

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
April 22, 2014**

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, April 22, 2014, at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Ms. Jennifer Wimmer, Chair
 Mr. Sanford Bond
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Ms. Mary Harding Sadler
 Mr. Joseph Yates

Members absent: Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Mr. Bryan Green, Vice-Chair

Staff Present: Ms. Catherine Easterling, CAR Secretary
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Ms. Wimmer called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the meeting minutes for a special meeting at the Virginia Department of Resources as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond, and passed 5-0-1 (Sadler abstaining).

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the March 25th minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Elmes, and approved 5-0-1 (Wimmer abstaining).

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve the quarterly business meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 4-0-2 (Elmes and Wimmer abstaining).

Design Review Guidelines

Ms. Wimmer stated that members of the Commission had met at the quarterly business meeting to discuss the need to update the Standards for New Construction with separate guidelines for large-scale infill projects. Ms. Easterling noted that the Commission had set the July quarterly business meeting as a tentative deadline for having a draft copy of the updates to the *Guidelines* available for public review.

Secretary's Report

Ms. Easterling stated that she attended a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) training session with the City Attorney's Office, and noted that the Commission appears to be compliant with meeting regulations.

Ms. Easterling noted that the City's Land Use Administration had received a Plan of Development for Oakwood Heights, and that CAR staff would be reviewing the plans to ensure that they match the drawings included in the application approved on appeal by City Council in 2008.

Ms. Easterling stated that she had spoken with Mr. Tyler Potterfield about the City's demolition process. She commented that Mr. Potterfield is in talks with property maintenance inspectors about the process for designating a property an imminent threat to public safety.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about a house in the Springhill Old and Historic District that has a condemned sticker on it. Ms. Easterling noted that condemned properties must still be reviewed by the CAR if the owner wishes to pursue demolition. She stated that the only designation that removes a property from the necessary CAR review in a City Old and Historic District is the imminent threat designation.

Ms. Easterling stated that the City would be implementing a new online system for tracking the legislation of Boards and Commissions. She commented that the new system, Granicus/Legistar, would replace the current FTP site as the means of distributing electronic copies of agenda items to Commission members and the public.

Ms. Easterling reminded the members of the Commission to submit comments for Resolutions of Appreciation for Mr. Johannas and Mr. Pearsall.

Enforcement

Ms. Easterling noted that the City was pursuing a number of enforcement requests, including window replacement at properties in the Shockoe Slip and West Grace Street Old and Historic Districts. She noted that some of the complaints were for work that was done many years ago.

Ms. Sadler suggested that a topic for one of the Commission's quarterly business meetings should be how the CAR addresses old violations, or work completed by a previous owner that is not noted until after a property has changed hands.

Administrative Approvals

Ms. Easterling distributed a list of approvals of the Administrative Approval report. Staff issued twenty-four approvals for the period through April 22, 2014.

<u>Address</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Approval No.</u>
3200 Monument Avenue	Install new garage door	A14-72
2337 W. Grace Street	Painting to remediate existing Violation	A14-75
1828 Monument Avenue	Revision to garage framing Plan	A14-93
21 E. Broad Street	Modify storefront and install Signage	A14-92
304 W. Broad Street	Install ADA-compliant bathroom	A14-91
1827 W. Grace Street	Remove interior wall	A14-89
2317 W. Grace Street	Replace main water service From alley to house	A14-88
719 N. 22 nd Street	Install new sprinkler system For building	A14-90

