



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.Richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2 Roll Call

Present: 6 - Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Joseph Yates, Gerald Jason Hendricks, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor and Joshua Bilder

Absent: 3 - Matthew Elmes, Jennifer Wimmer and Nathan Hughes

3 Approval of Minutes

[ID 15-007](#) June 23, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [June 23, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Bond, that the minutes from the June 23, 2015 meeting be approved.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

4 Other Business

Secretary's Report

Mr. Hill stated that at the Quarterly Meeting they touched on some staffing issues and stated that Ms. Pitts safely delivered a baby boy on July 15th. He stated that she will be on maternity leave until mid-October. Mr. Hill stated that usually in these cases the Planner I steps into this position but that they do not have a Planner I. Mr. Hill stated that they are going to call Mr. Palmquist to present some of the application for items which they would otherwise have conflicts of interest with. Mr. Hill stated that they are keeping up with the permit reviews, violations and enforcements. Mr. Hill stated that they are still working with the City Attorney to update the enforcement procedure and Notices of Violation, as well as discussed the changes of the language in the letter.

Mr. Green thanked Ms. Aarons-Sydnor for working on the annual report and stated that they are working on the idea of not doing an annual report from CAR to City Council that shows the number of cases and issues that come in and the amount of things that are appealed to Council. Mr. Green discussed the changes in the letter for BRT and that after they met with GRTC they made some modifications.

Mr. Bond inquired if their letter was available to the neighborhood associations and Mr. Hill stated that it can be distributed to them. Mr. Bond stated that he thinks it will be helpful to the neighborhood associations.

The Commission agreed to distribute the letter to the Planning Commission, Urban Design, Land Use and other organizations.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to accept the changes for the BRT letter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Hill distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 58 approvals for the period from June 23, 2015 through July 28, 2015.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Hill stated that he is sorry to say that in the case of the Monument windows case, that despite the fact that the owner has pleaded guilty to having the violation, the Judge asked him to pay the second half of the fine and didn't carry the violation forward. Mr. Hill stated that he is trying to get some time with the City Attorney to discuss that.

Mr. Hill stated that they received an appeal for the Springhill property that was denied at the last meeting and that he will email the members a copy of the response. Mr. Hill stated that there are a lot of extraneous matters in this appeal statement which boils down to the four elements which are the treatment of the siding, the porch railings, the porch post columns and the front door. Mr. Hill went into detail about the application and stated that the case will be heard in 45 days.

Mr. Bilder inquired if it will be heard by City Council and Mr. Hill stated yes, and that the appellant must find a council person to support the paper to reverse the decision and that they haven't heard that anyone has sponsored the paper yet. When that happens they will introduce it and refer it to Land Use and then it will be heard at a preliminary hearing that usually results in a recommendation for council action.

Mr. Green inquired how the timing works with the recess in August with City Council. Mr. Hill stated that Councilman Samuels introduced a paper that was adopted and it stated that in times of recess when 75 days expires they get to hear the appeal at the next scheduled meeting.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired who represents CAR at the meeting and Mr. Hill stated that typically staff will be there and one member of the Commission, as well as the public which is beneficial to the Commission.

Other Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Green to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Bond, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Abstain: 1 - Yates

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | <u>CAR No.
2015-098</u> | 2502 E. Grace Street - Replace front concrete steps with wood as part of repairs to the front facade, replace wall of rear shed, and install rear |
|---|---|---|

gate

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 2 [CAR No. 2015-097](#) 309 N. Adams Street - Install new fiber cement siding, windows, and door on the alley side of the structure

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5 [CAR No. 2015-090](#) 723 N. 22nd Street - Demolish an existing garage and construct a new two story garage

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report for the applicant's request to demolish an existing single-story garage and build a new two story-garage in its footprint at the rear of a property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff stated that the proposed garage is not compatible with main building on the lot which is a two-story, frame building with a shed roof. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they had a building permit. Mr. Hill stated that he got a call that a building was under construction and wasn't sure if they had a building permit but that he will check on it.

