



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, June 23, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means.

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public. Less than a quorum of Richmond City Commission of Architectural Review members will assemble for this meeting in the 5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 900 East Broad Street in Richmond, Virginia 23219, and most Commission members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

To access or participate, or both, in the Commission of Architectural Review meeting on Tuesday, June 23, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2020.027](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review.

Attachments: [Public Access and Participation Instructions -COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW](#)

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address: <https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video". Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the outlined in the Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review document.

Citizens are encouraged to provide their comments in writing to carey.jones@richmondgov.com in lieu of speaking through audio or video means during the meeting. When submitting your comments by email, be sure to include in your email (i) your full legal name, (ii) any organizations you represent, and (iii) any economic or professional relationships that would be affected by the approval of the application on which you are commenting. The person responsible for receiving written comments is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All written comments received via email prior to 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Tuesday, June 26, 2020, will be provided to all members of the Commission of Architectural Review prior to the beginning of the meeting and will be included in the record of the meeting.

Call to Order

Chairman James Klaus called the June 23 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:32 pm.

Secretary to the Commission, Carey L. Jones, read the announcement for virtual public

meetings.

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public. Less than a quorum of Richmond City Commission of Architectural Review members will assemble for this meeting in the 5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 900 East Broad Street in Richmond, Virginia 23219, and most Commission members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address: <https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video". Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the outlined in the Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review document. Citizens are encouraged to provide their comments in writing to carey.jones@richmondgov.com in lieu of speaking through audio or video means during the meeting. When submitting your comments by email, be sure to include in your email (i) your full legal name, (ii) any organizations you represent, and (iii) any economic or professional relationships that would be affected by the approval of the application on which you are commenting. The person responsible for receiving written comments is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All written comments received via email prior to 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Tuesday, June 26, 2020, will be provided to all members of the Commission of Architectural Review prior to the beginning of the meeting and will be included in the record of the meeting. Commission members are electronically present using Microsoft Teams, none were physically present in City Hall.

Chairman Klaus noted that only four Commissioners had as yet logged in to the meeting, but that it seemed advisable to get started.

Richmond 300 Presentation

Chairman Klaus stated that Mr. Mark Olinger and Ms. Maritza Pechin would be presenting about Richmond 300 and the Master Plan process during the first part of the meeting, and that attendees should be aware that this would likely go over the usual 30 minutes time allotment, thus impinging on the usual start time of the regular meeting. Maritza Pechin explained how to locate the Richmond 300 draft plan online and submit feedback, and proceeded to present about findings and goals of the Richmond 300 Master Plan process.

Ms. Pechin explained that Richmond 300 refers to the upcoming 300-year anniversary of the 1737 platting and founding of the city of Richmond.

Ms. Pechin stated that the initial public meetings, which started in 2017, yielded about 6500 ideas, which were then distilled via working group meetings.

Ms. Pechin stated that there have been seven virtual Richmond 300 draft plan summits, and that there are four remaining. There have also been community consultations and forums throughout the planning process. Participation has increased recently, perhaps because it is easier to participate as the process has shifted to online.

Ms. Pechin stated that community groups are encouraged to contact her if they would

like the Richmond 300 staff to present to and/or meet with them.

Mr. Olinger stated that the last time Richmond grew was in 1970 when the annexation of Chesterfield occurred and the total area of the City today is 62 ½ square miles. He continued that we often talk about how to reinvest in the City by creating places where people want to work and create.

Mr. Olinger encouraged those present to participate in upcoming Richmond 300 events, and to look at the work done thus far on the Greater Scott's Addition node. Chairman Klaus stated that he had attended a recent event and found that the feedback and discussion about plans were positive and productive.

Chairman Klaus commented that the Commission is very busy processing applications, and that this would be something to take into account when considering adding more buildings to the City and Old Historic Districts; he commented that there could be changes to how alleys or other features are considered, thus avoiding increasing the Commission's workload. Mr.

Olinger stated that this is a good point, given that funding is not likely to increase. Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission could brainstorm some ideas for streamlining at their next meeting.

Roll Call

- Present --** 7 - * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler, * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and * Commissioner Mitch Danese
- Absent --** 1 - * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Klaus explained that items on the consent agenda can be approved with minimal or no discussion, but that the public would have an opportunity to comment and applicants would have the opportunity to move their applications to the regular agenda if that was their preference.