3611 E. Broad Street	Porch repairs and railing installation	A14-87
100 E. Franklin Street	Temporary tent	A14-86
100 E. Franklin Street	Temporary tent	A14-85
7 N. Jefferson Street	Modify ductwork for new Guest work	A14-84
517 W. Clay Street	Install new gas lines for Generator	A14-83
101 S. 15 th Street	Lighting for new tenant build-out	A14-82
115 S. 15 th Street	Wiring & lighting for new tenant Build-out	A14-79
115 S. 15 th Street	Modify existing fire alarm	A14-78
3319 E. Marshall Street	Porch repairs, including replacing Missing brick piers	A14-77
115 S. 15 th Street	Install new mini split system, Ductwork modifications	A14-76
1106 W. Grace Street	Install new mechanical unit	A14-80
1106 W. Grace Street	Install new mechanical unit	A14-74
1106 W. Grace Street	Install new mechanical unit	A14-73
517 W. Grace Street	Wiring for new generator	A14-81
425 N. 26 th Street	Repair front porch	A14-71
2318 W. Grace Street	Install new HVAC equipment	A14-70

[The Commission took a brief recess until 4:00 P.M.]

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bond inquired about the design of the rear elevation of the proposed porch at 3220 Monument Avenue. Mr. Hyim Cantor with Cantor Construction the stated that the rear of the building is wider than the side and stated that they did not want to obstruct the view with divisions of the screen.

Ms. Easterling stated that the Zoning Administrator had indicated that the proposed height of the rear wall would require a variance. Mr. Cantor stated that they would reduce the height of the wall to comply with zoning regulations.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if the gutter style is prevalent in that area and stated that it looks

Mr. Bond introduced a motion to approve the consent agenda for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates, and passed 7-0-0.

Application No. 14-28 (M. & V. Sanson)
3220 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. Mr. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-28 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new screen porch and rear wall, and

WHEREAS, the applicant may adjust the height of the proposed rear wall to accommodate zoning regulations, and

WHEREAS, the application is otherwise 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, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-29 (Richmond Scattered Sites)
509 N. 23rd 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-29 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. Elmes seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new access ramp, 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, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-31 (VHS)

428 N. Boulevard

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-31 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. Elmes seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-1 (Wimmer abstained).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to revised design of previously-approved learning center entryway, 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, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-23 (L. Chavis)
873 N. 22nd Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to rehabilitate a residence, construct two new additions, and modify the garage at a property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Ms. Easterling noted her support for the applicant's proposal to remove inappropriate alterations and restore portions of the building. She noted that the applicant had originally intended to demolish the historic addition at the rear of the house, but had revised the plan after consultation with staff. Ms. Easterling recommended a number of minor changes to the project, and inquired about the construction technique for the first-floor addition roof that would overlap the historic addition's roof.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Lawrence Chavis, the property owner, was present to answer questions.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the reveal of the existing wood siding on the building. Mr. Chavis stated that he did not know the size of the siding, but would be happy to match the reveal of the new HardiPlank siding to the existing siding.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the material for the roof of the new, first-floor addition. Mr. Chavis stated that the roof could be standing seam metal, shingles, or whatever the Commission would approve. Mr. Elmes noted that shingles would be fine because of the minimal view from the right-of-way, but that the pitch of the proposed roof would not be ideal for shingles.

Mr. Brad Price, a representative of the applicant, noted that they would ideally like rebuild the entire rear roof to have a gable form centered at the rear of the building. He noted for Mr. Elmes that they would need to move windows if they did that.

Ms. Sadler inquired if there was a possibility of retaining the existing standing seam metal roof on kitchen addition. Mr. Price stated that it is possible, but that the existing roof is not in good condition. Ms. Sadler commented that the form of early twentieth-century addition should be retained, including the roof form.

Ms. Wimmer agreed that she would prefer to see the historic addition retain its current form, and for the applicant to move forward with the proposed design, not the one crossed out on the application drawings.

Ms. Sadler suggested that the applicant retain a corner board of the existing rear addition to help differentiate it from the new construction.

Ms. Easterling noted that the zoning administrator had stated that there is an issue with the amount of side yard setback. She suggested that the Commission allow some flexibility as to the amount of side yard setback for the new addition in order to comply with zoning.

Mr. Elmes suggested that the Commission could approve a TPO roof for the new first floor addition, which would work well with the proposed pitch of the roof. Mr. Price stated that they could use that material.

