

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MINUTES

June 23, 2015

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, June 23, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Mr. Mathew Elmes (arrived at 3:54)
 Mr. Sanford Bond

Members absent: Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

Staff Present: Ms. Marianne G. Pitts, CAR Secretary
 Mr. James Hill, DPDR
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary
 Ms. Kimberly Chen, DPDR

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

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

Secretary Report

Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Palmquist is changing roles in the department and stated that he is now a Planner II working more with the Comprehensive Planning aspects of the division. Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Palmquist will start his new position on June 29th and that Ms. Pitts will be out on maternity leave from August through October. He stated that they will be pulling Mr. Palmquist back along with Ms. Chen to help out with the

Commission. Mr. Hill stated that with 407 N. Allen Avenue they have not been in touch with them yet to find out if they have implemented the technique for the brick portion of the exterior of that property. Mr. Hill stated that the most recent extension of the appeal

period was renewed May 19th through August 3rd. Mr. Hill stated that they hope to communicate with them and find out if this has taken place. He stated that he hopes it will be resolved before the July meeting. Mr. Hill stated that he and Ms. Pitts will be in court on Friday, June 26th for the Houghton case at 2916 Monument Avenue and stated that he was served with a show cause papers. Mr. Hill stated that after the 6-month period he still hasn't abated the violation on his property as he was instructed and stated that the expected outcome would be that the judge will respect a continuation in which case the City will ask for a short turnaround. Mr. Hill stated that the second outcome is a hearing to determine whether he is in contempt of court for failing to follow the court's order to abate the violation.

The Commission members came to a consensus to have the next quarterly meeting on July 14th at Odell Associates at 6:30 p.m. The Commission discussed topics for the quarterly meeting which included buildings built on corner lots under the New Construction Guidelines.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he will work on the public outreach and educational Powerpoint for the CAR.

Ms. Pitts stated that the September meeting is during the UCI Bike Race and that they should have access to the building and parking.

Mr. Green inquired if they could move the meeting up a week or back a week during the week of the bike race. Ms. Pitts stated that she would check on it.

Ms. Pitts stated that there was a change in the vote for one of the consent agenda items in the draft meeting minutes for May 2015 and that it has since been corrected.

Approval of the Minutes:

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the May 23rd minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

Committee Reports

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in regards to the annual report, they put together some great maps and charts and that they are waiting on the case studies. Ms. Pitts stated that they were discussing updating the maps and data for the past fiscal year so that it will be more up to date by the time they present it.

Mr. Green inquired about the case studies and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they wanted to include samples on how the Commission work with applicants on difficult issues so they can demonstrate how they are trying to support the applicants in the neighborhoods and make it a positive process for everybody.

Mr. Green inquired if there are any updates on the maps and brochures and Mr. Bond stated that he has no updates as of yet, but hopefully will by the end of the summer.

UDC Report

Mr. Green stated that at the last UDC meeting they were looking at the details from the Kanawha Plaza project.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Palmquist distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 59 approvals for the period from May 26, 2015 through June 22, 2015.

Partial List of Administrative Approvals (Building Permits and Certificate Applications) Issued by Commission Staff

