



# 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, September 22, 2015

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### 1 Call to Order

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

Mr. Green introduced Mr. Andrew McRoberts to the Commission members.

### 2 Roll Call

**Present:** 8 - Sanford Bond, Matthew Elmes, Bryan Green, Joseph Yates, Gerald Jason Hendricks, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Nathan Hughes and Andrew Ray McRoberts

**Absent:** 1 - James W. Klaus

### 3 Approval of Minutes

The August minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

Mr. Hill stated that the August minutes could be approved at the October 13th quarterly meeting.

### 4 Other Business

#### Secretary's Report

Mr. Hill stated that they have two new members Mr. Andrew McRoberts and Mr. Klaus and stated that staff is going to reach out to both new members to go over some materials and procedures with them.

Mr. Hill stated that the Clerk received an appeal for the new construction at 3607 E. Broad Street and stated that it was filed after the 15th day so it missed the period in which the Clerk can accept appeals.

Mr. Hill stated that the Springhill appeal has expired without a councilperson sponsoring a paper to reverse the Commission's decision within 75 days of the appeal being filed which was yesterday. Mr. Hill stated that means the Commission's decision has been affirmed by council not taking action.

Mr. Hill stated that 407 N. Allen Avenue both parties to that appeal had agreed to extend it until the end of November but he learned yesterday that it was scheduled for the Land Use Housing Transportation Standing Committee that is taking place at this hour. Mr. Hill stated that he informed council staff that the Commission and the home owners are continuing to work together to try to find the products and process that would yield a result amenable to both parties. Mr. Hill stated that neither party was interested in having that hearing on that appeal.

Mr. Hill stated that Ms. Pitts will return on October the 7th.

Mr. Hill stated that they have four letters of opposition that will come up in the course of the agenda and stated that the first letter is of opposition addressed to Ms. Cynthia Newbille for 2325 Venable Street.

Mr. Hill stated that on item number #5 on the agenda for 2601 E. Grace Street they received a letter of support and stated that for agenda item # 8 for 901-901 N. 24th Street they received a letter indicating that the applicant was okay accepting the conditions that staff recommended.

Mr. Hill stated that they also received a letter for 823 Mosby Street wanting the assurance that the Commission would not approve a pay phone at that address and stated that the application does not include a pay phone.

Mr. Hill stated that because Yom Kippur begins at sundown today the applicant for 901-903 N. 24th asked if the application could be heard earlier before sundown.

#### Administrative Approvals

Mr. Hill distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 112 approvals for the period from August 5, 2015 through September 18, 2015.

#### Enforcement Report

No enforcement report was given.

#### Other Committee Reports

Mr. Green stated that they could go over some procedures at the quarterly meeting and cover some of the Robert's Rule.

The Commission came up to a consensus to have the quarterly meeting on Tuesday October 13th at Ms. Aarons-Sydnor office at 1421 Lombardy Alley at 6:00. Mr. Green stated that if any Commission member had any topics that they wanted to discuss at the quarterly meeting to send him an email. Mr. Green stated that there is Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP) which is a board training that it is really helpful and goes over the Roberts' Rule and procedures.

Mr. Green read the two Resolution of Appreciation into the minutes.

Whereas, Joshua Bilder faithfully and thoughtfully discharged his duties as a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from July 2012 through July 2015; and  
Whereas, he encouraged the Commission to consider and protect the city's historic resources; and

Whereas, he was a member of the Commission who spoke from a developers perspective; and

Whereas, his in-depth knowledge of the development community in Richmond helped to guide Commission deliberations and provide valuable perspective to discussions; and

Whereas, his enthusiasm for Richmond's rich history was greatly appreciated by his colleagues; and

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

Whereas, his desire to serve the City of Richmond through his public service was both recognized and greatly appreciated by his colleagues; and

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

Whereas, Jennifer I. Wimmer faithfully and thoughtfully discharged her duties as a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from November 2005 through July 2015; and

Whereas, following her nomination as a citizen at large to fill an unexpired term, and later reappointed for two full terms as a citizen at large, her service reflected well upon her commitment to making the City of Richmond a better place; and

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

Whereas, she was instrumental in the formation of the Springhill Old and Historic District; and

Whereas, her breadth of architectural knowledge helped guide and inform the Commission and applicants throughout her years of service; and

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

Whereas, she gave generously of her time during many protracted meetings and site visits; and

Whereas, her long experience and enthusiastic involvement with the Storefront for Community Design provided an important link to her service on the CAR; and

Whereas, she advocated for appropriate rehabilitation and sensitive infill construction in order to protect the integrity of Richmond Old and Historic Districts, and

Whereas, her contributions included her broad knowledge of the guidelines and her perceptive and accurate interpretations of them; and

Whereas, she was always engaged, thoughtful, and willing to offer assistance to applicants with questions; and

Whereas, her service as both Vice-Chair and Chair provided the Commission with direction and leadership;

Now therefore the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review hereby express thanks and appreciation to Ms. Wimmer.