Mr. Price asked if the Commission would approve the removal of the Bricktex siding. Mr. Elmes noted that the Commission would be happy for the applicant to remove the Bricktex siding.

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions, for the reasons cited in the staff report: final selections for the new front door and garage doors must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, the color of the new brick for the garage must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, the wood siding on the front of the house should be repaired or replaced in kind (the siding on the sides and rear of the building may be replaced with smooth HardiPlank siding), the new side addition may have a membrane roof, a cornerboard must be added between the original gable-roof addition and the new side addition to differentiate the new construction from the existing building, the HardiPlank siding must have a reveal that matches the reveal of the existing wood siding as closely as possible, and the footprint of the addition may be adjusted to accommodate zoning setback requirements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer, and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new additions and modify a garage, and

 WHEREAS, the final selection for the new front door and garage doors must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

 WHEREAS, the color of the new brick for the garage must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

 WHEREAS, the wood siding on the front of the house should be repaired or replaced in kind, and

 WHEREAS, the siding on the sides and rear building may be replaced with smooth HardiPlank siding, and

 WHEREAS, the new side addition may have a membrane roof, and

 WHEREAS, a corner board must be added between the original gable-roof addition and the new side addition to differentiate the new construction from the existing building, and

 WHEREAS, the HardiPlank siding must have a reveal that matches the reveal of the existing wood siding as closely as possible, and

Application No. 14-26 (R. & M. Amirsoleimani)
3820 Hermitage Road

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a new two-story outbuilding in the rear. Ms. Easterling noted that the overall building form, scale, siting, massing, and materials for the building appear to be consistent with the Commission's Standards for New Construction. She noted that she had received a letter from the civic association recommending support of the project. Ms. Easterling commented that the Zoning Administrator noted that zoning compliance cannot be verified with the information provided on the plans.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Manuch Amirsoleimani the property owner came up to answer questions.

Ms. Sadler inquired about the height of the proposed outbuilding. Mr. Amirsoleimani confirmed that the height of the main residence informed the height of the garage, and stated that they had tried to proportion the infill to respect the scale of the main house. He confirmed for Ms. Sadler that the roof height of the proposed structure would be much less than the main residence.

Mr. Yates inquired about the lack of alignment of the windows and doors on the first and second floors. Mr. Amirsoleimani stated that the proposed design was for aesthetics, but that the windows could be moved.

Ms. Wimmer agreed with the recommendation to align the windows and the garage doors.

Mr. Charles Field, a representative of the applicant, explained that moving the windows or doors would be problematic due to the interior layout. Mr. Field noted the presence of interior walls that would make moving windows difficult, and he stated that he would prefer to keep the fenestration as proposed.

Mr. Yates noted the lack of floor plans in the application.

Mr. Bond commented that the asymmetry of the windows and garage doors was unusual. Mr. Fields stated that they wanted to differentiate the garage from the house. Mr. Bond noted that differentiation could be achieved in other ways than playing with the scale of the building.

Mr. Elmes agreed that the fenestration should align. He inquired about the window and door model proposed for use.

Mr. Amirsoleimani noted that the property had been a foreclosure, and that he hoped to bring the building back to life.

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

Citing page 49 of the *Guidelines*, Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve the application as presented and as noted in the staff report with the condition that the garage doors shall be wood and that the window trim shall match the window trim on the main house. She noted that the Commission strongly recommends (but did not require) that the windows and doors of the primary elevation be aligned, and that any changes to the design to achieve alignment of these features must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Sadler, and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new two-story outbuilding, and

WHEREAS, the garage doors shall be wood and that the window trim shall match the window trim on the main house, and

WHEREAS, the Commission strongly recommended (but did not require) that the windows and doors of the primary elevation be aligned, and