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
2907 W GRACE ST		5/28/2015	P15052604	5/28/2015	A15-179	Replace water service line from the property line to the house	Replacement of water service line. No other work authorized under this permit	WP
1500 N LOMBARDY ST		5/26/2015	B15052607	5/28/2015	A15-180	Construct fence around existing equipment pad	The VUU parcel indicated on the application is not part of the campus that is designated as a City Old and Historic District. No review required	WP
718 N 27TH ST		5/27/2015	E15052702	5/27/2015	A15-181	Wire new home	Wiring new single family house that was previously approved by the Commission of Architectural Review	WP
2615 E CLAY ST		5/27/2015	M15052705	5/27/2015	A15-182	Install (3) ton HP w/ 10 Kw heater kit to existing duct work	Heat pump located in rear yard and not visible from public right-of-way due to rear fence and no alley directly behind property	WP
3618 E BROAD ST		5/27/2015	C14121201	5/27/2015	A15-183	BMP system as shown on attached documents including 98' of 46" cmp & std VDOT MH-1 tying into existing 12" RCP	Chain link fence and aluminum security fence visible from public right-of-way can be only temporary during construction. Check with CAR staff for approval of permanent fencing visible from public right-of-way	JCH
418 N 25TH ST	5/27/2015			5/28/2015	A15-184	Work items which have been approved by the Department of Historic Resources as an amendment to the project's Part 2 tax credit application include: repair or replace with in-kind materials display cases at the front facade to match the size and details of the original display cases; construct the commercial entry awning to match photo documentation of the historic awning; and install the "ticket booth" window on the front facade to match photo documentation of the historic ticket booth window		MP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 1 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
805 N 23RD ST		5/28/2015	E15052803	5/28/2015	A15-185	Wire to code	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
805 N 23RD ST		5/28/2015	E15052802	5/28/2015	A15-186	Wire to code	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
518 N 22ND ST		4/21/2015	B15042104	5/28/2015	A15-187	Demolishing 2-story wood porch and replacing in-kind	Approved by CAR at 5/26/15 meeting. Despite drawing submitted, railing must be in the style of Richmond rail. Call 846-7860 with any questions regarding this condition	WP
15 S 13TH ST		5/4/2015	B15050104	5/28/2015	A15-188	Addition of penthouse structure at rear of building	Approved by the Commission of Architectural Review at their meeting on 5/26/15	MP
3616 E BROAD ST		5/27/2015	N15052702	5/29/2015	A15-189	To connect to existing gas piping	Connection to existing gas piping only. No other work authorized under this permit	WP
3616 E BROAD ST		5/27/2015	M15052710	5/29/2015	A15-190	TO install owner supplied gas furnace and air conditioner connecting to existing duct and gas	Exterior unit to be located in rear of side yard and if visible from public right-of-way (including alley), is to be screened with a low, wooden, picket-style fence/gate	WP
309 N ADAMS ST		5/29/2015	B15052809	5/29/2015	A15-191	Restored the second floor two apartments. Install new walls and remove walls with architect's plan. Install kitchen, new bathroom, floor, etc	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit, including the replacement of windows	WP
2120 E BROAD ST		6/1/2015	E15050507	6/1/2015	A15-192	Light remodel, new light fixtures, switches and receptacles	No changes to the exterior of the structure	MP
113 E LEIGH ST		6/1/2015	B15060106	6/1/2015	A15-193	Repair/replacement of damaged materials. No structural work, no exterior work, no electrical, no plumbing, no mechanical work	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
607-6 N 29TH ST	5/28/2015			6/1/2015	A15-194	Modification of front yard setback for previously-approved new construction projects from 16'-2" to 10.25'		MP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 2 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
2815 E BROAD ST		6/1/2015	B15060110	6/1/2015	A15-195	Selective demolition of interior plaster walls. No structural changes planned. No structural work. No exterior work	Permit is approved for interior work only. Any change in scope of work visible from the exterior, including windows, must be brought to CAR staff for review	JCH
309 N ADAMS ST		6/2/2015	E15060207	6/2/2015	A15-196	Need to install a temporary electrical box	Temporary electrical box for renovation. No other exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2031 MONUMENT AV		3/31/2015	B15032716	6/2/2015	A15-197	Plan revision. Added notes per CAR	Project is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 5/26/15. Windows must be true or simulated divided lites	WP
609 N 29TH ST		6/2/2015	B15042718	6/2/2015	A15-198	Build new house	New construction project is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 2/27/15	WP
1133 W FRANKLIN ST		6/2/2015	B15052902	6/2/2015	A15-199	Tent for church bar-b-que	Temporary tent for event to be up for one day	WP
2913 E MARSHALL ST		10/9/2014	B14092210	6/2/2015	A15-200	Permit revision: rear balcony per attached plans/drawings, photo shows similar porch by same contractor	Rev 6/2/15: Rear balcony is consistent with CAR approval. Must be opaquely stained or painted	WP
515 N BOULEVARD		6/2/2015	M15052908	6/2/2015	A15-201	Boiler replacement - like for like	Like-for-like boiler replacement. No other work authorized under this permit	WP
523 N 22ND ST		6/2/2015	B15052901	6/2/2015	A15-202	Vehicle ran off road and damaged porch deck. Rebuild porch back to historical	Repair of side inset porch to be modeled on the historic porch using in-kind materials and same dimensions as existing	WP
511 N 28TH ST	6/1/2015			6/2/2015	A15-203	Installation of gold leaf address numbers on the transom above the front door of the structure		MP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 3 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
4109 HERMITAGE RO	6/1/2015			6/2/2015	A15-204	Painting of the structure the following colors: China White (similar to Classic Light #41) for the trim, soffits, and brackets; Norway Spruce (similar to Colonial Revival Sea Green #12) for the roof of the curved overhang above the front door; Cabin Fever (similar to Library Pewter #8) for the window sash and exterior doors; and Berkshire Beige (similar to Accessible Beige #21) for the stucco		MP
3218 MONUMENT AV		5/27/2015	B15052608	6/3/2015	A15-205	Remodeling of 3 baths and closet. Proposed block window on exterior of the house	Interior work and installation of block window at rear, right upper-story opening is not visible from the public right-of-way. No other exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2611 E GRACE ST		6/4/2015	E15060403	6/4/2015	A15-206	Install 2 ground rods	No exterior alterations	MP
418 N 25TH ST	6/4/2015			6/4/2015	A15-207	Painting of the stucco facade Accessible Beige (#21)		MP
101 W FRANKLIN ST		6/9/2015	R15060402	6/9/2015	A15-208	Renovation of elevator lobby and corridor 1st floor	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2109 M ST		6/9/2015	B15060403	6/9/2015	A15-209	Build new attached single-family home	Project consistent with CAR approval: porch roof metal or membrane, Richmond rail for balusters, window simulated-divided lites, and brackets spaced to frame each window	WP
2111 M ST		6/9/2015	B15060402	6/9/2015	A15-210	Build new attached single-family home	Project consistent with CAR approval: porch roof metal or membrane, Richmond rail for balusters, window simulated-divided lites, and brackets spaced to frame each window	WP
510 N 22ND ST		6/9/2015	E15042914	6/9/2015	A15-211	Kitchen and bath remodel with porch addition, no loads added	Interior work only	WP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 4 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
510 N 22ND ST		6/9/2015	B15042909	6/9/2015	A15-212	Replace existing fence, porch infill with living space, add 2-story rear porch, replace side and rear elevations with hardplank siding	Project consistent with CAR approval on 2/24/15. Windows to be wood or aluminum-clad wood with true or simulated divided lites, smooth hardplank can be on side or rear. Fence to be painted a color to be approved by Commission staff	WP
104 N 19TH ST		6/9/2015	M15060402	6/9/2015	A15-213	Replacing 2 135,000 BTU gas furnace and 2 A/C replacement	Like-for-like replacement of gas furnace and air conditioners	WP
510 N 22ND ST		6/9/2015	P15042904	6/9/2015	A15-214	Kitchen and bath upgrades, no fixture or load changes	Interior work only	WP
3317 MONUMENT AV		6/9/2015	P15012608	6/9/2015	A15-215	Replace water service, rough-in shower in lieu of tub in master bath, rough in and finish plumbing for one wet bar, laundry room, kitchen, and rework powder room sink, rough in and relocate basement floor drain	Interior work only	WP
211 N 26TH ST		6/9/2015	M15060902	6/10/2015	A15-216	Install 80,000 btu gas furnace and 3 ton straight A/C, replace 75,000 btu furnace and 3 ton straight A/C with new equipment	Replacement of outdoor units which are located on the roof of the structure and are not visible from the public right-of-way	WP
1903 E MARSHALL ST	6/10/2015			6/10/2015	A15-217	Renewal of CoA for 14-037 for 1903 E. Marshall Street for an additional year	This renewal only includes work described under the original approval, including the conditions of approval. Any changes to the design of the project will require the applicant to return to the Commission of Architectural Review for additional review	MP
16 E LEIGH ST		6/10/2015	M15060808	6/11/2015	A15-218	Install new duct work and relocate the 2 existing air handlers	Interior work only. Exterior units staying in same location as existing. Interior handlers to be relocated within the interior of the structure. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
7 N JEFFERSON ST		6/11/2015	E15052002	6/11/2015	A15-219	Phase II renovation of guest rooms. Install new lights and outlets	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 5 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
2629 W GRACE ST	6/12/2015			6/12/2015	A15-220	Replacement of existing unstable masonry sidewalk with in-kind materials. The new wall will be 5'-8" in height and will be 26 linear feet of 8" cinder block to match existing		MP
1903 E MARSHALL ST	6/4/2015			6/12/2015	A15-221	Changes to the previously approved plans (COA #14-037 issued 6/24/14) to include moving all first floor windows on the Cedar Street elevation which were proposed to be located inside a recessed corridor to the facade of the building		MP
600 W 19TH ST		6/12/2015	N15061201	6/12/2015	A15-222	Add gas water heater, gas logs, gas range	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
600 W 19TH ST		6/12/2015	P15061202	6/12/2015	A15-223	Alter to add 2 baths and remodel kitchen	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
309 N ADAMS ST		6/12/2015	B15061114	6/12/2015	A15-224	Restore commercial space, add 2 ADA bathrooms - refer to attached plans	Interior work and in-kind repair and replacement only. Paint colors will be reviewed and approved by Commission staff	WP
401 BROOK RO		6/15/2015	B15061503	6/15/2015	A15-225	Replace roof. No structural work/only roof replacement. No sq ft added	In-kind replacement of membrane roof which is not visible from the public right-of-way	WP
525 N 1ST ST		6/15/2015	P15061504	6/15/2015	A15-226	Install new water supply line of copper to water heater	Interior/utility work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
3618 E BROAD ST		6/18/2015	E15051312	6/18/2015	A15-227	Wire elevator	Interior wiring work only for previously-approved multi-family development. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
101 W FRANKLIN ST		6/18/2015	R15061501	6/18/2015	A15-228	Renovation of Phase II corridor and guest rooms 1st thru 6th floors	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
323 N 27TH ST		6/18/2015	M15061510	6/18/2015	A15-229	Reline 2 fireplace flues with new stainless steel chimney liners	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP

