



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, September 22, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### **This meeting will be held through electronic participation means.**

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public. Less than a quorum of Richmond City Commission of Architectural Review members will assemble for this meeting in the 5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 900 East Broad Street in Richmond, Virginia 23219, and most Commission members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

To access or participate, or both, in the Commission of Architectural Review meeting on Tuesday, September 22, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2020.055](#) Public Participation and Access Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review

**Attachments:** [Public Access and Participation Instructions -COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW](#)

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address: <https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video". Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the outlined in the Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review document. Citizens are encouraged to provide their comments in writing to [carey.jones@richmondgov.com](mailto:carey.jones@richmondgov.com) in lieu of speaking through audio or video means during the meeting. When submitting your comments by email, be sure to include in your email (i) your full legal name, (ii) any organizations you represent, and (iii) any economic or professional relationships that would be affected by the approval of the application on which you are commenting. The person responsible for receiving written comments is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All written comments received via email prior to 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Tuesday, September 22, 2020, will be provided to all members of the Commission of Architectural Review prior to the beginning of the meeting and will be included in the record of the meeting.

### **Call to Order**

Commission Chair Neville Johnson called the September 22, 2020 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:35 pm.

Secretary to the Commission, Carey L. Jones, read the announcement for virtual public meetings:

This meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice in the Richmond Times Dispatch, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website. The public may participate in the meeting by calling \*67-804-316-9457 and entering 201-932-327#. Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes for their comments.

The person responsible for receiving the comments from the public is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. Commission members are electronically present, none are physically present in City Hall.

We will be conducting a roll call vote with the Secretary stating each Commissioners name prior to voting.

**Roll Call**

Commissioner Brewer arrived at 4:10 PM.

All members of the Commission of Architectural Review participated by electronic communication means.

Staff in Attendance: Commission Secretary Carey L. Jones, Senior Planner Chelsea Jeffries, Senior Planner William Palmquist, Administrative Support Matt Everett

**Present --** 8 - \* Commissioner Sanford Bond, \* Commissioner James W. Klaus, \* Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, \* Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, \* Commissioner Sean Wheeler, \* Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and \* Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Approval of Minutes**

August 25, 2020

The August meeting minutes will be reviewed at the October meeting.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was provided by Commission Secretary Ms. Carey Jones.

Ms. Jones introduced the new Deputy Director for Planning & Development Review, Kevin Vonck, who has recently relocated from Green Bay Wisconsin where he was head of the department of Community Economic Development. Mr. Vonck stated that he will be focused on effective department implementation in light of the goals outlined in the nearly-completed Richmond 300 Master Plan.

Ms. Jones stated that PDR has a new website nearly ready, and it will have updated content, links, and forms.

Richmond 300 Update:

Ms. Maritza Pechin, Richmond 300 Master Plan Project Manager, thanked the Commission for comments made on the Master Plan. Ms. Pechin stated that 1400 comments on the plan were received and read by planning staff, and that the Plan was presented in pre-final form to Planning Commission on Sept. 21. Some minor changes to the pre-final Plan were made and shared with the Planning Commission, the final Plan will be posted online on September 29 in preparation for its submission for final approval to Planning Commission on October 5, 2020.

Ms. Pechin stated that the Advisory Committee of the Planning Commission voted last week 19 yes/ 2 absent in favor of moving the plan forward for approval by the full Commission.

#### Virtual Meeting Ordinance:

Ms. Jones stated that the City Council has extended the ordinance for virtual meetings, and meetings will be conducted online at least through the end of the year. Meeting invites will be updated accordingly. Ms. Jones expressed her thanks for participants' patience.

#### Monument Update:

City Council is currently reviewing offers received for City-owned monuments.

#### RVA Website Update:

Ms. Jones stated that the city's new RVA.gov website is on-line, and is now in a transition stage with the older one still active. The new site will have more comprehensive information about administrative approvals, thus hopefully giving the public a better idea of what can be approved.

Ms. Jones stated that the next Commission of Architectural Review meeting will be the quarterly meeting, to be held on October 13; and requested that Commissioners inform her of any items to be added to the agenda.

### Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that there were no major items to discuss on the Administrative Approval & Permits Reports.

### Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that some minor enforcement issues, including painting, fences, and railings, had been resolved, but that there were no major updates.

### Other Committee Reports

Ms. Jones stated that Urban Design Committee has two projects pending, information about which she would be sharing with Commission members.

### Update to Administrative Approval Guidelines for Signage

Ms. Jones stated that staff would like to expand the administrative approval guidelines to include awnings under the general heading of signage, as well as to make that section of the administrative approval guidelines clearer.

Ms. Jones stated that as best she can determine, awnings reviewed by Commission have never been denied.

Ms. Jones stated that if Commission staff receive an application for an awning, they would either work with the applicant to make it approvable, or pass it along for Commission review.

Ms. Jones also proposed to remove the page references in the administrative approval guidelines, as updates and edits will render them inaccurate.

Commission Chair Bond asked if Commissioners had any questions or issues with the new guidelines submitted by Ms. Jones.

Commission Chair Johnson, with Commissioner Bond seconding, moved to accept the new guidelines for administrative approval of awnings and signage, as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Mitch Danese, , Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond  
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

Commissioner Morgan stated that the Commission should make items that are regularly approved by Commission eligible for administrative approval. Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement.

Ms. Jones stated that Commission staff are fully in support of adding to the list of items which can be administratively approved, and suggested that the Commission could discuss this further at the upcoming quarterly meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:50 PM.

