

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
July 22, 2014**

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendrick
 Mr. Nathan Hughes (arrived at 3:32)
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

Members absent: Mr. Sanford Bond

Staff Present: Ms. Catherine Easterling, CAR Secretary
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the April 22nd minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the May 27th minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Green stated that they have been working on updates to the new construction guidelines and stated that most of changes are attempts to clarify new construction and infill because they had been co-mingled. Mr. Green stated that many of guidelines have been separated to make them more legible and that they created a separate category for large-scale construction and made the infill section easier to use for people. Mr. Green stated that they will be voting on the changes in August.

Ms. Wimmer stated that a previous quarterly meeting they had some images of infill and inquired if they should insert the images in the pages or should they have them in a separate appendix. Ms. Easterling stated that the she has the

photos on the FTP site and stated that she would send the Commission members a link to it. Ms. Easterling also stated that they discussed at a previous meeting that maybe they should have some Richmond examples. Mr. Green stated that they agreed that some examples from Richmond would be good.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment on the Design Review Guidelines. Mr. Green stated that the next topic that they are going to tackle are the mural guidelines.

Ms. Easterling stated that would be a great idea and stated that Historic Richmond Foundation had wanted to weigh in on murals and Mr. Pomajambo wanted to participate in that conversation as well.

SECRETARY REPORT

Ms. Easterling stated that she got everyone's comments for the resolution of appreciation for Mr. Johannas and Mr. Pearsall and asked Mr. Green to read them into the record.

Whereas, David Johannas faithfully and thoughtfully discharged his duties as a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from October 2004 through December 2013; and

Whereas, he provided invaluable insights into optimal planning practices; and

Whereas, his professional work has been an exemplar of the Commission's guidelines; and

Whereas, he regularly introduced excellent examples of new infill construction at quarterly business meetings; and

Whereas, he gave generously of his time during many protracted meetings and site visits; and

Whereas his articulate and insightful comments and motions served the Commission and applicants; and

Whereas, he advocated for appropriate infill construction in order to protect the integrity of historic buildings in Old and Historic Districts, and

Whereas, his service as Commission Chair provided the Commission with direction and leadership;

Now therefore the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review hereby express thanks and appreciation to Mr. Johannas for his service.

Mr. Yates made a motion to adopt the Resolution of Appreciation for Mr. Johannas. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and passed 7-0-0.

Whereas, John W. Pearsall III faithfully and thoughtfully discharged his duties as

a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from July 2010 through February 2014; and

Whereas, he encouraged the Commission to consider and protect the city's historic resources; and

Whereas, his in-depth knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order helped to guide Commission deliberations; and

Whereas, he kept the Commission informed about a broad range of historic preservation issues; and

Whereas, he gave generously of his time during many protracted meetings and site visits; and

Whereas his input at Commission Task Force meetings helped to shape updates to the *Design Review Guidelines*; and

Whereas, his succinct motions made Commission meetings more efficient, and

Whereas, his knowledge of earlier Commission processes provided a helpful framework for Commission discussions;

Now therefore the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review hereby express thanks and appreciation to Mr. Pearsall for his service.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to adopt the Resolution of Appreciation for Mr. Pearsall. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 7-0-0.

Ms. Easterling stated that they will also need to work on a Resolution of Appreciation for Ms. Sadler who has resigned her position. Ms. Easterling stated that the Better Housing Coalition, who is the new nominating body for that position, stated that they have submitted three nominees to the Clerk's Office for council review. Ms. Easterling stated that they could have a new member pretty soon and asked the members if they could send her their comments, they will compile those for a Resolution of Appreciation for Ms. Sadler.

Ms. Easterling stated that Ms. Kathleen Onufer, who is the staff person with the department, is involved with the Façade Improvement Program and stated that they met with Economic and Community Development staff a few weeks ago and they discussed the need for some dialogue between the departments when C.A.R.E. or Enterprise Zone funds are being used in City Old and Historic Districts. Ms. Easterling stated that they want to make sure that recipients of those grants understand that they need to abide by City Old and Historic District regulations and stated that hopefully it will result in C.A.R.E. applicants in City Old and Historic districts coming to the Commission.