Thursday, June 25, 2015

Page 6 of 7

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
413 N 27TH ST		6/15/2015	E15061207	6/19/2015	A15-230	Replace recept, replace lights, wire outdoor unit, install ground rods	Interior work and outdoor unit in the rear is not visible as there is no alley behind the property, and it is screened by a fence	WP
2818 E MARSHALL ST	6/17/2015			6/19/2015	A15-231	Painting of the structure the following colors: Classic Light Buff (SW #0050) for the body of the home; White for the trim; Colonial Revival Stone (SW #2827) for porch floor; and Royalcroft Copper Red SW (#2839) for the front door		MP
2625 MONUMENT AV		6/19/2015	B15061910	6/19/2015	A15-232	Remodel of 2nd floor with demo, including master suite, closet, bath - plumbing and electrical fixtures, cabinetry case work, GWB/sheetrock finishes. No structural work	Interior demolition. No exterior changes permitted	MP
113 E LEIGH ST		6/19/2015	E15061911	6/19/2015	A15-233	Adding receptacles and switches	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
113 E LEIGH ST		6/19/2015	P15061902	6/19/2015	A15-234	Replace damaged water/sewer lines	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2514 MONUMENT AV	6/19/2015			6/19/2015	A15-235	Application of "Cool Roof" coating on front tin roof to match existing color	Coating color must match that of existing roof color	MP
1627 MONUMENT AV		6/19/2015	E15061910	6/22/2015	A15-236	Electrical renovations	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
103 N 26TH ST	6/22/2015			6/22/2015	A15-237	Windows and sills on exterior window need to be scrapped and repainted "Classic Light Buff" (SW #0050, RGB (239,236,221)).		MP

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that they issued a Notice of Violation for a commercial property at 2300 Venable Street for signage and lighting and that they have been in contact with the applicant. He stated that there are also some zoning implications with the signage. Mr. Palmquist stated that this morning they issued a NOV in the 300-block of N. 21st Street for the demolition of a front porch. He stated they hoped to prevent the demolition but by the time they arrived the entire porch was gone.

Mr. Green stated that he and Mr. Yates noticed that a 3rd story addition coming up on a building in the 700-block of 24th Street.

Mr. Green read into the record Ms. Mary Sadler's Resolution of Appreciation:

WHEREAS, Mary Harding "Mimi" Sadler faithfully and thoughtfully discharged her duties as a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from July 2004 through November 2014; and

WHEREAS, her nomination by the William Byrd Branch of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and later, after the reorganization of the 2010 ordinance, she was nominated for reappointment by the Alliance to Conserve Old Richmond Neighborhoods, her service reflected well upon those organizations; and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, her service as Commission Chair provided the Commission with direction and leadership; and

WHEREAS, she has shown great perspective and patience as well as uncommon reasoned judgment during her years on the Commission; and

NOW THEREFORE the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review hereby express thanks and appreciation to Ms. Sadler for her service.

The Commission members had a brief discussion regarding the members terms for serving on the Commission.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the letter was sent regarding the Bus Rapid Transit project and Mr. Green stated that after they approve the letter the leadership for BRT approached them and wanted to set up a meeting to discuss the project. Mr. Green stated that they met at the end of last week and decided that they would need to make some revisions to the letter after their meeting. Mr. Green stated that he will do some revisions on the letter to reflect their conversations that they had with them and will distribute it to the Commission members.

Mr. Yates stated that it doesn't appear that any of the new bus structures will directly impact any of the historic buildings Downtown and that there are going to be two near Main Street station but they are not going to be directly in front of the building. Mr. Yates stated that the other locations didn't seem to have any direct impact.

Mr. Green stated that they have revised the approach a little bit and that they shared the Commission's concerns about moving the Downtown stretch off of the median. Mr. Green stated that as it is now, there are only four stations that will be in the downtown area and that in two of the stations there has to be a split because there is no median there. Mr. Green asked them to see if there was any way that they could put the three remaining station in the median and that if they could do that, most of their concerns would be addressed. Mr. Green stated that they inquired about a potential Park 'n Ride component and was told that there are no provisions at either the east or the west end for such a function. Mr. Green stated that they will ask them about the Park 'n Ride and update the Commission's letter. Mr. Green stated that they are adjusting the plan to have more on-street parking and more loading.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item # 5 for 605 N. 21st Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item # 9 for 535 W. Broad Street from regular agenda to the consent agenda. Mr. Hughes stated that he is not opposed to it but inquired that if something is being demolished shouldn't they take a step back and consider it more thoroughly. Mr. Bond stated that he agrees if it is a contributing structure and stated that he didn't see an issue with this. Mr. Hendricks stated that he had some concerns about the chain link fence going up for an indefinite time and that it is a prime corner. Mr. Yates stated that they don't have purview over that. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 5-2-1 (Hendricks and Aarons-Sydnor opposed and Green recused).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #10 for 115 S.15th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-1-1 (Elmes opposed and Hendricks abstained).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #13 for 104 N. Boulevard from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond. Mr. Hughes stated that he would prefer to see wood there. After further discussion the motion passed 6-0-1 (Elmes opposed).

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item #20 for 608 N. 27th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda and stated that there were conditions put on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hughes stated that it is brand new building and feels that they should consider it and stated that they have a lot questions that can pop up. After further discussion the motion failed 3-5-0 (Green, Elmes, Bilder, Hughes and Hendricks opposed).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 5-2-1 (Elmes opposed and Green and Hendricks abstained).

