

2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221; Telephone: (804) 367-2323; Fax: (804) 367-2391

## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION FORM (PIF) for INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

The Preliminary Information Form (PIF) constitutes an application for preliminary consideration of a property for eligibility for the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. The PIF is **not** the same as a nomination to the Registers, but is a means for evaluating the **eligibility** of a property for listing. The PIF is evaluated by Department of Historic Resources (DHR) staff and the State Review Board (SRB) <u>based on information available at the time of preparation</u>. Recommendations are subject to change if additional information becomes available. DHR and SRB recommendations regarding the property's eligibility will be provided to the property owner in writing.

#### **Before Preparing a PIF**

Contact **<u>DHR's Archivist</u>** for assistance in obtaining any information DHR may have on file about your property, such as a previous architectural survey record or eligibility evaluation. You are welcome to use this information in preparing your PIF. Contact **<u>DHR's Archivist</u>** by phone at (804) 482-6102, or by email at <u>Quatro.Hubbard@dhr.virginia.gov</u>.

Staff at one of DHR's three Regional offices also are available to answer questions you may have as you begin preparing your PIF. Locations and contact information for each office is at <u>https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/about-dhr/regional-preservation-offices/</u>. (You also are welcome to ask DHR's Archivist for the contact information.)

#### **Preparing a PIF**

A PIF consists of three equally important parts:

1. **Form:** Complete the attached form to the best of your ability, using your own research about the property to be evaluated as well as any information that DHR has provided. Remember that DHR's Regional staff also are available to assist you. The form may be completed using Microsoft Word software, typed, or hand-written. If using MS Word, send the electronic file via CD, email, ftp, or other file sharing means to **DHR's Archivist**.

Your PIF will not be evaluated if it is missing the property owner's signature and/or contact information for the person submitting the form (if different from the property owner)

- 2. **Photos:** Provide color digital images (JPGs are preferred) of your property's exterior and major interior spaces, with emphasis on architectural features instead of furnishings. Digital photos typically include views of the main building from all sides, as well as important ornamental and/or functional details; any outbuildings or secondary resources; and the property's general setting. Digital images can be submitted on CD, USB drive, or other file sharing means. Contact **DHR's Archivist** if you need assistance working with digital images. For further guidance on how to take photos, please refer to DHR's Architectural Survey Guidelines.
- 3. Maps: A minimum of two maps must accompany your PIF.
  - Location map: This map shows the exact location of your property. The map can be created using Google Maps, Google Earth, Bing, or other mapping websites. A copy of a road map also may be used as long as the property's exact location and physical address are shown on the map. If you need assistance, DHR's Archivist can provide you an example of an acceptable location map that shows boundaries.
  - **Sketch map:** This map shows the locations of all resources on your property, such as the main building; any secondary resources (often referred to as outbuildings); major landscape features such as a stream, formal gardens, driveways, and parking areas, and the road on which the property fronts. The sketch map can be drawn by hand, or an annotated aerial view, tax parcel map or survey map may be used.

#### Submitting a PIF

Once you have completed the PIF, submit it to **DHR's Archivist** at the mailing address at the top of this page or via email at <u>Quatro.Hubbard@dhr.virginia.gov</u>. The PIF will be forwarded to the Regional staff member who will review your PIF and will answer any questions you may have about the evaluation process. Do <u>not</u> include materials for other DHR programs, such as easements or tax credits, with your PIF.

**Note:** All submitted materials become the property of DHR and will be retained in our permanent Archive. In addition, the materials will be posted on DHR's public website for a period of time during the evaluation process.

Thank you for taking the time to prepare and submit a Preliminary Information Form to DHR!



## PRELIMINARY INFORMATION FORM (PIF) for INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

Note: PIFs are prepared by applicants and evaluated by DHR staff and the State Review Board based on information known at the time of preparation. Recommendations concerning PIFs are subject to change if new information becomes available.