Chairman Klaus stated that the 7th item, the application for 3303 Monument Avenue, had been intended for a Conceptual Review but due to a misunderstanding had been placed on the regular agenda for final approval. Chairman Klaus suggested that for this item the Commissioners vote to defer the application, and take turns providing constructive comments, in a similar manner to how they would handle a conceptual review.

Chairman Klaus asked if the Commissioners had any suggestions to add or remove items for the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to move the 5th item, 619 North 27th Street, to the consent agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 6 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

Commissioner Bond was present on line, but due to technical issues was unable to vote on this and some following items.

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to move the 4th item, 513 North 27th Street, to the consent agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 6 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

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

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

1. [COA-074044-2020](#) 316 N. 21st Street - Rebuild two-story rear porch, construct roof and screen second story.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the roof height or slope be revised to differentiate the historic building and new construction, and the redesign be submitted to staff for review and approval; the rear porch railing be Richmond rail; all materials specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit; the rear porch be painted a neutral color that complements the main building and final colors be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the screening on the second story be placed inside the posts and railing.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

2. [COA-073680-2020](#) 416 W. Broad Street - Paint exterior of building and install new awning.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: any unpainted masonry remain unpainted; any new glass be clear, and not tinted or covered in a reflective coating; the cornice and trim be painted one color.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr.,
Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner
Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

4. [COA-073683-2020](#) 513 N. 27th Street - Construct a new detached garage in a rear yard.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the exterior color be submitted for staff review and approval; the roof be a dark TPO; and the doors be a modern, simple design also submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr.,
Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner
Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

5. [COA-073706-2020](#) 619 N. 27th Street - Construct a new detached garage in a rear yard.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the height of the garage be reduced by 2 feet to be more consistent with outbuildings in the district; the exterior color be submitted for staff review and approval, the siding be unbeaded; and the door be a modern, simple design also submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr.,
Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner
Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

REGULAR AGENDA

3. [COA-074045-2020](#) 415 W. Clay Street - Paint exterior of a masonry building.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

The applicant, Ms. Karissa Kaseorg, stated that she and her husband have done considerable rehabilitation to the property. The applicant stated that paint selection is very subjective yet very public, and that she considered that the colors proposed do in fact fit with the neighborhood of Jackson Ward historically and in the present day, and that the Downing Slate gray color selected, though not used in Richmond specifically, was used elsewhere on houses of that style at the time period of the house's construction. Ms. Kaseorg stated that the property at 415 West Clay is unique in its area, due to the later addition of a two-tiered porch. Ms. Kaseorg referred to an article in Historic New England which named several grays which were in use for Italianate buildings during the relevant time periods.

Ms. Kaseorg stated that the proposed colors do not wash out or mute the architectural details, and that she believed the double porch was added in the 1930s, by which time some blue and gray colors were in use. Ms. Kaseorg stated that the proposed colors fit in to the area, as there are several blue and gray houses as well as colors such as Hunter Green, though some of these are not paint colors which have undergone review by the Commission of Architectural Review. Ms. Kaseorg stated that some of these blue houses were painted their present colors before the historic district was instituted.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the proposed Downing Slate color.

Chairman Klaus stated that he has been struck by how much more diverse painted brick colors are in the Fan, and how this is a reflection of the lack of restrictions due to its not being a historic district; he has observed overwhelmingly red painted brick in Jackson Ward, Monument Avenue, or Grace Street. Chairman Klaus stated that the applicants have many color options within the approved palette, as well as the option to retain the current color, and that he would support staff's recommendation to deny the proposed color scheme. Commissioner Wheeler stated that he appreciated the applicants' research, that the house's current color is already not on the approved palette, with some gray undertones and stated his support of the grayest of the applicants' proposed color options, due to its being neutral.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the proposed Downing Slate color. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 4 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

No -- 2 - Commissioner James W. Klaus and Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

6. [COA-073709-2020](#) 3310 E. Broad Street - Rehabilitate an existing carriage house and alter roof form.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that a condition that the windows should be of modern design had been discussed and should be added; Ms. Jeffries pointed out that the inclusion of HVAC location specifications should also be added as one of the staff recommendations.

The project architect, Evan MacKenzie, stated that complying with porch railings recommendation would not be a problem. Mr. MacKenzie stated that the metal panel was meant to go over a concrete block wall built above the original masonry, and that though he recognized the historic nature of the CMU, felt that the panel in its proposed material, which is found elsewhere in the area, and in the proposed color, was a contemporary way highlight the historical masonry form while correcting an imperfect construction technique.

