



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
www.Richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, November 25, 2014

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

2 Roll Call

Present: 6 - Sanford Bond, Matthew Elmes, Bryan Green, Joseph Yates, Jennifer Wimmer and Gerald Jason Hendricks

Absent: 3 - Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Nathan Hughes and Joshua Bilder

Staff Present

James Hill, PDR
William Palmquist, PDR
Tara Ross, PDR

3 Approval of Minutes

[ID 14-059](#) October 28, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Min 10-28-2014 FINAL.pdf](#)

The Commission stated that Mr. Todd Dkyson should be spelled "Dykshorn."

A motion was made by Mr. Bond, seconded by Mr. Yates, that the minutes from the October 28, 2014 meeting be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

4 Discussion and adoption of proposed changes to Mural Guidelines

The Commission introduced, discussed and revised the Mural Guidelines. The Commission came to a consensus to strike number 6 from the Mural Guidelines.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, to approve the revised Mural Guidelines as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

5 Other Business

Secretary's Report (including 2015 Calendar)

Mr. Hill stated that he had a training session with Ms. Rebecca Aaron-Sydnor and gave her a copy of the current Old and Historic Review guidelines and with the adoption of

the Mural Guidelines they will incorporate these into a new addition that also includes the new recently adopted revisions to the New Construction guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that the new construction staff reports were still modeled on the previous new construction guidelines and they are going to update the template that they use for staff reports to model the revised guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that they will start the New Year off with the new revised guidelines and updated template for review of new construction.

Ms. Wimmer inquired what guidelines were on the website and Mr. Hill stated that they are the previous ones and that they will be updated as well.

Mr. Hill stated that the property at 307 N. 21st Street, where the Commission approved demolition and reconstruction of a single-family house, ran into a zoning issue and must go to the Zoning Board and Appeals. They must meet the required 4ft setback and Mr. Hill stated that they drafted a letter of support on behalf of the Commission to the Board of Zoning Appeal and wanted to know if the Commission was willing to support the letter.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the first and last paragraph the word "Review" is missing from "Commission of Architectural Review."

Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve the letter of support with the revisions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Hill stated that they received a request for an extension for the appeal by the owner at 407 N. Allen Avenue and that staff was fine with the extension because they are working with them.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to grant the applicant the 75 day extension. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Hill stated that in regards to the window replacement at 21 W. Clay Street which was deferred from the last meeting, staff has been in discussion with the owner and they are not replacing the windows but instead they are repairing them. Mr. Hill stated that they are withdrawing their application and will be installing Velv-A-Lume storm windows and which staff can administratively approve.

Mr. Hill discussed the dates for the 2015 meetings, the quarterly business meeting and the February date for the retreat.

The Commission members came to a consensus to discuss the dates at the next meeting to give Commission members time to look at their schedules.

Mr. Hill stated that they are having trouble filling the Secretary's position and that they are working with Human Resources to get someone in that position.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Hill distributed the Administrative Approval Report which covers most of 2014 and some unreported approvals from 2012 and 2013. Mr. Hill stated that now that staff is caught up with entering the back log of administrative approvals, future administrative approval reports will be more regular and current.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that regarding 2300 Venable Street, they have been speaking with

the owner's representative who will be submitting an application for the January meeting for the siding replacement and reconstruction of the storefront cornice. Mr. Palmquist stated that they also spoke with the owner of 823 Mosby Street who will be submitting an application for the January meeting. The applicant for 312 N. 33rd Street, which is the Lavaloft Apartments, will be removing their banner sign and therefore their item was removed from the meeting agenda. Staff issued an NOV at 10 W. Broad Street for non-approved signage. Staff will be issuing an NOV in the 600-block of N. 25th Street for a lot of changes over the years without any permits. They will be issuing an NOV in the 600-block of N. 27th Street for the replacement of porch columns and railings. Mr. Palmquist stated that they will be investigating the replacement of porch columns and siding in the 500-block of W. 20th Street and they are investigating the replacement of windows in the 600-block N. 21st Street. They are also investigating installation of some satellite dishes in the front yards in the 3100-block of E. Broad Street. They have been working with the owner to complete an application for the ongoing work in the 400-block of N. 29th Street and they are trying to get a complete application and if that doesn't work out they will take the necessary steps. Mr. Palmquist stated that they are also looking into the installation of signage at 1600 Monument where the patio was approved a few months ago for a restaurant. There is some additional signage that may or may not have been approved.

Mr. Elmes inquired if there was any modification on a building permit or application for the N. 29th Street property and Mr. Palmquist stated no.

