

DRAFT Architectural Review Board Meeting Motions

Monday, January 20, 2026, 4:00 PM

Norfolk City Hall, 810 Union Street, 11th Floor

I. Call to Order

Ms. Barrientos called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

II. Roll Call:

Airiel Barrientos, Chair
Katie Nguyen, Vice Chair
Robert Wojtowicz
Greta Gustavson
Suping Li

Taylor Gould
Greg Rutledge (Absent)
Larry Pendleton, CPC Appointment
Karen Reynes (Absent)

City Staff Present:

Elizabeth Nowak
Faith Hamman

Susan Pollock
Wayne Green

III. Approval of Meeting Motions: January 5, 2026

Vote: Motion by Ms. Gustavson to approve the minutes with an amendment to correct a typo; second by Mr. Gould. The motion passed by a vote of 3 in favor to 0 against with 4 abstentions as Ms. Li, Dr. Wojtowicz, Ms. Nyugen, and Ms. Barrientos were absent at that meeting.

IV. Consent Agenda

Ms. Gustavson requested that 429 York Street be heard by the board given some questions that arose about the application that afternoon.

Vote: Dr. Wojtowicz made a motion to remove the application for 429 York Street from the consent agenda to move it to continued applications and to approve the remaining item on the consent agenda—a blade sign at 424 21st Street—as presented; second by Mr. Pendleton. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against.

V. Continued Applications

a. ***COA #26-00352 – 429 York Street – Replace asbestos siding with fiber cement lap siding***

Speaker: Morgan Wells, Applicant

Staff introduced the application, explaining that the request was limited to the rear elevation of the apartment building at 429 York Street. Ms. Nowak said that it had been her understanding that only one tower was part of the application, but the applicant had clarified that day that asbestos shingles on both towers and a portion of the wall on the west side of the fourth story were to be replaced. She added that it had come to Staff's attention earlier in the day that the asbestos siding on the building had already been removed. Staff confirmed that a demolition permit had been issued in error and the applicant had proceeded with work thinking they had proper approvals; no siding had been installed as they were waiting for approval of the new siding from ARB. Staff also explained its recommendation of approval for the faux wood grain on the siding: it is in a location where the texture will be minimally discernible and will match existing siding on the building. Mr. Wells affirmed Staff's presentation and indicated he was available for any questions.

The board requested clarification of the scope of work. Mr. Wells confirmed that the siding on the rear elevations of both towers and a portion of the west elevation of the western tower have had asbestos shingles removed; these areas would be re-sided with the fiber cement lap siding.

Dr. Wojtowicz asked Staff what the building would have originally been sided with. Ms. Nowak said that the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps only indicated that the building had a non-combustible veneer and that most likely it had been finished with stucco or something similar. Mr. Wells added that the primary elevations on the building have stucco on the fourth story.

Vote: Motion by Dr. Wojtowicz to approve the application as presented; second by Ms. Nyugen. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against.

VI. Certificates of Appropriateness

a. COA #25-00327 – 814 Graydon Avenue – Replace windows on south and west elevations

Speakers: Robyn Thomas (Representative)

Staff introduced the application, noting that the applicant had provided substantial evidence supporting the request to replace the windows. Ms. Thomas shared some additional details about the condition of the windows, including the lack of material that could be filled or otherwise stabilized. She added that the flashing that been

installed was apparently done to stop water intrusion and had required removal of the window in order to install it.

Ms. Barrientos and Dr. Wojtowicz commended Ms. Thomas's efforts to provide the information requested by the board and Staff. They noted that the documentation sufficiently demonstrated the need for replacement.

Vote: Motion by Ms. Gustavson to approve the application; second by Mr. Gould. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against.

b. COA #25-00260 – 730 W Princess Anne Road – After-the-fact removal of front porch and to construct replacement porch

Speakers: Shelby Brooks (Representative)

Staff introduced the application, explaining the timeline of the violation from spring 2025 through present. Ms. Hamman reviewed the elements of the proposed porch and how they met the Historic District Design Guidelines. She also explained that while demolition is not recommended and the condition of the porch appeared to have been due to neglect rather than causes outside the owner's control, Staff supported the demolition request given the reported conditions and that there was sufficient photographic evidence that most of the removed elements were not historic. Mr. Brooks added that they will be adding matching pilasters to the porch walls and indicated he was available for any questions.

Ms. Thomas provided public comment. She said that the bays of the new porch were unevenly distributed and that they should be equally spaced as they had been historically.

The board discussed the comment from Ms. Thomas, agreeing that the bays should be evenly distributed or balanced by making the outer two bays equally spaced. Ms. Li noted that the posts of the upper railing should be aligned with the centers of the porch posts as shown in the current drawing.

