

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
August 26, 2014**

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, August 26, 2014 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 (arrived at 3:40)
 Mr. Sanford Bond (arrived at 3:53)
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

Members absent: None

Staff Present: Mr. James Hill, CAR Secretary
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the June 24th and July 22nd minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 6-0-0.

Proposed Changes to the Review Guidelines

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the Standards of New Construction for residential buildings implied it was relevant to additions. Mr. Green stated that they could put "including additions," in parentheses after the New Construction title.

Ms. Wimmer stated that in the doors and windows sections of Standards for New Construction for residential and commercial, all the doors and windows line items seems to point more towards additions and not freestanding new construction. Ms. Wimmer stated that she would propose adding a line item to each that says the size, proportion and spacing patterns of door and window openings on freestanding new construction should be compatible with patterns established within the district. Ms. Wimmer stated that she would suggest that in residential they put the line in as number 3. Ms. Wimmer also stated that on porches and porch details in line number 6 that addresses faux balconies, which are flat-

applied constructs with no depth, they should add “strongly discouraged,” in place of “discouraged.”

Mr. Green opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Hill stated that they had one public comment from the Mr. David Johannas who stated that he thinks that The National Parks Service has included an exception for civic buildings and/or museums regarding the scale being subordinate. An example being VMFA, which has an incredible addition, but it is not subordinate to the original building. Mr. Johannas inquired if there was a statement regarding entries. Mr. Johannas went on to say that the Museum District Design Overlay Guidelines specifically states that entrances should face the street and that maybe some consideration should be given to entrances for commercial building if it is not already included.

Mr. Green stated that he is not aware of The National Park Service making any qualifications to the type of building.

Mr. Hill stated that his feeling was that it should be done on a case-by-case basis, instead of stating that institutional buildings need not worry about being subordinate to the original building. Mr. Hill stated that in the new construction guidelines they talk about the standards for new construction and addressing the street and stated that staff takes that to mean that they address the street and that there is going to be an entrance or access to the main street that it borders.

Mr. Elmes stated that they are both under the standards of new construction so it applies to both residential and commercial.

Mr. Green closed the public comment period.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the revision to the Standards of New Construction Guidelines as presented and amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed.

Mr. Elmes thanked Mr. Green and Mr. Yates for working on the proposed changes.

SECRETARY REPORT

Mr. Hill stated that Ms. Easterling has left the city services and is now working with Ms. Sadler. Mr. Hill stated that he got information on recruitment materials to the department’s HR representative. Mr. Hill stated that he is meeting with them tomorrow and that he hopes they will be advertising Ms. Easterling’s position in the next week or two. Mr. Hill stated that their other preservation position will close Sunday and that when they get back from the Labor Day weekend they will be setting up interviews. Mr. Hill stated that they would be in serious trouble without the constant help from Ms. Tara Ross and Mr. William Palmquist picking up the workload. Mr. Hill stated that the Administrative Approvals are numerous and that he talked to the director about getting help from an intern to help them enter the backlog of them. Mr. Hill stated that they are very careful not to overstep their authority in approving things and stated that he is much happier when he gives the Commission members a full report and are able to make that

determination for themselves. Mr. Hill briefly discussed the new systems for the database for the Administrative Approvals.

Enforcement

Mr. Palmquist stated that they sent a Notice of Violation for a property in the 900 block of N. 24th Street for replacement windows and stated that they issued a stop work order for a property in the 2300 block of Venable Street for replacement siding. Mr. Palmquist stated that they previously issued notices of violation for that property for other work because they were overstepping their bounds for the permit that was issued for that property and that they are hoping to get them into the Commission so they can get approval for the entire project all at once. Mr. Palmquist stated that there are a couple of items that they will be investigating this week and will be reporting on at next month's meeting.

Mr. Hill gave an update about the window replacement on Monument Avenue where the applicant appealed the decision unsuccessfully, stating that after he lost his appeal from City Council he petitioned for an appeal at Circuit Court but that he did not follow up. Mr. Hill stated that when they when got to Criminal Court the applicant pleaded no contest and the judge gave him 6 months to remediate the violation. Mr. Hill stated that expired on August 5th or 6th and that the day after it expired they went out and documented that the violation was still present. They sent that information to the City Attorney who is preparing the necessary paperwork to get the applicant back before that judge. Mr. Hill stated that his understanding is that at this point it is not a matter of whether or not a violation is present at the property, but whether or not the applicant is in contempt of court for not doing what the judge told them to do within the specified period. Mr. Hill stated that he will keep the Commission up to date. Mr. Hill stated that the City Attorney has asked that a trial date be set for the paint colors on North Allen Avenue in the Monument Old and Historic District and that they are still having a difficult time finding a judge that doesn't have a connection to the parties.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the new members and Mr. Hill stated that he is not aware at this point whether or not they have received the nominations and that he will check on it and report back to the Commission.