**Commission Chair Johnson, with Commissioner Bond seconding, moved to accept the new guidelines for administrative approval of awnings and signage, as submitted.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye -- 7 -** Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Excused -- 1 -** Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

The regular portion of the meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Ms. Jones re-read the announcement info for virtual meetings.

Commission Chair Johnson explained that there are 3 sections to the meeting: consent agenda with items not fully reviewed by Commission, regular agenda with items which are reviewed, and conceptual review during which new projects are given an initial review. Items on the consent agenda can be approved without meeting discussion, unless the applicant wishes for it to be removed and placed on the regular for more comprehensive review and discussion. Commission Chair Johnson explained time limits for applicant and public comment, and asked that speakers avoid duplication of comments.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners wished to move any items from

the regular agenda to the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 3rd item, 2721 W. Grace Street, to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Kevin Bohm, the applicant, stated that he had questions to be answered about his application.

Commission Chair Johnson recommended in that in that case that the applicant should ask that the item be kept on the regular agenda.

Commissioner Pearson pointed out that this item is very similar to one reviewed last month, and that he doubted the Commission would arrive at a different conclusion.

The applicant, Mr. Bohm stated he would like to have the opportunity to speak with the Commission and receive clarification about several aspects of the project, not only the painting of the façade to which he stated that Commissioner Pearson might be alluding.

Commissioner Pearson and Commissioner Bond withdrew the motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 4th item, 3411 E. Marshall Street, to the Consent Agenda.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond  
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 6th item, 3001 E. Broad Street, to the consent agenda.

Commissioner Brewer joined the meeting at this point.

The applicant, Ms. Page, stated that she would like to leave item #6 on the regular agenda in order to discuss the proposed use of asphalt shingles. Commissioner Pearson and Commissioner Bond withdrew the motion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 9th item, 620 Chamberlayne Parkway, to the consent agenda.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the Commission had received one public comment letter regarding this project, and it had been in favor.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Mitch Danese, , Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

Public Comment

Mr. David Henderson asked, in regard to the 620 Chamberlayne Parkway project, what the content of the public letter had been. Ms. Jones stated that the letter had been in favor of the new construction. Mr. Henderson stated that, based on his discussion with some neighbors, the appearance of the proposed building had been a concern. Mr. Henderson stated that he had been concerned about the look of the project also, but that it seemed as if the applicant had altered it. Mr. Henderson asked if the concerns expressed by the Commission at an earlier review had been satisfied in the current iteration. Ms. Jones stated that the applicant had addressed most of the staff and Commission concerns, which had been primarily about the height and the siting of the building. Ms. Jones stated that the applicants had fixed the siting and slightly reduced the height.

Ms. Jones stated that following approval of the current application, there would still be some minor project details for the applicants to work through with staff.

Mr. Henderson expressed satisfaction with this explanation.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional public comment. There was none.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that the consent agenda be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus  
Recused – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

1. COA-078391-2020      2304 E. Broad Street – Rehabilitate a two-story covered side porch.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the existing box gutters be repaired and relined; the rear porch railings be wood Richmond rail; the rear slope of the front gable be replaced in-kind with standing seam metal; the operable hardware be retained and the shutters be sized to fit the windows.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus  
Recused – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

2    COA-078594-2020    503 Stuart Circle – Upgrade existing mechanical and HVAC systems and install a fabric awning over a rear door.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the window units be installed in such a manner so as to divert water from leaking down the building envelope or pooling/building up around the foundation; final color selection for the awning be submitted for administrative approval and the awning hardware be installed into the mortar joints to avoid damaging the masonry; additional

information be submitted for administrative review if repairs to the window above the altar are required; the masonry cleaning be done with the gentlest means possible, to prevent damage to historic materials.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus  
Recused – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

4. COA-078646-2020      3411 E. Marshall Street – Construct a roof over a second story rear porch.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new pressure treated wood of the roof structure be painted or opaquely stained a neutral color; an application be submitted for any additional changes that are planned to the rear porch.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus  
Recused – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

9. COA-078389-2020      620 Chamberlayne Parkway – Construct four attached single-family residences.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant increase the height of the fascia board to match the height of the brackets, or remove the brackets and use a taller piece of trim to reference a cornice line; the porch roofs be flat-lock metal to be consistent with historic front porch roofs; all of the railings be wood Richmond rail and painted or stained a neutral color found on the Commission palette; the applicant simplify the body colors and choose two colors from the palette for wood frame buildings; the applicant provide additional information about the gutters and downspouts for administrative approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus  
Recused – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that the consent agenda be approved.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Recused --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

1. [COA-078391-2020](#) 2304 E. Broad Street - Rehabilitate a two-story covered side porch.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the existing box gutters be repaired and relined; the rear porch railings be wood Richmond rail; the rear slope of the front gable be replaced in-kind with standing seam metal; the operable hardware be retained and the shutters be sized to fit the windows.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Recused --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

2. [COA-078594-2020](#) 503 Stuart Circle - Upgrade existing mechanical and HVAC systems and install a fabric awning over a rear door.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the window units be installed in such a manner so as to divert water from leaking down the building envelope or pooling/building up around the foundation; final color selection for the awning be submitted for administrative approval and the awning hardware be installed into the mortar joints to avoid damaging the masonry; additional information be submitted for administrative review if repairs to the window above the altar are required; the masonry cleaning be done with the gentlest means possible, to prevent damage to historic materials.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Recused --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

