



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

### Roll Call

- Present --** 8 - \* Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Commissioner James W. Klaus, \* Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, \* Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, \* Commissioner Sean Wheeler, \* Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and \* Commissioner Mitch Danese
- Absent --** 1 - \* Commissioner Sanford Bond

### Approval of Minutes

December 17, 2019

**A motion was made by Commissioner Neville Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Sean Wheeler, that the December 17, 2019 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

January 14, 2020 Quarterly Meeting

**A motion was made by Commissioner Neville Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Lane Pearson, that the January 14, 2020 Quarterly Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese
- Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

### OTHER BUSINESS

Secretary's Report

Administrative Approval Report

Commission Secretary Carey L. Jones distributed the Administrative Approval and Building Permits Reports to the Commissioners, and stated that there were no especially

noteworthy items.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that, in 2019, Commission staff issued a total of 25 Notices of Violation, and has been able to work with property owners to resolve 17 (68%) of those. The cases included paint, window removal/replacements, and other unapproved items that were administratively approved by staff or were approved by the Commission.

Ms. Jones stated that staff was happy to announce that the fence violation at 8 W Leigh Street had been remedied, as had the house painted a single color on North 25th Street.

Ms. Jones stated that staff had issued three Second Notices of Violation, to which staff would receive a response by 2/17/2020 or pursue other avenues, including notices of pending prosecution. Staff is in contact with two property owners who have responded to their first NOVs, and is working to resolve the violations.

Ms. Jones stated that staff is also in contact with the property owner for 2800 East Marshall Street, who submitted an application for the current (January) meeting and then withdrew it due to being out of town, and that staff anticipates meeting with this owner next week when they are back in town. Historic Richmond has an easement on the property in question, and will be included in the meeting.

Ms. Jones reported that staff needed to follow up with owners for two properties who had received approvals but had not yet remedied their violations.

Ms. Jones pointed out a violation of particular note: the sign on the Belgian Building, on the Virginia Union University campus. Staff issued a Notice of Violation in December 2019; VUU had 30 days, ending on February 4th 2020, to remedy the violation or apply for a COA. Earlier on January 28th, VUU staff requested a meeting with CAR staff. This was tentatively scheduled for Friday January 31st.

Commissioner Brewer asked what had happened with VUU's sign application. Ms. Jones stated that staff had met with a representative from VUU, and that the application was withdrawn shortly thereafter, without an explanation.

#### Other Committee Reports

Ms. Jones stated that she had attended the last Urban Design Committee meeting, as Chairman Klaus, who is a member of that Committee, had been unable to attend. A proposal for replacement windows at the Binford Middle School was reviewed at the meeting. According to the approved plan, Richmond Public Schools will consolidate the salvageable windows to one bay on the west side of the building, repair the wood window frames as needed, and any windows that could not be repaired will be replaced with 1/1 windows, except on the third floor where the existing Gothic tracery will be replicated. None of the windows would be wrapped in any material, contrary to the initial application. Planning Commission approved this proposal on January 21st, 2020.

Ms. Jones reported that the plans to install bollards at Temple Beth Ahabah, which had been reviewed by UDC, were in the final stages of approval. The bollards will likely be cylindrical, of a dark tan concrete material, and placed in the sidewalk in front of the main building.

#### George Mason Elementary School

Ms. Jones reported that she and Ms. Kim Chen had met with Council President Dr. Cynthia Newbille and Bob Stone of the Department of Public Works the preceding week to discuss next steps for the George Mason Elementary School appeal.

Ms. Jones expressed thanks to Dr. Newbille for her time and efforts to move the situation forward and to develop a compromise solution.

Dr. Newbille worked with Superintendent Kamras, 7th District School Board Representative and Board Vice-President Cheryl Burke, and DCAO of Operations Bob Steidel, to develop a plan to memorialize the architectural features and history of the school. This includes the construction of an arch, with the cornerstone from the original 1922 building, near the location of the historic school using brick salvaged from the school, and the installation of two brick piers, one each for the 1936 and 1952 corner stones. Two plaques would also be retained for installation on the site. Dr. Newbille confirmed that funds would be available for this effort.

Ms. Jones recapped that the appeal of CAR's decision was still before City Council and that the proposal just described was a compromise suggested by Dr. Newbille, Superintendent Kamras, School Board Vice-President Cheryl Burke, and Bob Steidel of Operations. Ms. Jones stated that if the Commission were generally supportive of this compromise proposal, a revised application with this included would be expected for inclusion in the February meeting and, if approved, it would negate the appeal. If the Commission were generally not in favor of this, then the appeal would move forward to Council without additional input from the Commission.