Application No. 15-075 (J & B Whitworth)

2815 E. Grace Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-075 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-2(Elmes opposed and Hendricks and Green abstained).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to replace stainless steel roof on the front elevation with a copper roof, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bond, Hughes, Bilder, Yates and Aarons-Sydnor
Negative: Elmes
Abstain: Hendricks and Green

Application No. 15-080 (H. Combos Dreiling)

2551 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-080 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-2(Elmes opposed and Hendricks and Green abstained).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install new brick walkway,
and
WHEREAS, the details of the proposed lighting be submitted to
Commission staff for administrative review and approval, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission
approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of
Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, and Bond
Negative: Elmes
Abstain: Hendricks and Green

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 15-073 (L. & M. Wingfield)

2807 E. Grace Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report for the applicant's request for approval to infill an existing second-story window and to restore a second-floor window on the southeast elevation near the rear of the home in St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with the condition that the window be a wood or aluminum-clad wood window with true divided or simulated divided lite. Staff cannot recommend approval of the second-floor window and the infill of the masonry opening. Staff stated that if the Commission determines that the window removal is appropriate, staff recommends that the window be kept on site to allow for the possibility of reinstallation in the future.

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

Mr. Justice Miller, the contractor for the project, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Martha Winfield, the homeowner, came up to speak about the project.

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

Mr. Hughes stated that they should discuss infilling window openings for rehabilitation at the quarterly meeting.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application for infilling the second-story window and installing two new windows in existing openings as presented, ignoring the staff recommendation for the second-floor window infill and following the presentation of the applicant and concurring with the second section of the staff report where the window be wood or aluminum-clad. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that the original second-floor window be stored on the property and Mr. Elmes accepted the amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-1-0 (Aarons-Sydnor opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to infill 2nd floor window and install two new windows in existing openings, and
 WHEREAS, the window which will be are moved is to remain on site, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Yates and Green
 Negative: Aarons-Sydnor
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-074 (S. Kiatsuranon)

1600 Monument Avenue

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the installation of planters to form an outdoor dining area, as well as the installation of an awning and signage at the Stuart Court Apartment building located in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. The applicant is also seeking approval for two signs located on the building. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with a condition that the installation of the black stanchion and belt system, and not the silver colored option, which appears less compatible within the district. Staff recommends approval of the larger sign behind the outdoor dining space, but does not recommend approval of the smaller sign on the outside of the right stairwell wall.

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

Mr. Michael Pellis, representing the owner of My Noodles, came up to speak and answered questions.

Mr. Bill Galosh, President of Maps, came up and spoke regarding the project.

Mr. Joe Kiatsuranon, the owner of My Noodle, came up and answered questions regarding the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the project in accordance with the staff report with the black belts and extensions, with no sign on the wing wall and delegate the position and light fixtures to staff. Mr. Bond made a friendly amendment that they remove the sign on the building. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install signage, awning, and planters, and
WHEREAS, the awning and planters form an outdoor dining area, and
WHEREAS, the black stanchion and belt system be installed, and
WHEREAS, it not be the silver color option, and
WHEREAS, the proposed lighting be submitted to Commission staff for review and approval, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor, Yates And Green
Negative: None
Abstain: None

*Mr. Bilder recused

Application No. 15-076 (Sterling Bilder, LLC)

2401 E Marshall Street/313 N. 24th Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request for approval to construct a mixed-use project which will include multi-family residential, commercial units, and civic space in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project, with conditions. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards for New Construction outlined in the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned with the following:

- That the applicant attempt to preserve the existing trees on the property near the parking area.
- On the proposed new buildings, the applicant should maintain the fenestration pattern found in the neighborhood and replace the double window and doors on the residential portions of the north and west elevations with single windows and doors.
- On the existing building, the applicant should not alter the size of the western window opening of the front façade and should restore the size of the historic eastern window opening of the front façade.
- The applicant provide paint colors for the siding for review and approval by Commission Staff.

Mr. Hughes stated that on the eastern and western openings under materials and colors and stated that it sounds like Ms. Pitts is not recommending that those alterations be approved. Ms. Pitts stated yes, and stated that the historic opening should be reopened with glass versus how the applicant proposed to have the window extended to the ground.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired on the site plan if the space between the two new buildings is supposed to be a vehicular alley and Ms. Pitts stated that she believes it is for pedestrians and that the vehicular access is in the rear.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there were any discussion on where the trash and HVAC units are going to go and Ms. Pitts stated no.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired that on the elevations on the west face of the existing building those two openings that they plan to enlarge are storefront and not garage doors. Ms. Pitts stated yes.

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

Mr. Tom LeKometros, the architect with The Lawrence Group, on behalf of Sterling Builders, stated that 24th and Marshall is a really wonderful block and corner in Church Hill. Mr. LeKometros showed the Commission members photos of the project and stated that the versatility of housing and town house type in this neighborhood is very rich and equally very diverse, and that the brick and wood materials compliment everything here. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked very strongly to that as precedent. Mr. LeKometros stated that the Nolde garage building is quite a charming building but is in very serious disrepair and needing a lot of love which they try to instill with this project. Mr. LeKometros stated that their goal is actually to comply with the comments that staff made and stated that the proposed changes to the front of the storefront is not a

problem.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that her question is in respect to what's happening between the space between the two new buildings and Mr. LeKometros stated that it was pedestrian and that they both access 24th Street and Marshall.

Mr. LeKometros stated that all the trees that are in the parking area are intended to be maintained and that they have soil issues that they have to remedy and that if all goes to plan those trees will remain.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that when buildings have the conditions of 2 openings like that with multiple bays oftentimes in the city you will see a single opening and the façade of the building with a vestibule and then the two doors pushed back behind it so that you have that opening to maintain that symmetry and then the two doors can remain behind that. She stated that they may want to investigate that as an option. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked briefly at that in the very early stages and they found that the encroachment of space that you need for the vestibule to swing the doors opening was pretty significant to the way they pushed the stairs back into the units. Mr. LeKometros stated that he would wonder if there was a way they could detail the frame of the two doors on the ground level and stated that there are precedents in the neighborhood with single doorways with side lites and that it is a bigger opening and a single window above. Mr. LeKometros stated that if they went with the single window above they can make the design detailing of the two lower doors be one bigger panel in a way it will achieve something that has precedent in the neighborhood.