Mr. Bilder inquired how old the building was. Ms. Chen stated that steel garages like this one could be from the early 1920's to the late 1950's.

Mr. Charles Parham, the owner, stated that he was instructed by City staff that he had to tear the building down. Mr. Parham stated that when he was going to put it back they said that he didn't have to have a permit. Mr. Parham stated that once he started the project he wanted to know if he could out a second floor on it so that it is why he came downtown. Mr. Parham stated that when he got here they told him he had to the 5th floor to see CAR and that is where the process stopped. Mr. Parham stated that he was going to restore it but that he wanted to add a second story for storage, that the garage is the same size but a little taller, and that the height of the building is smaller than the house so it has to be in the same proportions. Mr. Parham stated that he didn't have a permit because he had to see the CAR first and that he will get a permit after the CAR lets him know what he can do.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the material is for the exterior wall and Mr. Parham stated that it is plywood now and he wants to put back the old tin that was there originally and that with the garage he wants to make the whole building tin including the doors, the roof and the dormers. Mr. Parham stated that he wants to duplicate everything in a grooved tin.

Mr. Green inquired whether the second floor would be able to be walked on or just an attic for storage. Mr. Parham stated that he wants more than an attic and something that he can walk around in. Mr. Green stated that the previous one was a gable but there was space and Mr. Parham stated yes, and that he wants space for storing pipes, wood or lumber but no walking space.

Mr. Yates inquired if the applicant checked with the Zoning Office to see if they will permit the same footprint and Mr. Parham stated that he hasn't gone to zoning but that he has questioned people in zoning and they stated that as long as the footprint is there that he could put it back and that it is not sketched in stone yet.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the applicant would be amenable to modify his design at all and Mr. Parham stated yes.

Mr. Charlie Field, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

Ms. Martha Faulkner, speaking as a member of the public, came up and echoed Mr. Field comments against the project.

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

Mr. Bond stated that he supports staff recommendation and that the application should be denied.

Mr. Yates stated that to clarify, in regards to the form of the building and the roofline, there is nothing about it that respects earlier garages of the period in the neighborhood. Mr. Yates stated that the material is not a material that is approved under their Guideline's and concurs with Mr. Bond.

Mr. Bilder inquired if they know what the proposed materials are and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the applicant stated that it was all tin.

A motion was made by Mr. Bond, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks and Aarons-Sydnor

No: 1 - Bilder

- 3** [CAR No. 2015-088](#) 2811 E. Marshall Street - Replace existing 1/1 window with transom window on the rear elevation

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report for the applicant's request to replace an existing 1/1 window with a transom window on the rear elevation of the subject project within the

Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The applicant is proposing to replace an existing 53" by 34.5", 1/1 wood window with a 32" by 14" vinyl, hopper-style window on the second story of the rear elevation. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Bilder inquired if the windows that are there are original to the building. Ms. Chen stated that they are 1/1 wood windows which are appropriate for the building.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if this was a part of a bathroom renovation and Ms. Chen stated that there was no documentation that it was for a bathroom renovation but the window is located in a bathroom.

Mr. Gabriel Suttle, the contractor doing the bathroom renovations stated that the reason why they would like to replace this window is that a wood window inside a bathroom and inside the shower creates condensation and it will drip down into the window sill and can cause rot. Mr. Suttle stated that another reason for the window change is privacy because they want to walk in their bathroom and not feel exposed because the window is quite large. Mr. Suttle stated that the vinyl helps with the moisture issue and that part of the building is an addition to the building. He stated that it is a bump-out and has vinyl siding. Mr. Suttle stated that it is on the back of house and thought that it wouldn't be an issue.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the addition is original to the building and Mr. Suttle stated no.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the location of the bath tub is changing and Mr. Suttle stated that the bathroom is going to remain the same and they are just bringing the tile down so the water would splash on it.

Mr. Bilder inquired if they would put a different type of window there if it gets denied and Mr. Suttle stated that he is willing to hear the options and stated that he will be willing to put up a stain glass façade on it to mimic some of the historic homes. Mr. Bilder inquired if maybe a metal window or something like that would work.