DHR No. (to be completed by DHR staff) <u>108-6195</u>

#### **1. General Property Information**

Property name: Cedarbrook Elementary School (Historic); W. Townes Lea Elementary School (Current)

Property address: <u>439 Cedarbrook Drive</u> City or Town: <u>Danville</u> Zip code: <u>24541</u>

Name of the Independent City or County where the property is located: Danville

Category of Property (choose only one of the following):ObjectBuilding  $\underline{X}$ SiteStructure

#### 2. Physical Aspects

Acreage: <u>10.27</u>

Setting (choose only one of the following): Urban \_\_\_\_\_ Suburban X Town \_\_\_\_\_ Village \_\_\_\_\_ Hamlet \_\_\_\_\_ Rural\_\_\_\_\_

Briefly describe the property's overall location and setting, including any notable landscape features:

Cedarbrook Elementary School is in the Stokesland area of Danville, Virginia. The 10.27-acre parcel is near the western edge of the city, about a half mile west of West Main Street and the Danville Golf Club. The school faces east to Cedarbrook Drive, with a setback of about 140 feet, and is fronted by a lawn planted with grass, shrubs, and a few deciduous trees. A semicircular driveway approaches the breezeway at the school entrance. There are concrete sidewalks beneath the breezeway and around the semicircular driveway. The U-shape formed by the 1962 school and its 1969 addition create a grassy rear courtyard, which is currently enclosed by a chain-link fence. A small parking lot is located northeast of the school. A wooded area is at the rear of the property. To the south of the school is a baseball diamond, which is on a separate parcel and is not part of this application. The surrounding neighborhood is suburban and residential in character, comprised of houses built in the mid-twentieth century.

#### 3. Architectural Description

Architectural Style(s): International Style

If the property was designed by an architect, landscape architect, engineer, or other professional, please list here: Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff

If the builder is known, please list here: John W. Daniel and Co.

Date of construction (can be approximate): 1962

#### Narrative Description (Please do not exceed one page in describing the property):

Briefly describe the property's general characteristics, such as its current use (and historic use if different), as well as the primary building or structure on the property (such as a house, store, mill, factory, depot, bridge, etc.). Include the materials and method(s) of construction, physical appearance and condition (exterior and interior), and any additions or other major alterations.

Built in 1962, Cedarbrook Elementary School is a one-story, low-profile, flat-roofed, brick-faced building. The building is an expression of the International Style with simple geometric forms, minimal ornamentation, and horizontal massing. Its U-shaped footprint is divided into four sections: the front wing, oriented north-south, with a library, administrative offices, and cafeteria; the north wing, oriented east-west, which contains the twelve original classrooms; the south wing, oriented east-west, which is a 1969 addition containing five classrooms; and a mid-1980s gymnasium addition at the rear of the school, connected to the 1969 addition by a narrow hyphen.

Defining exterior characteristics include a flat roof, walls faced in brick veneer, and large banks of original aluminum windows. The main entrance to the school is approached by a T-shaped breezeway supported by steel posts. The breezeway also covers a path connecting the cafeteria and the north classroom wing. A wide fascia unifies the roof lines of the school and the breezeway. Three single-leaf, flush main entrance doors are contained within an aluminum-frame window wall system with plate glass in the top rows and porcelain enamel panels in the bottom row. The walls to each side of the main entrance are faced with tan glazed tiles arranged in a vertical stack bond. The front elevation windows are contained within porcelain enamel window wall systems with aluminum windows and tan panels. The window banks on the north classroom wing are slightly recessed, resting on continuous concrete sills over blue glazed tiles in a stack bond. There are several secondary entrances around the perimeter of the school. On the north classroom wing, these entrances are deeply recessed with double leaf, half-light doors with single-pane sidelights and transoms. The cafeteria, located at the southeast corner, is slightly taller than the rest of the school and features porcelain enamel window wall systems with aluminum windows and blue panels.

The 1969 addition, designed by the same architecture firm, continues the horizontal massing and material palette of the original school. The addition has a flat roof and is faced with brick veneer. The addition also incorporates a wide fascia, unifying the original school and the addition at the roof line. The addition features a higher solid to void ratio, with fewer windows that are arranged in a notably different pattern. The windows rest on concrete sills and stacked glazed blue tile, but they are deeply recessed, narrow, and oriented vertically. A one-story gymnasium, connected to the rear of the 1969 addition by a brick hyphen, was added in the mid-1980s. The gym is faced in brick veneer and has a metal, gable roof.