Ms. Easterling stated that Commission staff met July 1st in court regarding the property at 2337 West Grace Street, the house that had the electric blue trim, and that they would prefer not to take the applicant to court and would prefer that the property owner abate the violation. Ms. Easterling stated that in most instances property owners abate the violations but that this applicant was not compliant. Ms. Easterling stated that initially they went to court and the city

attorney found out that he knew the defendant so they had to reschedule until July 1st and that it was very apparent that the judge understood the City Old and Historic Guidelines and that it was the law. Ms. Easterling stated that the judge indicated to the defendant that they need to abide by those regulations and that it was up to the Commission to determine the appropriateness of the paint color. Ms. Easterling stated that the judge deferred the court until August 5th and that he was inclined to find the property owner guilty if he did not abate the violation by the August 5th meeting. Ms. Easterling stated that shortly after that the property owner abated the violation.

Ms. Easterling stated that she and Mr. Hill met with the representative of the new Community School on Hermitage Road in the Hermitage Road Old and Historic District. She explained that a few years ago they considered a master plan for the development of that large parcel land and that they are making revisions to that master plan and will be coming back to the Commission with an updated version.

Ms. Easterling stated that the gas station on the corner of W. Broad St and Belvidere St may be redeveloped and the applicant wants to construct a Walgreens. She stated that they are applying for a Special Use Permit and that they will be coming to the Commission before that gets finalized.

Ms. Easterling stated that she doesn't have a printed copy of the administrative approval report. Ms. Easterling stated that she and Mr. Palmquist signed off on permits for the Black History Museum expansion and the revitalization of the Armory and that is moving forward. Ms. Easterling stated that they have also signed off for some emergency stabilization at 511 W. Marshall Street and that the Building Commission had declared it to be an eminent threat to the public and that Historic Richmond Foundation and someone who is going to do some pro bono work established some stabilization plans and that they signed off on some emergency roof repairs.

Ms. Easterling stated that she will be out of the office from July 28th thru August 4th and stated that members could call Tara Ross and she will direct them to a staff person that could assist them. Ms. Easterling stated that there are a couple of changes to the agenda and stated that the applicant for item number 9 for 2400 E. Franklin Street has asked to withdraw his application from the agenda and will reschedule it for the August meeting and that the applicant will submit some supplemental information. Ms. Easterling stated that for the consent agenda item number 1, only 3 windows in that application will be replaced and the other windows will be repaired.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Mr. Palmquist stated that they issued a number of violations in historic districts since their last meeting. Mr. Palmquist stated that notices of violations have been issued for 2700 block of E. Leigh Street for replacing windows, for the 2300 block of Venable Street for modifying the storefront cornice, for the 2100 block of

Cedar Street for installing new windows, siding and other exterior work and for the 400 block of North Allen Avenue for incomplete painting work and inappropriate column repairs.

Ms. Easterling stated that the property on E. Leigh Street, which is a church, started taking out windows and that they have indicated that they are going to submit an application for Commission review in August and that they replaced the windows on the first floor of the building. Ms. Easterling stated that there are a couple more violations that they will be issuing on Venable Street and a property in Springhill as well. Ms. Easterling stated that Mr. Palmquist will be taking over the enforcements in August.

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that the UDC reviewed 5 projects and that there was some ramp and canopy encroachments at 208 E. Leigh Street and a series of VCU street encroachments on West Marshall Street. Mr. Green stated that there were three regular agenda items VCU street light encroachment on the south side of West Marshall Street. Mr. Green stated that there were two other projects that the Commission will think is interested is at 201 and 207 W. Broad Street for the Quirk Hotel which has to go through both CAR and UDC. Mr. Green stated that it came before UDC for outdoor dining, planters and sidewalk encroachments and that it was approved for everything except for some of the sidewalk encroachments. Mr. Green stated that the only changes were that the planter boxes were reduced on the side street. The final project was the conceptual review of the redesign of the 17th Street Farmer's Market, which is calling for the removal of the existing sheds and the closure of the streets to have an outdoor space. Mr. Green stated that it passed with a couple of conditions that they try to keep more of the original street paving materials in place and that they will need to come back for final review and approval.

Mr. Bilder inquired if they were going to reuse any of the materials and Mr. Green stated that parts of the sheds will be given to other community groups that are running farmer markets and that some of the cobbles will be reused in the complex. Mr. Bilder stated that if all the sheds are taken down it will be a hot piece of concrete and Mr. Green stated that they showed planted trees on the plans. Mr. Green stated that they were told that there is a second portion added if the baseball stadium is constructed there and that there is a plan to connect those component but that is not part of the current design.