Mr. Green stated that he shares the same concerns in that that it is important to have a single door on the ground floor and stated that they can point to some examples but there aren't that many. Mr. Green stated that the overall paradox around the neighborhood and the immediate neighborhood is very much in the other direction and that they are looking at the norm. Mr. Green stated that this would have been an easier discussion if they would have come forward with a conceptual review and that they are not really in the position to have that design discussion.

Mr. Yates stated that the rendering shows a dark parapet around the top of the frame buildings and stated that there is something on the elevations drawings that indicate there is something on the top. Mr. Yates inquired if they could clarify what the top condition is on the wall of the frame structures. Mr. LeKometros stated that in the neighborhood there is precedence for cornices that range from 4 to 6 inches to 2' or greater and that the detail is a cornice piece from the top of the window to the top of the façade is about 4ft 10 ½ ft. by 11". Mr. LeKometros stated that the cornice piece comes down from that and that the intent was that it be a wood detail fascia piece more of an understated style not unlike the canopy for the porch. Mr. LeKometros stated that there are many precedents for the neighborhood for very grandiose kind of canopies over the porches and stated that their canopy and porch coverage is a minimally sort of thing consistent with the neighborhood with their interpretations. Mr. LeKometros stated that with the renderings there is a fair amount of shadowing and that it is coming across dark. Mr. Yates inquired if there was details of the cornice on the drawings and Mr. LeKometros stated that there is not one on the drawings that the Commission has.

Mr. Green stated that he can't tell how it is detailed and that in the rendering it looks continuous and inquired what the detail is that they are seeing. Mr. LeKometros stated that a similar kind of detail for brick cupping or cap at brick and the detailed wood by nature is different than brick and Mr. Green inquired if they were projecting corbels or a joint between the two butted 4-foot sections and that he can't tell what it is nor do they

have a detail to look at. Mr. LeKometros stated that it is intended to be a wood detail and that it is a segment of wood that has a joint between segments if panel wood and that they are envisioning a trim cap at the bottom and a continuous plate at the top. Mr. Green inquired if the vertical piece was projecting and Mr. LeKometros stated that it is projecting by a five-quarter inch of board with a quarter round below it and three-quarter inch panel on top of it and that the cap probably projects three quarters of an inch. Mr. LeKometros stated that they are probably talking about a 2 ½ inch depth to the entire thing from the face of the top until it meets the Hardi below.

Mr. Elmes wanted some clarifications on the west elevation, north storefront and stated that the elevation shows the window units in plan view and that it seems as though the garage openings that they were talking about are about 11'-2". Mr. LeKometros stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that if they are following the grade down because the street slopes slightly they really seem to be hulking over the door opening that they are beside. Mr. Elmes stated that he is also wondering what materials will be below the fenestration. Mr. LeKometros stated that they have been using aluminum-clad wood window systems in those kinds of applications which have integral color as an infill set. Mr. LeKometros stated that when they do those kinds of things with solid panels there are laminated integral color aluminum clad for panels so it becomes a homogeneous insert piece. Mr. Elmes stated that he is familiar with that corner and other corners that have commercial space and stated that he is looking at the scale of that storefront relative to the door that it is beside and stated that it seems to be quite massive. Mr. LeKometros stated that he thinks Mr. Elmes is right and stated that one of the balances is that they do retail work around the country and stated that from a customer's point of view and a retail tenant point of view the more windows that they can give them, the more connection they have with the community. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked at the overhang height being the continuum and stated that if they are walking down the street they imagine a perspective where the porch canopy jumps to the corner and they get a sort of continuity because the ground steps down. Mr. LeKometros stated that they saw it as a benefit where they give a little more glass exposure and that the interesting thing about this view here is that he wouldn't paint the door white, but a charcoal grey or something that would make it monochromatic equivalent to the brick. Mr. LeKometros stated that right now it stands out a lot because it is white and not brick and stated that from a materiality and color point of view they want that to blend with the brick.

Mr. Elmes stated that he is very familiar with the massing of the Nolde garage building, the size and the pedestrian scale of that as you're walking down the street. Mr. Elmes stated that he is looking at the fenestration on the other end of the block and stated that it seems as though the size and massing will really be a large element. Mr. LeKometros stated that they understand and stated that they are measuring the head of the window at the Nolde garage which is 11'-2 ¼" which is quite significant and stated that down on the corner it is probably 12'-6" or 13' which is a little more significant and stated that because the porch steps up, you can get a residential scale at the porch, the Nolde garage and the corner have a grander scale. Mr. LeKometros stated that in their tiny little block of façade on 24th Street they get a microcosmic large-scale for retail and small scale for residential. Mr. LeKometros stated that they consciously didn't drive the glass on the corner down to be 10' and that they wanted to keep at 11' or greater magnitude which in their minds distinguishes it from what happens to the porches. Mr. Elmes stated that it will be a little easier to have this discussion at a conceptual review and that it seems, for whatever reason, it doesn't seem to be quite as out of proportion.

Mr. Green inquired that on the north end of Marshall Street the commercial unit there

and as you come around the corner and inquired why are the windows on the second floor so far back from the corner. Mr. Green stated that it seems like so much masonry is coming from the corner on each elevation and inquired why it is so heavy. Mr. Green stated that he is trying to figure out the spacing of the windows on the second floor. Mr. LeKometros stated that because of the spacing of the windows it gave them a solid corner and stated that because of stairs, they thought it would be valuable and stated that the inside tracks to the outside. Mr. LeKometros stated that there are many solutions but that is an approach that they made. Mr. Green stated that his concern is that it is a very visible corner and they have so much glazing on the ground floor and then they move to second story and it becomes solid. Mr. Green stated that he is trying to figure out the rhythm of the fenestration.

Mr. Bond stated that it looks like they are missing a window and that in the space they have this big blank wall on the corner would be a wonderful place to be with a window because you can look down onto the streets. Mr. Bond stated that is where the light comes in and inquired why they would do that and Mr. LeKometros stated that it is perfectly possible to think about taking this rhythm and adding another window on rhythm and then they could have a more propagated upper façade and stated that it is something that could be done.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they have two different widths of windows on the residential and inquired if that was solely because those thinner windows are above the doors and Mr. LeKometros stated yes so that they can give it a vertical alignment.

Mr. John Meinyay, speaking as a member of the public, stated that he was concerned with the overhang on the buildings that have simulated wood and masonry and inquired how big is the overhang on those and Mr. Green stated that it is 6'. Mr. LeKometros stated that it is 2 ½ or 3 inches.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is concerned that they want to use stack bond design for the cementitious planks and stated that they don't see a joint plan or layout and that she believes that it is critical. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would like to see as part of their recommendations that they require elevations that shows the elevations of the joint for the cementitious panels.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to defer the application and treat it as a conceptual review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Mr. Bond stated that he would have to concur because there are a lot of unanswered questions and lack of details.

