



**Meeting Minutes - Final**  
**Commission of Architectural Review**

---

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

**1 Call to Order**

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

**Present --** 9 - \* Sanford Bond, \* Matthew Elmes, \* Bryan Green, \* Joseph Yates, \* Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, \* Nathan Hughes, \* James W. Klaus and \* Andrew Ray McRoberts

**2 Roll Call**

**Present --** 8 - \* Matthew Elmes, \* Bryan Green, \* Joseph Yates, \* Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, \* Nathan Hughes, \* James W. Klaus and \* Andrew Ray McRoberts

**Absent --** 1 - \* Sanford Bond

**3 Approval of Minutes**

**ID 16-002** January 26, 2016 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** January 26, 2016 Meeting Minutes

**Mr. Green made a motion to approve the January 26, 2016 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 6 - Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and McRoberts

**Excused --** 2 - Bond and Elmes

**Abstain --** 1 - Hughes

**4 Other Business**

Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts stated that staff has signed up for Historic Richmond Expo at Dovetail Construction on Saturday April 30th from 10 to 2 and stated that it is an event organized by the Historic Richmond Foundation where staff will have the opportunity to provide citizens with information about the Commission.

The Commission briefly discussed the expo and the members that will like to volunteer.

Ms. Pitts stated that she just left the Land Use Committee of City Council's meeting, and the Committee did make a recommendation to appoint Mr. Dave Cooley to replace Mr. Elmes. Ms. Pitts stated that the appointment will be going before Council at the first City Council meeting in April.

Mr. Yates stated that Mr. Cooley has been a restoration contractor in the City as long as he can remember and stated that he knows historic buildings in and out and will be an excellent replacement for Mr. Elmes.

Mr. Green stated that Mr. Elmes has been with the Commission about 10 years and that they will put together a great resolution for him because he has been one of the longest serving members on the Commission.

Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission currently has a quarterly meeting scheduled for April 12th and stated that she and the chair have been discussing moving it forward to April 4th in order to have some discussion about the Maggie Walker Plaza with the Commission to draft a letter to be received by the Urban Design Committee (UDC) by April 7th when they review the project.

Mr. Green stated that he hopes this does not inconvenience anyone by moving this up as he would like to know everyone's feeling on this project prior to its conceptual review by the UDC. Mr. Green stated that he will draft up a letter to get it started so the Commission will have something to go on at the quarterly meeting. The Commission had a brief discussion about the time, place and topics for the quarterly meeting.

Ms. Pitts stated that some of the Commission members had questions about the review process in regards to the Maggie Walker Plaza and stated that Mr. Matt Welsh from the City Attorney's Office is here to answer questions.

Mr. Green stated that the City Attorney has determined that the review path is not through CAR but through UDC to the Planning Commission and stated that the Commission has the opportunity to provide comments to both bodies.

Mr. Matt Welsh, with the City Attorney's Office, stated that what has happened so far is that the location, character and extent application has been submitted as any city structure on public land has to go through that process and stated that the history has been that in a lot of times in the historic district that the CAR is the advisory body to the Planning Commission in these reviews. Mr. Welsh stated that essentially in the City Charter, it is ultimately the Planning Commission determination who provides advice and that both UDC and CAR have duties of advising to the Planning Commission and City Council when requested. Mr. Welsh stated that the ultimate determination for it to go through UDC was not made from the City Attorney's Office because it is not a legal determination and stated that it was the Planning Commission that decided that was the body from which they wanted the advice. Mr. Welsh stated that the Planning Commission before reviewing the location, character and extent can request advice from the CAR and UDC or neither. Mr. Welsh stated that the CAR does a lot of things such as Certificate of Appropriateness when they are applied for which has not happened in this case. Mr. Welsh stated that the process that is going on now is for location, character and extent and the Planning Commission in their resolution decided that they wanted the opinion of UDC. Mr. Welsh stated that there is nothing prohibiting the Commission from reviewing plans and passing resolutions to send a letter to provide advice to those bodies before their next meeting.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if the City Attorney's Office inquired whether a Certificate of Appropriateness was required for the structures being erected on the parcel involved, and Mr. Welsh stated that the City Attorney has been engaged with the Zoning Administrator to look into that answer and provided some advice and stated that he does not think it's final because ultimately the determination is the Zoning Administrator's and the rest is just advice leading him to that determination. Mr. Welsh stated that in this case, they do not have a building permit because they haven't go that far yet and there has not been an official act of the zoning administrator to speak of. Mr. McRoberts inquired what the City Attorney's opinion is to this body on their jurisdiction