Mr. Yates made a motion to adopt the Resolutions of Appreciation for Ms. Jennifer Wimmer and Mr. Josh Bilder. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 8-0-0.

#### UDC Report

Mr. Green stated that there was a final review of a new Animal Care and Control building at 800 Swan Lake Drive; a final location, character and extent review of a new road narrowing project on N. 12th between E. Broad and E. Marshall Street; and some street scape encroachments along N. 12th Street. Mr. Green stated that there were a series of data nodes and stated that they are really small now and they will be sitting on top of the poles. Mr. Green discussed the several locations of the data nodes. Mr. Green stated that the final agenda item was the final review of the stage canopy and sun shelters for the Kanawha Plaza.

Mr. Green stated that he received an email Mr. Jeff Eastman, the Secretary for Urban Design Committee, that stated that the review schedule has been moved up for the GRTC Bus Rapid Transit Program and the UDC will be review the projects final design this fall. Mr. Hill stated that VDOT is going to be in charge of construction instead of GRTC that is part of the reason for the acceleration of the review schedule. Mr. Green stated that Mr. Eastman will send them the design as soon as it is ready, and it will be put up on Legistar.

Mr. Hill stated that at yesterday's meeting the Planning Commission accepted the

Commission's recommendation and approved the plans for the improvements at Abner Clay Park with the Commission's conditions.

\*recess 3:52

\*resumed at 4:00

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Yates stated that on application #1 the applicant is proposing to install 6 new windows on the south elevation which is on a property line and stated that it is something that staff might want to highlight because he don't think zoning will allow it based on the fact that it is on the property line.

Mr. Green made a motion move item # 9 for 823 Mosby Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. Mr. Green stated that there was a letter that states the citizen had no objection to the project but does not want to see a pay phone on the property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-2-0 (Aarons-Sydnor and Yates opposed).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to move item #5 for 2601 E. Grace Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. Mr. Green stated that they received a letter on this project that states that the owner will not be able at attend the meeting but will be happy to abide by any decision that the Commission makes to screen the proposed the shed as long as no screening is put atop the wall facing the property or along the street of the adjacent owners. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Yates stated that he has question about the project.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that her only concern is that the applicant provided 3 options and want them to be clear of what is being approved. After further discussion the motion failed 2-6-0(Green, Yates, Hendricks, McRoberts, Aarons-Sydnor and Elmes opposed).

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

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

- 1 [CAR No. 2015-020](#) 818 N. 25th Street - Rehabilitate with limited replacement-in-kind. Enclose porch and install new windows.

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)  
[Application & Plans - February 2015](#)  
[Site Map - February 2015](#)  
[Staff Report - February 2015](#)

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

- 2 [CAR No. 2015-121](#) 412 N. 25th Street - Install storefront windows and door

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the new porch be painted or opaquely stained.

- 9 [CAR No. 2015-120](#) 823 Mosby Street - Construct rear deck and stair

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the modified hood over the rear doors can be installed at a lower height than as currently exists.

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 8 [CAR No. 2015-119](#) 901-903 N. 24th Street - Enclose back porch, replace basement windows, rehabilitate garages

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Green made a motion to move item #8 for 901-903 N. 24th Street to the beginning of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and passed 8-0-0.

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to enclose an existing rear porch, replace basement windows, and rehabilitate a garage located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant is proposing to enclose the one-story porch on the east elevation of the house that has limited visibility from North 24th and O Streets, and from an alley to the east. Staff recommends that approval of the project with the condition that PVC windows be used.

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

Mr. Cory Weiner, the owner, came up and answered questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the conditions noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and failed 4-4-0 (Green, Hendricks, Yates, McRoberts opposed).