Mr. Yates stated that it would have been so much easier if this had been a conceptual approval the first time and stated that he would not feel comfortable given a final approval at this stage.

Mr. Bond stated that he would concur with staff in their assertion about the old windows in the garage building and stated that the sills and the sill height should be maintained.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he heard the applicants' desire to align the windows up with the masonry and windows that are happening below.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a request for an indication of the location of the joints and the cementitious panel and the elevations.

Mr. Hendricks requested information on the detailing of the cornice for both the brick and the wood, investigate additional fenestration and corner conditions at Marshall and 24th Street.

Mr. Yates stated that they need details of the first floor porches on the residential.

Mr. Green stated that they need details of both cornices.

Mr. Yates stated that they need details on trash and concealing HVAC.

Mr. Green also requested that they reduce the double door opening on the first floor.

Mr. Hughes requested information on the roofing and porch materials.

Mr. Elmes stated that he would like to see a perspective of how it works with the neighborhood as far as fenestration and things like that.

After further discussion the motion passed to defer the application 7-0-1 (Bilder recused).

Application No. 15-016 (J. Ogrodnik)

713 N. 24th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the rehabilitation work proposed on the exterior of this structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The application was initially the result of enforcement activity and was deferred at the February 2015 Commission meeting. Staff recommends that the proposed front door be replaced with a simpler, wood, paneled door and that the transom window be restored in the opening above. Staff recommends that the windows be true or simulated-divided lites instead of grid-between-the-glass. Staff recommends that the applicant provide staff with details and drawings of the elements for the installation of the front steps, handrails and railings and drawings of these elements to receive administrative approval. Staff recommends that the applicant have staff review the fence placement, design and paint or opaque stain color for administrative review. Staff recommends that smooth Hardiplank, with no beading, be installed on the sides and rear of the structure, and that wood siding be salvaged from the structure to be installed on the front elevation of the structure. Staff recommends that the front porch roof be replaced with a standing seam metal roof, or in the absence of the availability of such a roof, a black membrane roof be installed instead. Staff also recommends that the applicant seek administrative review and approval of any proposed paint color. Staff recommends that the applicant provide additional drawings of the proposed deck and roof structure, as only a description and plan drawing of the deck was provided.

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

Mr. Caceres 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 as based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates. Mr. Yates stated that Mr. Elmes stated that this Greek revival porch still has its original dentil moldings and the original column base capitals and recommend that they be restored. After further discussion the motion passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate home to include front porch repair and installation of new windows, doors, siding, and side and rear decks,

WHEREAS, the proposed be replaced with a simpler, wood paneled door, and

WHEREAS, the transom window be restored in the opening above, and

WHEREAS, the proposed windows have true or simulated-divided lites instead of grid-between-the-glass, and

WHEREAS, the applicant provide staff with details and drawings of the proposed steps, handrail, and front porch railings for administrative approval, and

WHEREAS, the applicant have staff review the privacy fence

replacement, details and paint or opaque stain color for administrative approval, and

WHEREAS, the applicant use smooth Hardiplank, with no beading, be installed on the sides and rear of the structure, and

WHEREAS, the wood siding be salvaged from the structure to be installed on the front elevation of the structure, and

WHEREAS, the front porch roof be replaced with a standing seam metal roof, or in the absence of the availability of such a roof, a black membrane roof be installed instead, and

WHEREAS, the applicant seek administrative review and approval for the proposed painting scheme, and

WHEREAS, the applicant retain the original front porch dentils and capitals, and

WHEREAS, the Commission denied the construction of a covered side and rear deck and encouraged the applicant to submit a complete application for this work to include plans that incorporate footprint dimensions, construction details, and elevations showing screening, stairs and railings, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Yates, Green, Hughes, Aaron-Sydnor And Hendricks
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-081 (E. Beecroft & N. Walsh)

2912 E. Leigh Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new storage shed at the rear of the subject property within the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the applicant install a privacy fence or vegetative screening to limit the visibility of the shed from the alley and E. Leigh Street.

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

Mr. Eric Beecroft 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 the application as presented with the consideration that it is a non-permanent, non-foundation shed within the footprint and height restrictions set by the City code. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that is not what the staff recommended. Mr. Elmes stated yes and stated that the vegetation screening will be helpful. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and failed 4-4-0.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendations for applying a privacy fence or vegetation screening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-1-0 (Green opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new storage shed, and

 WHEREAS, that the applicant install a privacy fence or vegetation screening to limit the visibility of the shed from the alley and East Leigh Street, and proposed siding be smooth and unbeaded, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Hughes, Hendricks, Yates and Aarons-Sydnor

 Negative: Green

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-082 (A. Pace)

322 N. 36th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval that approval be conditioned on the following conditions; that the cornice brackets be located to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly across the cornice as is currently proposed, that the fiber cement siding has a smooth finish with no faux wood grain and that the second floor rear window may be deferred to staff for their review and approval

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

Mr. Vitas Reinikovas came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the conditions in the staff report with the condition that the front porch roof be metal with the colors as presented and with the window on the first floor are extended to 6' in height and that the porch alignments and fenestration alignment and roof alignment on the front of the house be delegated to staff for review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 5-3-0 (Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Green opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a single-family home, and

 WHEREAS, the cornice brackets be located to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly across the cornice as is currently proposed, and

 WHEREAS, the fiber cement siding has a smooth finish with no faux wood grain, and

 WHEREAS, the windows on the right elevation facing Marshall Street be better aligned, a detail to be deferred to Commission staff for their review and approval, and

 WHEREAS, the second floor rear window be centered and not slightly offset, and

 WHEREAS, the first floor windows on the front elevation be 6'-2" in height as presented, and

 WHEREAS, the front porch roof be metal, and

 WHEREAS, the finished porch alignment, foundation height and fenestration be referred to Commission staff for review and approval regarding the appropriateness of the finished floor elevation, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of

Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Hughes, Hendricks, and Bond
 Negative: Green, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-050 (R. Cross)

1902-1908 Princess Anne Avenue

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct four, new, attached single-family houses in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicants came for conceptual review on February 2015 and was deferred for final approval at the April 2015 meeting. The general consensus of the Commission members present was that the proposed building needed to do more to address Princess Anne Avenue and Jefferson Park. The applicant has responded to Commission and public comments by orienting the first (south) dwelling towards the park. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