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that the UDC reviewed three projects that all passed and that they were final location, character and extent review for the Pavilion at Mary Munford Elementary School, a conceptual location, character and extent review for the phase IV of the Canon Creek Greenway. The final project was the final location, character and extent review of the Brown Island Dam Walk connecting the north and south bank of the James River and stated that this is the bridge that City Council has named after Mr. Tyler Potterfield.

Mr. Hill stated that the Planning Commission recommended that City Council name the bridge after Mr. Tyler Potterfield and stated that it hasn't taken place yet and probably won't take place until it is completed.

Mr. Green reminded the Commission members to be cautious and aware of commenting on social media regarding the agenda items on the Commission.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to move item # 3 for 415 N. 22nd Street, item # 4 for 405 N. Allen Street, item # 5 for 516 W. 19th Street and item #13 for 420 N. 1st Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda with the conditions noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

Mr. Green stated that he wanted a little clarification for the application at 405 N. Allen Street and inquired if the applicant intends to use concrete pavers and Mr. Palmquist stated yes, that the intent is to use concrete pavers, brick lines for the patio section and outlines of the planting beds with brick.

Mr. Hill stated that there were 2 illustrations, one using the brick edging and one that illustrates using concrete pavers that are textured.

Mr. Yates inquired about 516 W. 19th Street for the storm-damaged finial and asked if the applicant looked into having original finial copied. Mr. Palmquist stated that he doesn't know how much they looked at that option but states that the applicant reported that it is damaged beyond repair.

Mr. Hill stated that they understood that it might be difficult if they wanted to repair it quickly and that staff suggests keeping the finial on site so that it may be repaired or replicated in the future.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-1 (Green abstained).

Application No. 14-081 (S. and D. Johnson)
516 W. 19th 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. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-081 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 7-0-1 (Green abstained).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace storm-damaged roof-finial, 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, Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: Green

Application No. 14-092 (F. McKeone)
420 N. 1st Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-092 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 7-0-1(Green).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to paint previously painted brick house, 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, Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: Green

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-078 (L. and V. Heindl)
2107 Jefferson Avenue

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to improve an existing parking lot at a former filling station located on a prominent corner in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the application with a condition.

Mr. Green inquired if staff knew what the planting materials were and Mr. Hill stated no.

Mr. Bilder inquired if this property is being proposed as commercial or residential and Mr. Hill stated that it is for a school.

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

Mr. Steve Pishko, co-owner the Central Montessori School, stated that the fence is the standard 6' privacy fence made from pressure treated wood and that it can be painted the same color as their building. Mr. Pishko stated that they are investing a lot of money into the property and that it's a really good thing for the community, neighborhood and that street.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the chain-link fence poles. Mr. Pishko stated that they are coming down and that they are built in the structure and stated that they will be cut off below the grade level of the planter.

Mr. Bond inquired if the planter was wood and Mr. Pishko stated yes. Mr. Bond inquired if they are going to be treated for ground contact and Mr. Pishko stated that it was not in the ground. Mr. Bond inquired if they were going to put dirt inside the planter and Mr. Pishko stated yes. Mr. Bond stated that he was concerned about how it will look in the next five years. Mr. Pishko stated that they are aware that it will need maintenance and stated that there is a lining inside the container and the ground itself won't be touching it.

Mr. Elmes stated that it was unclear about something in the application and Mr. Pishko stated that computer generated planter. Mr. Elmes asked if it is a part of the application. Mr. Pishko stated that it is very similar to what they are doing now. Mr. Elmes inquired if that is the front of the planter and Mr. Pishko stated yes.