Ms. Jones requested on behalf of staff that the Commission vote to approve an extension of the 75-day time period for the appeal to be prepared by staff and signed by the Chair.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the arch proposed was not actually representative of the existing façade, and suggested that it be made larger and taller and include the existing cornice detail, and also that an outline of the historic building footprint be considered. Chairman Klaus stated that it might become top-heavy in appearance if the cornice detail were to be added.

Commissioner Pearson expressed appreciation that a compromise option had been brought before the Commission, and stated that it would benefit from some further refinement.

Commissioner Johnson asked if an historical placard next to the arch had been planned, to which Commissioner Brewer agreed, stating that it would be difficult to understand the meaning of the arch without it. Ms. Jones stated that she did not know of a plan for a plaque. Chairman Klaus stated that such plaques sometimes even have an image of the historic building.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed arch, by mimicking previously existing historic fabric, would create a false historicism. Commissioner Danese stated that the Commission had already offered a compromise, to wit the keeping of the façade, and that RPS had not produced any budget figures to indicate why the Commission-approved options would not be affordable but the arch would be, and that having such figures would be helpful in formulating a decision.

Commissioner Hendricks expressed continued support for keeping the whole building.

Chairman Klaus expressed concern that if the compromise arch proposal is rejected,

there is potential to not even get that if RPS' appeal is approved by the City Council; and suggested that Commission make a comment to the effect that any more substantial remembrance of the historic building, especially signage of some sort, would be appreciated. Chairman Klaus pointed out that budget was not the only factor cited by RPS, but that playground space had also been a concern.

Commissioner Danese said that RPS should have done the planning and design differently, and could thus have taken into account the façade location when planning the playground layout; and that it seems as if the Commission is rewarding someone who didn't follow the rules.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that, if the Commission were to allow the demolition, it would send the message that the Commission had erred in its original judgment which did not allow it, which would in turn create a problem with City Council upholding Commission rulings.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that, if the play area is lacking, he did not see why the site also contains a public play area; and suggested that the public area could be elsewhere in order to optimize available space for students.

Chairman Klaus stated that, based on Commission comments, it seemed as if RPS should be advised to go ahead with their appeal, with Commission's statement being that they appreciate the effort made at a compromise but would like the façade retained, and that if the Council rules against this, that they then act upon the arch concept.

Ms. Chen stated that during the meeting with Dr. Newbille, she had stated that the arch design would be included as part of the appeal package, and that it would be adopted in the event that CAR's decision were overturned.

Commissioner Morgan asked if an option like the arch proposed by Dr. Newbille had been among the options put forth by the Commission. Chairman Klaus and Commissioner Hendricks stated that the only options approved by the Commission had been preservation of the entire historic ca. 1922 portion of the building, or preservation of the whole façade of the historic building portion. Regarding the whole façade, Commissioner Hendricks pointed out that proportion is considered an important aspect of historic architecture.

Commissioner Danese asked if there was some intermediary option between the arch and the façade, perhaps for example preserving the steps if those were deemed important enough. Commissioner Hendricks stated that he'd had this in mind when he proposed extending the arch upward to include the cornice line, as a way to retain some sense of the scale and proportion of the building.

Ms. Chen suggested that preserving the entrance bay could be suggested as an option. Chairman Klaus stated that this would resemble an elevator shaft, that RPS would say they lacked funding for this option, and that in general he was doubtful that any partial preservation options would actually look like anything.

Commissioner Johnson stated that within the project time constraints RPS would not arrive at a solution satisfactory to CAR – given that they had not already made any effort to do so. Thus if the general feeling of the Commission is that the façade should be retained, that may be the position CAR has to take.

Commissioner Hendricks made a motion to extend the appeal deadline for another 75

days, while maintaining the Commission's decision of either maintaining the historic building or maintaining the entire façade, along with an historic plaque. In addition, Commissioner Hendricks proposed that the Commission approve the two brick piers proposed in Dr. Newbille's compromise. Commissioner Morgan suggested that the brick piers be of a different brick.

Commissioner Danese seconded the motion. The motion passed by the following vote:  
 Aye – 7 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan  
 No – 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler  
 Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

Chairman Klaus stated that, in light of this vote, RPS need not appear before CAR at the next meeting, but should instead go to City Council – unless they decide to retain the historic façade.

