes of the primary dwelling. Dr. Lounsbury noted that the primary dwelling's wing is an example of a true 1.5-story building. The brickwork demonstrates that it likely does not predate 1800; Flemish bond on the front with 1:5 bonding on the side walls indicate a ca. 1810 or later date.

Western Region.....presented by Michael Pulice

1. Archibald Thompson House [Clynchdale], Tazewell County, #092-5060, Criterion C

Dr. Garrett Olmsted, property owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Lahendro asked about the stretcher bond brick on the house's façade and the 8-by-8 bricks. Dr. Olmsted said these were used to avoid having to turn bricks. Mr. Pulice said the jack arches are in contrast to the stout wood lintels found on most houses in the area that date from the 1840s to 1870s; also square bricks and stretcher bond are not found there prior to about 1840. Land tax records show that a house was on this property during the 1830s. Dr. Olmsted is searching for architectural influences from northern Alabama to explain the anomalies seen on his house. He explained that the bricks have "frogs" on the interior, and such examples are rarely found prior to the mid-1820s; the square 8-by-8 bricks, meanwhile, were common in this region by the 1840s. The house's interior staircase has a stout turned newel of a type generally found by 1870 (although such examples would have appeared in the eastern part of Virginia by the 1850s). Dr. Lounsbury asked about the molding profiles around the doors and windows, but available photographs did not include these. The house's fireplace mantels are Neoclassical and could date to the 1830s. Mr. Pulice said three-bay facades typically aren't found in western Virginia prior to 1840, making another anomaly for the Thompson House; preceding era houses were usually five bays. The PIF notes the original owner may have had a land grant, but Mr. Salmon said that Revolutionary War land grants were located in Ohio and Kentucky; however, these could be sold to allow a veteran to purchase land in Virginia. Dr. Olmsted said renovations to the house took place during the 1870s. Dr. Olmsted noted that recent work on the house has been done to preserve original fabric wherever possible. Dr. Lounsbury asked for photographs of the architraves around the doors and windows. Neoclassical trim will suggest an 1830s date of construction, but Greek Revival and Italianate finishes would indicate a later date. Mr. Lahendro asked for additional information about the property's outbuildings and how they were used for farming purposes to be included in the nomination. Mr. Salmon said discrepancies between the documentary record and architectural evidence can be described in the nomination as well.

2. Jordan's Point Historic District, City of Lexington, #117-5027, Criteria A and C

Mr. Pulice noted that professional archaeological investigations have not been conducted within the proposed district; DHR staff evaluated that the archaeological potential is high, but the district was evaluated only under Criteria A and C. Mr. Lahendro asked what a tub mill is. Mr. Salmon explained it usually had two tubs of water to turn the millstone instead of using a mill race. Mr. Lahendro asked if graphics can show the district's development over time. Mr. Pulice said the documentation may be available to illustrate this. Mr. Lahendro asked for information about how the various commercial and industrial enterprises operated also be included in a nomination if one is prepared.

3. Robinswood, City of Radford, #126-5010, Criterion C

Mr. Lahendro noted the house's exaggerated rustication as an unusual feature. Mr. Pulice said pine shiplap exterior siding also is unusual. Mr. Salmon suggested checking John Well's book about Virginia architects to see if the original builder is included. Mr. Lahendro asked if the house's style and scale are typical of Radford or unusual. Mr. Pulice said Robinswood is architecturally more elaborate than most found in Radford and surrounding communities, and this will be documented if a nomination is submitted.

4. Slusser-Ryan Farm, Montgomery County, #060-0337, Criterion C

Tom and Susan Ryan, owners of the property, attended the meeting. Mr. Ryan said they have tried to maintain its historical integrity as they have made improvements to the main house. Mr. Lahendro requested that the outbuildings be described in more detail in a nomination. Mr. Ryan said the most interesting is an 1845 log building in the property's front yard; just a few of the logs show signs of water damage. It may have originally been a granary. Mr. Lahendro said including how the farm operated and what each building was used for would be helpful to include in the nomination.

Eastern Region.....presented by Marc Wagner

1. Blair Warehouse, City of Richmond, #127-6802, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked if tobacco warehouses have integrity, can they be listed under the Richmond Tobacco Warehouses MPD, and Mr. Wagner said yes. Mr. Lahendro asked for the buildings' historic functions to be described if a nomination is submitted.

2. Cedar Lane, New Kent County, #063-0005, Criterion C

Dr. Lounsbury asked about the house's construction date. On the chimney at one end of the house is a brick incised with an 1829 date, while at the other end of the house there are heavy log structural members. Dr. Lounsbury suggested dendrochronology could be used to establish a construction date. Dr. Lounsbury noted that the wing at the opposite end of the house is on piers, and that the chimney's exposure indicate an 1810s-1820s construction date. Chair Moore said that additional information about the property's history is needed to flesh out a nomination. New Kent County's early courthouse records were destroyed during the Civil War and an early-20th century fire destroyed more records, making it challenging to research of some of the property's early history.

3. The Cottage, Amelia County, #004-5023, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked about the reliability of the information included in the book excerpt included with the PIF. Dr. Lounsbury said the house more likely dates to 1810 than the 1780s. The chimney has step shoulders with 1:3 bond brick, which is not found prior to 1799 in Virginia (documented in Smithfield on a foundation).