Ms. Nowak asked whether the board had any concerns about the applicant's proposal to use fluted columns; she noted that most likely the original columns were smooth. Dr. Wojtowicz said that he would be comfortable with either option as both were used during the period this house was constructed.

Mr. Gould asked about the extent of the proposed shingle repair; he asked whether any shingles on the side elevations would be repaired or replaced. Dr. Wojtowicz agreed with Mr. Gould and recommended that any shingle damage that turned the corners of the building should also be repaired.

Vote: Motion by Dr. Wojtowicz to approve the application with the conditions in the Staff Report and two additional conditions: that the porch columns and upper railing posts shall be distributed to create three equal bays and that the shingle repairs shall turn the east and west corners; second by Ms. Nguyen. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against.

VII. Determinations of Architectural Appropriateness

There were no determinations of Architectural Appropriateness.

VIII. Recommendations to City Planning Commission

a. *DR #26-00348 – 2350 Berkley Avenue Extension – Modify material palette for community stage*

Speakers: Mel Price (Representative)

Staff introduced the item, explaining that the stage project had been recommended for approval by ARB and the City Planning Commission in August 2025. The CMU that had been part of the material palette is unable to be ordered in time to complete the project, and the applicant was proposing a new rusticated face CMU in a similar red color and a new mortar. Ms. Price shared four mortar samples: one being the previously approved light gray, two dark mortars, and a mid-tone reddish brown.

The board reviewed the revised palette. There was general discussion about how the darker toned mortars brought out browns and other warm tones in the new CMU.

Vote: Motion by Ms. Li to recommend approval of the application with the three dark mortars presented at the meeting; second by Mr. Gould. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against.

IX. Discussion

a. *601 E Freemason Street – After-the-fact construction of rear fence*

Speaker: Pat Gershon (Representative)

Staff introduced the item, noting that the discussion was to help the applicant craft an after-the-fact application for fencing installed without approval and that the

fencing should be considered to be the fencing for the foreseeable future. Ms. Nowak noted several concerns with the fence: it is too tall and opaque for a fence located in the clear sight triangle and the unfinished side of the fence faces outward. She noted that these concerns are related to Zoning Ordinance standards, not the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Gershon explained that during the week of the New Year holiday, a crew from General Services went out to the Willoughby-Baylor House to replace deteriorated fencing that had received numerous complaints through Norfolk Cares. The entirety of the rear fence was replaced before work was stopped; the intention is also to replace the same wood fence along the east property line.

The board discussed various options to address the height and transparency issues of the fence. Mr. Gershon said that there are multiple fences on the property: a 42" tall wood picket fence along Cumberland Street, a metal and brick fence along E Freemason Street, the remainder of the fence along the east property line, and the newly installed fence.

Ms. Gustavson, Ms. Li, and Mr. Gould asked whether a metal fence could be installed. Mr. Gershon said that metal is an expensive option and wanted to know if there was a way to salvage any of the fence that was installed. The board considered possibly removing every other picket to increase the transparency and rotating the fence or installing the removed pickets to the outside of the fence to make it a two-sided fence.

Ms. Nguyen and Ms. Gustavson asked whether a picket fence that matches the one facing Cumberland could be installed. There was general agreement from the board that this would be the cleanest option.

b. 601 E Freemason Street – Proposed site modifications which includes a driveway, garden shed, and metal fence

Speakers: Scott Campbell, John Maniscalco

Mr. Campbell and Mr. Maniscalco presented three options for potential driveway configurations at the rear of the Willoughby-Baylor House. Mr. Maniscalco said he was considering purchasing the property and converting it back to use as a single-family residence, but that he needed to be able to park and charge his electric vehicle on the property, install a new fence, and install a garden shed. The proposed fence

would be a 6-foot tall metal picket fence and the garden shed would be located along an axis in the gardens that Mr. Maniscalco would restore.

The board expressed support for the first exhibited driveway option—shown as a driveway accessing the rear of the building from Cumberland Street on the west side of the property—over the options with access through the south parcel line. The board also made comments supportive of the proposed style of black metal fence and the garden shed.

Several members expressed enthusiasm for returning the house to residential use.

X. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

XI. Staff Updates

Ms. Nowak informed the board that the first draft of the Historic District Design Guidelines would be posted for public comment this week.

XII. New Business

The board voted on its officer slate for 2026:

Dr. Wojtowicz made a motion to nominate Ms. Barrientos as Chair and Ms. Nguyen as Vice Chair; second by Ms. Gustavson. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor to 0 against.

Ms. Gustavson made a motion to reappoint Mr. Gould as the board's representative on the Public Arts Commission; second by Ms. Li. The motion passed with a vote of 7 in favor to 0 against.

XIII. Old Business

There was no old business.

XIV. Adjournment: 5:45 pm