and whether a Certificate of Appropriateness is required and whether it should be mandatory. Mr. Welsh stated that this body jurisdiction is if the project relates to a particular request and stated that in this case no one made a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. McRoberts stated that if they want an answer to that question they would have to ask the Zoning Administrator, and Mr. Welsh stated that there is nothing wrong with speaking to the Zoning Administrator about it but states that it is ultimately his decision and stated that right no one has asked for a building permit or has violations so there is no action that they can take. Mr. McRoberts stated that he wants to make sure that they have the time frame to do a review without holding it up and stated that for him he would like to make sure that they have jurisdiction and that it is mandatory Certificate of Appropriateness required for the structure and improvements on this parcel. Mr. Welsh stated that he cannot speak to whether the Administration and Zoning Administrator are having those conversations.

Mr. Green stated that his questions were more along the lines of the process and stated that they looked at two applications similar to this which was Abner Clay and the Triangular Park on Jefferson Avenue and stated that his problem was that they were both City owned and in the City right-of-way and his struggle was that they got the review on those ones but not this one. Mr. Welsh stated that he cannot speak to why the Planning Commission determined that UDC was a better body to provide advice on this project. Mr. Green stated that it should be some predictable process. Mr. Welsh stated that it is within the Commission's purview to make a statement and be heard.

As Mr. Elmes arrived late to the meeting, Mr. Green commented to Mr. Elmes that the Commission was just thanking him for his record service which they think is about 10 years and stated that Land Use has just appointed his successor if City Council approves it.

#### Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 61 approvals for the period from February 18, 2016 through March 22, 2016.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that staff received multiple calls regarding roofs of two attached homes being replaced with copper. Ms. Pitts stated that a stop work order was issued but no application has been filed by the owners to date. Ms. Pitts stated that staff received multiple calls regarding a new construction project where the applicant was approved for the installation of smooth unbeaded fiber cement siding and they installed wood grain fiber cement siding. The applicant is looking to come back before the Commission at a later meeting to request approval of the textured siding. Ms. Pitts stated that they are also waiting on the corner store at the corner of Venable with excessive signage and other violations and stated that April 19th is when they go back to court and the landowner hopes that the tenant will be in compliance by that time. Ms. Pitts stated that they hope to meet with the City Attorney's Office to figure out how to address the violations at Ocean's Groceries and stated that they have come before the Commission before and they are trying to determine how best to proceed to ensure the violations at the property are abated.

Mr. Green inquired if there had been any information on the Houghton case and Ms. Pitts stated that the City Attorney was interested in going back to court on that matter but he hasn't got back in touch with her as of yet with a court date.

#### Other Committee Reports

Mr. Green stated that they can take up the revised presentation to community groups at the quarterly meeting, and Mr. Hendricks stated that he has found a way to convert the presentation to power point.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the presentation outlines the Commission's process of what the districts are and why they are there, and the goal of the presentation is to help spread the word about what it means to be in a historic district and why it is important.

The Commission members briefly discussed what constitutes a meeting in which public notice has to be done.

Ms. Pitts stated that staff and the Chair have received a lot of communication regarding the Maggie Walker Plaza and she will upload all comments to Legistar for the Commission to review.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant for 1121 W. Franklin has withdrawn the application.