**Commissioner Hendricks made a motion to extend the appeal deadline for another 75 days, while maintaining the Commission's decision of either maintaining the historic building or maintaining the entire façade, along with an historic plaque. In addition, Commissioner Hendricks proposed that the Commission approve the two brick piers proposed in Dr. Newbille's compromise. Commissioner Morgan suggested that the brick piers be of a different brick.**

**Commissioner Danese seconded the motion. The motion passed by the following vote:**

- Aye -- 7 -** Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese
- No -- 1 -** Commissioner Sean Wheeler

#### Guideline Updates

Ms. Jones stated that there were no Guidelines updates to share at this time.

Chairman Klaus stated that an item of potential interest in the upcoming UDC meeting was a proposed skywalk between the downtown Richmond Children's Hospital at VCU and the VCU Medical Center Main Hospital on Marshall Street.

The business portion of the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Klaus at 3:59 PM.

#### \*\*\*Please Note\*\*\*

**Public comment on cases brought before the CAR will be heard after the applicant's explanatory remarks of the case and before CAR deliberation. Applicants and individuals wishing to comment on specific aspects of a given case are asked to briefly address issues related to the application.**

#### CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Klaus announced that item 3, COA-066673-2020, 2800 East Marshall Street; and item 6, COA-067387-2020, 420 North 26th Street, had been withdrawn.

Chairman Klaus stated that there were two items on the consent agenda, and invited the Commissioners to suggest projects that they would like to move from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. Chairman Klaus explained to members of the public present that there would be an opportunity to comment on consent agenda items.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, with Chairman Klaus seconding, to move the 4th item, COA-067073-2020, 2209 East Grace Street, to the consent agenda.

Commissioner Wheeler asked that the decision be revised to keep the keyhole detail as submitted, to which Commissioner Johnson agreed. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Elizabeth Price of the organization Historic Richmond stated that Historic Richmond holds an easement on 2209 East Grace Street, and that they have reviewed that application and sent an approval letter to the Commission and applicant. Historic Richmond approved the proposed brick wall repairs and the creation of an opening to serve as a pedestrian gate, and deferred to the Commission for the final details.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for a Commission motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that the consent agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

1. [COA-066639-2020](#) 1315 E. Main Street - Alter existing storefront to include an ADA accessible entrance.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

2. [COA-067261-2020](#) 1919 E. Broad Street - Replace deteriorated wood railings on five front porches and five rear porches with aluminum railings.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

4. [COA-067073-2020](#) 2209 E. Grace Street - Repair existing masonry wall; add new openings, metal gate, brick detailing, and a sign.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new gate design be simplified to appear as new construction, rather than replicating the historic design, and the revised design be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the repointing be done in accordance with the Commission's Maintenance and Repair guide for masonry and the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #2. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

3. [COA-066673-2020](#) 2800 E. Marshall Street - Replace 11 existing windows with two-over-two, aluminum clad wood windows.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was withdrawn**

5. [COA-067376-2020](#) 3101-3105 E. Marshall Street - Construct a new, mixed-use building, renovate first floor of an existing building and add a third story.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Project architect Patrick Zampetti of Studio Z Architecture introduced himself as the architect for the project. Mr. Zampetti stated that in a prior review, before he was involved in the project, the applicants had been asked to recess the balcony area in order to replicate some of the balcony rhythm of the original building.

Mr. Zampetti stated that he had found some ambiguity between the National Park Service historic preservation guidelines and those used by CAR, in regard to where the first floor façade for the commercial space should be sited – one set of guidelines calls for it to be set back further than the original building, while another set calls for it to be in line with neighboring buildings. Mr. Zampetti pointed out that as a corner property the building is allowed under the guidelines to have more attention-drawing features.

Mr. Zampetti stated that the applicants had attempted to break up the massing on the 31st Street elevation so that the two buildings will look like two residential-sized forms, one at the corner of 31st and East Marshall and another set further back on 31st.

Mr. Zampetti stated that the applicants were concurrently seeking a Special Use Permit. Depending on the outcome of that, the applicants might be required to brick in the window openings on the east side of the building, due to fire and safety concerns. Mr. Zampetti requested that the Commission approve setting back brick in the openings, to maintain their original forms. Mr. Zampetti stated that these windows would be invisible or nearly invisible to passersby. Commissioner Wheeler stated that they were already partially bricked in. Mr. Zampetti stated that many were, but that the applicants would need to brick them in more thoroughly, adding that they would retain the headers and set back the brick so that the original window forms are discernible.