Mr. Green inquired if they are planning to paint them and Pishko stated that they haven't planned on it but if they need to, they will be happy to do it. Mr. Green inquired about the planting material. Mr. Pishko stated that they are in great discussion about it and stated that they are hoping to find a low maintenance

indigenous plant.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the parking area going to be resurfaced and Mr. Pishko stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired about the material and Mr. Pishko stated that it will be blacktop. Mr. Bond commented that in the planters maybe they can have an urban garden and Mr. Pishko stated that they talked about that a lot and stated that they have won two awards for their gardens.

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

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application with the conditions cited in the staff report and as presented highlighting the fact that the existing chain-link fence poles in the planters will be cut off, if zoning has height restriction on the fence, it can be administratively approved by staff, as well as the paint or stain colors for the wood materials and the planting materials and paving be deferred to staff for review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct fence and pergola, and

 WHEREAS, the existing chain-link fence poles are cut off, and

 WHEREAS, the planters and fence be painted or opaquately stained a color to be approved by Commission staff, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant coordinate the planting and paving material with Commission staff, and

 WHEREAS, staff is authorized to review and approve any changes in the fence height dictated by zoning regulations, 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, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-083 (L. Farwell)
504 N. Boulevard

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for the replacement of front door glass with a textured glass which would obscure visibility through it. The applicant also requests approval to install a storm door with six clear glass panels. Staff is recommending partial approval of the project with a condition.

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

Ms. Elizabeth Boyle, representing the owner Ms. L. Farwell, stated that the door is pretty unsightly. Ms. Boyle distributed samples to the Commission members. Ms. Boyle gave her presentation on the door and detailed the security issues and stated that she will retain the historic door but wants to use a different kind of glass and a storm door.

Mr. Elmes inquired if it is tempered glass and Ms. Boyle stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that it is really only a veiling idea because you can break that glass as easily as you can break any other glass. Ms. Boyle stated that the storm door will be there as a barrier.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the owner looked into laminated glass and Ms. Boyle stated that she didn't know.

Mr. Green stated that he brought in a sample and stated that it looks like ordinary glass but states that it is strong glass. Mr. Green inquired if the applicant had looked at any other glass and Ms. Boyle stated yes.

Mr. Elmes stated that as a suggestion, safety being the concern here, that laminated glass will be the best for breakability concerns and that there are also companies that will apply the materials she wants on the inside of her door making it movable and removable so that it will accomplish the veiling.

Mr. Yates inquired if Ms. Farwell would consider something other than a 6-panel storm door, perhaps a 2-panel door to maintain the appearance of a single panel to the original door. Ms. Boyle stated that she is not sure if the owner wants 2 full panel doors.

Mr. Elmes stated that the question is being presented because typically storm doors are suggested as a full view door by the Guidelines.

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

Mr. Bond stated that there are other ways to resolve these problems besides that which is in direct violation of the written guidelines.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to partially approve the application based on the conditions in the staff report and not with the ribbed glass. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that the owner work with staff on an appropriate material for the glass door. Ms. Wimmer stated that she was recommending clear glass for the door and stated that she would welcome the friendly amendment. The motion

was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Ms. Boyle inquired if they are suggesting clear laminated glass and Ms. Wimmer stated yes.

Mr. Hughes inquired if laminated glass would be approvable and Mr. Green stated, not tinted but clear.

After further discussion the motion passed 7-1-0.

Mr. Elmes stated that his opposition was based on the storm door guidelines more than the actual glass.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install textured glass and storm door, and

WHEREAS, the new storm door is painted or opaquately stained a color to be approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the glass installed within the opening of the front door is clear, untinted glass, 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, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer and Yates

Negative: Elmes

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-086 (J. A. Homes LLC)
2813 M. Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new residence on a deep vacant lot located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Elmes stated that the building to the west has a grade change and inquired if any retainage was proposed and Mr. Hill stated that he didn't see anything in the plans.

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

Mr. Matt Jarreau, the applicant, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Green inquired about the main elevation, asking why there is a large gap between the doors. Mr. Jarreau stated that they did the same project last fall and that basically it was a piece of Hardi board in between the two doors. He can't remember why that came to be but states that it was a smooth Hardi board. Mr. Green stated that a more traditional route will be either to pair the doors or split them up because that is an odd detail. Mr. Jarreau stated that they kind of mirrored and matched what was approved before and stated that if the Commission wants to see the Hardi plank between those two doors that would be fine. Mr. Green stated that they should be closer together and Mr. Jarreau stated that you can't put them together because there is a firewall there so there has to be some separation.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it looks they are trying to align the windows with the doors below. Mr. Jarreau stated that is why they did that, because before Ms. Easterling left she stated that she wanted those windows and doors to match up and stated that is a zoning requirement that they have 30 percent fenestration on the front façade of the building.