**A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as amended per the conditions noted in the staff report and to include that the fence be a requirement for construction of the enclosed rear porch and that the colors for the rear porch be**

flipped so that the lighter color is on the top and the darker color is on the bottom and that the actual colors be deferred to staff. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she thinks color probably matters in this and stated that they are proposing a lighter color on the base and a darker at the top. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it may be more effective to flip them so that you have the lighter color adjacent to the windows. Mr. Elmes accepted the amendment to flip the colors and defer them to staff for review and approval.

**Aye:** 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No:** 2 - Yates and Hendricks

3 [CAR No. 2015-113A](#) 2325 Venable Street - Construct a new mixed-use building

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

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new mixed-use building on a vacant lot on the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The project was conceptually reviewed at the May 2015 CAR meeting. The applicant proposes to construct a commercial aluminum storefront on the first floor façade. Staff stated that information on the proposed location of mechanical equipment was not provided. Staff also stated that information on the proposed location of dumpster or other garbage collection devices was not provided. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned with the applicant submitting final brick and siding colors to staff for administrative review and approval.

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

Mr. Andy Scudder, an architect with Johannas Design Group, representing David Johannas, came up to answer questions. Mr. Scudder stated that the form is bridging between the 4 to 5 stories large brick mass to the west and stepping down to the 2-story buildings. Mr. Scudder stated that there was some concerns about the height and that the butterfly roof is bringing in the roof lines, not only the adjacent houses, but also with the rooflines of the houses to the south down Pink Street, which is a nice subtle way of temporizing what they find in the neighborhood and reducing that scale. Mr. Scudder stated that there is a shed in the back of the building that leads to a 3 ft private alley and that there is a curb cut that is about 3 ½ ft wide. Mr. Scudder stated that this is going before the Planning Commission and City Council for the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Hendricks inquired about the headers and stated that they look like stone and Mr. Scudder stated that they are some precast or stone material.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that on the elevations it appears that the lower floors of those headers are hatched like a stone or concrete hatch and that the upper floors are not and inquired if they were using different material. Mr. Scudder stated that there is cementitious siding there and the headers will be a PVC product.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the HVAC systems and the units themselves are conventional units and inquired where the compressors are going. Mr. Scudder stated that they will be on the roof or the east side of the building. Mr. Elmes inquired if the lot jogs and Mr. Scudder stated that no, it is a rectangular lot.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they said the alley to the south is a private alley and Mr. Scudder stated yes according to the survey. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the enclosure there looks like it's about 6 ft wide with 5 units plus the commercial and inquired if that is sized appropriately for the right number of super cans. Mr. Scudder stated that he can verify how trash will be handled and that he is sure that the Planning staff is going to know that as part of the Special Use Permit. Mr. Scudder stated that on the rear elevation they can provide a flanking and keep it enclosed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if there is no parking required and Mr. Scudder stated that there is no access to the site except a small curb cut. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the butterfly roofs are the same but opposite slope and Mr. Scudder stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the slope mimics the other adjacent houses and Mr. Scudder stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the railing on the top, front second floor is aluminum pipe railings because it is not showing any pickets or vertical rails and inquired if they were proposing glass. Mr. Scudder stated that it is noted as a potential deck and that it would be occupiable.

Mr. Yates inquired if Planning was not requiring any parking on this site and Mr. Scudder stated that he hasn't received staff's comments and that the remainder of the block has no alley access.

Mr. Charlie Field, speaking as a citizen, came up to speak against the project and stated that massing and scale is 50 percent taller than anything in the neighborhood and doesn't fit in the neighborhood.

Ms. Elaine O'Dell, speaking as a member of the Union Hill Civic Association, spoke against the project and encourages the Commission to defer the project.

Mr. Mark Anderson, speaking as the Vice President of the Union Hill Civic Association, came up to speak against the project and requested that the Commission take their concerns into consideration like parking, trash and the massing of the building.

Ms. Mary Fields, speaking as a citizen, came up to speak against the project because there is no parking and there is an issue of safety.

Mr. Mark Anderson stated that there are a lot of parking issues in the neighborhood.

Mr. Dave Seibert, speaking as a citizen, came up to speak on the project and stated that he is excited to see something there and that they should try and work out something with the Commission.

Ms. Annette Utre, speaking as a citizen, came up to speak against the project and that she agrees that something needs to be there but not a 3-story structure that doesn't blend into the rest of the neighborhood.

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

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter from Councilperson Cynthia Newbille from the Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter from Ms. Ann Wortham summarizing the process that there were two neighborhood meetings and that there was no support of the project and there were negative comments that the applicant should consider.