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

Mr. Bilder stated that it seems like this is an addition to the building.

Mr. Green stated that from the staff's review it has less to do with the fact that it's an addition but more to do with it being in the public right-of-way and that it is really visible from the alley.

Mr. Bond stated that it is a pretty direct violation and that they have to support staff, otherwise they set a precedent and that the scale and the size of the window is an issue.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is also concerned about the size and visibility and stated that it is not the same width as the window and is not designed to fit the opening.

Mr. Green stated that they can defer the application and the applicant could come back to staff with a design that staff could be administratively approve.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it may require that the windows be the same size.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred with the

recommendations that the applicant uses a non-vinyl window that has been approved previously that matches the existing opening size and like configurations that can be administratively approved. Mr. Green added an admendment to include screening.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

- 4 [CAR No. 2015-089](#) 3 N. Boulevard - Install new upper front porch railing

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

- 8 [CAR No. 2015-093](#) 3100 E. Marshall Street - Rehabilitation of outbuilding to include new windows, doors, lighting, and HVAC

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for the rehabilitation of an outbuilding to include a new windows, doors, lighting and HVAC at this property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that:

- That the masonry infill be recessed so that the full extent of the original opening remains visible, and
- That the dual head security light be installed on the east side of the rear door, closest to the neighboring property.

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

Mr. Green stated that there was a letter from the Church Hill Association in support of the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Bond that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the dual-head security lighting will be installed on the east side of the door that faces the main residence on the property. The Commission noted that the window will not be removed but will be blocked from the inside.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

- 9 [CAR No. 2015-094](#) 3607 E. Broad Street - Construct a new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - July](#)

[Site Map - July](#)

[Staff Report - July](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a new single-family house on a vacant lot in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. The proposed new construction meets the Guidelines except for the introduction of the raised parged block and bluestone patio on the façade of the dwelling. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned with an alternative porch treatment more compatible with traditional materials and forms found in the area.

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

Ms. Laura Pitcher, the designer working the owner, stated that staff presented the project well and that they are trying to keep up with the style and proportions of the neighborhood. Ms. Pitcher stated that she knows the front porch patio in question and stated that they are open to discussion and that one thing she wants the Commission to know is that it is a very long, skinny house and that light is an important consideration. She stated that the cooling effect of these porches might have been more appropriate at that time. Ms. Pitcher stated that they would like to get as much light into the building as they can and possibly have a smaller stoop and different materials.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if their concern was with the roof over the entire porch and Ms. Pitcher stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the concern is more with the materials on the porch itself and stated that most of the porches are wood standing on brick piers. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the windows on the east elevation are transoms and Ms. Pitcher stated that they are transom windows but that they are high. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they would be open to have windows that are typical in the neighborhood like ones on the left elevation and Ms. Pitcher stated that they could make them taller and that the intention was to let a little bit of light in and that they could go in the direction of having them a little more square.

Mr. Yates inquired about the material on the upper roof above the mansard in the front and Ms. Pitcher stated that if they have standing-seam metal on the mansard with a flat roof it would be a membrane TPO with a very low slope.

Mr. Bond inquired if there was a way to access the patio from the interior and Ms. Pitcher stated that the panels are intended to be sliding doors.

Mr. Green stated that they are not showing the full roof height and inquired how high is the roof rising over the mansard and Ms. Pitcher stated that it is 3ft above the top of the mansard.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the cornice height of mansard and Ms. Pitcher stated that it is 22 ½ ft and slopes up to about 25 ft.

Mr. Trudy Watkins, representing the home owners of 3605 E. Broad Street, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green inquired if anyone had any comments about the configuration of the porch.

Mr. Bond stated that he concurs and stated that it is a well taken comment and that you would expect to find a porch on the front of the house.

Mr. Green inquired what would happen if it were reduced to a stoop and Mr. Bond stated that he doesn't think it would work.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the materials on the porch patio are also an issue.