Mr. Zampetti introduced Mr. Sean Jefferson, pointing out that Mr. Jefferson had been involved with the project since its inception.

Mr. Jefferson stated that he believed the applicants had addressed all of the Commission's concerns and believed that the designs arrived at would be an enhancement to the City. Mr. Jefferson pointed out that the applicants had reduced the height of the 3rd floor addition.

Commissioner Wheeler asked about the windows on the east elevation, which were noted as existing in the plans though they are bricked in. Mr. Jefferson affirmed that the windows in question were existing, though partially bricked up, and that the applicants were not adding any windows to that elevation.

Mr. Jefferson stated that the alley between the two residences measured about 2 feet 4 inches, and thus was not a functional line of sight, so the bricking in of the windows would not be a loss. Mr. Jefferson also stated that they were removing the attic rafters to lower the rooftop addition.

Commissioner Danese asked about the location of HVAC equipment and garbage. Mr. Jefferson stated that the garbage would be at the rear elevation, next to the screening, and indicated the location on the plans.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the lack of windows due to the bricking in was a cause of concern. Mr. Jefferson stated that the redesign had taken this into account. Mr. Zampetti stated that it was an infill approach. Mr. Jefferson stated that some internal redesigning might be done to account for the light distribution.



The owner, Jing Jing, introduced herself, and stated that the applicants had taken Commission comments very seriously and worked hard to address them. She stated that the applicants had met with the Church Hill Neighborhood Association, who are supportive of the project and sent a letter of support in time for the October meeting at which one of the project reviews took place. The Neighborhood Association is in favor of larger units, conducive to family usage, to which the applicants have been responsive.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for a Commission motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to approve the application with the staff conditions.

Chairman Klaus stated that he would be willing to approve the application as submitted, stating that the Commission had often approved rear additions that hid historic fabric, and that he did not discern anything special about this one. Commissioner Pearson stated that he would also be in favor of approving the application as submitted, given the limited visibility of the rear elevation.

Commissioner Johnson withdrew the motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new masonry be differentiated from the historic masonry in tone, size, and/or bond pattern and that the final masonry specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final window specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final material specifications and colors, including the screening for the parking and trash receptacle area, be submitted for review and approval; clarification of the design treatment above the storefront window be submitted for staff review and approval.

Chairman Klaus added a note to the applicant that if the conclusion of the SUP application is that the east elevation windows need to be bricked in, this would be acceptable to the Commission given that they are already mostly bricked in.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new masonry be differentiated from the historic masonry in tone, size, and/or bond pattern and that the final masonry specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final window specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final material specifications and colors, including the screening for the parking and trash receptacle area, be submitted for review and approval; clarification of the design treatment above the storefront window be submitted for staff review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye -- 8 -** Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

6. [COA-067387-2020](#) 420 N. 26th Street - Rehabilitate an existing one-story detached, single-family residence and construct a rear addition; construct a new detached, two-story single-family residence.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was withdrawn**

7. [COA-066685-2020](#) 1 N. 29th Street - Alter existing fenestration, enlarge a rear deck and add partial screening.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Lucy Wheatley introduced herself and husband Kevin Wheatley as the owners of the property at 1 North 29th Street. Mrs. Wheatley stated that she, her husband, and their four children live at 1 North 29th Street, and that the planned renovations are to make it more functional for a large family but that they do not wish to make major changes. Mrs. Wheatley stated that some of the planned changes would actually bring it closer to its original historic state. Mrs. Wheatley stated that during a period when the property was a boarding house, changes were made which resulted in uneven floor levels between sections and some of the proposed work would address such inconveniences.

Mrs. Wheatley stated that the applicants were not concerned about most of the staff-recommended conditions, but that they did have two major concerns.

Mrs. Wheatley stated that on the second-floor porch, a section that will be converted to be a bathroom, the applicants disagree with staff's recommendation to keep the door but wall it off on the inside. Mrs. Wheatley stated that she has information from previous owners that in 1973 this part of the house was a different floor height, and she does not believe the door to be original as it couldn't have been there with that configuration. Mrs. Wheatley stated that the door in question is very small and barely visible, and the existing window is being retained, but the applicants would prefer to close off the door and use pressed tin siding to match the existing.