The interior plan features a single-loaded, north-south corridor at the front entrance, that accesses the administrative offices, library, and the cafeteria. The spacious cafeteria with a high ceiling is located at the southeast corner of the school. The kitchen is west of the cafeteria. The twelve classrooms and toilets

that comprise the original 1962 school are arranged along a double-loaded, east-west corridor at the north end of the building. Four classrooms in this wing feature individual toilet rooms. The 1962 section of the school incorporates banks of operable windows into the corridor walls around the classroom doors and the library to provide natural light and ventilation to the corridors. The 1969 addition comprises five additional classrooms and toilets arranged along a double-loaded, east-west corridor.

The corridors and classrooms of the original 1962 school and 1969 addition are characterized by modern materials, such as painted concrete block walls, glazed tile walls, and composition tile floors. There are terrazzo floors in the corridors and quarry tile floors in the kitchen. There are acoustical tile ceilings throughout most of the school and plaster ceilings in the toilets and kitchen. Interior doors are generally simple painted wood slabs, with some containing square vision lites, in hollow metal frames. The toilets have ceramic tile floors and glazed tile walls.

The exteriors of the 1962 school and 1969 addition are intact with excellent integrity. The historic floor plans of the 1962 school and 1969 addition also remain remarkably intact. The classrooms, cafeteria, library, and offices retain their initial configurations along the single- and double-loaded corridors. Most original interior finishes and features appear to remain substantially intact. The mid-1980s gym addition does not have a negative impact on the design integrity of the historic school as it is compatible with its scale, massing, and materials and is located at the rear, connected to the historic school only by a small hyphen.

In a bullet list, include any outbuildings or secondary resources or major landscape features (such as barns, sheds, dam and mill pond, storage tanks, scales, railroad spurs, etc.), including their condition and their estimated construction dates.

• Not applicable.

#### 4. Property's History and Significance (Please do not exceed one page)

Briefly explain the property's historic importance, such as significant events, persons, and/or families associated with the property. If the property is important for its architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, or other aspects of design, please include a brief explanation of this aspect.

The 1962 Cedarbrook Elementary School, currently known as W. Townes Lea Elementary, appears eligible for individual listing on the National Register under Criteria A and C with significance on the local level in the areas of Community Planning and Development, Education, and Architecture. In the mid-1950s, discussions began in Danville about the need for several new elementary schools to serve areas of anticipated suburban growth that had been added as part of the 1951 annexation of Pittsylvania County. Cedarbrook Elementary was one of three new elementary schools that were planned and built over the next decade based on recommendations in Danville's 1956 Comprehensive Plan. The concept was that these new elementary schools would serve as a nucleus for these anticipated growth areas and would help draw population. Built in 1962 for white students, Cedarbrook Elementary was part of a program of school construction in Danville associated with the city's growth following World War II that served to maintain *de facto* racial segregation in the aftermath of Massive Resistance (1956-1959) by continuing to build new segregated schools in predominantly white suburbs that further perpetuated public school integration.<sup>1</sup> Designed in the International Style by the South Carolina architecture firm of Lyles. Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff, the school is an excellent and intact example of post-World War II school design that reflects progressive trends in education as well as architecture and construction techniques. The period of significance for the school begins with its construction in 1962 and ends in 1970 when Danville schools became integrated. This period includes the 1969 addition, also designed by Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff.