4. [COA-078648-2020](#) 3411 E. Marshall Street - Construct a roof over a second story rear porch.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)



A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new pressure treated wood of the roof structure be painted or opaquely stained a neutral color; an application be submitted for any additional changes that are planned to the rear porch. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Recused --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

9. [COA-078389-2020](#) 620 Chamberlayne Parkway - Construct four attached single-family residences.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant increase the height of the fascia board to match the height of the brackets, or remove the brackets and use a taller piece of trim to reference a cornice line; the porch roofs be flat-lock metal to be consistent with historic front porch roofs; all of the railings be wood Richmond rail and painted or stained a neutral color found on the Commission palette; the applicant simplify the body colors and choose two colors from the palette for wood frame buildings; the applicant provide additional information about the gutters and downspouts for administrative approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Recused --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

3. [COA-078646-2020](#) 2721 W. Grace Street - Exterior rehabilitation, including painting an unpainted masonry façade.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Kevin Bohm, stated that he had purchased the property on August 3rd with rehabilitation in mind. Mr. Bohm acknowledged that painting the façade blue had been an error. He stated that there was substantial overspray on the façade and many already-painted surfaces of the property when he acquired it, including the garage and the porch footers. Mr. Bohm stated that he received a letter from CAR postmarked

September 16 explaining the historic guidelines, and that he did not know why he had not received it in August when he acquired the property.

Mr. Bohm stated that upon reviewing the staff report, there were changes he wished to make to his application, including that he no longer wished to replace the front railing. Mr. Bohm stated that the garage doors mentioned in the application had already been ordered with windows, so this would require a solution which he would have to work out with Commission staff.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that it sounded as if Mr. Bohm was willing to work with staff in regard to their recommendations. Mr. Bohm confirmed this.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Emily Pochter, stated that Mr. Bohm was maintaining the property in better and safer condition than the previous owners, with the yard and house well-maintained and vagrancy discouraged, and that the goal was to provide affordable housing in the Fan. Emily stated that there had been considerable overspray, including on the windows at the time Mr. Bohm purchased the property. Ms. Pochter stated that, though she knows the blue color painted by Mr. Bohm is not historic, there are several other houses painted blue in the area.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that this type of project with a paint job not adhering to the Guidelines had also been reviewed at the August CAR meeting, and asked if there was a way non-guidelines paint jobs could be prevented before they occurred. Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the West Grace Street Association could perhaps be asked to send information to incoming residents. Commissioner Pearson stated that welcome packets of some kind from neighborhood associations might be helpful, and that some sort of solution should be found.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with a paint removal company familiar with the removal of paint from historic masonry and provide updates to staff on the results of test patches; if staff determines, based on the result of the test patches, that the paint cannot be removed without damaging the brick, then staff recommends that the applicant submit a yellow clay color that closely matches the historic brick for administrative review and approval; a red brick color for the garage, in keeping with the other outbuildings on the block, be submitted to staff for review and approval; the applicant work with staff to design a railing that can be administratively approved, such as a simple black metal railing; the railing for the rear deck be Richmond rail, or the pickets be attached to the interior of the rail for a more finished appearance, and the deck be painted or opaquely stained a neutral color; the replacement garage doors be a simple modern design, without decorative glass or hardware, and submitted to staff for review and approval. The Commission denied the application for painting of the façade of the residence; denied the application for the tan brick color proposed by the applicant for the garage; and denied the application for the turned wood handrails.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

5. [COA-077183-2020](#) 3101-3105 E. Marshall Street - Modify previously approved plans to rehabilitate an existing building and build an addition onto the roof and rear, and to construct a new, connected mixed-use addition on the corner.

**Attachments:** [Base Map](#)  
[Application and Plans \(8/25/202\)](#)  
[Staff Report \(8/25/2020\)](#)  
[3101-3105 E Marshall St - Application and Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Sean Jefferson, introduced himself and stated that he did not have objections to most of the staff recommendations. Mr. Jefferson stated that the design intent was to maximize space, and asked that the column recommendation be removed to support the applicant in that. Mr. Jefferson asked that the applicants be enabled to move forward with the currently suspended Special Use Permit, and that any necessary design details be resolved afterward. Mr. Jefferson stated that currently the SUP process is suspended until all issues are resolved.

Ms. Jones stated that only some of the conditions recommended by staff require SUP approval, and that resolving those specific items as quickly as possible would help. Ms. Jones stated that some items, such as materials, do not need to be resolved in order for the SUP to go forward. Mr. Jefferson stated that he did not understand why the SUP is currently suspended, since the SUP-related changes were made to the design some time ago, and have not been altered in recent revisions.

Commissioner Danese stated that there were some public comments in regard to this application.

Commissioner Wheeler asked Mr. Jefferson when he would have to re-submit the application for SUP review.

Mr. Jefferson stated that he was not sure of the schedule, but that he anticipated re-introducing the project next month [October]. Commission Chair Johnson stated that some of the changes can be approved administratively by staff and Commission Chair and Co-Chair, thus expediting the process.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the Commission focus on the SUP-related items, in order to help move the application forward.

Mr. Jefferson stated that he had applied for SUPs in the past and had not experienced a suspension.