Chairman Klaus asked the nature of the louvered item next to the door. Mrs. Wheatley stated that the louvers are on a fan.

Mrs. Wheatley stated that the applicants were also concerned about staff's recommendation to not allow an additional window on the main body of the house, as this would add necessary illumination; and that applicants also are concerned about staff's recommendation regarding a window location: the window in question would be 10 feet up on the interior if staff recommendations are followed, and thus would not be operable. Mrs. Wheatley stated that the location of the planned window, which would be lower, would have limited visibility to passersby. Mrs. Wheatley stated that that section of the house had already undergone numerous changes, and the requested alteration would only bring the window down to the same level as the other windows.

Chairman Klaus suggested that the arch over the existing window could possibly be retained, and a transom put in with the window below it. Mrs. Wheatley stated that, if it is deemed feasible by contractors, she would be open to this idea.

Commissioner Wheeler asked, regarding the applicants' plan to get rid of the small second-floor door, what sort of exterior cladding would be used. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the pressed tin might be unavailable. Mrs. Wheatley stated that she would be open to guidance as to what to use, but that she would not want it to be a different color.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for a Commission motion.

Chairman Klaus stated that he was in agreement with the applicant regarding the door and the high window. Commissioner Hendricks expressed agreement, but echoed Commissioner Wheeler's concern about what to replace the door with, were it to be removed. Regarding the high window, Commissioner Hendricks suggested that the arch be left in its current location, the area below be bricked in, and then a lower window put in to match nearby windows, probably with an arch. Commissioner Hendricks also added that it may be easier for the applicant to leave the existing door as the pressed tin will be difficult to match.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new door opening in the porch enclosure be of a simple or contemporary design and be aligned with the door above; the new doors on the south elevation be aligned by converting the westernmost window to a door on the second story and the new doors be at least half-lite doors, to maintain the open appearance of the windows; the existing door in the porch enclosure be enclosed from the interior in a manner that is reversible and does not alter the exterior appearance of the door unless the applicant can find an exterior material that matches the historic tin; the salvaged window sashes be installed in the opening that will be restored to a window on the south elevation, the existing arch above the window opening on the north elevation be maintained and the window fit into the existing jambs, and the new window have a simplified or contemporary design rather than the 6/6 light configuration proposed; the exterior materials be repaired and not replaced, and any new paint colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; any repointing of the masonry be done in accordance with NPS Preservation Brief #2, paying special attention to the need for removing existing mortar to sound mortar with hand tools and not power tools; and that any new mortar match the hardness of the existing mortar; all new windows be wood or aluminum clad wood with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar between the glass; and final window and door specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit; accurate existing condition plans and elevations be submitted to staff for administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Commission denied the application for proposed second story window in the main massing on the north elevation.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

8. [COA-066625-2020](#) 517 Catherine Street - Rehabilitate an existing multi-family residence and construct a rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Chairman Klaus stated that many letters had been received regarding this application, most of which pertained to rooms labeled as dining rooms and living rooms but which, judging from bathroom placement, appeared to actually be bedrooms. Chairman Klaus stated that such interior details are not within the purview of the Commission. Ms. Jones stated that she had brought this matter up with Zoning staff, and that they were looking into it. Chairman Klaus stated that if members of the public were present at the meeting to address such matters, they should be advised that these are not within the mandate of CAR.

Jimmy Montgomery with Carver Homes introduced himself and thanked Ms. Jones for her assistance. Mr. Montgomery stated that the applicants had no problem with staff recommendations.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicants intended to replace the existing asphalt roof shingles in kind. Mr. Montgomery stated that they were, and that the National Parks Service approved this.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the DHR had raised any issues in their letter about the property. Ms. Jones stated that DHR had concerns about the roof. Mr. Montgomery confirmed that he would have to check in with DHR about the roof and about the windows. Commissioner Wheeler stated that CAR generally does not allow asphalt shingles. Chairman Klaus pointed out that CAR can add additional conditions, and that this could be one of those.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Arthur Burton introduced himself as the resident of 519 Catherine Street. Mr. Burton stated that the house at 517 Catherine was a single-family home, and the proposed changes would make it a rooming house. Mr. Burton stated that the Commission was allowing essentially an entirely new structure which would not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Burton stated that the neighborhood has already absorbed additional population during the past ten years, which is burdensome and makes parking difficult.