Mr. Elmes stated that the siding option might give it a more traditional look because of the fact that they have to be spread a little further and that the siding in between the two doors will make it more compatible. Mr. Elmes inquired about the plan when they enter the side doors on the west of the building and inquired if they were going to have a fence on the retaining wall. Mr. Jarreau stated that there are some trees planted there and they didn't want to disturb them. Mr. Elmes inquired how they are going to get to the two doors in the back and Mr. Jarreau stated that they will have some sort of concrete pathway from the sidewalk to those doors. Mr. Elmes inquired about the front roof material and Mr. Jarreau stated a black colored product of EPMD. Mr. Elmes stated that in the context plan study, the house to the left is set further back and Mr. Jarreau stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if this cornice detail is one that they have used in the

past or are there any differences and Mr. Jarreau stated that basically it's the same application that they did for 609 and it is the same cornice detail. Mr. Elmes inquired about the window materials. Mr. Jarreau stated that they will do a NMW Jefferson Series double hung 2-over-2 with a cellular PVC exterior with smooth grain finish. Mr. Elmes inquired about the front door and Mr. Jarreau stated that they are doing fiberglass front doors.

Mr. Green inquired about the setbacks and Mr. Jarreau stated that they wanted to pull this property as close to the sidewalk as possible because it is deeper into the lot and that they wanted to push that property back into the lot. Mr. Jarreau stated that he still wanted to have an 8' deep covered porch.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the intent is to have the front of the porch align with the house on the right and Mr. Jarreau stated yes.

Mr. Yates stated that the spacing on the top and second floor windows and the cornice seems to be unusually wider. Mr. Jarreau stated that they are trying to do what was done at 609 and stated that the front façade will make it the same and that he has no objection to bringing the cornice down.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the materials for the siding, the porch, and the porch floor and the foundation. Mr. Jarreau stated that they will use a smooth HardiPlank with 6" reveal, tongue and groove composite, smooth decking and a battleship grey for the flooring, a parged blocked foundation and EPMD roof on front.

Mr. Elmes inquired if it was going to require a handrail, and if so, what materials. Mr. Jarreau stated that they are going to be painting the columns white on the front with Richmond Rail.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the columns were PVC or wood and Mr. Jarreau stated that they would be 6"x6" wood.

Mr. Hendricks inquired about the attic vent and stated that it seems a little out of place and inquired if they could incorporate it in the front cornice. Mr. Jarreau stated that they put it there so they wouldn't have to make any punctures in the roof and stated that someone could make those punctures into a cool design. Mr. Jarreau stated that basically it's the same design and you will see it. Mr. Jarreau asked the Commission's feelings about a covered 2-story porches and stated that he was discouraged about doing it and that he had an idea to do a 2nd story covered front porch design that he thinks will be a cooler. Mr. Jarreau inquired if that would be something that they consider, support or approve.

Mr. Green stated that they discourage it and stated that porches need to reflect the neighborhoods and stated that it does not fit in the district.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they could take advantage of CAR conceptual review.

Mr. Hill stated that they received one comment and read it to the Commission.

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

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application for the reasons stated in the staff report with the following clarifications: that cementitious siding will be used to fill in the gap between the two doors, that the setback will be as described in the meeting, the porches will align with the houses on the left, the materials will be as the applicant described with cementitious lap siding with a 6" reveal, colors to be reviewed and approved by staff, the windows will be 2-over-2 with the product as described by the applicant, and the applicant will lower the cornice height at the front of the building and use a porch similar to 625-627 N. 28th Street. Mr. Elmes made a friendly amendment and stated that the applicant isn't interested in lowering the roof height but increasing the cornice height. Mr. Green stated that the front porch material will be black EPMD and the light fixtures will be deferred to staff and that they will use Richmond Rail and the windows will be simulated divided lites. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new quadraplex, and

WHEREAS, the siding be installed between the two front entrance doors, and

WHEREAS, the setback will match that of the house to the west, and

WHEREAS, that the siding be smooth, untextured, cementitious siding with a 6" reveal, and

WHEREAS, the windows be 2-over-2 double-hung PVC cellular with simulated divided lites, and

WHEREAS, the cornice be revised to proportional dimensions similar to that found at 627 N. 28th Street, and

WHEREAS, the front porch roof be black EPMD, and

WHEREAS, the stair rails will be Richmond rail, and

WHEREAS, the applicant will coordinate the review and approval of paint color and exterior light fixtures with Commission staff, and

Application No. 14-089 (C. Stipe)
2723 W. Grace Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace or install ten windows and two doors at this property located in the West Grace Street Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project and offers conditions for approval of the remainder of the work.