Mr. Yates stated that as a Commission of Architectural Review member they cannot address the zoning issues and that their hands have been slapped on numerous occasions by City Council because they have gone over that fence. Mr. Yates stated

that as to the building, he applauds the architect because they took a very difficult site and worked up a contemporary solution to it of something that the Commission would like to see in terms of design. Mr. Yates stated that he thinks the building is too tall and that because there is a large factory building across the street is not a mitigating circumstance. He stated that he does like the transition in the materials from brick to wood. Mr. Yates stated that he understands why the recess entries is there, because it is on a corner but states that the fact that the recess entry aligns with the existing 2-story houses on the block, it's never going to be picked up and that the only reason it is visible to them is because it is noted on the floor plan. Mr. Yates stated that in his opinion the building is too large for the site and he wishes there was some way of mitigating that.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the height doesn't bother him and that they should consider the building across the street. He stated that it's a part of the historic context of the neighborhood and went on to say that the three stories isn't so much of an issue. Mr. Hendricks stated that he agrees with the material changes and that he does think the architect took the 2-stories on the front piece to help contextualize the front that sticks forward. Mr. Hendricks stated that as far the depth along that façade, it is big from a massing prospective and that it is broken down well in scale with the other neighborhood areas but thinks overall it is too large.

Mr. Green stated that he agrees that the 2-story portion will help to bridge if it weren't projecting forward and that if it was actually aligning with the building next door and there was a step up into 3-stories and there might be a way to make it work. Mr. Green stated that the 3-story portion aligns with the 2-story portion and the 2-story portion thrusts further than any other building on the block and that it undercuts that as a design choice. Mr. Hendricks stated that the precedence they used was that when you look at the commercial developments they are 2-story massing up on the street, which probably was the driver for that. Mr. Green stated that typically when they are applying this to residential design they look at an average setback based on the other buildings on the block and that this doesn't fall into that. Mr. Green stated that he understands what they are saying about the transition to the factory building but it is a different building type and that he is not sure how valid that is. Mr. Green stated that the 2-story projection makes the 3-story portion even bigger and that if the 2-story portion had aligned with the buildings next door stepping into a taller portion to the back he thinks it might be a way to make it work. Mr. Green stated that right now it's a big 3-story building with a 2-story addition plunging forward and that to him it doesn't blend in or fit the massing of the neighbors around it.

Mr. Elmes inquired if conceptual review applications are publicly noticed and Mr. Hill stated that they send direct public notice letters. Mr. Elmes stated that when this came before the Commission for conceptual review there was no adversity to the project at that time from the public. Mr. Green stated that there were some people here opposed to the project.

Mr. Elmes stated that he remembers at the end of the conceptual review and discussion it seemed to be focused more on the design at that point.

Mr. Hendricks stated that there were some discussion about the front porches and where they use to be.

Mr. Elmes stated that the difficulty with the process is there is great deal of disappointment with the way the project is coming before the community at this point and that as a body it is difficult when you are presented with a conceptual project to get feedback from a body and they give them feedback based on what they believe their guidelines are suggesting. Mr. Elmes stated that they always take into consideration the public's perspective and that they aren't necessarily bound to by Neighborhood



Associations or groups as much as they are to their Guidelines. Mr. Elmes stated that the difficulty that he is having is that at the conceptual review there were no discussion to the negative that he recalls.

Mr. Green stated that he disagrees and that there were some comments. Mr. Elmes stated that it was from the Commission and not the public.

Mr. Hill stated that Ms. Lumpert spoke at the meeting and discussed her concerns with the visual impacts and setbacks.

Mr. Elmes stated that he agrees that from a siting standpoint and if there was a more visible division between where the residential setback of the residential 3-story came in, the massing might be reduced and would probably mitigate the butterfly roof issue because everything could drain in one direction. Mr. Elmes stated that the connecting tower is not all that successful and that those were things that were brought up when they discussed it previously and that they have to put it in the guideline related motion.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that with 6 units that means 2 super cans which adds to 12 plus 6 condensers if they have their own heat pump and that she is concerned that there is not enough space on the site for everything and those items aren't currently being shown. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would also prefer that if they are going to make a nod to this 2-story at the front she thinks it will be much more successful if the entire front portion stop in height at the top of the current brick and that if the 2-story and rear portion was 3-stories that would probably be much more acceptable for massing for the community and it would mean one less unit which will mean less stuff on the site. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is also concerned about the railing that isn't detailed because it's on the front façade and that there is no real precedent.