Other Committee Reports

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that there were three items on the agenda for the November 6th UDC meeting for final location, character and extent review, including a roundabout at the off-ramp from interstate 95 to the off-ramp at Grayland and the final review for the Richmond Police Canine Training Facility which received final approval, as well as a conceptual review for a telecommunications monopole at the Fire Station at 8800 Huguenot Road.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Elmes inquired about application #7 for 3412 E. Broad Street and asked if they were dictating the stain color and Mr. Palmquist stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to move item #14 for 2610 E. Grace Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda based on the comments in the staff report.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was still some question about the proposed porch railing and Mr. Hill stated that was one item for discussion and that they proposed a railing that is in more in line of a Colonial Revival railing. The house next door has columns that are turned down and don't taper. It is more in keeping with the spools and the spindle freeze and that was the only issue with that. Mr. Hill stated that the question was whether the proposed balusters were appropriate.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they will be able to source the metal shingles and Mr. Hill stated that they are planning to salvage the existing metal shingles.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and failed 2-4-0 (Elmes, Yates, Green and Hendricks opposed).

A motion was made by Mr. Bond, seconded by Mr. Yates, that the Consent Agenda items be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

- 1 [CAR No. 2014-127](#) 2306 E. Marshall Street - Replace porch decking with composite material

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 2 [CAR No. 2014-143](#) 401 W. Marshall Street - Replace non-primary elevation with Hardiplank siding

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the Hardiplank reveal and color closely match that of the existing wood siding and shall have a smooth finish, rather than the raised wood-grain finish.

- 3 [CAR No. 2014-126](#) 2035 Monument Avenue - Enclose rear porch, remove rear spotlight and conduit, replicate missing downspout scupper

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 4 [CAR No. 2014-128](#) 7 E. Broad Street - Rehabilitate building exterior

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the following conditions: the work shall be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant shall submit any additional conditions imposed by DHR or the National Park Service to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

- 5 [CAR No. 2014-129](#) 2209 Monument Avenue - Demolish non-historic addition, add exterior door, and relocate front east gate

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 6 [CAR No. 2014-130](#) 119 E. Leigh Street - Restore storefront elevations and construct new infill portion

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the following conditions: the work shall be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant shall submit any additional conditions imposed by DHR or the National Park Service to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

- 7 [CAR No. 2014-134](#) 3412 E. Broad Street - Construct rear deck and balcony

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the deck and balcony shall be painted or stained with an opaque stain a neutral color complementary to the color of the building. The applicant shall submit information on the selected color and the lighting to be installed to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

- 8 [CAR No. 2014-136](#) 403 N. Allen Avenue - Replace asphalt shingles to match color of surviving historic clay tile

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 10 [CAR No. 2014-120](#) 21 W. Clay Street - Replace 6/6 wood windows with 6/6 vinyl windows

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

- 11 [CAR No. 2014-124](#) 2307 E. Clay Street - Construct new single-family residence

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a single-family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. Hill stated that in the front of the packet there is a letter from a member of the public who had voiced their concerns regarding the project.

Mr. David Clinger, the architect, came up to answer questions and concerns.

Mr. Green stated that their question was about the massing of the side-wing stair tower and asked if he could explain any changes that have been made to modify or address the concerns. Mr. Clinger stated that they eliminated the room on the front and pushed the stair tower back 7 feet.

Mr. Elmes asked if there are other examples of this type of architecture in the immediate area and Mr. Clinger stated that not on that particular block but it is found in the next two blocks. Mr. Elmes inquired if that would include the metal railings and roof styles and Mr. Clinger stated that there are some that have metal iron railings and that they are willing to use wood and the owner wanted to do some decorative iron railings that would fit in the district. Mr. Elmes stated that with regards to the Guidelines, they don't feel that the massing relative to the square feet is larger. Mr. Clinger stated that he thinks it's within reason of the other surrounding properties and that they will fit it in just fine. Mr. Elmes stated that it is an unusual lot and the total massing on the front facade isn't quite as large and Mr. Clinger stated that with this size of massing that it fits in fairly well. Mr. Elmes stated that it is a large massing for the front façade. Mr. Clinger stated that he hoped that the recessing it back will help eliminate the massing.

Mr. Bond stated that he has a problem with the stair tower and it looks so tacked on that it doesn't look like part of the structure and wonders if there was a way to integrate it more into the house.

Mr. Green read the letter of rejection from the residents at 417 N. 21st Street into the minutes.

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

Ms. Wimmer applauded the applicant and the architect for choosing an underutilized style for new construction but states she agrees with the Commission members and that part of the issue is that the stair tower looks like it is supposed to be an addition but it is not subordinate to the main structure in terms of massing. Ms. Wimmer stated that she also has an issue with use of materials in this instance and the fenestration patterns don't seem to be compatible at the stair tower, as well as beside and above the door.

Mr. Green stated that he would like to see the stair tower integrated fully into the building or expressed more shallowly as a feature and that this is just not something they see in the historic district.