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

Mr. Richard Cross came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Christopher Faigel, 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. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented and for the reasons in the staff report.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor asked for a friendly amendment that the front porch on the Princess Anne elevation be at least 5'. Mr. Hendricks stated that he would like the building mass on Princess Anne to align with the adjacent construction and that the front porch be sized to align with the front porches on Princess Anne Avenue on the corner unit. Mr. Elmes stated that he accepts the amendment but doesn't know if it is feasible. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-2-0 (Yates and Green opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct four attached single-family houses, and
WHEREAS, the porch fronting on Princess Anne Avenue be at least 5 feet in depth, and
WHEREAS, the building massing and porch fronting Princess Anne Avenue align with the adjacent structures, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Hughes, Hendricks, Bond, Elmes and Aarons-Sydnor
Negative: Yates and Green
Abstain: None

Application No. 15-083 (J. Rautio & R. Baratta)

2302 E. Grace Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install new hardscaping including walls and walk ways in the front, side and rear of the property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that the details of the proposed gate be submitted for review and approval by Commission staff. Staff also recommends that these front walls should be constructed with in-kind materials and that the applicant should not use a limestone cap on these walls. Staff recommends that the applicant should not use the proposed slate and amber quartzite pavers and should repair or replace in kind the historic herringbone brick front walkway.

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

Ms. Julie Rautio came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with the staff recommendation that they use another material. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes. Mr. Elmes made a friendly amendment that it goes back to staff for administrative review and approval. After further discussion the motion passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes installation of walkways and brick walls at the front and rear of the property, and
 WHEREAS, the details of the proposed gate be submitted for review and approval by Commission staff, and
 WHEREAS, the front walls along E. Grace Street be constructed with in-kind materials and a limestone cap not be on these walls, and
 WHEREAS, the slate and amber quartzite pavers not be used for the front walkway, and
 WHEREAS, an alternative material, to be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, be used on the front walkway to provide the desired contrast to the brick, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bond, Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-030 (C. Keck)

512 W. 20th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval for work performed on the front of this property located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of enforcement activity and was deferred at the March 2015 meeting. Mr. Palmquist stated that the work involves the replacement of the siding, the installation of a new door, the removal of porch railings and the installation of new porch columns and posts. Mr. Palmquist showed the Commission the previous and new conditions of the house. Mr. Palmquist stated that according to the applicant, beaded siding was used due to the unavailability of smooth Hardiplank siding.

Mr. Palmquist stated that cedar shake siding was installed and painting was performed and the main house was painted a sage-green color, the cedar shake siding was painted brown, all trim was painted white, and the porch decking and steps were painted gray. Mr. Palmquist stated that there was a 15-lite front door was replaced with a Thermo-tru craftsman style 1-lite door and that the owner stated that the side lites were uncovered and restored after the aluminum siding was removed. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant proposes to replace the door with a single lite with beveled glass. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant states that the porch piers were bowed and that the porch columns were rotten and the painted brick porch piers were replaced with shorter and slightly wider stone piers, and the tapered porch columns replaced with a similar tapered column that are a bit thicker and taller. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant is awaiting the Commission's decision before installing the final porch column where pressure-treated lumber is currently installed for support. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant states that the railing on three sides of the porch was rotten and was therefore removed.

Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. Staff does not take issue with the installation of the beaded siding and cedar shake siding, the replacement of the porch piers and columns, the uncovering of the side lites, or the painting of the structure. While most of these items do not constitute an in-kind replacement, they are similar enough in design and materials to remain compatible with the structure and the larger historic district. However, staff does not recommend approval of the installed door, which is a molded panel door with a single beveled glass lite. The *Guidelines* state, "Do not remove original doors and door surrounds. Replacement doors and door surrounds with stamped or molded faux paneling or leaded, beveled, or etched glass are strongly discouraged and rarely permitted. Stamped or molded faux paneled doors are inappropriate substitutes for door types found in historic districts" (p. 67 #14). Furthermore, staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the railing, as its repair or in-kind replacement would typically be recommended. Therefore, staff recommends that approval of the project be conditioned on the installation of a Richmond style railing with similar dimensions as the original railing as well as the replacement of the existing door with a true-paneled, six-lite wood door with clear glass.

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

Mr. Chris Keck, the owner, stated that Mr. Palmquist gave a thorough assessment and that the goals were to improve the aesthetics of its original condition. Mr. Keck stated that he did a lot of research on the style of the home in the neighborhood to make the material selections after learning more about the process. Mr. Keck stated that he

realizes that he did not follow the proper procedures for an approval. Mr. Keck stated that to address the issues that staff brought up in reference to the porch railings, after researching the homes within the time frame, he found that it was not common to see these houses without railings and that he has a problem installing railings. Mr. Keck stated that in reference to the front door it was chosen by looking through the neighborhood and that he couldn't find a consistent door and that of the 52 properties there were 6 unobstructed wood doors that staff recommend.

Mr. Yates inquired if the side lites in the front door composition is original or has the whole door assembly been replaced. Mr. Keck stated that the side lites are original and that they uncovered it when they took off the aluminum siding.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates stated that he has some issues with this and that if they approve this he will wonder what they are doing here. Mr. Yates stated that the brick piers, which certainly seemed to be original, have been replaced, and the smaller tapered columns, which appears to have been original, have been replaced and the railings have been removed which certainly matches the overall craftsman style of the house. Mr. Yates stated that he has always been able to find smooth and beaded Hardiplank siding. Mr. Yates stated that the character of the house is similar but the details are all changed.

Mr. Elmes inquired if Mr. Yates was inquiring that if this application came before them as an application would they approve the changes that were implemented. Mr. Yates stated that he was making more of a statement than a question and stated that he certainly wouldn't approve the changes and that although they are similar to craftsman houses he doesn't know of a craftsman house in the city that has simulated stone piers originally. Mr. Yates stated that again, if they approve this he don't what they are doing here.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the piers are a different material and a different height and the columns are taller and fatter and Mr. Green stated yes.

Mr. Yates stated that the railings are craftsman style railing.

Mr. Elmes stated that it means that the balusters would be more like 2 inches by 2 inches and they would be square with a much wider handrail than a Richmond rail and that a Richmond rail isn't really going to work as far as replicating because it is going to look too thin and narrow.