Mr. Bond stated that last time they did have some concerns about how it relates to the row of houses on the street and that they all have porches and stated that he would suggest that they try to align it and that he doesn't see where they tried to do that. Mr. Bond stated that they asked Mr. Johannas if they had attempted to do that and he stated no. Mr. Bond stated that he is not inclined to approve it without more details and how it relates to the buildings surrounding it and that there is no scale and it doesn't show context.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that by them bringing it to the street it is relating to the context because wherever you have a corner commercial with residential on top throughout Church Hill and Union Hill they are pushed to the sidewalk.

Mr. McRoberts stated that this fails with a number of guidelines and that the siting doesn't respect the development on the block and that it busts out of form on that block. Mr. McRoberts stated that he agrees with the speaker that said that because there is a larger industrial historic rehabilitation across the street justifies the height and that it he doesn't agree with that and that it needs to conform to the block. Mr. McRoberts stated that he has no problem with it projecting to the street because it is consistent with storefronts on the corner but that the problem is that it is a 2-story projection. Mr. McRoberts stated that one thing that hasn't been said is that the projection in the back bugs him because it busts out of the form from all the other houses on the block.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application so that the applicant and architect can work with the community and work within the guidelines to bring the building into compliance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly amendment that when it comes back, the location for the condensers, trash and recycling receptacles be clearly denoted on the plans and

that they have a context elevation of the adjacent house.

Mr. Elmes made a friendly amendment that they have the downspout location shown.

Mr. Hughes made a friendly amendment that they have detailing for the railing.

**A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred so that the applicant and architect can work with the community and work within the guidelines to bring the building into compliance.**

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**4**    [CAR No. 2015-116](#)    3820 Hermitage Road - Construction of a new garage

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report for the applicant's request approval to paint the brick on a proposed new two-story outbuilding in the rear yard of 3820 Hermitage Road located in the Hermitage Road Old and Historic District. The application came before the Commission at the April 22, 2014 meeting a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued at that time with conditions. This application is before the Commission at this time because the applicant would like to construct the garage of red brick to be painted to match the color of the house leaving the belt course and the segmental arches unpainted. Staff recommends denial of the request to paint the brick, and suggests that use of either the previously approved stucco or light brick or smooth cementitious.

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

Mr. Charlie Fields, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

**A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the applicant paint the brick exterior of the proposed garage with opaque paint with no unpainted red brick accents recognizing within the Guidelines a distinction between new and historic brick construction, and that the applicant submit the paint selection to Commission staff for administrative review and approval.**

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**5**    [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](#)

[Application & Plans - July 2015](#)

[Site Map - July 2015](#)

[Staff Report - July 2015](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a prefabricated 8'x16' shed at the rear of the property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The project was presented at the July 28th CAR meeting and was deferred. Staff finds that shed has been located as close to the southeast corner of the garden as possible and will be minimally visible from the street because of the elevated nature of the terrace and the enclosing brick wall. Staff finds that the proposal to install a trellis with screening vegetation along the inside of the southwest corner of the brick wall meets the guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that a trellis and screening be installed.

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

Mr. Bryan Loos, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Hughes stated that there was a public comment from Tom and Arlene Sanders, noting that they are in support of the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

**Mr. Bond made a motion, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved noting that the Commission approved the application's preferred Option 1 with the condition that the screening trellis would be extended to the forward opening in the brick wall.**

**Aye:** 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No:** 1 - Elmes

**6** [CAR No. 2015-117](#) 3110 E. Marshall Street - Review of siding installed by previous owner

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of siding installed on a dwelling in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The application is the result of enforcement activity. The previous owner replaced the lap wood siding on the house with Hardiplank, unbeaded, Cedar mill, textured siding. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with the condition that smooth Hardiplank, be installed on the façade and that the siding be installed on the diagonal in the gable.