Ms. Marie Cousins introduced herself as the owner of properties at 509 and 511 Catherine Street. Ms. Cousins stated that most of the houses on Catherine Street, including 517, date from the 1850s. 517 Catherine underwent many changes over time, including conversion into a multi-family dwelling. Ms. Cousins stated that she did have questions about the number of bedrooms in the planned rehabilitation, which she realized CAR does not handle; she asked, however, how the scale of the work compared to other rehabilitations on the block.

Ms. Cousins stated that she had noticed that a zoning variance had been requested, to allow building up to the lot line. Ms. Cousins expressed concern about the rear egress of the building and about the number of likely residents and the impact this would have on the area, including parking. Commissioner Hendricks stated that in terms of fire safety, windows are considered a viable emergency exit. Ms. Cousins stated that, in looking at

historic photos, she had not been able to corroborate the applicants' finding that there had been 6/6 windows. Ms. Cousins stated that the property as proposed would not be conducive for family dwelling and that while she is okay with changes it seems to be at the expense of neighborhood balance.

Diane Jeffries of 521 Catherine Street introduced herself. Ms. Jeffries stated that the main topic of the letter she'd sent to CAR was the number of bathrooms proposed and how this would relate to actual number of bedrooms. Ms. Jeffries expressed concern about the shingle roof, as she had been required to install a metal roof on her property; and about the parking. Ms. Jeffries asked if there would be any parking in the back yard of the property. Ms. Jeffries asked what the maximum number of families anticipated to live in the finished dwelling would be. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the zoning would allow up to 3 non-related family groupings, and that parking regulations would allow a maximum of 5 parking spaces in the back of the property. Ms. Jeffries stated that she was concerned that the neighborhood was changing rapidly and was not attracting families, and that she would like to keep it historic.

Ms. Cousins asked how to share her concerns with the Zoning staff and Ms. Jones stated she would follow-up with Ms. Cousins and Zoning staff. Ms. Cousins then stated that the Historic Jackson Ward Association did not support this project.

Mr. Montgomery stated that the applicants had spoken with Ms. Janis Allen, President of the Jackson Ward Association, and would be glad to continue working with her. Mr. Montgomery stated that the house is currently zoned as a duplex, thus a two-family house. Mr. Montgomery stated that the applicants are attempting to remain true to the historic character of the house and neighborhood by adding a porch; and that though they are adding an addition but that it will be subordinate to the main structure and stylistically in keeping with the neighborhood. In terms of lot coverage, Mr. Montgomery stated that the building, with the addition, will still have less than many others in the area. Mr. Montgomery stated that the windows will be 6/6 at the top and 2/2 at the bottom, and that this was recommended by DHR based on photo evidence, and that it is very difficult to discern the light configuration in the historic photo.

Mr. Montgomery stated that there will be six parking spots behind the property, which will be dealt with in a separate application and approval process with Ms. Jones.

Ms. Cousins asked how many air conditioning units there would be. Mr. Montgomery stated that there would be two, and that they would be screened.

Ms. Cousins asked what type of fence there would be, since the chain link fence would be removed. Mr. Montgomery stated that there would be no front yard fence. Ms. Cousins pointed out that this would be unlike other houses in the area, and asked if that would be a problem. Chairman Klaus stated that this would be discussed.

Chairman Klaus commented that the Commission had not been provided information about the lot coverage relative to other properties in the area, the removed chain link fence, HVAC location, or about the plans for parking space in the rear of the property. Commissioner Danese recommended that the applicant meet with the neighborhood association before a further review. Chairman Klaus agreed, adding that meeting with neighbors would also be beneficial. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the Commission should have an opportunity to address the choice of roofing material as well.

Commissioners Wheeler and Johnson stated that existing non-approved features, e.g., asphalt shingle roof or vinyl siding, may be replaced in kind. Ms. Chen stated that such

features can be allowed to remain if “grandfathered in,” but once such a feature is removed, it must be replaced in a manner that conforms to the Guidelines. Mr. Montgomery stated that in this case it was a non-issue.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that two site plans submitted seem to contradict one another, with one showing the building to the side and one showing it centered on the lot.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the addition still seemed too big, and that by her reckoning it would be 800 square feet, as against the stated 400 square feet and this could be too big for the existing 1700 SF house. Commissioner Morgan stated that if the siding replacement were to be approved, the applicant might then install the siding in a manner that does not differentiate the historic building. The north elevation details also were lacking.

Chairman Klaus stated that the size ratio of original house to addition is important, but also important is the general consistency of the building plan with the neighborhood, in terms of lot coverage and other details. Thus a context site plan would be helpful.