Mr. Yates inquired if staff will support lowering the window in the rear with 6-over-6 sash so that the windows fill the original opening. Mr. Hill stated that it is difficult to require them to restore something that they inherited from the time of the district's designation. Mr. Hill stated that if they wanted to do a restoration probably either with a 4-over-4 or 6-over-6 window and that it will be hard to make them do additional work.

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

Mr. Marko Yurachek thanked Mr. Hill and stated that he enlightened him with his presented. Mr. Yurachek stated that they just bought a new old house and wants to make their best efforts to restore to its original condition, one of the things being the rear deck. Mr. Yurachek stated that they want to add a garage which is something they didn't put in the proposal and stated that the garage will cover the rear windows so they are not visible from the street. Mr. Marco inquired if 6-over-6 rear windows satisfy for replacement windows.

Mr. Yates inquired if their intention is to replace them exactly the same size or return them to the original size of the windows. Mr. Marco stated that depends on what the Commission allows them to do and stated that replacing them the way they are now is fine. Mr. Yates stated that they can't require them to do that. Mr. Yurachek stated that replacing with them with a 6-over-6 is something they can do and Mr. Elmes stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the muntins were simulated divided lite and Mr. Yurachek stated that he hasn't talked to the window people about it yet and that if the muntin have to be on the outside.

Mr. Green stated that ideally the original windows would have filled that opening and that something to fill that opening would be ideal rather than keeping that blocked off.

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

Ms. Wimmer stated that because the windows aren't original, if they want to they can replace the sashes with 6-over-6 because that meets the guidelines and that if they were to go back to the original openings it wouldn't be with a 6-over-6 it

would be a 1-over-1.

Mr. Yates stated that he has a really hard time because the windows are replacement on the rear and stated that he really has a hard time approving something that was incorrect to begin with and saying that it is okay to put the incorrect windows back. Mr. Yates stated that the other houses all have 4-over-4 and stated that if the guidelines stated that it has to be 6-over-6 he would be fine with 1-over-1 and stated again he doesn't see the point in repeating a mistake.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application as outlined in the staff report that the first floor windows be retained and that the side windows be 1-over-1, the second floor door be repaired and the first floor windows be restored to original opening being 6-over-6, 4-over-4 or 1-over-1 sash. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Green stated that they might want to refine the window detail because it's a little wide open and inquired if the motion was a defensible motion because of the 3 options. Mr. Hill inquired if the motion was to restore it to its original opening and install 6-over-6, 4-over-4 or 1-over-1 and Mr. Yates stated yes. Mr. Hill stated that they can vote on this motion.

Mr. Green inquired if they are making a motion that is not enforceable.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they were allowing the applicant to repair or replace the existing 6-over-6 in-kind and in-place. Mr. Yates stated that was not his intention.

Mr. Hill stated that the contention of the motion is to require them to return to the condition to something that was originally there and stated that it is generally understood to over step the practice of the Commission.

Mr. Yates stated that his recommendation is that the windows be returned to their original appearance or original size.

Mr. Green inquired if the 3 options were still available and Mr. Yates stated yes.

After further discussion the motion passed 6-2-0(Elmes and Wimmer opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace windows, and

 WHEREAS, the front windows be retained and repaired, and

 WHEREAS, the windows on the west elevation be 1-over-1,
 and

 WHEREAS, the rear 15-lite door be retained and repaired,

Application No. 14-090 (F. Pichel)
2915 E. Broad Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a one-bay, two-story frame garage at the rear of this residential property in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The applicant had based the design of the garage on historic garages of similar proportion and scale found elsewhere in the district. In staff's opinion the work proposed is compatible with the existing structure with sufficient differentiation in materials so as not to be mistaken for original or historic fabric. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Frank Pichel came up to answer questions.

Mr. Green inquired about the windows and Mr. Pichel stated that his intent is to do a glass with true muntins with a 2-over-2 grid pattern.