Commissioner Danese asked the applicant for clarification on what he was requesting. Mr. Jefferson stated that he would like the SUP condition removed.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Fay Ferguson stated that she was concerned because the project review seems to be at the stage of minor tweaks, whereas she feels there are larger issues with the project. Ms. Ferguson stated that the parking seemed insufficient, and that parking in Church Hill is generally becoming more challenging. Ms. Ferguson stated that the appearance and the footprint of the proposed project are not in keeping with the historic nature of the district. Ms. Ferguson expressed concern about safety, with the project potentially adding more traffic and thus endangering children at a nearby school. Ms. Ferguson stated that she had recently decided not to move to Church Hill, and that projects of this kind were part of the reason.

Ms. Lauren Trotta, who lives next door to the project site, stated that she felt that she had learned about the project late, that the three-story height of the project seems very atypical, and that she had moved to the district hoping to avoid being near developments of this kind. Ms. Trotta stated that the project will add to typical urban issues of heat concentration and loss of green space and foliage, and that there are also concerns about drainage.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met:

For 3105 East Marshall Street: the character-defining architectural elements including but not limited to the cornice line details, decorative elements, the faux mansard, and stepped parapet walls on the front and east side elevations are not increased in height, removed, or altered in any way; the applicant provide additional information about the condition of rear CMU section and the need to demolish it, including that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition or opportunities to retain it, for review and approval by PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair; the design of the rehabilitated historic storefront match the historic photograph including, but not limited to, the wood panels below the windows and the pilasters separating the bays; and the windows surrounding the door be a consistent size; the interior floor plans be updated with the dimensions of the east elevation inset and submitted to staff for review and approval; the brick infill for the windows on the east elevation be recessed from the original opening and any decorative elements, such as exterior sills and headers, be maintained; the brick pier at the corner be retained as a terminating element to unify the overall design.

For 3101-3103 East Marshall Street: the new masonry be differentiated from the historic masonry in tone, size, and bond pattern, and the final masonry specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the applicant submit a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; the revised plans reflect the panels aligned with the window openings as indicated with a note on the plans; the applicant provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; the applicant submit the following for approval: a line-of-sight drawing to determine the extent of the visibility of the new rooftop additions; the final materials specifications including the parking screening; an accurate dimensioned site plan be submitted with all setbacks indicated on a physical improvements survey rendered at a legible scale; a detailed roof plan with the location of the HVAC units indicated and a line-of-sight drawing from East Marshall Street and North 31st Street; information about the gutters and downspouts; and a key to the plans and

elevations.

Commissioner Klaus stated that CAR and Zoning requirements are different and generally the Commission does not interact with Zoning; therefore requiring a specific sequence of operations of the applicant seems unnecessary.

Ms. Jones stated that there is generally a sequence in which CAR approval occurs first, and then the SUP which goes through Planning Commission.

Commissioner Klaus asked how the applicant could get approval for an existing plan, if the plan is being at this time altered due to Commission requirements. Commissioner Klaus stated that it did not seem necessary for the conditions of approval to make reference to the SUP process, since it would occur regardless.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she hoped the applicant was aware that even if the Commission does not require items to be submitted prior to the SUP, the items will still need to be addressed.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the number of bedrooms in the building is not within the control of CAR, and is in Zoning's purview, and that this, not lack of concern, is the reason the Commission is not discussing these matters.

Commissioner Morgan stated that CAR receives many letters from the public about concerns about parking, water runoff, trash, and about building heights, specifically of new construction. Commissioner Morgan stated that she has been fairly consistent in advising that new construction should not be taller than historic buildings, and that her vote in this instance would probably be consistent with that.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if, when the Zoning ordinance is written for the Special Use Permit, a stipulation can be made that the Commission changes be honored; and stated that he had seen similar stipulations for approval by the Director of Planning.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he assumed there would be changes made during the course of construction, and that the final product will not perfectly match the drawings. Ms. Jones stated that in her experience, the Zoning ordinance for the SUP would state that the applicant must be in substantial compliance with CAR-approved plans.

Mr. Mark Olinger, PDR Director, stated that Commissioner Wheeler is correct and that, after an SUP is approved, a project application is looked at again to check for adherence to requirements by CAR, Planning staff, and Zoning staff. If there is significant deviation from Zoning and CAR guidelines, it may be necessary at that point for the applicant to go through the process again.

Commissioner Pearson suggested that he would not object to a friendly amendment to his motion, removing the language about the SUP deadline from the motion, since the applicant would incur the risk as described, but if he is comfortable with that risk, he [Commissioner Pearson] has no strong feelings either way.

Commissioner Klaus made the friendly amendment to remove the motion language referring to the SUP process; Commissioner Pearson agreed to the amendment.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met:**

For 3105 East Marshall Street: the character-defining architectural elements including but not limited to the cornice line details, decorative elements, the faux mansard, and stepped parapet walls on the front and east side elevations are not increased in height, removed, or altered in any way; the applicant provide additional information about the condition of rear CMU section and the need to demolish it, including that there are no feasible alternatives to demolition or opportunities to retain it, for review and approval by PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair; the design of the rehabilitated historic storefront match the historic photograph including, but not limited to, the wood panels below the windows and the pilasters separating the bays; and the windows surrounding the door be a consistent size; the interior floor plans be updated with the dimensions of the east elevation inset and submitted to staff for review and approval; the brick infill for the windows on the east elevation be recessed from the original opening and any decorative elements, such as exterior sills and headers, be maintained; the brick pier at the corner be retained as a terminating element to unify the overall design.

