



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, December 18, 2018

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

James Klaus, the Chairman, called the December 18th meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:30 pm.

Roll Call

Present -- 9 - * Commissioner David C. Cooley, * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler and * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Approval of Minutes

November 27th, 2018

Other Business

Secretary's Report

Commission Secretary Carey L. Jones informed the Commission that the November meeting minutes are not yet ready, and will be distributed to Commissioners via email. Ms. Jones asked that Commissioners send comments on the minutes to her and not to all Commissioners.

Ms. Jones announced that the Commission 2019 meeting dates have been established and are posted on the City of Richmond Legistar website. Hard copies of the schedule were passed out to the Commissioners. Meeting invites have also been distributed to the Commissioners via email.

Ms. Jones pointed out that the next Commission meeting will be the Quarterly meeting at 6pm on January 15, and asked if Commissioners had any suggestions as to location. Vice-Chairman Hendricks stated that his office should be available at that time. It is located at 2100 East Cary Street, Suite 100, with parking across the street and an accessible entrance. Ms. Jones requested that Commissioners contact her with any additional agenda items for this meeting.

Ms. Jones announced that Planning and Preservation staff met internally recently to examine the application review process and turnaround times. One finding was that additional information and questions arrive after the staff reports have been posted. The decision was made to complete staff reports by the Tuesday one week prior to Commission meetings, and distribute them electronically to Commissioners at that time. Ms. Jones will be working with City information technology staff to set up an FTP site and

asked for the Commissioners' patience while this is under construction.

Ms. Jones announced that staff will be meeting with City legal staff regarding how Planning and Preservation can work with Code Enforcement to address long-standing code violations on historic buildings, specifically buildings on the way to a potential "demolition by neglect" situation.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that recent administrative approvals have been distributed to Commissioners via email.

Chairman Klaus stated that there seemed to be more denials than usual among the administrative approvals, and asked if this was true and if so why.

Ms. Jones explained that this would have been primarily permits being denied, and that staff typically denies permits if an applicant applied for a building permit before applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Klaus stated that there also seemed to be instances in which applicants were submitting plans which were different from what had been previously approved, as well as one instance in which documentation was missing.

Ms. Jones confirmed this and stated that the two main reasons for denials are 1) applicants need a COA prior to permit application and do not realize this; or, 2) what was submitted for building plans does not match what the Commission had previously approved. Staff will generally meet with these applicants and advise them to re-submit their applications; however, if they do not do so in time, they will receive a denial.

Ms. Jeffries stated that the quantity of denials may have been larger because she had recently gone through and cleared out some permits for which staff had been awaiting further information.

Chairman Klaus stated that the higher number of denials, in addition to the reasons stated, was also attributable to the compressed application and approval timeframe in December, due to the holidays.

Ms. Jones mentioned that staff does not issue denials without contacting applicants first to attempt to get needed information and/or documentation.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that the Enforcement process, and the Commission's role in it, would be a topic at the upcoming quarterly meeting. Staff will be meeting soon with City attorneys to find out about any additional tools that might facilitate the enforcement process. Ms. Jones and Ms. Chen recently attended a meeting of the Code Enforcement staff and will be meeting with the Code Enforcement staff who work in historic districts to enlist their help in spotting violations.

Ms. Jones stated that two paint color-related violations have recently been resolved. Ms. Jones and Ms. Chen are also in the process of meeting with property owners to resolve window violations.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that there are two aspects to the violations Commission staff

addresses: one being maintenance issues; the other being non-compliance with the Guidelines.

Ms. Jones replied that this relates to a question staff is trying to resolve. Currently Commission staff may only issue a Notice of Violation in a situation in which non-approved changes are made to the exterior of a property. However, some important historic buildings are currently suffering from neglect; therefore staff is investigating ways within the City code by which this can be addressed.

Chairman Klaus stated that a related matter already discussed with Ms. Jones, which can be addressed at the quarterly meeting, is the idea of staff issuing to the Commission, either on a quarterly or monthly basis, a list of current outstanding violations.

Ms. Jones confirmed that this will be on the quarterly meeting agenda for January 15th 2019.

Discussion of Robert's Rules of Order

Ms. Chen distributed an abridged version of Robert's Rules of Order to Commissioners, and discussed how these could be used to make the meeting discussions, motions, and approvals or denials clearer for the staff taking minutes as well as the public in attendance or listening to the recordings of the meeting minutes.
The Business portion of the meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus stated that, due to his absence from the most recent Urban Design Commission meeting, he had nothing to report.