4. Edenetta, Essex County, #028-0010, Criterion C

Dr. Lounsbury noted that the Port Royal plan has been documented on a 1788 house and a 1801 house. He is not aware of this plan being found beyond a very limited area in Virginia. The central hall originally was an open space, often with glazing at the rear end, while the stairs up to the second floor were enclosed and located in a side room. Mr. Lahendro asked about the two-story rear porch's alteration. The Greek Revival entablature has been removed on both the front and rear porches, with the current porches' configurations having been installed within the last 20 years. The two-story rear kitchen/quarter building is an important resource for its association with the antebellum enslaved population. Extant interior finishes probably postdate its use as a quarter, but evidence of earlier finishes may be extant beneath them. Mr. Wagner noted that the property retains 261 acres, raising the potential for archaeological sites associated with agriculture and the enslaved workers who once worked on the property. A slave cemetery has not yet been found. Mr. Lahendro noted that all the outbuildings are important to the property's significance and integrity. Regarding the primary dwelling, the non-historic central stair is a reversible alteration, and its impact on the house is mitigated by the quality of the remaining historic interior finishes. Dr. Lounsbury said the 1840s brick kitchen/quarter is an even rarer resource type than the Port Royal plan house (the other brick outbuildings also likely date to the 1840s). Mr. Wagner said the owner will be asked to take interior photos of the kitchen/quarter, and DHR will forward them to the SRB members. Dr. Lounsbury said the primary dwelling's more elaborate interior finishes, such as the mantels and plasterwork, likely date to the 1850s; examples of pierced molded ornament also arrived in the 1850s. Mr. Salmon said the land tax records, agricultural census, and slave schedules should provide information about improvements to the property after 1820. The primary dwelling is considered the primary resource on the property despite its non-historic alterations, but the property 's architectural significance is only one part of its story. The SRB members agreed that **the nomination should not proceed unless Criterion A (Ethnic Heritage: African American and Agriculture) are included.**

5. First Baptist Church, City of Williamsburg, #137-5071, Criteria A and C and Criteria Consideration A

Dr. Lounsbury noted that the congregation has a long history in Williamsburg; local newspapers document their church building was destroyed in 1834 during a storm. He also noted the congregation's relationship to the establishment of Colonial Williamsburg. Several SRB members questioned the building's architectural significance. Mr. Wagner said additional research is needed about the architect, Bernard Spiegel, and the congregation retains the church's original drawings, which can be used to add to the argument for significance.

6. Imperial Tobacco Warehouse, City of Portsmouth, #124-5210, Criteria A and C

Mr. Pollard noted that the railroad bed is intact and adds to the integrity of setting and association. A 1958 fire along Portsmouth's waterfront erased much of the city's industrial heritage, with the Imperial Tobacco Warehouse having been spared because it is about 8 blocks from the fire's site. Mr. Lahendro asked how natural light was brought into the buildings. Mr. Pollard said most buildings were for tobacco storage and did not need large windows for light. Large doors for loading products onto railroad cars are extant. Ms. McDonald recommended that the Richmond tobacco warehouses MPD be consulted for contextual information. Mr. Lahendro requested that a potential nomination include how work was performed at the complex, and how goods were stored and moved into and within the buildings then out again.

7. Moss Side, New Kent County, #063-0229, Criterion C

Dr. Lounsbury said that a Civil War-era map does not include this house, which persuaded researchers from Colonial Williamsburg that the primary dwelling postdates the war. The property is interesting for what it can illustrate about treatment of freed people in the war's

immediate aftermath; for example, an extant tenant house appears to have been designed for one family, which contrasts with housing provided to enslaved families in the antebellum era. He noted the property's similarity to Iden (also in New Kent County), which has an antebellum quarter that likely housed more than one family. Mr. Salmon said improvements to the property should be traceable in the land tax records (archived at the Library of Virginia).

8. Oceana Historic District, City of Virginia Beach, #134-0968, Criteria A and C

Mr. Lahendro asked about an accident zone policy that is mentioned in the PIF for the district. Mr. Wagner said the neighborhood is across the street from a naval installation, and Ms. McClane said that as part of a BRAC process, the City agreed to reduce density in the neighborhood. The district originally was identified during a 1992 survey, but subsequent Section 106 projects expanded the district boundaries and Ms. McClane conducted windshield survey to delineate the boundaries as shown today. Vice-Chair Lee asked if the neighborhood's demographics have changed over time and Ms. McClane said no. Multiple generations of families have lived in the neighborhood. Ms. McClane explained that the City of Virginia Beach has guidelines for appropriate redevelopment of vacant lots within the neighborhood.

9. Virginia National Bank Headquarters, City of Norfolk, #122-5817, Criteria A and C and Criteria Consideration G

Mr. Lahendro asked if Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM) designed the parking deck associated with this property. Mr. Pollard said that hasn't been verified yet; although a deck was included in the original drawings, there was no access directly to the built garage from the basement of the headquarters building. The significance of the plaza was agreed to be important and it should be retained as designed. Mr. Pollard noted that the headquarters building's lobby has excellent integrity of materials and design. Mr. Lahendro noted the building has a Brutalist influence in its design and Mr. Pollard agreed and said the nomination's architectural context will include both International Style and Brutalism discussions. Mr. Pollard explained that local newspapers provide ample documentation as to why SOM was selected as the firm to design an important building to emphasize how important the project was. Mr. Pollard added that the changes in state regulations for banking that allowed operations to expand in the 1960s will be included in the nomination; the Fifth & Main Street Banking Historic District nomination provides an excellent context for this.

Chair Moore adjourned the SRB meeting at 4:00 p.m.