Mr. Hill read a comment from the public.

Mr. Pichel stated that he has no intentions to put plumbing in the building.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that he was concerned that the door and window configuration is exactly copied from other garages and it creates false historicism for that particular door style.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she doesn't take an issue with it.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report with true divided lite wood windows and the paint colors will be deferred to staff for review and approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to build new two-story garage, and

 WHEREAS, the windows be 2-over-2 double-hung wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with true or simulated divided lites, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant work with Commission staff to choose an appropriate color, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes,
Wimmer and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-091 (121 W. Broad LLC)
123 W. Broad Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the existing projecting wall sign with an internally illuminated wall sign. The proposed replacement sign is for the new Graffiato's restaurant. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Travis Croxton with Graffiato's Restaurant stated that they were not aware of the discouragement of illuminated signs and they were trying to take down the existing illuminating Popkin's Tavern sign which is about 5 times the width of the sign and 3 times the width from this sign. Mr. Croxton stated that they worked with a sign company to come up with a trademark sign and stated that they came up with this one and stated that their intention is to bring more west enders to downtown Richmond. Mr. Croxton stated that they want people to see the restaurant and explore downtown. Mr. Croxton stated that the cost of removing the sign is \$3,000 and to replace and install the new sign it is \$5500.

Ms. Susan Almond stated that she didn't know this was on the agenda and stated that she does know the restaurant and that she doesn't think the sign fits with the Broad Street corridor and stated that it might be a good non-fit to be modern. Ms. Almond stated that she was wondering if they could get some other proposal that is somewhere between that and what the old Popkin's Furniture sign was that fits more with the building and stated that obviously that sign wouldn't have been made for the existing building façade.

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

Ms. Wimmer inquired if this was in the Arts District and Mr. Palmquist stated yes.

Mr. Elmes stated that they allowed signs that aren't back lit but the letters are floating in front of a light that's in front of them and stated that there are other ways to illuminate the sign where the rectangular box itself would have the letters mounted off the actual sign and the letters being back lit. Mr. Elmes stated that without going through great lengths there are other ways to illuminate a very similar design for the sign and stated that he has a problem approving an internally illuminated sign for that location.

Mr. Bond stated that he concurs and stated that he can think about 10 ways to put up an illuminated sign and stated that he doesn't think they should approve this because it clearly doesn't fit within the guidelines.

Mr. Green stated that the Commission is saying that there are other ways to

achieve the goal that they want it within the guidelines.

Mr. Elmes stated that if they were going to craft a motion he will defer the illumination of the sign to staff so that it would fit within the guidelines and stated that there would be a channel lit sign or other types of signs that would be approvable.

Mr. Hill stated that they have approved a non-illuminated version of this that met the guidelines but also allowed them to identify their business for opening.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to defer the application based on the staff recommendations that the internal illuminated sign goes against the guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-1 (Hughes recused himself).

Ms. Wimmer inquired if they were allowing the applicant to work with staff on an alternative lighting method and Mr. Elmes stated yes.

After further discussion the motion to defer the application passed.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Application No. 14-082 (Mid-Atlantic Comm. Properties)
535 W. Broad Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a new 13,000 square foot commercial building with parking area and drive-thru pharmacy pick-up at the intersection of Broad Street and Belvidere in the Broad Street Old and Historic District. The application includes a building summary describing general design and materials. The intersection is recognized as an important "Richmond Gateway." A canopied filling station/convenience store currently occupies the site. Construction has just begun on the VCU Institute for Contemporary Arts on the property across Belvidere to the west. Mr. Hill gave a presentation of the standards for new construction which includes the siting, form, scale, height, width, proportion & massing, materials, and colors & details.

Mr. Yates inquired if there were any historical photos that the city has of that corner before the Hess Gas Station was there. Mr. Hill stated that he is sure that they have sanborn maps here and stated that Belvidere is kind of a modern construction. It was a very narrow street that stopped at Broad and then Smith and Munford continued and where it plows through the north it used to be the 600 block of the neighborhood that connected Jackson Ward and the Carver neighborhoods. Mr. Hill stated that there was a period in time when this was the far west and there were things like brick yards and lumber yards.

Mr. Hill read a public comment from Mr. Johannas to the Commission members.