*****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

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 1st item, COA-045778-2018, 2800 East Leigh Street to the consent agenda.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks expressed concern about the apparent removal of one of the chimneys in the building plans. The applicant representative, Michelle Bebb, clarified that though the chimney was not visible in the drawings, there was no plan to remove it. Mr. Bond accepted an amendment from Chairman Klaus amended, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, that the condition be added that staff confirm the non-removal of the chimney. The motion carried with all in favor, except Vice-Chairman Hendricks and Commissioner Cooley opposed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Brewer, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 6th item, COA-045801-2018, 2017-2019 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks expressed concern about the proposed brick pattern. Chairman Klaus stated that the pattern had been changed since this project was last reviewed.

Commissioner Cooley stated that when last reviewed, the owner had wanted the brick pattern to match those nearby, whereas the Commission had requested that it be differentiated. Commissioner Johnson stated that this had been achieved in the current plan. The motion carried with all in favor, except Commissioner Bond and Commissioner Cooley opposed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 4th item, COA-045484-2018, 511 West Marshall Street to the consent agenda.

Commissioner Morgan stated, and Chairman Klaus concurred, that this building, being in the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit review process, is already under significant scrutiny and review. Commissioner Cooley voiced concern about the permastone cladding currently on the building; Chairman Klaus stated that its removal is in the plans. The Commission unanimously approved moving item #4 to the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to move the 2nd item, COA-045812-2018, 305 North 30th Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, with Commissioner Pearson seconding, to move the 7th item, COA-045485-2018, 2327 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda.

Chairman Klaus requested clarification on point of order: whether a denial recommendation can be moved to the consent agenda. Ms. Chen clarified that it can. The motion carried with all in favor, except Brewer, Hendricks, and Cooley opposed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, with Chairman Klaus seconding, to move the 3rd item, COA-045814-2018, 706 North 21st Street to the consent agenda.

Chairman Klaus stated that, as per earlier discussion and agreement with Ms. Jones, staff recommendations are only feasible with the amendment of allowing the removal of a chimney; Commissioner Bond agreed to this amendment. Commissioner Morgan expressed concern that the size of the proposed garage was too large, and its proposed gable roof inappropriate. Ms. Jones stated that the applicant had discussed the possibility of a gable roof with staff, and had since changed the proposal to call for a shed roof instead. Commissioner Bond accepted a friendly amendment of allowing staff to review the roof form. Commissioner Morgan still expressed concern about the garage size in proportion to the house. The motion failed, with Commissioners Cooley, Hendricks, Pearson, Morgan, and Johnson voting against.

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to move the 8th item, COA-045479-2018, 3317 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks expressed concern about the proposed removal of a parapet. The motion failed, with Commissioners Morgan, Johnson, Hendricks, Bond, and Pearson voting against.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to approve the consent agenda.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment concerning the consent agenda.

Michelle Bebbs, applicant for the 1st item, 2800 East Leigh Street, stated that both chimneys will remain on this property and that the addition will have a sloped roof, which

will echo the slope at rear of the existing house.

Ned Ruffin, applicant for the 7th item, 2327 Monument Avenue, stated that he had concerns about staff recommendations regarding shutters and denial of the gate component of his application. Chairman Klaus explained that Mr. Ruffin was in effect asking that this item be removed from the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to remove the 7th item, 2327 Monument Avenue, from the consent agenda. The motion carried, with all in favor except Commissioner Pearson.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment on the consent agenda. Hearing none, he restated the final list of items on the consent agenda, which was as follows:

1. COA-045778-2018, 2800 East Leigh Street
2. COA-045801-2018, 2017-2019 Monument Avenue
4. COA-045484-2018, 511 West Marshall Street
6. COA-045812-2018, 305 North 30th Street

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to approve the consent agenda.