Mr. Yates stated that most houses are narrower and he agrees that the scale of the windows are larger and if the fenestration was aligned between the first and second floor, it would help.

Mr. Bond stated that if they move the door over to the center, it might help align it.

Mr. Elmes stated that he wanted to know if this was compatible within the district.

Ms. Wimmer stated that it is a proportion and massing issue.

The Commission continued their discussion briefly and came to the consensus to defer the application.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Ms. Wimmer, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

12 [CAR No. 2014-131](#) 3404 E. Broad Street - Construct new single-family residence

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

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Andy Beach, the contractor for the project, stated that he examined the information in the CAR Guidelines and that he believes the project complements, and fits into the neighborhood.

Mr. Bond stated that one drawing has nine risers and the other drawing has eight and the other has six. Mr. Beach stated that until they set the base of the walls, they can't determine exactly how many stairs there will be.

Mr. Elmes stated that the one floor says four-feet plus or minus.

Mr. Bond stated that he is curious where they are putting the first floor relative to the building. Mr. Beach stated that it will be four inches above the sidewalk at the front of the building.

Mr. Elmes stated that because there is a fairly strong linear comparison to the other homes, in a perfect world the porches and fenestration would all line-up. He inquired if the intent is to line up the porch with the other buildings to the east. Mr. Beach stated that they will align with the other houses. Mr. Elmes stated that because of the width of the house and the width of the front porch, the center column really jams up the whole front porch. Mr. Beach stated that he could remove that.

Mr. Green inquired if the porch will be covered and Mr. Beach stated that all of it will be covered.

Mr. Yates stated that most houses in this block have attics with a story over the front portion and that his issue with the design and is that it needs an attic story to be compatible along the block.

Mr. Green stated that they could add dormers for verticality and Mr. Beach stated that they could add a dormer over the bay.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

- 14 [CAR No. 2014-137](#) 2610 E. Grace Street - Demolish non-historic rear addition, rehabilitate front and rear porches

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to repair and/or replace elements on both the front and rear porches at a residence in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. James Flanagan stated that they will be happy to work with staff.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant work with Commission staff to model the profile of the porch closely to that of the house to the west. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

- 15 [CAR No. 2014-138](#) 2025 Venable Street - Replace frame rear addition with new construction

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to demolish a non-original addition and construct a new addition in its place, as well as to

rehabilitate the building's storefront and make site improvements at this property in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Todd Beach came up and gave a brief description of the project and their intentions.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- That the new addition is clad in cement board siding with a smooth finish with no faux grain.
- That the staff review and approve an appropriate paint color for the addition from the CAR paint color palette.
- That the applicant have staff review and approve the proposed fence and gate design.
- That the applicant shall submit any additional conditions imposed by DHR or the National Park Service to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

- 16 [CAR No. 2014-139](#) 535 W. Broad Street - Construct new commercial building and parking area

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new commercial building and parking area in the Broad Street Old and Historic District. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards of New Construction and staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. Barry Byrd came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 18 [CAR No. 2014-132](#) 1914 E. Franklin Street - Construct new multi-family development

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a new five-story multi-family apartment building that incorporates two levels of structured podium parking in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. George Ebersson stated they came to get feedback.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she agrees with all of Mr. Hill's comments and concurred that this appears more like a building suited for a commercial strip area rather than a manufacturing area. She also noted that what appears to be firewalls separating the abys is unusual for the district. Ms. Wimmer stated that rustification is on the ground floor and she is not sure if any is in this district. She stated that the fenestration patterns seem to be fairly consistent until you get to the top floor. Ms. Wimmer stated that along the lines of fenestration, the three big entry pieces looks like spandrel panels which is foreign to the district.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he was glad to hear that Land Use might be requiring some ground use and commercial space and stated that his biggest issue is with the parking garage on the first two floors over the entire structure and hoped that they get some more activity on the ground floor. Mr. Hendricks commented that they are not looking for the Juliet Balconies, they want something that is substantial and usable.

Mr. Bond stated that he finds the design to be a little frenetic and it's in an industrial area. He stated that the design can't figure out whether it wants to be a line of row houses, commercial space, or industrial space and that it needs to decide what it is. Mr. Bond stated that he would be happy to see something that is large and monolithic like an industrial building and that they don't have to use brick necessarily because it's a new building. Mr. Bond stated that there are new materials out there and that they still can have a massive building.

Mr. Yates stated that his concern is that there seems to be too much going on within the building and the other large buildings in the neighborhood are monolithic and carry a theme throughout the entire façade. Mr. Yates stated that it needs to calm down a little bit so that it fits better in the neighborhood and more closely resembles the historic factory buildings that are there.