For 3101-3103 East Marshall Street: the new masonry be differentiated from the historic masonry in tone, size, and bond pattern, and the final masonry specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the applicant submit a fully dimensioned elevation with exterior heights to staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; the revised plans reflect the panels aligned with the window openings as indicated with a note on the plans; the applicant provide detailed drawings of the proposed storefront design and the revised plans be submitted to PDR staff and the Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for review and approval; the applicant submit the following for approval: a line-of-sight drawing to determine the extent of the visibility of the new rooftop additions; the final materials specifications including the parking screening; an accurate dimensioned site plan be submitted with all setbacks indicated on a physical improvements survey rendered at a legible scale; a detailed roof plan with the location of the HVAC units indicated and a line-of-sight drawing from East Marshall Street and North 31st Street; information about the gutters and downspouts; and a key to the plans and elevations.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**No --** 2 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

6. [COA-078393-2020](#) 3001 E. Broad Street - Replace a metal roof with asphalt shingles.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

The applicant, Ms. Corbin Page, stated that the property was in disrepair when

purchased and had significant roof leakage, which has caused internal damage to the house as well as causing it to sink. Ms. Page stated that the roof needs to be replaced and that cost of an all-metal replacement roof was quoted at over \$45,000.00, which would be prohibitive. Ms. Page stated that, contrary to the staff report, a combination of asphalt and metal, which would cost over \$25,000.00, had been initially proposed by the applicants. Ms. Page cited nearby houses that have shingled roofs, and asked, since it is not unprecedented in the area, that the Commission allow the asphalt shingles.

Ms. Page cited 2102 East Clay Street and 3014 East Broad Street as two nearby properties which have asphalt roofs.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if patching and re-coating the roof had been considered. Ms. Page stated that the roof had been re-coated twice and patched seven times, and that multiple roofers had told the applicants that a roof replacement would be necessary. Ms. Page stated that the most recent incidence of roof leakage has caused drywall to come down in the ceiling of the property.

Commissioner Danese asked the number of quotes for a full metal roof. Ms. Page stated that three quotes from different companies had been secured.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the lower roofs be replaced with flat-seamed metal, to match the existing roofs, and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval; and to deny the proposed asphalt shingles and request that the main roof be replaced in-kind with new standing seam metal.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if planning staff had background information about the nearby asphalt roofs cited by the applicant. Ms. Jeffries stated that the asphalt shingled roof at 3014 East Broad Street which had been installed without approval, was reviewed by the Commission in 1989 and was ultimately approved due to the underlying metal roof being beyond repair. The minutes from that meeting reflect that the Commission would not have approved the work if proper procedure had been followed. The other address cited, 2102 East Clay Street, is in the Union Hill City Old & Historic District, which was established in 2009. This property is documented as having an asphalt shingle roof in place as early as 2001, which predates the establishment of that historic district.

Ms. Page stated that there was one other property with an asphalt roof, on Grace Street. Ms. Jeffries stated that this property, at 2702 East Grace Street, is in a Georgian style, built in the 1830s, which is different than the property being reviewed, which was built later and in a different style. Ms. Jeffries stated that the asphalt shingles proposed for 2702 East Grace Street were approved by the Commission in 1998; their reasoning was that asphalt shingles would more closely resemble the original wood shingles than the asbestos shingles which were being replaced.

Commissioner Pearson stated that he would be open to deferral of the application for a month, in order to give the applicant and staff time to arrive at an alternative acceptable solution.

Ms. Page stated that they have an active leak and all other house repairs must wait on the roof being repaired.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that metal roofs can last hundreds of years, while asphalt can last about 25 years; but another option is a new product, a which silicone sealant

which is warrantied for 50 years.

Ms. Page stated that sealants had been tried. Ms. Jones stated that as a point of order, further discussion with the applicant should occur outside the meeting.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she believed a membrane roof material had been approved for porch roofs in the past due to its visual resemblance to a flat seam metal roof, and asked if this might be an economical option in this instance for the secondary roof surfaces, to make the metal for the main roof more affordable.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the application is challenging for the Commissioners because, for a main house roof, asphalt shingles are specifically forbidden by the Guidelines.

Commissioner Danese stated that there is a membrane roof material, the name of which he could not recall, which would last approximately half as long as a metal roof.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that membrane roofs typically last 25-30 years.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the visibility of the roof is a major issue for the corner property in question, but that a membrane could address this by appearing flat, and that he would not have an objection to this option. Commission Chair Johnson asked if Commissioners had any other suggestions.

Commissioner Wheeler advised the use of aluminum peel-and-stick to patch the holes in the roof while deciding on a specific roof replacement material.

Commissioner Danese asked if it would be faster to change the decision to a deferral, thus allowing the applicant to work with staff to arrive at a solution. Ms. Jones stated that the Commission has several options: a friendly amendment could be added to the motion, to include Commission suggestions and working with staff on a solution; withdraw the motion; or vote on the motion.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if there was a major difference between a deferral and a denial of the application.

Ms. Jones stated that a deferral, though it would not prevent the applicant continuing to work with staff, would not be eligible for an appeal by the applicant; whereas a denial of the application could be appealed by the applicant to City Council, although this would be time-consuming and likely take longer than working with staff to arrive at a solution that could be administratively approved.

Commissioner Pearson left the meeting before the vote on this motion took place.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 2 - Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Mitch Danese  
No - 5 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler  
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Lane Pearson

Commissioner Klaus asked that the Commission be sensitive to the urgency of the applicant's need for a solution to their roof situation, and stated that there seemed to be Commission support for the idea of a membrane rather than asphalt shingle roof. Commissioner Morgan stated that she had been referring to the porch roof and other



secondary roofs that currently have a flat seam metal roof.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to allow the applicant to work with staff to find a solution that can be administratively approved with a recommendation that a dark membrane be used on the secondary roofs (porch, rear overhangs) and to consider a silicone roof coating for the main roof.