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 1 [COA-045778-2018](#) 2800 East Leigh Street - Construction of a rear addition, enclose existing porches, install new windows and railing.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the window specifications be submitted for staff review and approval; chimneys be retained on the exterior of the building; the columns and porch railing be constructed of wood; and the fiber cement siding be smooth and without a bead. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 2 [COA-045812-2018](#) 305 North 30th Street - Construction of first floor rear deck and single car garage, replace vinyl siding on rear.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the proposed fence and elevation with the height and design of the fence for staff review and approval; the deck be painted or stained a neutral color; final paint colors for the siding and garage be submitted to staff for review and approval; and the final garage door materials be submitted for staff review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

4 [COA-045484-2018](#) 511 West Marshall Street - Rehabilitation of a single-family home.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, with Commissioner Cooley seconding, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the exterior paint colors and window specifications be submitted for staff review and approval; the fiber cement siding be smooth and without a bead; and any additional conditions imposed by the National Park Service and/or the Virginia Department of Historic Resources be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

6 [COA-045801-2018](#) 2017-2019 Monument Avenue - Addition of elevator to rear of building.

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

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

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

- 3 [COA-045814-2018](#) 706 North 21st Street - Construction of a second-story rear addition and a single car garage.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that the Commission conceptually reviewed this application at the October 23, 2018 meeting and were generally supportive. Ms. Jones stated that the Commission clarified with the applicant at that time that he would repair the internal gutters and install half-round gutters as needed; would retain the flat lock metal for the front porch roof; would use a wider reveal for the siding on the addition; and that the garage would use the same siding as the addition. Ms. Jones stated that staff recommends that the historic chimney be retained on the exterior; that the garage utilize a TPO or standing seam metal roof; that the deck be painted or stained a neutral color that complements one or more of the colors found on the main structure; and that the following items be submitted for staff review and approval: existing and proposed dimensioned elevations showing the size of door and window openings; additional details concerning the fence and the rear and garage doors; windows specifications that meet the Commission Guidelines; and color selections for the siding and garage.

Commissioner Cooley requested clarification as to which chimney is to be removed. Ms. Jones stated that the small one in the back would be removed, while the two toward the front of the building would be retained.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if gutters and downspouts had been discussed with the applicant. Ms. Jones responded that gutters and downspouts had been discussed at the conceptual review for this project, and that the applicant had agreed to repair the internal gutters, and install half round gutters as needed.

The applicant, Enoch Pou Jr., stated that he was in agreement with staff conditions except concerning the removal of the rear chimney.

Mr. Hendricks asked if the applicant would consider a narrower width for the garage, to be more in proportion with the main house and suggested approximately 22 feet. Mr. Pou stated that this would be fine.

A motion was made by Commissioner Neville C. Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Sanford Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the width of the garage be reduced to 22 feet; the applicant submit existing and proposed dimensioned elevations showing the size of door and window openings to staff for review and approval; additional details concerning the fence and the rear and garage doors be submitted for administrative review and approval; the applicant clarify plans for the front façade fenestration pattern and submit window specification information that meets the Commission Guidelines; the deck be painted or stained a neutral color that complements one or more of the colors found on the main structure; and the color selections for the siding and garage be submitted for administrative review and approval.

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

No -- 2 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

5 [COA-045748-2018](#) 206 North 32nd Street - Renovation and addition to a two-story existing addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Brewer recused herself from review of this item.

The application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

Ms. Jeffries stated that the Commission had conceptually reviewed this proposal on November 27, 2018, and had voiced concerns at that time regarding the loss of historic fabric on the rear addition. Ms. Jeffries stated that the applicant had revised the plans and was now proposing shiplap siding with mitered corners rather than the beadboard and trim previously proposed; and that the size of the rear additions appeared to have been reduced. Ms. Jeffries stated that staff recommended the following conditions: that the new third story addition be reduced in width to better reflect the historic window design; and that paint colors be submitted for administrative review and approval.

Chairman Klaus asked if staff's goal in reducing the width was to convert the existing window opening into a door. Ms. Jeffries stated that, since dimensions were not provided, it is difficult to be certain if that was possible; and that the staff goal was to reduce the width so that the window of the addition would more closely match the original window.

The applicant, Dave Johannas, stated that a Hardi material would be used for the cladding on the addition and that it could be mitered such that no trim would be necessary at the corner.

Commissioner Cooley asked for clarification on the synthetic material that would be used.

Mr. Johannas stated that the intended product is not Hardiplank but a new, sturdier product made by the same company, which is made to be mitered. Mr. Johannas mentioned that the rear windows on the current addition do not appear to be original. Mr. Johannas also stated that he has in the past received approval from DHR to build a third story on the back of a historic building. Mr. Johannas stated that he would have no problem reducing the scale of the addition as per staff recommendations, and that he had made a sketch of a reduced-scale version which he could show the Commission.