WHEREAS, any changes to the design to achieve alignment of these features must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is otherwise 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-27 (Michaux, LLC)
308 N. 21st Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to make changes to the design of this a residence located in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. Ms. Easterling noted that the Commission of Architectural Review had previously granted conditional approval on March 26, 2013, for a new single-family dwelling at a vacant lot in the district. After approving a building permit for the project, staff noticed some changes the design of the residence that did not comply with the Commission's earlier approval, including modifications to the placement of windows, the design of some windows, and the introduction of a new, two-story deck. Ms. Easterling noted that the applicant had indicated a willingness to make adjustments to the windows on the façade to address Commission concerns. She commented that, based on the drawings provided, it was difficult to determine the proportions of certain elements. She noted that the applicant had raised the windows on the second floor, and now those windows are more in keeping with the window placement of the earlier approval.

Ms. Easterling confirmed for Ms. Wimmer that the earlier application had included a context drawing. She noted that the approved application had indicated that the windows would match the width of windows at the adjacent property, but said nothing about the length.

Ms. Easterling confirmed for Mr. Yates that the windows on the property should have simulated divided lites.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Mike Alexander, the owner, and Mr. Dean McGee, the contractor, were present to answer questions.

Mr. McGee confirmed for Mr. Elmes that he had called for a framing inspection, and that the inspector did not have any issues with the changes to the building permit drawings.

Mr. Elmes commented that the adjustment to the placement of the second floor windows on the front of the house was an improvement. He noted that the Commission requires drawings that accurately reflect what an applicant wishes to do at a property. He inquired about the side and rear windows that have grids between the glass, and Mr. McGee noted that they would be applying an exterior bar to these windows to simulate a true divided lite.

Mr. Bond expressed concern over the lack of accuracy in the drawings provided.

Mr. McGee noted that the new house was much longer than the adjacent house, so the roof needed to be higher.

Mr. Alexander noted that they had moved the second-floor windows up as high as he could.

Ms. Wimmer noted that the context drawing provided with the previous application depicted the new infill matching the height of the adjacent residence. Mr. Alexander stated that the drawing was not accurate.

Mr. Bond noted that the cornices of adjacent properties had a certain rhythm, and the brackets framed the windows. Mr. Alexander confirmed that it was his intent to replicate the pattern of the adjacent building's cornice.

Ms. Easterling noted that the Zoning Administrator had indicated that the introduction of the new rear decks could affect the variance that was granted earlier.

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

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the alignment of the windows on the side elevation. Ms. Easterling noted that the Commission's earlier approval required the alignment of these windows. She noted that staff is not particularly concerned with the current side windows, as this is a secondary elevation.

Mr. Elmes expressed concern with the window openings at the rear of the property.

Mr. Yates agreed that the rear windows were more problematic than the side windows. He noted that he could approve the rear deck, but was still concerned about the building's cornice.

Ms. Easterling confirmed for Ms. Sadler that the cornice indicated in the current applicant's drawings differed from the cornice indicated in the previous application.

Mr. Yates expressed concern over the height of the cornice.

Mr. Hendricks agreed that the scale of the cornice as indicated was problematic, and more concerning to him than the placement of the brackets.

Mr. Bond noted the need for accurate drawings.

Ms. Easterling noted door and window spacing guidelines on page 47 of the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve the application in part for the reasons cited in the staff report, and with the following conditions: the rear deck may be adjusted to meet zoning requirements and must be painted or stained a color approved by staff, the windows on the south elevation shall align to the degree possible and must have applied exterior muntin bars, and the applicant must return to the Commission with a revised design for the cornice, brackets, and rear windows that accurately depicts what the applicant wishes to construct. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes, and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to revise previously-approved plans for new single family dwelling, and

 WHEREAS, the Commission approved the rear deck, noting that the plan for the deck may be adjusted to accommodate zoning requirements and with the condition that the deck shall be painted or stained a neutral color approved by staff, and

 WHEREAS, the Commission also approved the addition of muntin bars applied to the exterior of the window sash on the south side of the building with the condition that the windows on the south elevation must align to the greatest extent possible, and