Mr. Green inquired about the awning window on the side of the east elevation. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that typically they approve them in bathrooms and privates spaces and stated that all of these are in public spaces.

Mr. Green stated that they could defer the HVAC to staff for more details and locations and Ms. Pitcher stated that they don't have the exact location where they would be but that the intention would be that it will not be visible from the public right-of-way either in the basement or tucked away in the back.

Mr. Green inquired about the roof form and thinks that what is different about this is the incline to the rear.

Mr. Yates stated that the real ridge of the roof is going to be considerably higher than the top of the mansard and that he is not convinced that it is going to be disguised that much because it is a considerable rise.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it is such a narrow lot that he doesn't think you will see it.

Mr. Bond stated that he agrees because if you look at the angle it will be very difficult to see.

Mr. Yates stated that the more you get to it the more you will see it because it is such an enormous gable.

Mr. Green stated that he is struggling with the peak of the roof and that he is concerned that it will be very visible over the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Yates stated that the applicant and the designer have put a lot of thought into this and wonders if would be agreeable to the Commission to defer this application and have the owner and the designer discuss this with staff and come back with revised design that might meet the concerns of the Commission.

Mr. Green stated that he likes the fact that on the front elevation they have closed down the distance from the cornice and the window and that he would like to see a condition that is not quite as visible.

Ms. Pitcher stated that on the model view they didn't hide the roof in that view and stated that the 3D view isn't entirely accurate.

Mr. Hendricks stated that more details on the sliding windows in the back would be helpful.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred with recommendations for clarification of the roof line, the roof form, front porch configurations, rear

windows on the east elevation and the rear sliding window heights.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

- 11 [CAR No. 2015-096](#) 2601 E. Grace Street - Construct a new storage shed to be screened by lattice

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a prefabricated 8'x16' shed at the rear of the property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the shed be screened by a pergola or planters containing screening vegetation that meet the Guidelines. The use of vinyl or wood lattice atop the brick walls should be denied and the shed should be screened with a painted or opaquely stained wood pergola, or as an alternative, planters containing screening vegetation. Staff also recommends that the shed be located as close to the southeast of the property line as is allowed.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the lattice on the brick wall, and Ms. Chen stated that to her understanding she asked the applicant for more clarification but that she hasn't heard back from him. Ms. Chen stated that to her understanding the brick wall would be extended to the height on the corner and then the lattice would be installed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the taller wall is about 4 ½ ft tall now and Ms. Chen stated yes.

Mr. Yates stated that there is also an item that utilizes post cap solar lights and Ms. Chen stated that would be if the lattice and posts were extended across the top of that brick wall and that staff is recommending against the lattice work and the post or anything that is added on top of the brick.

Mr. Green stated that the rear wall is going to continue and inquired if the applicant was proposing that the lattice be the same size as the rear wall. Ms. Chen stated that it was unclear to staff as well and that they felt that adding lattice on top of the brick wall was not an appropriate solution.

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

Mr. Bryan Loos thanked the Commission for the time and consideration for reviewing his application. Mr. Loos stated that he and his wife are very excited to be a part of the St. John's Church neighborhood and that he thanks staff and is pleased to have them as a resource. Mr. Loos stated that he went around the neighborhood to see what was existing in regards to outbuilding structures and that there were a lot of different types. Mr. Loos stated that the best thing he could come up with in regards to a design was mirroring the construction of the homes that were around there which was a flat roof as well as the other building materials of the shed. Mr. Loos stated that he heard at the last meeting that screening was very important and that they didn't have a natural lot that was vacant next to them so they were going to have some greenery to grow up and take care of it. Mr. Loos stated that their proposal was to start at the top of the brick wall in the back and run lattice to the end and then lattice all the way down. Mr. Loos stated that this was to form a screening that will cover it up and then bring the lattice all the way to screen the shed from the street. Mr. Loos stated that he is glad to take the suggestion from staff for a vegetative screen and inquired that instead of planters would it be appropriate to attach lattice to the side and have it come out just a couple of inches

from the side of the building and plant dark vines.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was any plan to infill the rear gate area where the metal railing is and Mr. Loos stated that he has no plans to infill the opening.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the height is from the surface patio to the lower brick wall and Mr. Loos stated that it is 3ft and then goes up about another 47 inches.