Commissioner Pearson requested that the applicant give a verbal rundown of plan changes made since the conceptual review of this project.

Mr. Johannas responded that they changed the materials in the back to read more as a solid mass, removed and changed some details, and rear addition reduced in scale and changed materials.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Wheeler agrees that the roof line is appropriate.

Chairman Klaus stated the seven foot windows are question if you see this as an addition or changing an opening.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

No -- 2 - Commissioner David C. Cooley and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

7 [COA-045485-2018](#) 2327 Monument Avenue - Restoration of front stoop and stairs, installation of metal gate.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Ms. Jeffries stated that staff recommended that the replacement shutters be wood, paneled on the first story and louvered on the second story, painted black, mounted on hinges, and sized to fit the window opening; that new shutters only be installed where there is physical evidence of historic shutters; that the proposed gate be denied; and that the applicant work with staff to determine if the steps can be repaired and submit additional documentation on their condition, with only the steps that are beyond repair to be replaced in-kind.

Chairman Klaus stated that the 1920s picture and the application have white shutters in those pictures. And that seeing the white solid shutters could be original to the 1920s with black on top and white on the bottom. The applicant stated he would be happy to do the same and is seeking clarification.

Mr. Ruffin asked for clarification as to why the gate component of the application was denied in the staff recommendations.

Chairman Klaus explained that it was due to the historic absence of a gate, which would make approval for any proposed gate unlikely to occur.

Mr. Ruffin stated that other houses in the area have gates, and that it is a safety and security issue. He stated that the police have had to be contacted and that "flaggers" (pro-Confederate-monument demonstrators) have been on the property brandishing weapons. He also stated that skateboarders enter the property, and that during events members of the general public will wander onto the porch. He stated that he would be glad to work with staff to install a gate that addresses their concerns.

Mr. Ruffin also stated that he would be glad to work with staff on the repair and replacement of the steps.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant planned to replace all of the steps.

Mr. Ruffin responded that the upper steps only require minor repairs, but that two of the lower steps need to be replaced.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicant was certain that the steps are limestone. Mr. Ruffin stated that he believed that they are. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the front ones appear to be partly granite and partly concrete.

Mr. Ruffin stated that he would like to make the front stairs consistently granite.

Dan Ensminger, architect for the project, stated that the concrete steps in question are in fact aggregate patch jobs and that most likely they were originally granite. He also affirmed that the rear limestone steps will not be touched in this project.

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

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by David Cooley, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the replacement shutters only be installed where there is physical evidence of historic shutters; the shutters be wood, and paneled on the first story and louvered on the second story, painted black or white, mounted on hinges, and sized to fit the window opening; the gate be designed with minimal ornamentation and submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; and the concrete aggregate steps, identified as the upper two at the street entrance, be replaced with granite to match the existing first street level stair.

- Aye --** 6 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler
- No --** 3 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

8 [COA-045479-2018](#) 3317 Monument Avenue - Construction of a new carport.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(12/18/2018\)](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report\(12/18/2018\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Ms. Jeffries stated that staff recommended conditions were: that the garage door enclosure be revised to read as a garage door, rather than the proposed mix of materials; that the revised design be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that proposed colors also be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; and that

a window survey be submitted to staff for administrative review to determine if the window is beyond repair and the window be retained if it is not beyond repair.

Commissioner Bond asked if the Commission allows PVC columns and trim.

Ms. Jeffries responded that these have been allowed.

Commissioner Cooley asked if the PVC in the proposed project would be painted, to which Ms. Jeffries replied that she did not know.

Joe Yates, the architect for the project, stated that he would be happy to submit documentation for the windows. He stated that the low brick wall in the plans was for drainage – because the garage floor is 14-16 inches below grade, water flows continuously into the garage. Since it is too small for a modern car, it was determined that the garage should be used as a garden shed.

Chairman Klaus asked if there is some way that this drainage protection could be provided while retaining the sense of previous historic usage.

Mr. Yates replied that this could be attempted, but that drainage is very problematic at this site.

Chairman Klaus asked if the window could be repaired.

Mr. Yates responded that this may be possible, but that the window looks worse from the inside than it does from outside.

Chairman Klaus reiterated Mr. Bond's question as to whether the PVC would be painted.