#### Post World War II Annexation and Suburban Development in Danville

Following World War II, the City of Danville experienced tremendous growth in land area and population. In 1951, Danville annexed 6.201 acres of Pittsylvania County to the north, west, and south that increased its total land area by 154 percent to 10,231 acres and the population by 32.8 percent.<sup>2</sup> The 1956 Comprehensive Plan for Danville, by Harland Bartholomew and Associates, included an analysis of the 1951 annexation areas with recommendations for civic infrastructure improvements necessary for their development. The Stokesland area, site of the future Cedarbrook Elementary School, was mostly vacant and identified as one of several new growth areas where new residential development was expected to take place.<sup>3</sup> The plan noted that "before a residential neighborhood can be considered completely desirable, it must have educational and recreational facilities of the highest standard."<sup>4</sup> It also recommended combining school and park amenities for efficiency as a greater emphasis was being placed on the role of play and recreation in education. As a result, new school construction required larger tracts of land. Combining school and park facilities avoided redundancy and created a community center that would serve as the nucleus of the neighborhood. The plan recommended that five new elementary schools be built over the next ten years, with three specific geographic areas identified, including the Stokesland area. In addition to providing schools in outlying areas where students at the time had to travel long distances, these new schools would also, to some degree, be able to draw new population near the schools

Department of Historic Resources 2/22/2024

Preliminary Information Form Rev. September 2022 Note: PIFs are prepared by applicants and evaluated by DHR staff and the State Review Board based on information known at the time of preparation. Recommendations concerning PIFs are subject to change if new information becomes available.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Hershman, James.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Harland & Bartholomew, 1956:17-18.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid, 136-137, 146-147.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ibid. 150.

<sup>4</sup> 

according to the plan.<sup>5</sup> The plan recommended that the Stokesland area school have capacity for 540 students, a minimum site of 10.4 acres, and be located near the center of the neighborhood.<sup>6</sup> Voters approved a bond for a new elementary school for the Stokesland area in the fall of 1961. The school was designed by Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff (LBC&W) of South Carolina. The Stokesland school would replace the West End School, a white elementary school built in Pittsylvania County in 1922, before the annexation.

The new school would be built on a 22-acre site and include twelve classrooms, a library, administrative offices, and a cafeteria. The construction contract was awarded to John W. Daniel and Co. in May 1962 for \$328,800.7 The Danville School Board announced in December 1962 that the new Cedarbrook Elementary School would likely be ready for occupancy in February 1963.<sup>8</sup> By 1968, a building boom in the Stokesland area resulted in the need to use two mobile classroom units before a five-classroom addition, also designed by LBC&W, was completed in 1969.<sup>9</sup> Renamed in 1983 in honor of W. Townes Lea, former Danville School Superintendent (1955-1983), the school continued to operate until 2012.<sup>10</sup>

There were three elementary schools built based on recommendations in Danville's 1956 Comprehensive Plan: Woodberry Hills (1959); Cedarbrook (1962); and Park Avenue (1967). All three schools were designed by LBC&W, are one-story with designs influenced by the Modernist Movement, and located on generous sites central to suburban residential areas. Woodberry Hills and Cedarbrook have similar designs, with flat roofs, brick veneer, breezeways, and large banks of windows. Park Avenue differs in its design, with minimal fenestration in narrow, vertical slots. Cedarbrook appears to retain the highest degree of integrity of the three schools, since the windows at Woodberry Hills have been replaced and the Park Avenue roof has been altered in an incompatible manner.

#### School Equalization & Desegregation in Danville

Constructed in 1962 for white students in the aftermath of Massive Resistance in Virginia (1956-1959), Cedarbrook Elementary School represents how new school construction in the rapidly expanding, and predominantly white, suburbs throughout Virginia perpetuated *de facto* segregation in public schools.<sup>11</sup> Following the 1954 and 1955 landmark decisions in Brown v. Board of Education that ruled segregated schools were inherently unequal and must be integrated "with all deliberate speed," Virginia attempted to maintain segregation in public education by providing "separate but equal" school facilities and, eventually, allowing for limited integration by application and assignment through the 1959 Freedom of Choice policy. Danville continued to operate a dual school system until the 1964-1965 school year when five Black students opted to attend the all-white George Washington High School.<sup>12</sup> Afterwards, Danville finally instituted the Freedom of Choice policy in 1965. That same year, students entering the first, seventh, and ninth grades were also assigned to schools, including Cedarbrook, based on their geographic residence rather than race.<sup>13</sup> In 1968, the Supreme Court decision in Green v. County School Board of New Kent County rejected the Freedom of Choice policy and required school systems to submit desegregation plans. In December 1968, Danville submitted their plan to the US Department of Health,