**A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application to allow the applicant to provide updated elevations with the correct window lite configuration and which shows the differentiation between the wood siding on the historic building and the new fiber cement on the addition, a context site plan, information about the removal of the fence and if a new fence is proposed, a dimensioned site plan with parking spaces and the location of the HVAC units indicated, to clarify the roof materials, to address inconsistencies between the site plans, and to provide a north elevation. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

9. [COA-066753-2020](#) 2412-2416 Venable Street - Construct ten new, single-family townhomes.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Sarah McInerney of Walter Parks Architects introduced herself on behalf of the applicants. Ms. McInerney stated that the applicants had looked at the option of rotating the building so it would be sited on Russell Street, but found it unworkable without reducing units and parking. Ms. McInerney stated that her research showed that houses in the area generally do not front on side streets and also that there had never been houses facing Russell Street; however, the applicants had attempted to add more doorways and entry points on the Russell Street side.

Ms. McInerney stated that listening back to the previous Commission review she perceived that the stepping down of one of the units to address the neighboring properties was only recommended by one Commissioner, and thus it had not seemed to be of great importance.

Ms. McInerney stated that, contrary to the staff report, the design does have some steps to the main entrance, though they do not go very high; and that along with the porches, these create a design consistent with those in the community.

Ms. McInerney stated that some windows had been left off the plans, and that this would be corrected.

Chairman Klaus asked if the unit that is on Russell Street could be oriented toward Russell Street and have an entrance on that side. Ms. McInerney stated that it would be challenging due to the closeness of the property line; and that it would be even more challenging to do this on the Venable Street because of the steps on the front.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Nancy Lampert introduced herself and requested that the Commission adopt the staff recommendations and defer the application. Ms. Lampert read from a letter she had sent to the Commission, stating that the design is not of a human scale or of a character in keeping with the neighborhood, despite previous Commission recommendations, and that taller buildings with rooftop amenities change the character of the neighborhood.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for a Commission motion.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the building as planned would be four stories high. Ms. Jones clarified that the "pop-up" higher portion of the building would only be on the northern building.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the wood privacy screen on the porch is atypical for a residential area, but that she was okay with this, and also that she liked the placement of the planters. Commissioner Morgan stated that defining an appropriate scale, given the range of buildings in the area, can be difficult.

Chairman Klaus stated that, in regard to the stepping down of one unit so as to address the surrounding buildings, that this had been requested by the Commission. In regard to Russell Street, in the current plan the Russell Street-facing side is a "dead wall" without any exit or entry, and that making it read as a front façade, without sacrificing units, had been discussed in the previous review.

After the Commission vote, Ms. McInerney began to formulate a question for the Commission. Ms. Jones and Chairman Klaus suggested that the applicant meet with staff prior to the next review so that issues can be clarified.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report and to allow the applicant the opportunity to redesign the Russell Street elevation to address the street, and to consider stepping down one unit to address the neighboring properties.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Mitch Danese
- Abstain --** 3 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

10. [COA-067419-2020](#) 3610 E. Broad Street - Construct a two-story rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Don Files introduced himself as the project designer on behalf of TDZ Properties, LLC.

Mr. Files stated that maintaining the rear wall of the property was not practical, and that keeping the wall would require making the overall design larger. Mr. Files stated that the textured faux wood-grain siding had been selected as it tends to camouflage irregularities caused by studs drying and building settling.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Dominic Willsdon, owner of the house next door at 3608 ½ East Broad Street, introduced himself. Mr. Willsdon stated that the two houses, being near-twins, should retain some historic parity, and expressed that he was concerned about changes that would permanently alter the relation between those two buildings.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for a Commission motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application.

Chairman Klaus stated that the main reason to defer would be the retention of the brick wall at the rear. Chairman Klaus stated that he had discussed the wall with staff and that if the addition is allowed, the interior wall becomes invisible to the outside and thus is no longer in CAR's purview. Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement with Chairman Klaus, stating that she would not feel comfortable dictating the retention of the interior wall. Commissioner Wheeler stated that this seemed to be a gray area, the closest analogue being decisions regarding removal of doors and windows. Chairman Klaus stated that during his tenure at CAR, the Commission had never dictated the appearance of an interior wall. Commissioner Hendricks stated that the applicants could leave the interior wall in place, build out the exterior wall, then demolish the interior wall. Chairman Klaus stated that, apart from the wall issue, the proposed addition is small in comparison to others in the area.