Mr. Yates responded that all the PVC would be painted to match the main house. As a former Commission member, Mr. Yates stated that the Commission had often approved the use of PVC due to the poor quality of modern wood.

Chairman Klaus asked if during Mr. Yates' tenure the Commission had always required the PVC be painted.

Mr. Yates replied that he thought so.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks expressed concern about the removal of some historic garage details, and asked if one of the parapet walls could be retained.

Mr. Yates responded that the parapet is too low, and also that it is in very poor condition.

Commissioner Pearson asked if the columns and decorative elements proposed for the garage are intended to reference the addition, which is a modern addition.

Mr. Yates responded that they are, and that the addition is in fact a modern construction.

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

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to approve the application with staff recommendations and that the exterior door be revised and administratively approved by staff.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks expressed concern that the proposal was essentially to demolish an existing garage, and that the form would be completely altered, and that too much of the historic fabric would be lost.

Chairman Klaus stated that this is a conversion from a one-car garage to a two-car garage, and that the Commission has approved many similar projects.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the original function of the structure was to serve as a receptacle for a carriage, and that it currently cannot serve that function because it is too small. He also stated that he sees no problem with secondary or tertiary structures such as garages being converted for modern usage.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks stated that the desired functionality could be achieved with less substantial change to the form of the garage, and that some of the parapet should be retained. He stated that, rather than an addition, the proposal is for a new construction which reuses selected pieces of the old.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that it should be possible to achieve the desired function while retaining some existing architectural elements.

Mr. Yates requested permission to speak, then stated that the brick piers of the garage would not be covered up in the proposed design, though the parapet would be removed.

Commissioner Morgan asked Mr. Yates why the carport was not being built as a separate structure. Mr. Yates responded that this was considered but that it seemed ungainly, and a more unified architectural composition was desired.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner David Cooley, Chairman James Klaus

No – Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Neville Johnson, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, and Commissioner Sean Wheeler.

Abstain – Commissioner Morgan

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Jason Hendricks, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the applicant to retain the parapet walls of the existing garage building. The motion carried with the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

No -- 2 - Commissioner David C. Cooley and Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 9 [COA-045475-2018](#) 530 North Boulevard - Construction of a new multi-family residence.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that the Commission previously reviewed a proposed building on March 27, 2018, and that at that time the Commission had expressed concerns about the setback, massing, entrance location, and exterior details. Ms. Jones stated that the applicant had redesigned the building to address staff and Commission concerns. The applicant's new design relocates the main entrance to North Boulevard, incorporates balconies into the overall design concept, and adjusts the North Boulevard setback. Ms. Jones stated that staff requests the applicant submit the following for the final review: a narrative description of the proposed building and how it meets the Guidelines; a description of all exterior materials including windows specifications; dimensioned elevations for all sides of the building; and context elevation with dimensions. Ms. Jones stated that staff also requests details about the railing design for the final review.

Bob Englander, the developer for the project, introduced himself and the architects Ron Worley and David Paiva.

Mr. Worley stated that the project was initially submitted for review in March of 2017. He stated that in the new design the architects were very mindful of the geometry of the corner where the project is sited. They also set back the upper level to give the building scale. Space was made by the entrance to insert an artwork or other element to lend focus.

Chairman Klaus called for public comment.

Danielle Porter of Historic Richmond stated that that organization had sent in a comment letter, and that she would be happy to respond to any questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he opened Commission discussion.

Commissioner Bond stated that the revised design is much better than what was previously submitted. He stated that the drum at the corner needs to be more readable as such and that the cornice should therefore go up rather than going through the drum.

Commissioner Bond asked if the cost of maintaining the turntable parking system had been investigated.

Mr. Englander stated that they had not ascertained the cost, but that condominium fees were expected to offset the expense.

Commissioner Brewer stated agreement with staff concerns about the column placement and style.

Commissioner Pearson expressed concern about the curb cut on Patterson Avenue. He also stated a preference that the angled area of the façade should instead be parallel to the street, to be consistent with the other structures on the block.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he felt that the revised design is effective and meets the requirements set forth in the previous Commission review.