Mr. Hughes stated that he doesn't recall seeing anything in the Guidelines about drive-thru windows and inquired how do they approach them and Mr. Hill stated that there is one across the street at the Rite Aid and stated that it is symmetrical to the placement of this drive-thru window. Mr. Hill stated that rather than them having an alley they have an entrance off of Marshall Street and stated that they do occur and stated that the main thing is to keep off the front face and screen them.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment

Mr. Chris Gill with Christian and Barton Law Firm, Mr. Barry Byrd the project architect and Mr. John Stan with Mid Atlantic Properties came up to answer questions. Mr. Gill stated that Mid Atlantic Properties is a preferred developer for Walgreens for more of the suburban types and stated that for this project they wanted to try to do something different and not just replicate their suburban models but do something more urban. Mr. Gill stated that they met with staff and got comments early on and tried to incorporate some of the designs from the surrounding areas. Mr. Gill stated that he thinks that the architect has done a

really good job of that and welcomed the Commission's thoughts on how to make it better.

Mr. Yates stated that one thing that is confusing to him is that when he looks at the perspective sketch and what appears to be staggered setbacks on Broad Street and Belvidere and when he flips over to the site plan, it doesn't appear to show any setbacks of the building. Mr. Barry stated that the site plan was done conceptually first and then the elevations were done. Mr. Barry stated that the setbacks are incorrect.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the intent was to have it step in and out and Barry stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired about their feeling on the entry location and Mr. Barry stated that they can add an entrance on Broad Street and stated that they would keep an entrance on the parking lot side and on the Broad Street side and that this building will probably be required to have a vestibule.

Mr. Elmes stated that having that entrance on Broad Street will speak more to the human scale of the building and the connectivity that it will have with the passer by.

Mr. Green inquired if they could talk about the glass and Mr. Barry stated that some of them are transparent and stated that the parking lot side and a good bit of Broad Street are transparent and the side that goes down Belvidere will be a showroom type window or a window with graphics in it. Mr. Barry stated that they are not proposing using spandrel glass because it's not appropriate for this location.

Mr. Yates stated that he thinks that on the entrance on the corner is something that a number of the Commission members would like to see and it would help reinforce that corner on Belvidere and Broad and stated that if a higher part showed further down Broad was incorporated on the corner to kind of emphasize the corner of Belvidere and Broad. Mr. Yates applauded them for trying to get some verticality to the building and that he would love to see a taller building. Mr. Barry stated that they recognize the same things that Mr. Yates is saying and that because the site is relatively small they are going to use some upstairs storage, and because the storage will occur off of the alley that is why the element on the back is a little taller. Mr. Barry stated they are not sure how to work that verticality into the front and have receiving on that front portion of the building. Mr. Barry stated that they are going to try to work on that and that function of the building is creating a little bit higher verticality in the back. Mr. Barry stated that they will suggest to Walgreens adding an entrance on the corner and that one of the issues that Walgreen typically have is if they put an entrance on that corner then they will have to have another set of cash registers and operational staff and that most times that will affect their operational cost.

Oftentimes it will add to tens of thousands of dollars to their operational costs each year to have that extra staff. Mr. Barry stated that they will offer that to Walgreens.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if that could be the only entrance and Mr. Barry stated that they could offer that.

Mr. Hughes stated that will depend if they are focusing on foot traffic or vehicular traffic.

Mr. Green stated that it is heavy pedestrian foot traffic at that intersection throughout the day.

Mr. Elmes stated that thinking about other urban situations that are not dissimilar to this in more densely populated in cities that corner tends to be the entrances but not necessarily with a cash register and stated that in looking at the project the corner needs to be the focus. Mr. Elmes stated that from a material standpoint the windows are going to be clear glass on the 2nd floor. Mr. Barry stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if the windows are going to be faux windows and Mr. Barry stated that they will be open to the interior.

Mr. Green commented that they should focus on more verticality and stated that by using their cornice band in the light colored material works against the verticality. Mr. Barry stated that it might and stated that in walking the area there is a use of a lighter brick and stated that they were trying to pick up the same elements in the neighborhood and stated that they are going to look at other options.

Mr. Yates stated that zoning is not our purview and stated that they might want to check with zoning about the awnings.

Mr. Gill stated that they are separately going through the Special Use Permit process for the drive thru and stated that they recently received comments regarding that. Mr. Gill stated that some of the comments suggested that this intersection would be a good candidate for a roundabout which will take a portion of the property in the corner.