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item #9 for 2716 Monument Avenue from the regular agenda to the consent agenda with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0 (Yates recused from consent agenda).

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts to move item #12 for 865 N. 22nd Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda with staff recommendations. Mr. Green stated that they received a letter for support of the project and encouraged the Commission to approve it. The motion was seconded by Hughes and passed 7-0-0 (Yates recused from the consent agenda).

Mr. Hughes inquired if they could move an item that has partial approval and Mr. Green stated that it is easier to hear it through if it has a split review.

**Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**Excused --** 1 - Bond

**Abstain --** 1 - Yates

- 1 [CAR No. 2016-031](#) 119 W. Broad Street - Rehabilitation of the structure to include new windows at the rear and the installation of missing features

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

**Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.**

- 2 [CAR No. 2016-032](#) 117 W. Broad Street - Rehabilitation of the structure to include the restoration of the storefront, the installation of new windows and doors,

and the installation of other missing elements on the rear and front elevations

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

- 3 [CAR No. 2016-033](#) 800 N. 25th Street - Rehabilitation of an existing home to include painting the structure and altering the slope of the existing addition's roof

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

- 4 [CAR No. 2016-034](#) 100-200 Virginia Street - Installation of LED string lights over the 100 and 200 blocks of Virginia Street

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

- 5 [CAR No. 2016-039](#) 3006 E. Broad Street - Rebuild front porch

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

- 6 [CAR No. 2016-042](#) 311 W. Broad Street - Remove and reconstruct existing projecting bay window reusing the existing glazing and replacing wood framing with PVC

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

- 9 [CAR No. 2016-038](#) 2716 Monument Avenue - Construct a pergola

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**Excused --** 1 - Bond

**Abstain --** 1 - Yates

- 12 [CAR No. 2016-043](#) 865 N. 22nd Street - Rebuild rear addition

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**Excused --** 1 - Bond

**Abstain --** 1 - Yates

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 7 [CAR No. 2016-035](#) 315 W. Broad Street - Rehabilitation of the structure to include restoring the storefront glazing, replacing non-historic windows, creating new window and door openings, and painting all previously painted brick including the existing mural

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to rehabilitate a mixed use building in the Broad Street Old and Historic District. Currently, there is a mural painted in the eastern façade which was painted without receiving approval from the Commission. The applicant has not submitted details on the proposed signage; therefore staff recommends the applicant to submit an application with details on the signage for review. Staff supports the reintroduction of a door opening on the eastern façade and recommends the applicant to submit details on the proposed lighting for staff to administratively review and approve. As the existing mural was not approved by the Commission, staff recommends the mural be removed in a manner which will not harm the masonry. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Spencer Grice, the architect, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission members expressed their concern about the mural and trying to remove it without damaging the brick.

**Mr. Green made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness in accordance with the staff report for the front, north and south rear elevation, and recommend that on the east elevation that the applicant do a test trial removal for the mural and if that is not possible then they recommend the reinstating of the historical vertical sign band if possible and if possible remove the mural on the rest and if that is not possible use a brick paint color that blends in with the building and come back to staff with that. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and carried by the following vote.**

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

**Excused -- 1 - Bond**

- 8 [CAR No. 2016-036](#) 512 W. 20th Street - Modifications to the front facade including siding, attic vent, front door and elements of the porch

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval for modifications to this home in the Springhill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of an enforcement activity for alterations to the front of the structure which included the removal of the original porch siding and the replacement of the siding, front door and porch posts and columns. Since the October meeting the applicant has met with staff several times to discuss a plan for abating the violations at the property and addressing the Commission's concerns. Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted.

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

Mr. Chris Keck, 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 the application as presented with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus.

Mr. Yates left the meeting.

The Commission had a detailed discussion about the project, and Mr. Elmes withdrew his motion.