The motion to defer the application failed by the following vote:

Aye – 3 - Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr.,  
Commissioner Sean Wheeler

No – 5 - Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

Chairman Klaus stated that the faux wood grain siding could not be allowed, and that CAR has been consistent in not allowing that.



Commissioner Hendricks stated, and Chairman Klaus agreed, that the proposed setbacks were not a problem.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the rear porch railing be Richmond rail or the pickets be placed on the interior for a more finished appearance, and the porch be painted a neutral color that complements the main structure; the fiber cement siding be smooth and without a bead; and the applicant submit information about any proposed HVAC units.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- No --** 3 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Mitch Danese

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

11. [COA-066632-2020](#) 620 Chamberlayne Parkway - Construct four new attached residences.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Jimmy Montgomery on behalf of 1309 Clairborne LLC, introduced himself. Mr. Montgomery stated that the proposed three-story height was necessitated by the odd lot shape. Mr. Montgomery stated that the proposed roof was modeled on the mansard across the street, but that the applicants would be open to a flat roof design.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. David Henderson introduced himself as the owner of a property adjacent to 620 Chamberlayne Parkway. Mr. Henderson stated that with the proposed locations of the buildings, one of them would be on his property at 622 Chamberlayne. Mr. Henderson stated that parking for the new construction was problematic as well, given that parking on Chamberlayne is not an option. Mr. Henderson stated that the proposed construction does not fit the character of the neighborhood.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened the floor for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Brewer stated that the height of the buildings should be reduced, though without floor plans it is difficult to comment. Commissioner Brewer stated that the window configuration seemed odd, and that a different roof form would be desirable. In general, Commissioner Brewer stated that more information would be needed, especially a site plan.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she would like to know the width of the units, and that

to abide by Commission Guidelines they should be sited parallel to Chamberlayne. Regarding the windows, Commissioner Morgan stated that the window configuration and also the window sizes are problematic – the windows on the front elevation should not all be the same size, nor should the dormer windows be the same size as the first floor windows. Commissioner Morgan stated that referring to nearby construction is fine, but that it appeared the applicant was picking up ideas from newer construction in the area, rather than historic houses. Commissioner Morgan advised referring to the historic houses while keeping in mind that most of them are two-story.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he was comfortable with the siting, but concerned about the height and massing of the buildings, as well as some blank wall façades. Commissioner Hendricks suggested that having porches wrap around to the now-blank walls might alleviate this.

Chairman Klaus stated that there are both brick and wood-frame houses in the area, with the more modern ones tending to be brick. He added that most of the buildings in the vicinity are two stories.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he did not find the proposed building height so problematic, given the uniqueness of the site, and that he appreciated the creativity of the design. Commissioner Johnson requested that inconsistencies in the plans be cleaned up, and that the porch roof not be shingles.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the siting is interesting; and that the applicant should refer to the Guidelines regarding corner properties and address the aforementioned blank walls which face the street. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the massing of the windows in front is off-balance, and suggested that an additional bay be added; and suggested that some element, e.g. a porch, wrap around the corner to add interest, and that there should be trim of some kind. Commissioner Wheeler suggested that a survey plat be submitted to clear up any ambiguities about property ownership, and that some plan details need to be clarified, e.g. the stair configuration. He also mentioned that there were inconsistencies between the plans and the renderings.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the windows on the other side elevation should be taller and be placed lower, and that the windows should generally be taller; that the applicant should consider adding a transom over the front doors to provide more light; that mansard roofs can work but in this instance he would be disinclined to approve it; and that final plans should include locations for HVAC equipment, parking, and trash.

Commissioner Danese stated that he might prefer the houses oriented parallel to the street, as suggested by Commissioner Morgan, but it is difficult to tell without having more renderings and a context elevation.

Commissioner Pearson stated that he would like the project to go more in a clean modern direction, or to be closer in style to surrounding houses; that he did not have a problem with the proposed height.

Mr. Montgomery asked if there was a Commission consensus regarding height. Commissioners responded that they would need more contextual information. Mr. Montgomery asked if the Commission would be receptive to an English basement type of solution, with which he believed he could reduce the height from 32 feet to 30 or 28 feet. Commissioner Wheeler stated that an English basement would be somewhat atypical for the neighborhood.

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed**

## Adjournment

Chairman Klaus adjourned the meeting at 6:26 PM.