Mr. Green read the Resolution of Thanks and Appreciation to Ms. Easterling.

WHEREAS, Catherine Easterling has faithfully and thoughtfully discharged her duties as a Planner for the City of Richmond: she began in May 2007 as an intern in Planning; in January 2008 she was hired a Planner I in the Division of Planning and Preservation; in January 2009 she became Alternate Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review, in May 2011 she began serving as Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review, and In July 2011

she was appointed Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review; and

WHEREAS, Catherine filled the requirements of her position with thoughtful, consistent professionalism; and

WHEREAS, her dedication to the City of Richmond and its Old and Historic Districts has resulted in the preservation of many significant historic resources throughout the City allowing these historic resources to be enjoyed by generations to come, and

WHEREAS, her knowledge and endless patience have provided both support and guidance to the Commissioners, the applicants and concerned citizens throughout her years of service to the city, and

WHEREAS, she has served the City of Richmond and the Commission of Architectural Review with distinction, and dedicated great effort to solving complicated issues, and

WHEREAS, her commitment to her work as Secretary of the Commission of Architectural Review has had a resounding impact on the way the Commission does business and maintains its guidelines, and

WHEREAS, her honesty and dedication have provided invaluable service to the city and the Commission, and

WHEREAS, Catherine's staff reports were thorough, well-reasoned, and always consistent with the Commission of Architectural Review Guidelines, and

WHEREAS, her knowledge of procedure kept the Commission on track on numerous occasions, reminding us to return to the point and to follow these procedures, and

WHEREAS, she invariably treated applicants with patience and respect, and under all circumstances remained a consummate professional, and

WHEREAS, her professionalism in dealing with the public, with City Council members, and with the Commission has been exemplary, and

WHEREAS, Catherine was a very effective representative of the City and the CAR in several court appearances, and

WHEREAS, her second meeting as Secretary is the only recorded instance of a CAR meeting being cancelled due to seismic activity, which event did nothing to shake her poise, and

WHEREAS, it is clear that Catherine has maintained a steady hand at the helm through numerous personnel and leadership changes at the city, and

WHEREAS, she will be greatly missed, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review of the City Of Richmond hereby express their thanks and appreciation to Catherine Easterling for her many contributions to the Commission of Architectural Review and, most importantly, to the citizens of the City Of Richmond.

Mr. Green made a motion to pass the letter of resolution for Ms. Easterling. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Green made a motion to move application 14-75 at 1327 E. Cary Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the consent agenda items per the reasons cited in that staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

Application No. 14-75 (CFC of Charleston)
1327 E. Cary Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-75 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Hughes seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace existing rear deck, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-70 (A. Nasser)
2434-3438 Venable Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's requests for a number of work items that were completed without a necessary Certificate of Appropriateness at several vacant lots and a corner commercial building located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Hughes inquired if the block around the store is new and Ms. Easterling stated yes, and that it was added after the district.

Mr. Bilder inquired if they were asking for approval for the mural that is there and Ms. Easterling stated yes.

Mr. Ali Nasser came up to answer questions.

Ms. Ann Wortham stated that she lives in Union Hill and stated that she urges the Commission not to approve this application and stated that a large part of comments are included in a letter that she sent in. Ms. Wortham stated that the mural is painted on a non-painted block wall and that it was done without a permit and that the parking lot doesn't meet any of the Zoning guidelines. Ms. Wortham stated that the parking lot is encroaching over the brick sidewalk and is hazardous to pedestrians.

There were no additional comments from members of the public. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes inquired when the mural was done and Mr. Green stated that it was post district.

Mr. Yates stated that they don't get involved with zoning and parking lot issues and that there is an historical issue here about the sidewalk and the granite curb which is being damaged by the traffic. He stated that he would certainly strongly support the reinstallation of some kind of curb along there to prevent the traffic from driving over the sidewalk. Mr. Yates stated that this may not be an historical issue but a safety issue in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hughes stated that he feels that the curb falls into the Commission's purview and that they do oversee parking lots and that this doesn't conform to the Guidelines.

Ms. Easterling stated that she didn't see the letter from Ms. Wortham in her e-mail.

Mr. Yates stated that he is not sure of the use for the retaining wall on the side of

the building and that he could live with it if it was parged. He stated that the Guidelines state that a brick wall should not be painted and that he doesn't have problem with the rest of the mural that is not on the unpainted brick.