Commissioner Morgan stated concern about the height of the building, even allowing for the corner location. Commissioner Morgan also agreed with the comments from Historic Richmond about the exit stair at the front being a solid mass of wall facing the boulevard. She suggested blind windows or some other element to break up this area. She also stated agreement with Commissioner Pearson that the façade should be flat facing, and that if windows could be put in that that would be preferable.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested, in response to Commissioner Morgan and Commissioner Pearson's comments, that the stairs and the garage door be flipped so that the public face of the balconies continue the curve and stairs would be at the alley where the entrance is located. Commissioner Wheeler also suggested making the guardrails less pronounced so that the balcony reads more as a massing element than as a pedestrian access element. He also recommended limiting the ornamentation on the balcony.

Chairman Klaus stated that windows would improve the stairwell, and expressed doubts about the cornice extending around the tower. Chairman Klaus disagreed with staff, finding that the trim around the columns would not be a problem.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks suggested that the residential unit be moved so as to front onto Patterson Avenue. He stated that he did not find the angle in the front problematic.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the front entry does not read clearly as an entry.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the balconies above the parking entrance on Patterson Avenue should be more differentiated.

Mr. Englander stated that the windows in the current plan are a placeholder, and that the end design will most likely include floor to ceiling windows.

Mr. Englander stated that the current design reflects a reduction from 6 to 5 units, in response to Commission concerns about traffic.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

10 [COA-045482-2018](#) 3312 East Broad Street - Construction of a rear addition and deck.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Ms. Jeffries stated that a rear addition was approved for this property by the Commission in 2018; the proposed addition was never built, and the design of the rear façade was altered for the current proposal.

Ms. Jeffries stated that that staff had the following comments: That the fenestration pattern on the side and rear elevations of the addition should be revised to be more consistent with patterns found on the home and within the district; and that the following information should be submitted for final review: materials details; fully dimensioned

plans, including head and sill heights; and a window and door schedule.

Chairman Klaus asked if the plans being submitted were identical to those proposed in 2008. Ms. Jeffries explained that the current plans are similar to the 2008 plans, but not identical.

The applicant, Bryan Traylor of Unlimited Renovations, introduced himself and stated that the sight lines of the fenestration on the eastern side of the house would be matched up to the existing structure. The proposed windows are somewhat smaller than the existing windows, to differentiate the addition from the existing house. He also stated that large windows make it more difficult to fit in countertops and other interior features.

Mr. Traylor stated that the proposed rear, north side triple window is intended to meet the needs of the owner, and to provide more light, and that it will not be highly visible. Mr. Traylor clarified that the transom above the rear door is 12 inches. In response to Commissioner Cooley's question about what is meant by a "triple window," Mr. Traylor explained that this denotes two smaller wing windows with a larger window in the middle.

Chairman Klaus stated that it will be important to provide product and materials details and specifications for the final review.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened Commission discussion.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the siding of the addition should be similar to but differentiated from the historic part of the structure, mostly in terms of reveal.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the windows be aligned in elevation; that the side windows be enlarged; that 1 over 1 windows be used instead of divided lites; and that a trim element be used to break up the previously mentioned wall.

Chairman Klaus expressed concern about placing the triple window against the door, and suggested that possibly placing a roof over the door might provide a solution.

Commissioner Cooley recommended that a roof over the entrances be added, among other reasons because it protects the door.

Commissioner Brewer expressed concern about the triple window, suggesting aligning it with the top window and eliminating the side lites.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that changing the siding, perhaps substituting a panel, underneath the triple window could be an improvement.

Commissioner Bond left the meeting at 6:25 pm.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

11 [COA-045478-2018](#) 2007 Cedar Street - Construction of a new multi-family residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones stated that staff recommends that the building be reduced either in height or in

depth; that the first floor opening on the Cedar Street entrance be emphasized with additional architectural details; that the third story follow the historic pattern and be differentiated from the first and second story with architectural details such as a mansard roof, dormers, or a change in roof plane or materials; and that the window heights on the first and second story be raised to be more aligned with the window heights of the adjacent historic building.

Ms. Jones stated that staff requests the applicant submit the following for final review: a narrative description of the proposed building and how it meets the Guidelines; dimensioned elevations for all sides of the building; context elevation with dimensions; a lighting plan for the building and site; and window specifications.

Zach Kennedy, developer, stated that a Special Use Permit is also being applied for. He stated that the property is zoned R-3 and is 300 feet short of being eligible for multi-family use.

He stated that the building plan includes using slab on grade in order to minimize the height.

In response to Commissioner Cooley's question, Mr. Kennedy stated that the proposal under consideration is for a 9-unit dwelling consisting of six 1-bedroom units and three 2-bedroom units.