**Mr. Hendricks made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions and with the conditions that the stone piers be replaced with brick to match the height of the 2010 photographs and that the wood pier be replaced as closely as possible. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 5 - Elmes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**No --** 2 - Green and Klaus

**Excused --** 2 - Bond and Yates

- 11 [CAR No. 2016-041](#) 2519 W. Grace Street - Construct a two story front porch and install a new cornice

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report for the applicant's request approval to construct a two-story front porch and install a cornice on the front façade of a home in the West Grace Street Old and Historic District. The applicant is proposing to install a new cornice to match the historic cornice and install a new two story front porch with a brick foundation, brick piers and round columns. Staff recommends approval of the reconstruction of the cornice with one condition that it be constructed of wood and painted white to match the historic cornice. Staff was unable to recommend approval of the proposed 2 story porch at this time and recommends that the applicant revise their application to include more details on materials and documentation to provide justification for their design.

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

Mr. Frank Cava, the 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 this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness without the recommendation that the reconstruction of the cornice be in wood as there may be a composite material and with the condition that the design of the porch and rail be based on sited neighboring properties and the final design and paint colors be reviewed and approved by staff. The**

motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

Excused -- 2 - Bond and Yates

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

- 13 [CAR No. 2016-037](#) 2808 1/2 E. Leigh Street - Construct a new single family residence

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and comment to construct a new two-story, three bay, frame Italianate dwelling on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The dwelling will be clad with smooth Hardi, and have 2/2 vinyl clad windows. The dwelling is located on a block that was developed in the 1920's and consists primarily of masonry dwellings with mansard roofs and classically decorated porches.

Mr. Elmes stated that from his recollection that the property is really high off of the street, and Ms. Chen stated that you can see there is a perceptible rise. Mr. Elmes stated that he wanted to ask the applicant how they were getting from the street to the house and stated that it (the context drawing) is showing everything very linear but the front porch on the house to the right is pretty high up. Ms. Chen stated that there is a retaining wall in the front and about 4 or 5 steps to a landing then 4 or 5 steps up to the porch.

Mr. Klaus inquired if there had ever been a building on this lot, and Ms. Chen stated no that it was a lot that functioned as a side yard and stated that it has been recently been subdivided and split off. Mr. Klaus inquired if they are allowed to build a house on it, and Ms. Chen stated that any lot can be subdivided and stated that currently according to Zoning it is not a buildable lot and it will require a BZA variance or a Special Use Permit.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that there were two reasons that it did not meet zoning requirements because of the setback and the other was that there is no off street parking. Ms. Chen stated that there is no alley access so off street parking could not be provided. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that off street parking is required for it to be a buildable lot, and Ms. Chen stated yes for new construction.

Mr. Green inquired about the width of the lot, and Ms. Chen stated that according to what was submitted it is about 22ft.

Ms. Chen stated that a letter from the Zoning Department was included in the packet.

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

Mr. Frank Cava, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Matt Jarreau, agent working on the project, stated that the lot has been in existence since 1909 with a separate address. Mr. Jarreau stated that it is a legal lot of record and it has never been subdivided in the past 60 years. Mr. Jarreau stated that they have to go through BZA because it did not have off street parking, and they were building within

the 3ft side yard setback.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is curious why they have the 2ft (side yard setback) on the left versus the right when the house on the right seems to be farther from the property line and asked if they do want to move forward with a 2ft setback on one side. Mr. Jarreau stated that they met with all of the neighbors on the block and got signatures of approval for this particular plan and stated that the neighbor to the right was concerned about the encroachment on their property. Mr. Jarreau stated that as a concession they moved it to the left in order to appease that concern.

Mr. Hendricks inquired how does one get to the northwest corner to build with a 12 inch wide setback between the existing building and stated that it seems like a narrow spot to try to build on and stated that he is concerned that it will be too close to the building and the setbacks aren't consistent with setbacks on the front of the building. Mr. Cava stated that the best way to answer that question is carefully and stated that the beauty of this is he owns 2808 E. Leigh Street and stated that they were going to work from that side. Mr. Cava stated that when they walked the site they felt that there was room to construct the building as proposed.