Mr. Green asked Ms. Easterling about the mural guidelines and Ms. Easterling stated that adopted Mural Guidelines do call out non-contributing buildings in which this building is identified in the National Registry as a non-contributing building and stated that the Guidelines note that painting directly on walls of a non-contributing building will be considered by the Commission on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Easterling stated that it specifically talks about brick on an historic building.

Ms. Yates stated that this is such a prominent location that he is concerned about the possible precedent and that this would send a message to the neighborhood that they are okay with murals at or on any location.

Mr. Elmes inquired why the applicant built the concrete wall and Mr. Ali Nasser stated that the side is far from the building and that he asked if he could have some bricks in there and they stated that he could have 10 inches so no one will hit the building with their cars. Mr. Nasser stated that he wants to have parking for his customers and that it is important to him and the neighborhood that he have a parking lot and that he wants it to look nice and better. Mr. Elmes asked if they can access the parking lot from the alley and Mr. Nasser stated no, because it's not his property. Mr. Elmes inquired where they get deliveries and Mr. Nasser stated that they deliver on the street. Mr. Elmes inquired if they have a longer term plan for improving the parking lot and Mr. Nasser stated that they will do what the city wants. Mr. Elmes stated that gives him a little more clarity of what is going on and stated that the mural was to make the building look a little nicer and Mr. Nasser stated, yes.

Mr. Yates inquired if the applicant had any conversations with the zoning office about the driveway and Mr. Nasser stated yes, and that they filled out a permit application and that he is waiting on the meeting.

Ms. Easterling inquired if he was waiting to submit his application after the Commission made a decision and Mr. Nasser stated yes. Ms. Easterling stated that sometimes the zoning and permitting staff will hold off on allowing the applicant to apply for a permit until they understand that the Commission is open to the idea of the work.

Ms. Easterling asked Mr. Nasser if he paid for a permit and Mr. Nasser stated yes.

Mr. Green inquired if they submitted a building permit and Mr. Nasser stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer asked if the curb cut and paving was in the application and Mr.

Nasser stated yes, for a curb cut.

Mr. Green stated that normally when you submit a permit in an Old and Historic District it is usually routed to Ms. Easterling.

Ms. Easterling stated that a curb cut will usually have to be seen by Public Works.

Mr. Elmes stated that it seems to be a work in progress and stated that if the parking lot is owned by the applicant and that he don't see it as a terrible thing as long as it came back to the Commission.

Mr. Yates stated that if it was a proper curb cut and entrance into the parking lot that he could live with that.

Mr. Elmes stated that they can defer it until the building permit can be located or until the applicant has a plan.

Ms. Easterling stated that it is a violation so they would like to move forward with this as efficiently as possible and that it would be helpful to know whether or not the city will approve a curb cut at this location. She stated that you can't tell him to build a retaining wall or structure if they are going to approve a curb cut.

Mr. Yates inquired if staff could track this down before the next meeting. Ms. Easterling stated that they will do all they can to contact the various parties to see if any permits for a curb cut has been applied for.

Mr. Hughes inquired if they should piece the motion out because the mural doesn't have anything to do with that. Ms. Easterling stated that if they are going to be approving components of the project or denying components of the project then they need to approve as a partial approval with a very specific request that the applicant return at the following meeting with additional information.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he would suggest that they keep it the application together and that he doesn't think approving parts of the application are going to benefit one way or the other and that the critical issue is the drive way entrance and the curb cuts.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant time to pursue the curb cut and flesh out his plan for a potential parking lot to be located at that location and for it to be contingent upon CAR Guidelines.

Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that this deferral will go no further than the September CAR meeting. Mr. Elmes accepted the amendment.

After discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

Application No. 14-72 (S. Hodges)
2241 W. Grace Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace all windows on the front, rear and sides of this structure within the West Grace Street Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition.

Mr. Yates inquired when the photo at the top was taken and Mr. Palmquist stated that it was taken in 1996.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Sarah Hodges, the property owner, inquired if there is transfer of the property or change of ownership does that affect what happens with the windows. Ms. Easterling stated that the City Attorney's Office advised them that it doesn't affect the Commission's consideration for a violation.

Mr. Elmes stated that the windows were replaced post 2008. Ms. Hodges stated that the property was transferred into her name and refinanced and stated that at the time her ex-husband made the decision.