Mr. Hughes inquired if this was the same applications they saw at a previous meeting and Mr. Elmes stated that the project was deferred for further understanding the situation that was at hand. Mr. Elmes stated that a lot of it was done with good intentions and that part of it was approved and it kept going on and that typically they would ask for photo documentation. Mr. Elmes stated that he knows there are similar craftsman style houses and they understand that architecturally but that this was one specifically set up that way to begin with. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was aluminum siding that was on the front at the time and inquired if there were cedar shakes under it when they took it off. Mr. Keck stated that it had a little rotted clad board siding. Mr. Elmes stated that they are trying to prevent what is called false historicism where they put something on because it seemed like the correct material to use at the time, such as beaded Hardiplank. Mr. Elmes stated that is why they are questioning what they are really doing here if they just approve this and say that it's okay for you or any applicant to establish their belief on how the house was. Ms. Elmes stated to the applicant that he didn't mean to pick him

out personally.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to deny the application for the reasons noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hill asked for clarification for staff beyond the action that it might take, and also provide staff with some guidance on what should be done to abate the violation.

Mr. Elmes stated that that he doesn't think the Richmond Rail handrail was an appropriate style handrail for this so he is going to disagree with that particular staff recommendation and suggest that the handrail be replaced with the same style of handrail that was there previously. Mr. Elmes stated that he disagree with the beaded cementitious siding and stated that he disagrees with the cedar shake siding and stated that the painting is fine and the front entry way door is acceptable if a single lite piece of glass is put in it.

Mr. Yates inquired about the porch piers and the columns and Mr. Elmes inquired if they are going to go back to the brick that is underneath the applied stone. Mr. Palmquist stated that they were replaced also.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in her opinion, when you make a change you should at least be consistent in one way, form, material or color and stated that they can raise the height of the pier to where the brick was or change the material of the pier but somehow make it reflect what was there.

Mr. Hendricks stated that all of the proportions get messed up.

Mr. Elmes stated that while he agrees with Mr. Yates, the porch columns/piers situation is a problem he would be more tempted to leave it because it could be more difficult. Mr. Yates stated that then he repeats his earlier comment which what are they doing here and stated that they are the Commission of Architectural Review. Mr. Yates stated that the original or earlier details were changed in his mind beyond recognition and that he doesn't see a middle ground here.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he would argue that the piers are more important than the siding.

Mr. Bond stated that he agrees that the piers are the defining element.

Mr. Yates stated that he could go along with the siding if it was changed to the smooth unbeaded sided.

Mr. Elmes withdrew his motion and stated that he would be happy to support another one.

Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't know how to reformulate this in a way that is acceptable because he is disagreeing with all of the items.

Mr. Green stated that Mr. Hill was asking that if they were going to move to deny the project that they give a list of recommendations to the applicant for corrections that would lead to a positive outcome. Mr. Green stated that they are denying the application and giving the applicant suggestions that if they were to mediate these things it will lead to an approval.

Mr. Yates made a motion to deny the application and that smooth unbeaded cementitious siding be installed on the front of the main structure and gables and that masonry brick piers be replaced, and that the wood columns be replaced to match the 2010 photograph and that the railing be replaced matching the 2010 photograph and

that the front door configuration be deferred to staff and that a similar or acceptable craftsman style railing be installed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor seconded the motion and passed 7-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

Application No. 15-050 (A. Beach)

608 N. 27th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family house on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The application was deferred at the May 2015 Commission meeting. The applicant has since made changes to the design, reducing the overall height by 3' and thereby reducing the space between the 2nd floor windows and cornice. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

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

Mr. Chris Pollock Poole came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application as outlined in the staff report and defer the brackets and final colors to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-0-1 (Hughes abstained).

Mr. Elmes stated that he is opposed to the project due to the massing.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new single-family house, and
 WHEREAS, the details regarding the proposed cornice brackets and paint color be submitted to Commission staff for review and approval, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Elmes, Bilder and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: Hughes

Application No. 15-063 (D. Kleyman)

2100-2102 M. Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a single-family house on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The application was deferred at the May 2015 Commission meeting. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned on the applicants seeking administrative approval for the proposed privacy fence and opaque stain color.

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

Mr. Daniil Kleyman came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and tied 3-3-0 (Elmes, Yates and Green opposed).

Mr. Bilder stated that he feels that the applicant made every effort to take the Commission comments and did what the Commission asked him to do.

Mr. Hughes stated that he concurs with Mr. Bilder.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application for the reasons stated in the staff report with the suggestion that the Greek revival style porch on the front be considered. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 4-2-0 (Yates and Green opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new single-family house, and
 WHEREAS, the proposed privacy fence and opaque stain color be submitted to Commission staff for review and approval, and
 WHEREAS, that consideration be made to construct a Greek Revival-style porch rather than the wider porch that was submitted, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

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

Application No. 15-085 (J. Armstead)

619 St. Peter Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install windows on all elevations totaling 13 windows and infill one rear window per the requirements of the building code on a structure within the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. At the Commission's meeting on January 25, 2011, the Commission approved an application to address code violations that included a number of exterior repairs at the property. That application did not address the issue that some of the windows had been replaced without receiving the approval of the Commission. Staff recommends approval of the project, with conditions that the applicant install true divided lite or simulated divided lite Marvin Clad double hung 2/2 aluminum clad wood windows rather than the Legend HBR white double hung 2/2 PVC clad windows.

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

There was applicant present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the reasons stated in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install new windows on all elevations and infill one rear window, and

 WHEREAS, that they use true-divided lite or simulated-divided lite, and

 WHEREAS, the Marvin Clad double hung, 2/2 aluminum clad wood windows be installed rather than the Legend HBR white double hung 2/2 PVC clad windows, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

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

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Conceptual Review

Application No. 15-087 (L. Johnson)

411 N. 1st Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the rehabilitation of a commercial building in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. The proposal is for the rehabilitation of a two-story building constructed in 1977 with a parking garage on the first floor and office space above. The proposed new use will have a retail space and commercial kitchen on the first floor and offices above.

Mr. Hendricks inquired about the mural on the alley side.

Mr. Yates stated that he appreciates the fact that they are trying to dress the building up and that they are always talking about false historicism and stated that they are trying to Victorianize this 1970's building that doesn't have a whole lot going for it. Mr. Yates asked why they would add the wood trim and stated that it would be better to go ahead and do a soldier course of brick over the openings in the same color brick and make it what it is and not apply decorations to it.

Mr. Green stated that he likes the wood trim and that it gives the opening some character and stated that the street could use some more dressing up and it is a great project.

Mr. Bilder stated that everything looks good and that he concurs with Mr. Yates and stated that they should use brick for the trim.

Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks the aesthetic is the aesthetic whether they use wood, or soldier course or if they painted it and stated that as a non-contributing structure couldn't they paint the facade of it. Mr. Elmes stated that to him that would be most bang for their buck and stated that it would brighten it up.

Mr. Green stated that it might be nice to see some lighting on the façade.

The meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review