Mr. Elmes stated that there are a lot of steps and a lot of elevation to the front porch and stated that they may have some fenestration issues to amend when they cross laterally between the 3 properties.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in the photographs it looks like the floor line of the building to the right is 3 or 4 feet above the floor line of 2808 and stated that they will have to pick an elevation to match or figure out how they are going to negotiate between the two. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in reality they have a 3 or 4 foot difference in elevation.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he had a question about the style of the house and stated that it seems to be different than all the others on the block and inquired if there was any interest or ability to do something that was similar to one that is on the same block.

Mr. Hendricks stated that on the east and west elevation the second floor looks longer. Mr. Cava stated that there is a 2ft cantilever off the back of the home.

Mr. Green inquired why they have a cantilever and Mr. Cava stated that it is give it a little more functionality and stated that they are constricted on the building envelope. He stated that the way they interpreted the Zoning, they can either have a cantilever space or deck space in the back. Mr. Cava stated that they want to provide a little more functionality. Mr. Green stated that when you do that kind of overhang that it gets really tough to insulate front the underside.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that looking at the floor plans they have the porch at 8ft deep and the second floor has it at 5ft deep and Mr. Cava stated that he was incorrect that the cantilever is 2ft deep. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor commented that the lot is so narrow and there is no alley that she does not know if anyone would even see it. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that when they submit for final review they need to indicate the location of the HVAC and recycling bins and what the surface is leading to the steps and clear vertical and horizontal dimensions so they understand the proportion of the roof heights and window heights.

Mr. Hendricks stated they should show how they are going to modify wrought iron fence and incorporate it into the project.

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter from a neighbor who expressed three

thoughts regarding the project which included that they feel the foundation should be brick, that parged concrete is not suitable, the cornice height is too small and the door should be more suited for the neighborhood. Mr. Green stated that they when they come back he wants to see the elevation from the street level to see how they are tied together, thicken the cornice and encourage the applicant to do something more than Italianate.

Mr. Elmes stated that side of the block starts off with the stucco house that has an A-gable roof facing the street and they are beside a four square to the right. Mr. Elmes stated that it might be a unique opportunity to do something that will give you a little bit more architectural interest on that side by picking out some things that are already there within that six house block. Mr. Elmes stated that it would be great to see a slightly different version of vernacular especially the cornice.

Mr. Cava inquired if there was a special height that the Commission would like to see. Mr. Elmes stated that a lot of the houses that are initially proposed the mansard roof comes down closer to the top of the windows and stated that in their proposal there is a really large distance between the top of the windows and the cornice bandings at the top. Mr. Elmes stated that they should pay close attention to how to get up from the street and into the house.

Mr. Hughes suggested that the applicant bring back details on the materials and reveal and stated that he commends them on the level of details.

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

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.**

- 14 [CAR No. 2016-044](#) 1121 W. Franklin Street - Expansion of the education building for the Congregation Beth Ahabah and connecting the building to the temple building on the east and the Joel House on the west

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 10 [CAR No. 2016-040](#) 823 Mosby Street - Restore storefront and enclose first floor open area at the rear of the structure

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

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request approval to restore the storefront along Mosby Street and enclose first floor area located below an existing second floor addition at the rear of this structure in the Union

Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends the applicant to submit plans for staff to review and approve which restores the storefront per the physical evidence and the photographic evidence to not include a new door and to include storefront glazing to fit the historic opening. Staff recommends approval of the project with that condition.

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

There was no applicant present.

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 with staff's recommended conditions and with the conditions that the storefront be allowed without the door as proposed and that the infill on the rear of the building be denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 6 - Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**No --** 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

**Excused --** 2 - Bond and Yates

## Adjournment

The Commission thanked Mr. Elmes for his 12 years of service.

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.