Department of Historic Resources 2/22/2024

Preliminary Information Form Rev. September 2022 Note: PIFs are prepared by applicants and evaluated by DHR staff and the State Review Board based on information known at the time of preparation. Recommendations concerning PIFs are subject to change if new information becomes available.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Ibid, 164.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Ibid, 166.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The Danville Register & Bee; May 8, 1962.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Ibid; December 7, 1962.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Ibid; June 16, 1968, and August 7, 1968.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Ibid; June 10, 1983.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Hershman, James.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Hedrick, 2002: 81.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Ibid: 84.

<sup>5</sup> 

Education and Welfare (HEW and received notice of acceptance in March 1969).<sup>14</sup> However, it was not until the 1970-1971 school year that Danville public schools became fully integrated.

Elementary schools constructed in Danville during the period immediately before Brown v. Board of Education and during Massive Resistance include: E.A. Gibson (1952); G.L.H. Johnson (1953); Grove Park (1956); Woodberry Hills (1959); Cedarbrook (1962); and Park Avenue (1967). E.A. Gibson was the only elementary school constructed for Black students during this period. Notably, E.A. Gibson and G.L.H. Johnson were built as nearly identical schools in 1952 and 1953.

#### Post World War II Elementary School Design

With school enrollment increasing by 42 percent nationwide between 1950 and 1960, and years of little or no maintenance or new construction due to the Depression followed by war rations, the need for school construction was second only to housing in the United States after World War II. This need for new schools, along with progressive approaches to education that focused on nurturing the child, new construction materials and technologies, as well as concern about the future of democracy amidst Cold War anxieties, combined to transform the design of post-World War II elementary schools. In her article "Building for Learning in Post-War American Elementary Schools," Amy Ogata claims these school designs "indicate how architects, planners, researchers, educators, and parents embraced the discourse of modernism and its faith in the power of design to change behavior and improve society."<sup>15</sup>

Rather than the monumental and classically detailed designs for individual schools of the early 20th century, architects began to provide standardized and mass-produced solutions for new, and often suburban, schools. Intended to be child-centered, these schools were typically one story to allow direct access outdoors. Designed in the International Style with an emphasis on simple, horizontal massing and minimal detailing the schools were constructed of steel frame and concrete, often with brick veneer, and featured large expanses of aluminum-frame and plate-glass systems to maximize spatial flexibility and natural light.<sup>16</sup> Designed in the International Style by the South Carolina firm of Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff, the 1962 Cedarbrook Elementary School is an excellent and intact example of post-World War II school design that reflects progressive trends in education as well as architecture and construction techniques.

#### Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff (LBC&W)

Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle, and Wolff (LBC&W) was a South Carolina firm that worked throughout the Southeast from 1948 to 1976. The firm expanded outside of South Carolina in the 1960s, with satellite offices in Washington D.C., Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina. Their portfolio included a wide range of project types, including apartment complexes, private residences, primary and secondary schools, and higher education facilities, as well as government, military, commercial, industrial, and healthcare buildings. Their designs show the influence of the Modernist Movement and primarily employ the International Style, Neo-Formalism, or Brutalism.<sup>17</sup>

LBC&W's first known project in Danville was Langston High School, an equalization school built for Black students in 1958. George Washington, Danville's high school for white students, was designed by the architecture firm Thompson and Ragland and was completed in 1956. After the completion of

Department of Historic Resources 2/22/2024

Preliminary Information Form Rev. September 2022 Note: PIFs are prepared by applicants and evaluated by DHR staff and the State Review Board based on information known at the time of preparation. Recommendations concerning PIFs are subject to change if new information becomes available.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Ibid, 2002:84.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Ogata, 2007:563.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 564.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Lee, Casey.