Mr. Green stated that screening arises when they had prefabricated shed and that they discourage prefab sheds. He stated that if it was not a prefab shed then screening wouldn't be needed. Mr. Loos stated that he thinks the pergola would be unrealistic and that they rather go the vegetative route.

Mr. Tom Saunders, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green stated that the drawing is pretty out of scale and stated that is not quite as big as it is drawn. Mr. Green inquired if they are proposing to center it on the rear wall. Mr. Loos stated that on that long wall there is a 3ft brick planter that comes in to the patio so they can only get so far and that they will move it far to the back as they as they can.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they had any option in regards to the pitch of roof and Mr. Loos stated that they can do a 3 ½ pitch smaller roof.

Mr. Bilder stated that if the applicant put up a fence on his property then it wouldn't be viewed from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they have been seen on low brick walls as well.

Mr. Yates stated that lattice was a traditional material that was used on top of wood and brick walls.

Mr. Hendricks stated that if they hold it off of the planter 3ft from the back brick wall it is going to be centered on that wall with about 4ft on one end of that corner so they aren't able to push it to the southeast corner.

Mr. Yates inquired if the planter was against the rear wall or against the long wall and Mr. Loos stated that it is against the long wall.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he has concerns and doesn't think you are going to be able to screen it from the south. Mr. Bond stated that he thinks that if they turn the building into a screen and cover the building with lattice they could have roses grow around it. Mr. Hendricks made a clarification that as long as both the south and west walls are vegetative screened. After further discussion the motion failed 3-3-0 (Yates, Green and Hendricks opposed).

Mr. Bond inquired if a pergola would be appropriate and they could screen it without a pergola or lattice.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that the owner come back with a design for the screening of the shed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor added to the motion with a reduction of the shed. Mr. Hendricks stated that they need a more detailed site plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

No: 1 - Green

- 12 [CAR No. 2015-099](#) 601-601 1/2 N. 23rd Street - Revise previously-approved plans for the construction of two attached single-family houses

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - July](#)

[Site Map - July](#)

[Staff Report - July](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of modifications to previously-approved plans for the construction of two attached single-family houses in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The project was approved at the March 24, 2015 Commission of Architectural Review meeting and a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on May 1, 2015. The proposed changes address adjustments made necessary due to the slope of the property that have necessitated changes to the siting and finished floor elevations. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the relationship of the proposed finished floor and total height be confirmed as they relate to the house to the north.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicant was proposing taking one CMU course down and Ms. Chen stated that it may be more than that because the corner is at 54 inches and they are planning on bringing it down to 44 inches which is probably 2 courses and the siding will cover the rest of it.

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

Mr. Michael Alexander, the owner stated that the foundation was constructed and they ran into more slope than they had anticipated and that at the high end of the lot the foundation wall is 32 inches and at the lower end on the Leigh Street side in the front of the house it is a 16 inch drop. Mr. Alexander stated that they would like to minimize the exposed foundation wall and they want to take down 2 courses and overlap the siding to cover up as much of the exposed block as possible. Mr. Alexander stated that they feel they can get within that 24 inch plus or minus. Mr. Alexander stated that they did meet with the building inspector and the architect and determined that they are within code if they removed the 2 courses of block all the way around.

Mr. Yates inquired about the total height on the Leigh Street side from the sidewalk to the top of the cornice and Mr. Alexander stated that would be 29 ft and that in doing that, because of the lay of the land, their structure would be a 1ft lower than what was previously approved.

Mr. Green stated that the adjacent building is 29 ft so they are going to be about 28 ft and Mr. Alexander stated yes. Mr. Green inquired if the porches will be at the same

elevation or will their porch be lower. Mr. Alexander stated that theirs will be slightly lower.

Mr. Green inquired what the difference was on the two porch decks and Mr. Alexander stated that it would be within a foot.