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

Mr. Weldon Chafe, the owner came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

**Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness and allow the wood grain Hardi plank to remain because it was applied by a previous owner. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if that included the gable. Mr. Hill stated that in the case of the gable there was a feature that is obscured or changed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made an amendment they allow the Hardiplank to stay on the first and second floor but the gable should be put back. Mr. Elmes added to the motion that the gable be changed back to the original materials and stated that he feels strongly that the architectural feature within the front gable was a very prominent contributing feature to the front façade should replicated via a photograph of its previous existence. Mr. Elmes stated that the cedar mill siding can be maintained on the front and side. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.**

**Aye:** 6 - Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No:** 1 - Green

**Abstain:** 1 - Yates

- 7 [CAR No. 2015-118](#) 511 W. 20th Street - Construct new storage shed

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a prefabricated 12'x20' shed at the rear of the property located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. The prefabricated shed will be effectively screened from W. 20th Street by the existing 6' privacy fence and trees and from Semmes Avenue by a concrete wall and vegetation. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that colors for the shed be submitted for staff approval.

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

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

**A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant will submit colors selected for the shed to Commission staff for administrative review and approval.**

**Aye:** 6 - Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No:** 1 - Green

**Abstain:** 1 - Yates

- 10 [CAR No. 2015-122](#) 600 W. 19th Street - Rehabilitate house and garage

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request for approval to rehabilitate a house and garage located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. The rehabilitation of the house includes replacing vinyl siding with smooth fiber cement siding, replacing deteriorated windows with vinyl sash, repairing and painting brick work, repairing a wood fence and removing a chain link fence, reconfiguring an enclosed porch, and repairing or replacing in-kind and extending existing concrete sidewalks. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that the wood siding on the façade be repaired and retained if possible, and that the wood or aluminum clad 1/1 or 2/2 simulated divided light windows be installed.

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

Mr. Scott Cofield, the co-owner came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

**Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the siding that they use the existing wood gather it up for the front façade and smooth fiber cement board on the remaining elevation and ask that the applicant come back with a complete window survey. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.**

**After further discussion, Ms. Aarons-Sydnor revised her motion to approve the roofing, the garage and the enclosed porch as presented, and the siding with the condition that the existing wood siding be moved to the front façade and that smooth fiber cement board on the remaining faces and that a window survey be performed and that the Chair and Commission staff review the survey and give final approval on which windows can be replaced. Mr. Green made a friendly amendment that a cut sheet be provided for the windows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.**

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

- 11 [CAR No. 2015-052](#) 2405 E. Clay Street - Construct new single-family house

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)  
[Application & Plans - April 2015](#)  
[Site Map - April 2015](#)  
[Staff Report - April 2015](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's for approval to

construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The proposed building is an Italianate-influenced structure with a front porch and a rear deck. The Commission deferred an earlier application at the April 28, 2015 meeting, requesting additional information and clarification. The applicant has addressed the request for alterations to the front elevation to improve the proportions by reducing the distance between the top of the windows and the cornice by using an alternate roof form and modifying the rearmost window on the right-hand (west) elevation to be more compatible with windows in the district. Staff recommends approval of this project with the conditions that the applicant install cement-fiber siding with a smooth finish, windows with true or simulated divided lites, and that the lattice under the porch be orthogonal (rather than diagonal) wood lattice.

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

Mr. Tyson Bates, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Gerard Hines, speaking as a member of the public, spoke against the project.

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

**Mr. Hendricks made a motion to approve the application as noted in the staff report with the following conditions that they provide only one step to the front porch lowering the building approximately 3ft so the decks align with the adjacent neighbors, that it be clear glass in the front and rear doors, with a preference for metal roof on the front roof of the front porch with an option to use grey TPO and confirm the metal roof with Commission staff, that the main façade of the front elevation align with the adjacent neighbors and the mechanical units be located far to the east as possible. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.**

**Aye:** 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

- 12 [CAR No. 2015-123](#) 725 N. 26th Street - Construct a two-story carriage house

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - September 2015](#)

[Site Map - September 2015](#)

[Staff Report - September 2015](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a two-bay two-story frame garage at the rear of this residential property in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The applicant has referenced Sanborn maps indicating that a one-story outbuilding with a similar footprint formerly stood on the site. The garage/apartment would be of slab-on-grade frame construction with Jeld-Wen wood 1/1 double-hung and transom-style windows. The orientation of the garage doors would require a curb cut adjacent to the alley for access. In staff's opinion the massing of the building proposed and the orientation of the garage doors facing the street are elements that are not compatible with the Guidelines for outbuildings and the historical pattern of development in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff does not recommend approval of the current project.