Ms. Hodges stated that she thinks that with the Old and Historic District upon purchasing a house they should be told when they are closing the contract and that would bring awareness. She stated that they had a neighbor come to their association board meeting this past year and that he made it clear that he was going to make sure that things got changed. Ms. Hodges stated that they would love to have the Commission's approval to keep the windows.

Mr. Elmes stated that for the record the State did at one point have that information in closing documents and that it was voted out on the state level.

Mr. Doug Marmon stated that there is a contractor that knows the permitting process and stated that it's not just the homeowner and that there needs to be something in the contractor's association for the Old and Historic District to address these issues.

There were no additional comments from members of the public. Commission Discussion began.

Mr. Yates stated that he is familiar with the house and stated that he cannot remember what the earlier windows looked like and that it is a newer house that probably dates from 1923.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to partial approve the application and that the five windows be replaced for the reasons stated that in staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 7-0-0.

Ms. Easterling stated that the applicant would need to come back to the Commission to get approval for the style of the window that would be replacing the current ones and stated that they like to act within a year and would like the

violation abated within a year of the Notice of Violation.

Ms. Hodges inquired if they have to be replaced with a one-over-one wood window and Mr. Green stated with wood or aluminum clad wood and that staff could help her work through those details.

Mr. Elmes stated that he would defer it to staff.

Mr. Yates made a motion to reconsider the motion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Elmes made a motion for a partial approval that the applicant can retain all but the five front windows which should be 1-over-one wooden or aluminum clad and that the window style and color could be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace windows, and

WHEREAS, the Commission approved the window replacement on the sides and rear of the property, but did not approve the use of five replacement windows at the front of the residence, and

WHEREAS, the windows should be replaced with wooden or aluminum clad windows in a one-over-one configuration that is compatible with the color and style of the building, and

WHEREAS, Commission staff should review any replacement window option for these five windows, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-73 (S. Kiatsuranon)
1600 Monument Avenue

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install a concrete patio and fence for outdoor dining at the Stuart Circle apartment building located in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Yates inquired if Ms. Easterling heard from the Monument Preservation Society and Ms. Easterling stated yes, that she heard from the President of the Monument Preservation Society and they stated that were only concerned with the time and hours of the business.

Mr. Kiatsuranon came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes inquired how the wall was going to integrate on the concrete wall and Mr. Kiatsuranon stated that it will be on the ground. Mr. Elmes inquired if it would be an integrated interior bar section about 12 inches wide and Mr. Kiatsuranon stated where the fence is.

Mr. Green inquired what the counter material is and Mr. Kiatsuranon stated that it is a wood counter top and that it would be stained.

Mr. Yates stated that as a neighbor he doesn't know anyone that is in opposition to the restaurant at this location and stated that the stairway makes it difficult to access and a lot of people walk by it and that the neighbors he talked to are very supportive of the restaurant. Mr. Yates stated that as a resident he doesn't see anything that is being proposed that is in opposition to their rules and guidelines and stated that it is part of living in an urban neighborhood.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application based on the staff guidelines and with the conditions outlined in the staff report that the stained color of the counter be deferred to staff. Mr. Green added an amendment that the only conditions that were illuminated by staff report is the fence. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer.

Mr. Hughes inquired about what the fence is going to look like and Ms. Easterling stated that it will be a simple picket fence with a black metal finish.

After further discussion the motion passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install fence and patio for outdoor dining, and

WHEREAS, the Commission staff must review and approve the stain color for the wooden counter attached to the new fence, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE:	Affirmative	Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates
	Negative:	None
	Abstain:	None

Application No. 14-74 (Mangrove Porperties LLC)
2319 M. Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's requests to repair and replace damaged exterior materials, paint the structure, construct a rear one-story addition, and remove a window and relocate a door on the rear elevation. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the intent was to take the window on the right and turn it into a door and Mr. Palmquist stated yes. Ms. Wimmer inquired if they were going to leave the openings as they exist.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Bryan Traylor with Unlimited Renovations came up to answer questions.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the applicant had any information on the door that is going in the window opening and asked if they are going to leave the widths as it is and insert the door. Mr. Traylor stated yes, that they are going to remove the window on the right and cut that into a doorway and that the window on the left is going to remain the same. He stated that they are not going to increase or decrease the height or the width and the door that they are using for that will be coming from the basement. Ms. Wimmer inquired if it was a wooden door and Mr. Traylor stated that it is a wooden 6 panel door.