Mr. Bilder thanked the applicant for coming back and amending his plan and that initially he was opposed to the whole project but appreciates the applicant coming back and making it more fitting within the neighborhood.

Mr. Charlie Field, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

Mr. Will Cane, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

Ms. Mary Field, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Bond inquired if there were any validity in the drawings and what they are doing out there. Mr. Hill stated that staff had a little discussion and that their goal was to reduce the exposed foundation along Leigh Street to 24 inches and that if they could effectively bring the siding down.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the applicant is willing to put brick running down covering the 24 inches or is that something they are opposed to. Mr. Alexander stated that is something they can look at and explore and stated that they will make sure that the parging is of quality.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has concerns about the lack of dimensions on the drawings and that she is not clear on where the finished floor height is relative to the windows. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is not convinced that the elevations are accurate and would like to see more information about the dimensions vertically to demonstrate the correct placement of the windows.

Mr. Bond stated that he concurs because they are not showing correct dimensions.

Mr. Green stated that they are looking for the dimensions.

A motion was made by Mr. Bilder, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred and that the applicant return with exact plans and a different opaque parging system for the knee wall.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

No: 1 - Green

6 [CAR No. 2015-091](#) 603-603 1/2 N. 21st Street - Construct a new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct single-family house on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The proposed building is an Italianate-influenced structure with a front porch and rear inset porch. Staff takes issues with the proposed transom windows located on the sides of the structure which are not an historic design. Staff feels that the lack of windows on the side elevations represents a missed opportunity and is unusual feature compared to similar, but historic houses in the area. Staff also finds that the porch columns centered on the window is inconsistent with historic precedence and a result of the atypical four-bay design. Staff recommends approval of the project be conditioned that the transom windows on the sides of the structure be replaced with windows that match the proposed 2/2 sash windows, that all windows are true divided or simulated divided light windows and that the columns centered on the window be removed.

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

Mr. Jimmy Freeman, representing the owner, came up and answered questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions: the transom windows on the side elevations shall be replaced with windows that match the proposed 2/2 sash windows, that all the windows shall have true divided or simulated divided lites, and the porch design shall be revised to have five columns to complement the four-bay design of the front elevation.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

- 7 [CAR No. 2015-092](#) 511-511 1/2 N. 26th Street - Construct a new 4-unit multi-family dwelling

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - July](#)

[Site Map - July](#)

[Staff Report - July](#)

Mr. Hill stated that he gave the members two letters of comment, one was in favor of the application and one against the application.

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request for approval to construct a 4-unit multi-family house on two vacant lots in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff takes issue with the proposed transom windows located on the sides of the structure which are not an historic design. Staff feels that the lack of full windows on the side elevations represents a missed opportunity and is an unusual feature compared to similar but historic houses. Staff also finds that pitch and height of the roof on the façade is not compatible with the closest historic properties. Staff recommends that approval of the project be conditioned on the following:

- That the transom windows on the sides of the structure be replaced with windows that match the proposed 2/2 sash windows,
- That all windows be true-divided light or simulated-divided light,
- That the four-panel door with two upper lights be replaced with a solid, six-panel

door, and

- That the doors on the façade be placed in the outside bays with windows in the center to match the pattern of double-houses on the block, and
- That the front roof pitch be reduced from 12/6 to a shallower roof pitch that is compatible with the historic roof pitches.

Mr. Yates inquired how the height of this building is compared to the historic houses on the block and stated that he believes the height of the cornice is a little over 32ft from grade. Mr. Hill stated yes, and that if they take a cue from the relative heights of these buildings and then looking at the photographs that shows each of these buildings they are more pronounced because they sit closer to the street and appear taller.

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

Mr. Jimmy Freeman, representing the owner, stated that they are okay with the transoms. Mr. Freeman stated that they have tweaked the elevations from a 12/6 to a 12/8 and that reduced it to about 2'-6" which got the height down to 29'-9" so now it is a foot above the neighbor on the right.