Mr. Green stated that he would recommend that they simplify the design a little and that the old CAR Guidelines encouraged people to do small bays and setbacks. He stated that they were seeing buildings that were approaching full city blocks faces, that actually worked against itself. By breaking it down into so many bays the building seems bigger and busier. Mr. Green commented that they were trying to encourage with the new construction guidelines that applicants create single large buildings or two large buildings. He stated that this neighborhood takes larger buildings really well. Mr. Green went on to say that that if it is simplified in character, the building can be really big and not feel like it's imposing on the neighborhood.

The Commission members encouraged the applicant to look at other large buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Elmes stated that in looking at this initially he remembered the E. Clay and 18th Street project where there was a lot of undulation moving in and out of the bays. He was unclear what was capping it and it seemed a little frenetic. Mr. Elmes stated that when you talk about compatibility in that area, there are a lot of different cues to take from and stated that he is not finding any specifically here in this design that really aligns itself to the other buildings surrounding it. Mr. Elmes stated that the form seems to be more suburban and that there is a lot going on. He stated that a lot of that could be the fenestration because he is having difficulty to see how the floors are aligned horizontally. Mr. Elmes stated that his issue is more with the compatibility issue and whether it fits with other building in the district. He stated that he doesn't have a lot of concern with the parking lot, but the building seems incompatible with the immediate structures because it moves in and out.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they will be interested to know where the HVAC will be going.

The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity.

- 19 [CAR No. 2014-135](#) 3000-3006 E. Franklin Street - Construct three attached townhouses

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of up to three attached, single-family dwellings at lots fronting East Franklin Street in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. Jeff Bunch came up to answer questions.

Mr. Bond stated that the garage is fine and stated that this is an unusual situation with an opportunity to do something a little different.

Mr. Elmes stated that the topography is flattened out and is a lot more dramatic in the back. Mr. Bunch stated that it does fall back but not as dramatic as the rest of the hill.

There was no public comment. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes stated that garages don't exist in the city and that it has to be detailed carefully to work. He stated that the overall form is fine and is similar to other forms. Mr. Elmes stated that it seem like there would be a natural joining of house there and the houses could be more like townhouses.

Mr. Yates stated that he appreciates the opportunity to go off the grid and doesn't know a single house in the city that has this configuration and that he has a problem with front facing garages. He stated that there are other ways to get around this issue.

Mr. Green stated that the general form of the house is fine but that he has a problem

with a front garage because it's a foreign design in the district. He stated that they have not approved it in the past and stated that it will set a precedent for it. Mr. Green stated that he supports the building but not the garage.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he couldn't support a front facing garage.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the way to continue the urban fabric is to reinforce the use of alleys and streets.

Mr. Elmes stated that they appreciate the comments and that he doesn't know if they are going to have an opportunity to drive behind the building or have a yard in the back unless the parking is beside the house.

The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 9 [CAR No. 2014-118](#) 2109-2111 M Street - Construct two new single-family residences

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

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct two new single-family residences on two vacant lots located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist stated that staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green inquired if the rail will be painted or be a metal rail and Mr. Palmquist stated that it will be a wood Richmond railing.

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

Mr. Allan Watkins came up to answer questions and gave a brief description of the project and stated that they will be using Richmond rail.

The Commission members and applicant discussed the project.

There were no additional public comment. The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- That the porch roof be a metal or membrane roof.
- That Richmond Rail be used for the balusters.
- That the presented corbels and porch posts be installed.
- That the windows have simulated divided lites.
- That the windows installed reflect those shown on the elevations drawings.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

- 17 [CAR No. 2014-141](#) 2912 E. Leigh Street - Construct new single-family residence

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

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a new single-family dwelling at two vacant lots located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Zach Kennedy came up to answer Commission questions.

There were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussion began

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the approval only applies to the new front steps design. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

Excused: 1 - Bond

- 13 [CAR No. 2014-133](#) 2818 E. Marshall Street - Restore facade, construct rear deck and balcony

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

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to repair the front porch, replace windows and construct a rear porch and deck in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends the approval of the project with conditions.

Ms. Wimmer asked if the rear second floor deck is visible from the public right-of-way and Mr. Hill stated that he could make a recommendation that they use a closed Richmond Rail.

Mr. Green opened the floor for public comment.

There was no applicant present and there were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred because of several questions and concerns for which the applicant was not present to discuss.

Aye: 5 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer and Hendricks

Excused: 1 - Bond

Adjournment

Mr. Hill thanked Ms. Kathleen Onufer and Ms. Kim Chen for helping them write the staff reports.

Mr. Hill apologized to the Commission for the snacks due to the keys being locked in the Executive Secretary's desk.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the house at 21 W. Clay Street. Mr. Hill stated that Old House Authority is repairing each window and they are going to install Velv-A-Lume storm windows which can be administratively approved.

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.