Mr. Schirra Hayes stated that as the project moves through the process, if there will be more opportunity for public interactions and the neighbors' input on the designs and Mr. Green stated yes.

Mr. Hill stated that with the Special Use Permit they will be taking to the City Planning Commission, there will be a period of public comments there and stated that if it goes before City Council for approval there will be an opportunity for public hearings.

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

Mr. Hughes stated that he likes Mr. Yates' idea about the corner and stated that it feels incomplete without the entrance on the corner and thinks that it will enhance the building.

Mr. Green stated that he thinks the corner could take more mass and as much of a bigger feature that could be applied there and states that it needs something to hold that prominent corner.

Mr. Hughes inquired if it would make sense to go up on the verticality to emphasize that corner and Mr. Green stated that creating a larger corner feature and just an entrance.

Ms. Wimmer thanked staff for their excellent staff report and stated that she agrees that a typical corner area is going to be the area of focus and that will be their biggest mass and entry points. Ms. Wimmer stated that it is a high pedestrian corridor and stated that the entry on the street front is important as well as clear glazing or visibility into the storefront. Ms. Wimmer stated that the store room window will accomplish some of that because it does give a pedestrian experience and you are not just looking at brick wall.

Mr. Green stated that he appreciates them bringing light to that corner especially at night and stated that there is a lot of foot traffic there at night.

Mr. Bond stated that it brings life to the corner. Mr. Hendricks stated that as across the streets develops, and with the main corner for entry, both corners will be activated.

Mr. Bond stated that in this situation an entrance from the parking lot directly in the front of the store is not as important as it might be another environment just because people are used to getting out of their car and walking down the sidewalk to enter something and stated that is not unusual condition in an urban environment. Mr. Bond stated that they could have just one entrance that they can control and have it the right spot and allow that there will be a lot of pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the metal cross detailing with the x's will be really interesting to see some brick that has been turned and have some depth to create the shadow line or the texture that they are looking for with the aluminum metal detailing and stated that it will be interesting to see some brick detailing instead of that.

Mr. Bond stated that Richmond is a place where you have good masons and where you can good masonry work done.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he always sees those fake wood reveal panels at the bottom of glazing and stated that he doesn't know if there is something else they can do there. Mr. Hendricks stated that he knows the alley elevation is not a pedestrian side but states that it will be read by pedestrians being that it is set back and stated that it seems a little flat.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she will piggy back on what Mr. Yates said regarding the use of EFIS at the top band and stated that perhaps brick is a better solution to give more verticality and stated that some of those surrounding buildings where they are using the two-tone brick are not necessarily contributing historic structures that you want to mimic.

Mr. Green stated that one of the dominant architectural features along Broad Street in Richmond is the presence of a 1st floor cornice and a sign board to help define the street rather than a metal canopy and stated that something like that might give the building a stronger urban presence. Mr. Green stated that a strong 1st floor cornice will help unify that and link it back to the cornice at the top and it will make the building taller versus longer.

Mr. Hendricks stated that signage would be applicable to the applicants as well.

Mr. Green stated that if they would have done a 1st floor cornice with a sign board it will give them more opportunity for signage and not illuminated.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the applicant could come back for conceptual review as many times as they like.

Application No. 14-084 (B.Gould)
315 N. 22nd Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to replace deteriorated wood siding on the alley elevation of the structure with fiber cement siding, as well as to replace the 1st floor alley-facing window. Staff recommends approval of the project.

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

There were no additional public comment. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report with the new siding that it be smooth and textured fiber cement siding. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace wood siding with cementitious siding and a single window on the alley elevation, and

 WHEREAS, the new fiber cement siding will have a smooth, untextured finish, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes and Wimmer

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-088 (S. Towne)
2712 E. Leigh Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for the replacement of two 1st story windows on the front of this building in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Green inquired if there was a response from anyone in the congregation about if the windows are still on the site and Mr. Palmquist stated that there was no response.

Mr. Bond inquired how long it has been since they put in the windows that were not approved and Mr. Palmquist stated a month or so.

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

Mr. Bond made a motion to deny the application per the staff report. Mr. Elmes stated that this is not the only work that is being done in the building. After further comments the motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Green stated that there was a big meeting with DHR and Parks Service and stated that for residential rehabilitation tax credit projects they will not accept aluminum clad wood windows.

After further discussion the motion to defer the application was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

James Hill
Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review