Mr. Green inquired if they were moving the door and Mr. Freeman stated yes.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the HVAC on the site and Mr. Freeman stated that they are putting in on the gable portion of the front roof. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the locations for the 4 parking spaces and the super cans. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the side door on the first floor unit necessary. Mr. Freeman stated that it is ADA compliant.

Mr. Yates inquired about staff recommendations that all the windows be true divided-lite or simulated-divided lite and Mr. Freeman stated that they are using simulated-divided lite.

Mr. Yates inquired if there were transom windows and Mr. Freeman stated yes.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they were using corbels and Mr. Freeman stated no. Mr. Hendricks stated that the ramp is extending farther than the façade and inquired if they would be amendable to lowering the building to lessen the length of the ramp. Mr. Freeman stated that he doesn't know because of the crawl space.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired how many accessible units are they required to have and Mr. Freeman stated that he believes that it is one.

Mr. Green stated that they did receive two letters of comments one in favor and one against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates stated that they have been given a handout that substantially differs from what was shown in the packet that was presented and that if they were to go by these what kind of issue does that present. Mr. Hill stated that sometimes the applicant tries to address the staff report and make changes and that if these illustrate things that the Commission is comfortable with, they could agree to defer them to staff for review and approval. Mr. Yates stated that his main issue was the roof and stated that this has alleviated that concern and also the door relocation helps. Mr. Yates stated that it looks like the applicants are willing to address all of staff's recommendations.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he is still concerned with the siting and that there is no location for HVAC and trash cans and he would like to see the ramp pushed towards the back.

Mr. Green stated that he has concerns about the scale and height of the building and the roof form.

Mr. Bilder stated that he thinks the form of the building is in keeping with the area and stated that they need to find a different color for the building.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has concerns about the HVAC, the trash cans, the recycling cans and the ramp length and material. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she agrees with the suggestion that the ramp be pushed back to serve that back apartment and flipped so that someone can park off the alley and get on the ramp back there.

A motion was made by Mr. Bilder, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred with the recommendations that staff suggested and the recommendations that they come back with clarifications of colors, show historic context, trash screening, HVAC location and ramp details.

Aye: 5 - Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Bond

- 10 [CAR No. 2015-095](#) 726 N. 27th Street - Enclose existing side and rear porches and construct a new rear screened porch and garage

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to enclose an existing two-story side porch and construct a new rear screened porch and single-story garage at the rear of a property located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the rear screened porch with conditions that the owner considers the construction of the deck that meets the guidelines as presented on page 48 of The Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines. Staff recommends denial of the porch enclosure.

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

Mr. Yates stated that there is a note on the site plan regarding the enclosure of the porches and the new outer wall wood porch and inquired if all they were proposing is moving the wall of the porch. Ms. Chen stated that she doesn't think the size and the depth of the porch is being changed and that they are leaving the roof and floor structure exposed. Mr. Yates stated that the garage appears to have a wide overhang on one side supported by a bracket and inquired if the owner provided an explanation for that and Ms. Chen stated that there was no explanation.

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

Mr. Green stated that they are confused with the overhang.

Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't agree with the enclosure of the porch the way it is designed and that he has some problems about approving the deck without a redesign and has questions about the garage overhang. Mr. Yates stated that they should defer or deny the application until further explanations are provided.

Mr. Green stated that they could defer the garage to staff. Mr. Yates stated that it is not clear and he feel uncomfortable deferring it to staff.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they don't have proper details of the decks and garage.

A motion was made by Mr. Hendricks, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred and that the applicant return with more information on the garage materials, windows, doors and clarification on the deck.