<sup>6</sup> 

Langston High School, it appears that the Danville School Board continued to use LBC&W through the late 1960s to design all new public schools, as well as many additions to existing schools. The firm designed Woodberry Hills Elementary School (1959) and Cedarbrook Elementary School (1962), which were both for white students. LBC&W also designed Park Avenue Elementary School (1967) and North Danville Junior High School (1968), which both opened after Danville instituted the Freedom of Choice policy in 1965. The LBC&W designed schools in Danville are influenced by the International Style. Cedarbrook Elementary School is a representative example of one of LBC&W's modern, International Style school designs.

Please list all sources of information used to research the history of the property, such as deeds, census and tax records, and/or published articles and books. (It is not necessary to attach lengthy articles or family genealogies to this form.)

- Harland Bartholomew & Associates. "The Comprehensive Plan, City of Danville, Virginia," 1956. Hathi trust. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112117749603&view=1up&seq=103.
- Hedrick, James E. "A Case Study in the Desegregation of George Washington High School and Langston High School in Danville, Virginia During the 1970-1971 School Year." Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2002, <u>http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-04042002-203119/unrestricted/4.pdf</u>
- Hershman, James. "Massive Resistance" *Encyclopedia Virginia*. Virginia Humanities, (07 Dec. 2020). https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/massive-resistance.
- Lee, Casey. *Preserving the Architectural Legacy of Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle & Wolff, 1948-1976.* Master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2016, Retrieved from <u>https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/3854</u>
- Ogata, Amy F. "Building for Learning in Postwar American Elementary Schools." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Berkeley, Vol. 67, Iss. 4, December 2008: 562-591.
- The Danville Register & Bee, various articles, 1962-1968.

**5. Property Ownership** (Check as many categories as apply):

Private: X Public\Local Public\State Public\Federal

Current Legal Owner(s) of the Property (If the property has more than one owner, please list each below or on an additional sheet.) name/title: <u>Cedarbrook Partners LLC</u> organization: <u>Cedarbrook Partners LLC</u> street & number: <u>28A Kirk Avenue SW</u> city or town: <u>Roanoke state: VA zip code: <u>24011</u> e-mail: <u>brentgcochran@gmail.com</u> telephone: <u>540-597-6914</u></u>

Legal Owner's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## •• Signature required for processing all applications. ••

In the event of corporate ownership you must provide the name and title of the appropriate contact person.

Contact person: <u>Brent Cochran</u> Daytime Telephone: <u>540-597-6914</u>

Applicant Information (Individual completing form if other than legal owner of property) name/title: <u>Katie Gutshall and Alison Blanton</u> organization: <u>Hill Studio</u> street & number: <u>120 Campbell Avenue SW</u> city or town: <u>Roanoke state: VA</u> zip code: <u>24011</u> e-mail: <u>kgutshall@hillstudio.com</u> telephone: <u>540-342-5263</u> date: <u>2/1/2024</u>

PLEASE DO NOT ATTACH CONTINUATION SHEETS TO THIS FORM. THANK YOU!

## Sketch Map

W. Townes Lea Elementary School 439 Cedarbrook Drive Danville, VA 24541





NTS



Virginia Cultural Resource Information System

Legend

Location Map W. Townes Lea Elementary School 439 Cedarbrook Drive Danville, VA 24541

WGS84 Map Source: VCRIS



# Title: W. Townes Lea Elementary School

# Date: 1/25/2024

DISCLAIMER: Records of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) have been gathered over many years from a variety of sources and the representation depicted is a cumulative view of field observations over time and may not reflect current ground conditions. The map is for general information purposes and is not intended for engineering, legal or other site-specific uses. Map may contain errors and is provided "as-is". More information is available in the DHR Archives located at DHR's Richmond office.

Notice if AE sites: Locations of archaeological sites may be sensitive the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) and Code of Virginia §2.2-3705.7 (10). Release of precise locations may threaten archaeological sites and historic resources.

Feet 0 50 100 150 200 1:2,257 / 1"=188 Feet

Ν







KMK KMK/RWP RWP 01/30/2024 1/16" = 1'-0"

CEDARBROOK DRIVE APARTMENTS RENOVATION FOR APARTMENTS FIRST FLOOR AS-BUILT DRAWN BY DESIGNED BY

CHECKED BY

DATE

SCALE

REVISIONS













