 WHEREAS, the Commission requested that the applicant return to the Commission with a revised design for the cornice, brackets, and rear windows that actually depicts the size and placement of the features of the building, and

Application No. 14-30 (M. Ryan)
417 Catherine Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of painting that was done at a residence in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District without the required Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission of Architectural Review. Ms. Easterling noted that the previously-painted brick building had been painted yellow, which did not meet the Commission's standards for painting a previously-painted brick building. Ms. Easterling recommended denial of the application.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

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

Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to deny the application for the reasons stated that in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond, and passed 7-0-0.

Application No. 14-25 (L. Venable)

620 W. 20th Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the roof at one of the oldest properties located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. She noted that the applicant had provided information that indicated why the existing roof could not be repaired. Ms. Easterling stated that the replacement product was generally found to be an appropriate replacement product, but that the applicant had not provided information to indicate the gauge of the metal or to confirm the size of the seam profile.

Mr. Bond commented that a 24-gauge metal was standard.

Mr. Elmes noted that there might be an issue with the cap for the roof hip.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the roof ridge and hips on this building are really nice, so it is important to retain that character.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that the back of the roof is tarred, and noted that the transition to a new material might result in a large hip cap.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the rear roof is not very visible from the right-of-way.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if there was a way to use a prefabricated roof system without an enormous hip cap. Mr. Elmes stated that the metal could be field-bent, but it would still need to lock into the system.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it is about four-inch cap on each side.

Mr. Yates commented that the applicant should replicate the form of the current roof seams as closely as possible. Mr. Bond stated that it might not be possible to do that with the prefabricated system. Mr. Yates noted that the appearance of this cottage is important, and requested that every effort be made to replicate the appearance of the current roof.

Ms. Easterling advised the Commission to make their motion as specific as possible.

Mr. Bond stated that they can say that the applicant should match the existing ridge and hip cap of the existing building.

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the application for the reasons stated in the staff report with the condition that the that the roof must match the appearance of the existing roof particularly with regard to the standing seam profile, seam spacing, and the treatment of the ridge and hip cap. He noted that the new roof system should not include the bulky hip cap commonly used in prefabricated roofing systems. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond, and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace a roof, and

 WHEREAS, that the roof must match the appearance of the existing roof, particularly with regard to the standing seam profile, seam spacing and the treatment of the ridge and hip cap, and

Application No. 13-102 (P. Candido)
2611 E. Grace Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install a front and side yard fence at a property located in the St. John's Old and Historic District. Ms. Easterling noted that the Commission had considered an application for a fence at this property in September of 2013, but deferred review because the applicant had not yet selected a design for the proposed fence. Staff stated that the applicant had returned with two options for the design of the fence. Staff recommended approval of the less ornate post style so that the fence would not be confused with the historic fences in the district.

Ms. Easterling confirmed for Ms. Sadler that the applicant's intent is to exactly replicate one of the designs indicated in the package. She noted that the pickets would be fabricated by hand.

Ms. Easterling confirmed that the photographs of fences she presented were fences located in the immediate area of the property in question.

Mr. Yates noted that the Commission had had trouble in the past with property owners wishing to install a fence that could create a false historical record.

Mr. Elmes noted that there is evidence that this property once had a fence. He recommended approval of the fence, provided that the design utilize a simpler finial.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

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

Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve the first fence design selection indicated in the application, in accordance with the reasons cited in the staff report, with the condition that the finial on the fence posts be simplified. The motion was seconded by Ms. Sadler.

Ms. Easterling confirmed for Mr. Hendricks that the pickets would be simple.

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

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install a new front yard fence, and

 WHEREAS, the Commission approved the first option listed in the application, and

 WHEREAS, that the final component shall be of a simpler design, and

 WHEREAS, the application is otherwise 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.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Catherine Easterling
Secretary to the Commission of Architectural