Aye: 5 - Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Bond

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 13 [CAR No. 2015-076](#) 2401 E. Marshall Street / 313 N. 24th Street - Construct a new mixed use building and an addition to an existing structure

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - June 2015](#)

[Site Map - June 2015](#)

[Staff Report - June 2015](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a mixed-use project which will include multifamily residential units, commercial units, and civic space in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The project will be located on two parcels, 2401 East Marshall Street and 313 North 24th Street, which are adjacent to Patrick Henry Memorial Park and in close proximity to Saint John's Episcopal Church. The project was presented at the June 23, 2015 CAR meeting and was deferred. Staff has found that the following items need to be addressed prior to final review: that additional information is needed for the porch materials and treatments, that the use of painted plaster needs to be clarified and materials for the steps, columns, and handrails needs to be indicated and that additional information is needed for the brick to be used in the new construction. A photograph of the proposed sample next to the existing brick and the sample should be provided to staff. Additional information is needed for the location of existing trees and which ones will be retained as part of the project.

Mr. Tom LeKometros, the architect with The Lawrence Group, on behalf of Sterling Builders, came up and gave the Commission updates to the Commission's concerns.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the porch rails and Mr. LeKometros stated that it will be Richmond rail and the porch materials are going to be painted white wood and that their intent is to do the underside of the overhang with a waterproof plaster painted white and a simple kit of wood painted parged.

Mr. Green asked what their intent is for the columns and inquired about the materials and Mr. LeKometros stated that they are not intending to flute them and that they will be square posts.

Mr. Hendricks stated that on the east and the west elevations the window sizes are different and Mr. LeKometros stated that they took the literal translation of that width and that is their typical window size so that is what was driving that.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the spacing in the west elevation on the left-most window doesn't look like they are spaced equally and Mr. LeKometros stated that they will be identical and equal.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they are showing the trash enclosure as 6' by 12't and Mr. LeKometros stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if that was enough for the 24 units and Mr. LeKometros stated that it is a private service in this case.

Mr. John Mourner, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

Mr. John Poole, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project. Mr. Poole stated that he was under the impression that the City was keeping this as a parking lot. Mr. Poole stated that his view will be obliterated and he is also concerned about his safety with the enclosed building. Mr. Poole stated that he is sure that Mr. Josh Bilder is affiliated with Sterling Builders and stated that he is assuming that issues of conflict of interest have been addressed. Mr. Green stated that a Commission member with a conflict of interest with projects does not participate with the projects or discussions and they leave the room. Mr. Green emphasized that they have very clear procedures about conflicts of interest, they fill out forms and identify personal interest and any person that is identified as having a conflict of interest cannot be in the room while the discussion is taken place. Mr. Green stated that the member can re-enter the room after the discussion is over so they cannot have any influence on what takes place during the discussion. Mr. Poole inquired if this project is a done deal. Mr. Hill stated that they are taking his public comment and stated that any comments that he has about this project should be directed to the Commission. Mr. Hill stated that the Commission is here to review the applicant's design by using the Old and Historic District Guidelines.

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

Mr. Hendricks stated that they should take note of the staff report and stated that they need additional materials for handrails, color samples, colors of the aluminum and the brick samples. Mr. Hendricks stated that overall he would request a more consistent and vigorous approach to the window spaces and sizes. Mr. Hendricks stated that he has concerns with HVAC and that they will be visible because the parapet is really low.

Mr. Yates inquired about the windows in the Nolde Building face N. 24th Street and inquired if those windows are being salvaged or replaced with new storefront windows. Mr. LeKometros stated that there are no windows there so they are being replaced. Mr. Yates stated that he is also concerned about the visibility of the HVAC units since this project is on a very prominent corner. Mr. Yates stated that he appreciates them working with the Commission in addressing their concerns. Mr. Yates stated that he feels that the roof of the private porches are too low which seems to be crushing the first floor window opening which are fairly generous.

Mr. Green stated that it would help a little bit if the windows became a little more

uniform without changing their placement. Mr. Green stated that he had some concerns about the row house section, that when it is constructed it could be stark and stated that it is a very thin cornice, all white Hardiplank and then aluminum storefront details and that it could end up being very stark. Mr. Green stated that maybe it's a way to add shadow and relief without details and maybe making the cornice a little bit taller and no more detail and a softer color instead of stark white. Mr. Green stated that they could look at some minimal detail where the edge of the porch roof resolves itself. Mr. Green stated that he appreciates the applicants changes.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

Adjournment

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.