Regarding the roof form, Mr. MacKenzie stated that its present form, with a continuous gutter all around, causes water to sheet off and that, if not parapets, some edge condition to channel the water to one gutter would be desirable.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that the skylights would have very limited visibility with the proposed parapets, but that if a smaller roof form were specified, the skylights would be adjusted also to make sure they are not visible or only minimally visible, and that the details of this could be administratively approved. Mr. MacKenzie stated that avoiding the installation of a deck mount would be preferable, for water infiltration purposes.

Mr. MacKenzie clarified that the condenser unit's location is correct as shown in the plans, while the drawings need correction, so this should not be a problem.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that, regarding windows, the owner strongly prefers a divided light design, and that they would like to find a contemporary design that could be administratively approved.

The owner, Catherine Badger Young, mentioned, regarding the metal panel over the concrete block wall, that if the Commission is concerned about preserving any masonry, the design could be adjusted so that the panel attaches to the concrete block instead.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicants planned to reframe the roof or use the existing. Mr. MacKenzie stated that they would not be reframing the roof, but that they wanted to add a parapet along the roof edge to channel water in a better fashion, and to help with the installation of the skylights.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: The new deck railing not extend below the decking, and a revised design compatible with the district be submitted for administrative approval; the skylights not be visible from the right of way and specifications be submitted to staff for

administrative review; the HVAC unit be installed in the location shown on the proposed site plan; the new windows be of a contemporary design with no divided lights, and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; any repointing be done in accordance with the Commission's Maintenance and Repair guide for masonry and the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #2; and if the masonry requires repainting, any damaged or deteriorated paint be removed by hand to the next sound level of paint prior to repainting.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would prefer to keep the skylight as submitted, because flush-mounted skylights tend to leak. Chairman Klaus agreed, adding that the skylight profile could be approved administratively.

Commissioner Wheeler stated, regarding the metal panel, that an alternate material such as CMU or brick would be more awkward.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: The new deck railing not extend below the decking, and a revised design compatible with the district be submitted for administrative approval; the skylights not be visible from the right of way and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review; the HVAC unit be installed in the location shown on the proposed site plan; the new windows be of a contemporary design with no divided lights, and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; any repointing be done in accordance with the Commission's Maintenance and Repair guide for masonry and the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #2; and if the masonry requires repainting, any damaged or deteriorated paint be removed by hand to the next sound level of paint prior to repainting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

7. [COA-073712-2020](#) 3303 Monument Avenue - Partial demolition of and alteration of an existing garage.

Attachments: [Base Map](#)
[Application and Plans \(06/23/2020\)](#)
[Staff Report \(06/23/2020\)](#)
[Application and Plans](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Chairman Klaus asked for clarification regarding the model provided by the applicant, and whether it included new revisions. Ms. Jones stated that it did not as far as she knew, and explained that the inclusion of the model in the current review was due to the level of detail in the design, and to the fact that staff had become aware the applicant had made the model.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the application was intended to be conceptually

reviewed. Ms. Jones explained that staff had intended the application for conceptual review, but there had been a mix-up which resulted in placing the application on the regular agenda as final review. Ms. Jones stated that, despite the mix-up, since the application is listed for final review, it could potentially still be treated as final, at the option of the Commission. Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission could nonetheless provide feedback as they would for a conceptual review.

The architect, Ms. Emma Fuller, introduced herself as co-architect for the project as well as daughter of the owner, Sharon Fuller, and stated that the project has a lot to do with her own architectural practice.

Ms. Fuller stated that the goal of repurposing the garage was to provide a work space for architectural practice and also as an auxiliary outdoor multi-function space for the owner.

Ms. Fuller stated that the design worked off the architectural context of the area, as well as research by the applicants.

Chairman Klaus stated that it is a cool project, but that many of the appealing details, such as the curved wall, are more visible from the public-facing alley than they would be to the occupants, and that staff's concerns have partly to do with the open character of the garage being lost, with no indication on the walled side of the structure's history as a garage.

Chairman Klaus suggested that the curvilinear shapes could be moved to the other side so as to be less in public view, and creating more openness where the garage doors had been.