Commissioners Brewer expressed agreement that a membrane material for non-central parts of the roof such as over the porch would be acceptable, if this would make it affordable to make the main roof part metal.

Commissioner Wheeler stressed that silicone, which is an effective sealant, is different from elastometric, is more expensive but waterproof and worth considering, and that he was in the process of applying it to his own roof and was pleased with the product's performance.

Commissioner Morgan suggested a friendly amendment regarding the use of membrane for secondary roofs, and asked whether a combination of membrane for secondary roofs and standing seam metal for the main roof could be approved administratively. Ms. Jones stated that she believed staff could administratively approve membrane on secondary roofs as a substitute for metal, and that, if not, she would likely recommend that that be added to the administrative approval guidelines.

Ms. Jeffries stated that she was not certain that the administrative approval guidelines included roofs other than front porch roofs.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to allow the applicant to work with staff to find a solution that can be administratively approved with a recommendation that a dark membrane be used on the secondary roofs (porch, rear overhangs) and to consider a silicone roof coating for the main roof.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

7. [COA-078383-2020](#) 2322 Venable Street - Construct a new two-story mixed-use building.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant Sam Tuttle introduced himself and the architect Evan MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that regarding the increased window size requested by staff, he wanted to confirm that the smaller windows were being referred to. Mr. MacKenzie stated that the other windows, being 3 feet by 5 feet, were large for that condition, and that other windows on neighboring properties range from 3 feet by a bit less than 5 feet to 3 feet by

a bit more than 5 feet.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that the applicants would be happy to make a modest increase in the size of the smaller windows, to about 3' x 3' but that those are bathroom windows and the applicants do want to maintain privacy at those locations.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that the storefront glazing as proposed would have a 4' x 8' panel, and that making it much larger would require that it be in two or more sections. The intention had been to make this be one uninterrupted piece of glass, but if the Commission determines the overall size needs to be larger, Mr. MacKenzie stated that the applicants would be glad to work with them to arrive at a workable fenestration.

Mr. Tuttle stated that if the applicants put the windows back on the north elevation at the rear of the building, then they would propose to remove one vertical band of windows on the west elevation, so as not to increase the overall amount of glazing and also to maintain wall space for furniture. Mr. Tuttle stated that with the currently proposed changes to the plans, two vertical bands of windows have been added to the west elevation at the rear of the building, which would serve the rear bedroom.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to determine the final window sizes and locations; all of the mechanical units be located at the rear of the building, or if the units are located on the roof, a line-of-sight drawing be submitted for administrative review; the applicant submit additional information regarding proposed drainage for the front of the building, a dimensioned context elevation; and the final signage for administrative approval.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he liked the idea of one large window for the storefront.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to determine the final window sizes and locations; all of the mechanical units be located at the rear of the building, or if the units are located on the roof, a line-of-sight drawing be submitted for administrative review; the applicant submit additional information regarding proposed drainage for the front of the building, a dimensioned context elevation; and the final signage for administrative approval.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

8. [COA-078379-2020](#) 1825 Monument Avenue - Expand rear porch; reconstruct rooftop balustrade; and construct a new two-car garage and brick wall.

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

ITEM WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

10. [COA-078394-2020](#) 708 N. 21 Street - Remove rear, enclosed porch and construct a two-story addition.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Ms. Michelle Bebb, the project architect, introduced herself. Ms. Bebb stated that the applicants intended to follow the staff recommendations, but that she asked for clarification as to whether the staff were suggesting that the rear window of the addition should be different from the historic 6/6 windows. Ms. Bebb asked if a 1/1 or 2/2 window could be utilized. Ms. Jeffries stated that 1/1 would be the preference, but that some other configuration different from the historic 6/6 would also work.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

**A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new front porch posts and railing be wood; windows 12, 7, and 8 be replaced with 6/6 aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights, and window 13 be replaced with a 4/4 aluminum clad wood window with simulated divided lights; windows 9 and 14 be retained and restored, consolidating sound sashes from the rear and sides of the home to the façade if possible; window 12 be enclosed from the interior in a manner that could be reversed in the future and maintains the existing exterior appearance; the replacement windows for windows 1-3 match the original light configuration,; the addition be inset from the south wall the width of a corner board; the windows and doors on the addition and the new windows on the rear elevation be of a contemporary design; the addition be clad in smooth unbeaded fiber cement siding; the rear deck and balcony have Richmond rail and be painted or opaquely stained a neutral color; the following items be submitted for administrative review: paint colors; roof material specifications; door and window specifications; a site plan with the location of the exterior HVAC unit. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Mitch Danese

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

11. [COA-078388-2020](#) 2320 E. Marshall Street - Rehabilitate an existing building, construct a semi-attached single-family residence, and construct a new single-family residence off the alley.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Mr. Bob Steele, applicant representative, introduced himself and stated that the staff comments regarding 2320 E. Marshall Street were spot on architecturally, and that the applicants would want to comply fully with them if this was the sort of building suitable for a rehabilitation tax credit. Mr. Steele stated that the applicant has three issues with the suggested changes, which are important for practical and other reasons.