Mr. Yates stated that on the renovated first floor plan the window in the rear wall that was shown as being a door is going to remain and Mr. Traylor stated yes, that they are trying to change this from a single family home to a duplex and stated that if they do get that approval then it will be a half bath. Mr. Yates inquired about the length of the basement addition and Mr. Traylor stated that they will have the bathroom addition within the existing outline of the porch and shorten the length of the bathroom.

Mr. Elmes inquired if it is aluminum siding and Mr. Traylor stated that it is sort of a hodge podge but that they are planning on leaving the aluminum siding and that any of the cornice work and brackets will be repaired and replaced in-kind.

Mr. Jay Hanes stated that he is a neighbor and inquired about noise and access and inquired when the start and stop time in terms of months and years, the daily process, parking issues, the locations of the dumpsters and the period of time.

Mr. Traylor stated that the dumpsters will be on 24rd Street and that it will be signed off and that they will have the street permits as well as the sidewalk permits.

Ms. Easterling stated that the applicant will be applying for a Special Use Permit and that the Commission doesn't regulate sound, noise or length of construction.

Mr. Elmes stated that the city mandates the start and finish times of all construction in the Permits and Inspections Office.

Mr. Hendricks stated the times are from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m.

Ms. Easterling stated that there was a letter of support from a member of the community.

There were no additional comments from members of the public. Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to repair deteriorated features and construct new rear addition, and

WHEREAS, the new addition must not extend beyond the brick piers at the basement level, and

WHEREAS, the window at door openings at the rear of the building will no longer be modified, and

WHEREAS, the window opening between the sun room and the porch will be lengthened to accommodate a paneled, wooden door, and

WHEREAS, the review and approval of any changes required by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service for rehabilitation tax credit purposes may be deferred to Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-76 (NoVa Ventures XI)
3107 E. Marshall Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a 2nd floor addition at this property in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Enoch Pugh on behalf of NoVa Ventures XI stated that they accepts staff's conditions.

There were no additional comments from the public. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green introduced a motion to approve the application with the conditions noted in the staff report and in accordance with the reasons in the staff report and that the reveal be 7 ½".

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they want to specify the specific reveal on HardiPlank siding.

Mr. Elmes stated that the standard is 7 ½".

The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new rear addition, and

WHEREAS, the new windows for the addition shall match the configuration of the existing windows on the building, and

WHEREAS, the reveal of the HardiPlank siding shall be approximately 7 ½ inches,

WHEREAS, the review and approval of any changes required by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service for rehabilitation tax credit purposes may be deferred to Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City

Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes,
Yates and Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-69 (E. Akarkarasu)
720 N. 25th Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report of the applicant's request to replace the front porch columns and railing at a residence located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project.

Mr. Green inquired if they know what the materials were for the columns that were removed and Ms. Easterling stated no, that the applicant stated that they were deteriorated.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Green made a note that the applicant was not present at the meeting.

There were no additional comments from the public. Commission discussion began.

Ms. Easterling stated that the sister houses have been demolished and stated that the adjacent houses are new infill construction.

Mr. Yates stated that the original rails were less intrusive than those that they put up. Mr. Yates stated that the original porch columns that are there were very slender columns which you see in Church Hill and stated that he supports staff recommendations that the columns be replaced to match what was removed.

Ms. Easterling stated that the historic district nomination states that it was constructed in 1865.

Mr. Green stated that with this form it is usually cast iron.

Mr. Elmes stated that a chance to get an octagonal column back is pretty difficult and asked if they want to get away from a false historicism with a turned column and go with something simpler like a 4x4. Mr. Elmes stated that the survey says that it appears to be an octagonal delicate thin column and stated that what is there now is not a historic column and stated that he is inclined to leave it as it is because it seems like they are guessing.

Mr. Yates stated that he would rather see a 2 ½ inch round metal post which would be closer to what was there originally.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the condition that if the previous octagonal columns exist they be installed. Otherwise, the new porch columns may remain.

Ms. Easterling inquired if they can have it on site and Mr. Elmes stated that they

can have them on the site.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if they were painting them and Ms. Easterling stated yes.

After further discussion that motion passed 5-2-0 (Green and Yates opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace front porch columns and railing, and

WHEREAS, the previous columns stills exist at the property, they should be reinstalled on the porch, and

WHEREAS, if the previous columns have been thrown out, the applicant may keep the existing columns, provided that they are painted a color that is reviewed and approved by staff,

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes and Wimmer

Negative: Green and Yates

Abstain: None

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

James Hill
Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review