Ms. Fuller stated that she would be amenable to this, although there are plantings including a rose bush and a crepe myrtle along the north and west walls, which the applicants would ideally not wish to impinge on. Ms. Fuller stated that the design is intended to bring a visitor around the whole of the structure to arrive at the public/private entrance area at the corner with the elliptically shaped area.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Cyane Crump of Historic Richmond stated that she commended Ms. Fuller for her exciting and forward-thinking design, and stated that she appreciated that Ms. Fuller had incorporated some visual references from a Historic Richmond infill design contest of a few years ago.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report to allow the applicant the opportunity to work with staff to design an addition and alterations that maintain the historic form and massing of the garage, meet the needs of the proposed new use, and read like an addition to the historic building.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he appreciated and enjoyed the project proposal, but that he was somewhat concerned about making changes to a garage which is considered historic and could potentially be rebuilt. Commissioner Johnson stated that he was open to something new, but was also conscious of another garage project, down the street from this one and like this one very visible to the public right of way and stated that the Commission should show consistency, and that flipping the ornate details as suggested by Chairman Klaus, so that the appearance of a garage is visible from the street, might be advisable.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sanford Bond

To afford the applicant the advantages of a conceptual review, Chairman Klaus asked the Commissioners to offer their comments.

Commissioner Johnson stated the Commission has in the past been sensitive about partial demolition, and that the ornate additions, which he appreciates as an homage to the historic background, being inward-facing to the property might therefore be a good approach.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement about avoiding destroying historic fabric, and that instead building an addition might be a good solution. According to the guidelines, maintaining the street face is important and therefore orientating the architectural interventions toward the house is indicated. To save the garden as the applicant desires, Commissioner Wheeler suggested a pseudo-courtyard of some sort might be a solution.

Commissioner Bond stated that it would make more sense to continue on the current project trajectory rather than turning the design around, which would end up demolishing more of the historic structure. Commissioner Bond stated that the ellipse opening upon which the applicants are building is already there, and with the current plans very little of the original structure would be demolished. Commissioner Bond stated that to save the old structure the applicants would have to practically rebuild it, and he would be leery of using old brick for new construction; new material would be better structurally as well as demarcating what is new.

Commissioner Brewer expressed agreement with Commissioner Johnson, and stated that she liked the design idea but that it may be too much.

Commissioner Pearson expressed agreement with Commissioners' observations and staff recommendations, and stated that it is important to maintain the historic fabric, although creative, complementary additions are appreciated.

Commissioner Danese had no comments to add.

Chairman Klaus stated the flipping of the design as suggested should allow applicants to implement most of their design, and that the Commission is mainly asking only that an indication of the garage's original function be left intact. Chairman Klaus stated that there is a bit of a catch-22 in what the Commission is asking, as the only visible historic detail is the south façade. The Commission would prefer to lose the north façade.

Ms. Fuller stated that the design, including the landscaping, as proposed was an attempt to work with the existing historic walls.

Chairman Klaus stated that it is clear the applicant has put a lot of time and thought into the design.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report to allow the applicant the opportunity to work with staff to design an addition and alterations that maintain the historic form and massing of the garage, meet the needs of the proposed new use, and read like an addition to the historic building. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

8. [COA-073979-2020](#) 2322 Venable Street - New construction of a two-story mixed-use building.

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

Commissioner Pearson stated that he would abstain from review of this project, and absent himself from the meeting henceforth. Chairman Klaus stated that elections for new Commission of Architectural Review officers would be taking place at the end of the meeting. Commissioner Pearson stated that he would attempt to rejoin in time for the voting.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The architect for the project, Evan MacKenzie, stated that the applicants liked the idea of reflecting the original material in the extent of the use of masonry, but that they would be happy to redesign the elevation in question for re-submittal. Mr. MacKenzie stated that it seemed as if, as opposed to the proposed materials such as EIFS board, that perhaps a cementitious siding would be preferred, and that the applicants would like the alcoves and balconies of the design to be distinctly articulated, while still addressing staff's material concerns.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that the applicants would have no problem addressing staff comments about the windows.

Regarding the balconies, the applicants had felt that the corners would be enhanced by a layering of private and public spaces, but that they could make the recommended adjustments if the Commission agrees with staff recommendations. Mr. MacKenzie stated that more detailed information about signage would be provided for final review, and that it seemed to be in keeping with much of the historic signage of the area which is painted on the sides of secondary elevations. Mr. MacKenzie stated that aside from this mode of signage, the primary regional commercial signage seems to be of a blade form which can be seen on 25th Street and appears from a different historical era. Mr. MacKenzie stated that Commission guidance on this would be appreciated.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that the applicants, given the site constraints, would appreciate the flexibility to consider various options for mechanical/HVAC placement, which could potential be the roof if they are able to devise a sufficiently invisible design and placement.