Mr. Steele stated that the front staircase design was done with tenant safety in mind; the current configuration allows and encourages vagrancy and is recessed about 5 feet from the exterior building façade, and thus dark, whereas the proposed turning stair design allows the stairs to have defensible space. Mr. Steele stated that the stairs were built to go straight to the street, although the current stairs are not original and are currently in disrepair. Mr. Steele stated that the proposed design would use two existing plinths as a base for a curved set of stairs, with a landing. Mr. Steele stated that the proposed stair design would not extend any further into the street than the current configuration. Mr. Steele stated that the owner had proposed brick originally for the stairs, but that the architects had recommended wood as being more delicate and more in keeping with the historic design.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicants' second issue had to do with the large sliding glass door on the rear of the property, off the kitchen. Mr. Steele stated that the owner is amenable to converting the existing windows to doors as suggested by Commission staff, but that the one of the reasons the proposed outdoor deck is "floating" is so it can provide private, defensible outdoor space for tenants.

The third item brought up by Mr. Steele was the 12-foot deck. Mr. Steele stated that the modern house proposed at 2318 East Marshall Street is designed to allow the 12-foot porch to abut its side. Mr. Steele stated that the staff recommendation to reduce the porch depth to a more typical 6-8 feet at 2320 East Marshall would cause that property to sit back from the more modern construction at 2318 East Marshall. Mr. Steele stated that in general the applicant is amenable to suggested design changes and is eager to move forward with the project.

Mr. Steele asked if it would be acceptable to receive comments regarding 2320 East Marshall Street before delivering his own thoughts on the proposed 2318 East Marshall Street property.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicants will be meeting with Mr. David Herring with the Church Hill Association, with whom the applicants have been communicating, and are pursuing feedback from the Church Hill community about the project.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Commission Chair Johnson asked Commission Vice-Chair Wheeler his preference: reviewing the proposed buildings one at a time, or all together. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the plans are thorough enough that he did not have many comments; therefore, it would make sense for Mr. Steele to speak about all the proposed buildings at once, with Commission commenting on all of them afterward. Commission Chair Johnson

agreed.

Mr. Steele, regarding 2318 E. Marshall Street plans, stated that the most significant staff comment seemed to be one regarding the front elevation. Mr. Steele stated that a wood or hardie panel section, as opposed to brick, was proposed between the two brick façades was in order to create architectural separation between the two brick buildings.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicant is open in terms of window configurations, but that the 2/2 configuration was selected to distinguish the building from the neighboring Adams Row property, and to associate it with 2320 East Marshall Street.

Regarding the proposed rear free-standing structure, Mr. Steele stated that if the Commission approves the project, the applicant will apply for a Special Use Permit to create a separate 3000-square-foot lot at the rear of the property. Mr. Steele stated that one of the reasons for the height of the detached rear structure is the proposed parapet, and that height concerns could be addressed by removing the parapet, but that the parapet's height is intended to conceal HVAC equipment. Mr. Steele stated that the height, allowing for topography, is in keeping with heights of neighboring buildings.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicants would like to use solid garage doors, without glass, for security reasons.

Mr. Steele stated that the choice of wood as a material for the screen was in order to correspond to the doors, thus creating three wood masses in the façade. Mr. Steele stated that all the windows and doors have been vertically aligned. Regarding staff comments about the variety of materials, Mr. Steele stated that the applicants feel it works aesthetically, that the brick and wood tie in to different nearby structures, and that paint selections will tie the materials together. Mr. Steele stated that the various metal elements, e.g., railings, will be painted to match the cladding on the windows. Mr. Steele emphasized that a garden is considered an integral component of the overall design concept.

Commissioner Wheeler stated, regarding 2320 East Marshall Street, that he liked the idea of changing the staircase as proposed, but that he would prefer a lighter, non-masonry material, even metal, to differentiate the stairs from the historic fabric. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the openings on the rear did not seem consequential, being of limited visibility. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed rear porch depth also seemed limited in its visibility, and that he was okay with it.

Regarding 2318 E. Marshall St, Commissioner Wheeler stated that since it is new construction he would be in favor of a more modern palette, and that he agreed with the staff comment about 1/1 windows. Commissioner Wheeler suggested bringing over some design elements from the back of the proposed 2320 East Marshall to this part of the project, and also pushing it forward to align better with its neighbors.

Mr. Steele stated that the front façade is being aligned with the roof line of Adams Row, so as to marry most harmoniously with its roof details. Commissioner Wheeler stated that as long as there is some kind of alignment, he is for it.

Regarding the new alley construction, Commissioner Wheeler stated that since it is at the alley, it goes beyond a typical garage apartment and is successful, and that its strong architectural style helps it to succeed.

Commissioner Brewer expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler, including the

rear details being difficult to see, and stated that it is a good-looking project overall.

Commissioner Klaus expressed general agreement with Commissioner Wheeler, except regarding the front steps of 2320 East Marshall, which Commissioner Klaus stated are a defining characteristic of the building, at least 70 years old and probably original, and should be preserved. Commissioner Klaus expressed skepticism that the proposed sideways turn of the stairs would increase security and discourage vagrancy, as it would still be an accessible alcove, and suggested that perhaps a removable and relatively innocuous barrier of some kind, such as a gate, could be used if security is a concern.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she agreed with Commissioner Klaus' comment that the stairs should remain with their original orientation.

Commissioner Morgan left the meeting at about this juncture.

Commissioner Bond stated that he agreed with Commissioner Wheeler's comments for the most part.