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

Mr. Joe Monopoli, the owner, stated that he already has permission from the City to cut the curb. Mr. Monopoli stated that they would cut the curb and replace the concrete sidewalk with brick so that it will go back to the way it was originally. Mr. Monopoli stated that the pad in the back where he wants the garage to be is the full length of the property and that he is doing what was there at one time. Mr. Monopoli stated that he needs 12ft ceilings that he can install a lift on the 1st floor to work on cars and a second story for an apartment for his mother. Mr. Monopoli stated that as far as the garage exit going into the alleyway he wish he could but stated the fence across the alley comes right to the edge of the alley and there would be no way to turn into the back alley. Mr. Monopoli stated that he does not want access from the alley to deter from theft and stated that on the street side the garage doors are more visible. Mr. Monopoli stated that he has signatures from his neighbors in support of this project as they think what he is doing is a plus.

Mr. Yates inquired if the City Zoning Department was okay with the apartment over the garage. Ms. Deanna Lewis stated that they were okay with it but they have to get a special use permit for the height.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the existing shed on the property was being demolished, and Mr. Monopoli stated that it is going to get moved to his neighbor's house. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the distance from the house to the garage was 28ft 7 and stated that based on the photograph it looks more like 25ft and inquired in there is an inaccuracy. Mr. Monopoli stated that is the porch and stated that from the back edge of the house all the way down is roughly 27ft not counting from the edge of the porch to the garage. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they planned on keeping the section of the fence that is painted white and Mr. Monopoli stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired which door style they were using and Mr. Monopoli stated that it is a single sided garage door. Mr. Elmes stated that they have a door with a bunch of colonial hinges on it and they have a picture of a door that hasn't have colonial hinges on it and inquired what door they are using. Ms. Lewis stated that what is shown in the specs is a 16ft wide steel door that is made to look like a double carriage house with hinges and stated that there are some examples in the Church Hill area that have large carriage house doors. Ms. Lewis stated that they have doubled that so that he could actually use this building as a functioning door.

Ms. Lewis inquired if the Commission wanted the applicant to show them some pictures of examples of garages in the neighborhood. Mr. Elmes stated that he does not think the concern is in regards to the garage being 2-stories but the orientation is what the Commission will have to talk about. Ms. Lewis stated that the applicant's intent is to use the first floor as an actual garage space and stated that they will do go to the extent to install garage doors that will mimic what carriage house doors look like.

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

Mr. Green stated that with the orientation he could not find any oriented this way is his concern.

Mr. Elmes stated that there are some garages like that on Monument and Grace Street and stated that the best way to argue something like this would be to put them in the presentations.

Mr. Green stated that the issue with passing things around is that it needs to be in the public record so that everyone sees it ahead of time.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated there is another carriage style garage on 22nd and Broad but states that it's a single bay and it's much smaller and stated that her concern is the overall massing is subordinate to the house. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the drawings are deceptive because the distance between the house and garage shows that it is going to be a very crowded lot with a large house and a 2-story garage. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has concerns about it facing the street and stated that she knows there are 1 or 2 precedences in Church Hill but that is more of the exception but not the rule.

Mr. Elmes stated that the corner houses on 28th and Broad the carriage house is facing the side street and stated that it does occur in corner houses but it is going against the grain. Mr. Elmes stated that it is accenting the corner to a certain degree as well and stated that the side street is really narrow and stated that it is a case by case basis. Mr. Elmes stated that there are a lot of cons with it facing the alley as far as use goes.

Mr. Hughes stated that it is subordinate but states that it's large in scale with the 2 bays and 2-stories.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he was okay with it accessing it off the road and stated that it will be difficult turning out of the alley.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has more of a problem with the width than the height because that takes up more than half of the length of the fencing.

Mr. Green stated that scale wise it's another house on the lot and states that he understand the functional need to drive that elevation up in and get the depth but stated that it reads like a second house and stated that it is not reading as an accessory building.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he does not know if the problem is the height or the width and stated that his preference would be to have a single bay.

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to defer the application and ask the applicant to come back with a different design. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Elmes stated that he would like the applicant to bring back a site plan.

Mr. Monopoli stated that the back of the fence is there is 2ft there that he owns. Mr. Elmes stated that for an application like this the Commission typically needs a survey and site plan showing how big the lot is from the front to the back.

Ms. Lewis stated that the dimensions came off the City Website.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly clarification that the additional information address the size, height and width of the building.

**A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred.**

**Aye:** 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No:** 1 - Green

## Adjournment



Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.