Chairman Klaus called for public comment.

Rachel Davis, of 614 North 21st Street, stated that there are insufficient parking spaces in the area, a problem which the proposed project will exacerbate. She also stated that there is a trash problem due to already existing multi-family buildings in the area.

Chairman Klaus explained that the applicant will also be applying for a special use permit, and that that context would more applicable for raising concerns about parking.

Johanna Christenson, who lives across from the proposed construction, expressed concerns about retaining the historic fabric of the neighborhood. She stated that the proposed siting provides no place for a yard, which is inconsistent with other houses in the area; and that there is no green space, only a stark urban appearance. She also expressed concern that the new building will block natural light from reaching her house. She stated that the larger size of the proposed structure is out of proportion with existing structures in the neighborhood. She stated that the proposed entrance location is not in keeping with the Cedar Street-facing orientation of other entrances in the area. She expressed concern about the possibility of security lighting creating light pollution; and about the potential safety issues of a multi-dwelling building, as there is one currently in the neighborhood which has been the scene of violence.

Anthony Kieu of 614 ½ North 21st Street expressed concern that the alley entranceway of the proposed structure would be susceptible to auto accidents; that trashcans were likely to become messy; and that the alley was likely to be blocked due to construction and increased traffic, thus impeding access to parking spaces.

Charles Scirbona, co-owner of 2010 Cedar Street, stated that the proposed modern construction is not compatible with the neighborhood, and that the height of the proposed building is a major concern.

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

Commissioner Cooley expressed concern about the main entrance being positioned off

an alley which is used for parking and as a pedestrian thoroughfare. He stated that it is a lot of usage, and a large building size, for the piece of land.

Commissioner Brewer agreed that the building is taking up too much of the lot. She stated that the massing should be scaled back, but that she does not find the height problematic. She agreed with concerns about the alley entrance, stating that in general an entrance on a main street is best.

Commissioner Pearson stated that the height is problematic with the current design, but that this could be alleviated if massing were broken up in some way, particularly along Cedar Street, possibly by stepping the cornice in the front roof line, or with recesses, or by some other means. He stated that the setback along Cedar Street should either be parallel to the street or be set back further, or both. He agreed with previously stated concerns about the alley entrance and the extent of lot coverage.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with concerns about the building being too large and thus changing the character of the neighborhood; and about the entrance being on the side of the building. He stated that he applauded the creativity of the design, but that the building needs to be reoriented toward Cedar Street.

Commissioner Morgan agreed that the alley entryway is counter to the Guidelines; that the building as proposed is too tall; that it should be set back further. She expressed appreciation of the attempt at a modern design, but expressed concern that the horizontal wood elements under the windows made the building appear industrial as opposed to residential.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he did not mind the side entrance location, since the design includes other entrances. He applauded the modern design as differentiating itself from, not mimicking, the historic buildings of the area. He stated that, assuming the proposed design meets zoning requirements, he would approve it.

Chairman Klaus stated that he was pleased that the design includes entrances at the front, but that the side entrance reads as the main entrance. He stated that the proposed two and a half story height is too tall for the area. He suggested that it might be possible to add an additional story toward the back of the structure.

Chairman Klaus stated that the slab construction as proposed would not be compatible with aligning the windows as suggested by staff; since the slab helps to keep the height down, Chairman Klaus suggested foregoing the window alignment.

Commissioner Hendriks stated that he did not find the proposed height problematic, in the neighborhood context. He did express concern about the extent of lot coverage, and about the lack of definition of the main entrance and the traffic congestion at the proposed alley location.

Zach Kennedy requested clarification about the entrance location. He stated that the balconies are meant to mimic a bay, and that it would be easy to move the main entrance to the front. He asked if the perception of a front entrance was important, or if it was also important that foot traffic be directed to a front entrance. He also asked if the Commission had a specific calculation in mind regarding the height of the building.

Chairman Klaus responded that there was no specific recommended height for the building, and that this is subjective within the Commission's general charge to maintain the neighborhood character.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks recommended referring to other houses in the neighborhood which have third floors set back or sloped back in such a way as to not appear overly tall, such as a false mansard, and to not block light for shorter neighboring houses. Chairman Klaus cautioned that the Commission could not guarantee it would approve such a design.