Commissioner Bond asked what material was being considered for the panels. Mr. MacKenzie stated that a cementitious product such as one of the hardie products had been considered, but nothing specific had been determined as of yet.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Nancy Lampert stated that she hoped the window design and the proposed asphalt shingles, both of which are not in keeping with the area, would be dealt with by Commission as per staff recommendations. Ms. Lampert stated that, aside from on the first-floor commercial component, double-hung windows would be more appropriate for the district than what was proposed.

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

Chairman Klaus stated that he liked the plan; that he agreed with many staff comments including regarding the window sizes; that he did not object to the use of modern materials, but that the stark white color proposed was problematic; and that the solid non-porous balcony railings proposed seemed too incongruous with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bond stated that he liked the design and found it clearly modern yet not out of scale with its surroundings. Commissioner Bond stated that he did not mind the solid railings, nor their projecting profile, as the projection indicates the entrance to the commercial section, and the solid railing surface could potentially be used for signage. Commissioner Bond stated that the brickwork is overly fussy, the windows should be larger, and that he did not mind the panels although metal panels might be considered as an alternative. Commissioner Bond expressed agreement with Chairman Klaus that the stark white color is excessive.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she liked the project in general, but agreed that the white was a bit much, and stated that she would prefer to see an open railing.

Commissioner Danese stated that he enjoyed the design concept overall, and expressed agreement with Commissioner Bond regarding the masonry and that it should be broken up by some other material. Commissioner Danese stated that the HVAC needs to be out of sight, that he agreed with Commissioner Bond regarding the balcony projections, and that the closed railings are not a problem.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he agreed with previous comments, and that he had no problem with the balcony shape.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he liked the balconies as proposed, including the railing, and that adding another one in the recessed area on the north alley elevation could be considered. Commissioner Wheeler agreed with staff that windows should be larger, especially on the front and around the corner, this being a corner property, and stated that the brick openings should relate more to the windows. For the panels, Commissioner Wheeler recommended more durable materials, as opposed to an EIFS material which could be prone to denting, at the street level where the tactile qualities of the material would be discernible.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement with Ms. Lampert that the asphalt shingles should not be used in a historic district, although with the relatively flat roof these would not be very visible.

The application was conceptually reviewed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes

May 26, 2020

Ms. Jones stated that she did not have minutes from the last meeting, of May 26, ready for review and approval, and that this could be done at the upcoming quarterly meeting or at the next monthly meeting in July.

Secretary's Report

Ms. Jones stated that she would also be amenable to deferring the Secretary's report to another meeting also, other than to touch on recent developments regarding Monument Avenue. This, the Administrative Approval Report, the Enforcement Report, and Other Committee Reports were all deferred.

Ms. Jones stated that the City Council has unanimously indicated support for the removal of the monuments, that there have been internal meetings on the topic, and that at this point it is up to Council to determine a way forward for removal of the monuments. Ms. Jones stated that the state enabling legislation requires the state to publish guidelines regarding any future contextualization, and that she hoped to meet with staff at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for further clarification about this.

Board Elections

Chairman Klaus stated that at the last meeting, potential interested Commission officer candidates were asked to express their interest to Ms. Jones. Two Commission members, Commissioner Wheeler and Commissioner Johnson, contacted Ms. Jones and let her know that they would be willing to serve as either Chair or Vice-Chair.

Chairman Klaus asked if there were any additional nominations, and stated that he himself could not be re-elected for another consecutive term, as the bylaws and the limits of his remaining term as Commissioner would both preclude this. Chairman Klaus stated that both Commissioner Wheeler and Commissioner Johnson have more than two years remaining in their terms, and thus could fulfil Chair or Vice-Chair duties for the whole two years of that term.

Chairman Klaus suggested that, if no Commissioners object to the idea, Commissioners could at their earliest convenience contact Ms. Jones and inform her of their preference, and that whichever of the two candidates has the most votes would be Chair, and whoever has the second-most would become Vice-Chair. This method would make a secret ballot process, as opposed to publicly voting during the course of the meeting.

Chairman Klaus stated that a related but less urgent issue is selection of a CAR representative to serve in that capacity on the Urban Design Committee. Chairman Klaus stated that he would be happy to serve in that capacity through the summer, but that hopefully by September the new officers would select a new person for that position.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:52 pm.