Commissioner Bond expressed ambivalence about the front staircase, stating that if it is an original feature, it is worth preserving. Commissioner Bond suggested a security gate that is locked at night could be a solution for privacy and security issues.

Mr. Steele stated that the current wood stair is not original but closely matches the original.

Commissioner Bond stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed materials of the alley house, and that he foresaw there would ultimately be fencing added, which would harmonize with the wood.

Commissioner Danese stated that maintaining the front stairs going straight down on the 2318 East Marshall property might look somewhat awkward. Commissioner Danese stated that he did not have a particular solution to recommend, but that there are options, since it is new construction. Commissioner Danese asked Ms. Jones for clarification regarding materials – whether the staff concern was with the use of synthetic hardie material, or if it was just that they recommended a different material be used to connect the two buildings [2318 and 2320 East Marshall]. Ms. Jones stated that because the connecting segment would be flat and uniform across the front, as opposed to recessed as in other instances of connecting sections, the staff comment was that it should be the same material. Commissioner Danese stated that this was confusing, and that he thought there was a general desire that there be differentiation between historic and new construction, whereas making the front, including the connecting section, be all brick would tend to be counter to that.

Ms. Jones stated that the section being referred to as a connector is not a connector, and that the idea had been that other materials, i.e., for the roof and the cornice line, and the canopy as opposed to a pediment, as well as the suggested 1/1 window configuration, would serve to differentiate new from old. Ms. Jones stated that the overarching concern was that the mix of materials on the front [across both 2318 and 2320] would not be in keeping with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Danese expressed concern that relying on the smaller details to indicate the difference between old and new construction might create confusion.

Mr. Steele stated that the 2318 East Marshall Street property would sit back far enough that he thought there would not be confusion. Mr. Steele stated that the applicants are

trying to situate their property so as to respect both neighboring roof lines, and that their not wishing to use brick had been partly to differentiate the property from Adams Row.

Commissioner Bond asked if the property 2318 East Marshall would be partly brick and partly some other material. Ms. Jones confirmed this. Commissioner Bond stated that he did not see why the building could not all be one material, either brick or some other material, but stylistically contemporary so as to differentiate it.

Commissioner Bond stated that the new building at 2318 East Marshall being brick and only slightly different from 2320 East Marshall seemed confusing. Commissioner Bond suggested treating 2318 East Marshall like a rowhouse and giving it its own material and its own character.

Mr. Steele stated that the proposed structure at 2318 East Marshall is a modern building.

Commission Chair Johnson reiterated the suggestions about retaining the current stairs at 2320 and installing a gate of some kind, and stated that he had no problems with proposed designs for 2318 East Marshall, and for the rear property.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the gate idea was a good one, but that being on a stair, with the door kept in its current location, it would require a landing of some sort in order to be safe, which would push the stairs out into the public way and require a redesign.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the gate could open inward, since there is an interior alcove. Mr. Steele stated that a gate would have to open outward, since the stairs are continuous.

Mr. Steele stated that in the next, revised iteration of the project, the applicants would retain the front stair in its current configuration, and come up with a creative solution to the lighting and security concerns.

**The application 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.**

12. [COA-078396-2020](#) 3135 W. Franklin Street - Construct a new single-family residence on a vacant lot.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant representative, Mark Baker, stated that he and the applicant had a good understanding of the staff comments and suggestions. Mr. Baker stated that a Special Use Permit had been submitted to split the lot. Mr. Baker stated that the applicant has had some experience with the SUP procedure, with a recently approved project at 420 North 26th Street; this knowledge of the process is reflected in the relative simplicity of the submitted design. Mr. Baker stated that based on staff comments it is apparent that there are some contextual issues with the current submitted design.

Mr. Baker stated that stucco and brick are in use in the area. Mr. Baker requested that

the Commission share recommendations on desirable materials, and advise on whether the front façade of either brick or stucco could potentially transition to a hardi material or other synthetic material for the less visible sides and back. Mr. Baker stated that a consistent paint color would be used to make the transition less discernible.

Mr. Baker stated that the applicants had sent out notices to all property owners within 150 feet, and had not heard anything back, and that the applicants would be meeting with the Museum District Association soon.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment regarding this application. There was none.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the two-bay design did not bother him, as there is a newer building next door with a similar pattern. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed window pattern also works, and opens up the appearance of the building and asserts its modern character. Commissioner Wheeler stated that it would be nice if the masonry did wrap around, as this would help define the side of the building on which the windows are not in order. Commissioner Wheeler stated that, if it is not a zero lot line, adding windows on the other side of the building would help to provide termination points for the wrapped-around masonry.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she had nothing to add, and that she generally agreed with staff comments regarding the window configuration.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with comments of staff and other Commissioners, and stated that the roof line is a bit underwhelming and seems like it needs to be enhanced in some way.

Commissioner Danese stated that the right side elevation has at least a 3-foot setback, and that any setback less than 3 feet is going to prohibit any windows on that side. Commissioner Danese stated that the house is a bit confusing in that the design seems distinctly modern yet at the same time too conservative. Commissioner Danese expressed agreement with Commissioner Klaus regarding the underwhelming roof line.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Danese, and also with Commissioner Wheeler's comments about wrapping around the brick. Commission Chair Johnson stated that he likes 3-bay windows, and that something at the top of the building to give it more definition would be desirable.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he can see the applicants are going for a simple design, and it seems to be somewhat caught in between.

**The application 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.**

## Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:11 PM.