Chairman Klaus stated that the side entrance could be maintained, but that the main entrance should be in front not only for aesthetic reasons but also for safety reasons.

Mr. Kennedy stated that, to improve drainage and for a cleaner appearance, the building plan includes paving the alley out to the street, as well as putting sidewalk on that side of the property, and that he has been in discussion with the Department of Public Works about these plans. He stated that no floodlights are planned for the property, but rather small ambient "up/down" lamps for safety and security.

Commissioner Morgan stated that enlisting neighborhood support for the project would be helpful in getting the project approved by the Commission.

The applicant stated that he had sent a general notification letter to residents of the area.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

- 12 [COA-045476-2018](#) 2217-2219 Cedar Street - Construction of two attached single-family homes.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that staff recommends that the applicant utilize wood for the decorative features on the façade including the cornice line and porches; that the center bay of the porch be a single column; that the windows on the visible bays of the side elevations be vertically and horizontally aligned.

Ms. Jones stated that staff requests the applicant submit the following for final review: a narrative description of the proposed building and how it meets the Guidelines; a revised description of all exterior materials including windows specifications; dimensioned elevations for all sides of the building; and context elevation with dimensions.

The applicant, Matt Jarreau, asked the Commission's opinion about the siting of the proposed houses, and whether they should be closer to the street. He stated that there would be limited visibility of the right and left sides of the duplex from the street.

Chairman Klaus stated that relative to the historic pattern, the planned houses could be moved slightly forward.

Chairman Klaus stated that Commission approval would be more likely if the applicant provides plans for the final review which show the limited visibility of the windows from the street.

Mr. Jarreau stated that he did not believe the window composition of PVC would be discernible from the street, and expressed concern about the long-term viability of using wood instead.

Chairman Klaus responded that, though there are windows in the area which would not have been approved by Commission, the Commission intends to be more discerning and stringently adherent to the Guidelines going forward. Chairman Klaus also responded to Mr. Jarreau's questions about other PVC elements, stating that, though there is some leeway on use of PVC, e.g. for use on secondary elevations, the Commission prefers not to have PVC used for key façade elements.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Chris Davis, owner of 2221 Cedar Street, expressed concern about safe and convenient access to trash and recycling being maintained. He also expressed concern about the proposed house setback and its potential to block sunlight reaching his property.

Johanna Christenson also expressed concern about potential impact on access to trash and recycling.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that in some existing cases trash and recycling are picked up from alley locations due to residents lacking access to the street, which seems to indicate that easy access is not guaranteed; and also that this is a city services issue.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks suggested negotiating an easement with neighbors so that they can store and access their trash.

Mr. Jarreau agreed that some such negotiation and/or agreement would have to take place.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was further public comment. Hearing none, he opened Commission discussion.

Chairman Klaus suggested that more design inspiration could be drawn from neighboring buildings. He also reiterated staff comments that the uneven window spacing is problematic, and that the use of PVC for the cornice and other important details is problematic.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks suggested aligning the major windows, while allowing some unevenness to remain with smaller windows. He also stated that the house setbacks form a zig-zag pattern in the area, suggested making the setback of the proposed construction consistent with that. He stated that he believes the proposed use of PVC for trim is within acceptable limits for new construction. He suggested that the bays could be more robust.

Commissioner Cooley stated that he did not find the small windows a problem, due to their lack of visibility from the street. He agreed with Vice-Chairman Hendricks' recommendation about maintaining the zig-zag setback spacing.

Vice-Chairman Hendricks pointed out the doubled columns and suggested that the other single columns also be doubled so that the design looks intentional.

Commissioner Brewer agreed with Vice-Chairman Hendricks that the PVC elements would not be problematic. She pointed out that the side windows on an elevation very close to a neighboring house might constitute a safety code issue.

Commissioner Pearson and Commissioner Johnson had no comments to add.

Commissioner Morgan stated that there is too much false historicism in the proposed

design. She suggested that, if the gable vents were pushed back, this would be beneficial. She suggested a second-story window in the first bay. Commissioner Morgan stated that the priority of the Commission is to insure adherence to the Guidelines, and not to insure that all desired amenities, e.g., bathroom windows, are provided for tenants.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that windows be aligned wherever possible. He also advised being attentive to the railing for the front steps and how this fits into the overall design.

Chairman Klaus stated that the Guidelines allow use of PVC in modern construction, but questioned whether the design under review could actually be considered modern in style.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.