

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MINUTES

February 24, 2015

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, February 24, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder (arrived at 4:16)
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer (arrived at 5:10)
 Mr. Mathew Elmes

Members absent: Mr. Sanford Bond

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

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

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

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the January 27th minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 4-0-2.

Secretary Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that staff would ask that the Commission consider extending the appeal period by 75 days for 407 N. Allen Avenue. He stated that the owner will be providing a formal request to the CAR.

Mr. Yates made a motion to extend the appeal period by 75 days. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Palmquist stated that the new CAR Secretary will start on March 9th. Her name is Marianne Pitts and she is coming from a council liaison role for Councilman Samuels.

He stated that she has Master's Degree in City Planning from the University of Southern California and Historic Preservation experience working with the Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zones. Mr. Palmquist stated that they are very excited to have Ms. Pitts coming onboard and that they will be gradually training her and getting her up to speed.

Mr. Palmquist stated that the GRTC would like to offer a presentation to the Commission on the proposed Bus Rapid Transit System during the business portion of the March 24th meeting. Mr. Palmquist stated that the work is within the public right-of-way and will need no Certificate of Appropriateness but that the routes runs through the Broad Street Old and Historic District.

Mr. Green gave the Commission a brief description of the BRT system.

Mr. Yates inquired if he could get them to clarify how long the presentation is because they are pretty lengthy. Mr. Palmquist stated that he will ask them to do a condensed version of their presentation followed by questions and answers.

The Commission briefly discussed the Old and Historic District brochures being updated. Mr. Palmquist stated that the retreat was very successful and that they will follow up with Commission members regarding resource materials.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the Resolution of Appreciation for Ms. Mary Jane Hogue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Palmquist stated that they received some last minute comments on a couple of the projects and that there are no new enforcement notices.

Mr. Elmes showed the Commission a new synthetic handrail product that does not rot or decay like newer growth wood. He stated that it has aluminum brackets and that they come in a narrower form. The Commission members briefly discussed and looked at the product.

Mr. Hughes inquired about the Administrative Approvals and inquired if 3404 E. Broad Street was a new construction project that came to the Commission for review. Mr. Palmquist stated that they get permits for those projects that are already approved. Mr. Hughes stated that he was curious about the Oakwood Heights project in Churchill and Mr. Palmquist stated that a stop work was issued and that Mr. Hill can fill the members in on the current status.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Palmquist distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 50 approvals for the period from January 23, 2015 through February 23, 2015.

<u>Address</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Approval No.</u>
20 W. Leigh Street	Installation of Cali Bamboo Decking (slate gray) on front Porch and rear deck, including Stair steps and risers	A15-024
2705 E. Broad Street	Replace 60, 000 BTU gas	A15-025

	Furnace	
110 E. Leigh Street	Installation of gas furnace on Existing heat pump system	A15-026
2116 Venable Street	Demo inside, take out old walls	A15-027
2716 Monument Avenue	Detached garage	A15-028
7 N. Jefferson Street	Demolition only of existing guest Rooms, floor 1-6. Phase II no Structural demo-only non-load Bearing partition walls, plumbing Fixtures and finishes	A15-029
515 St. James Street	Demo of falling wall	A15-030
515 St. James Street	Demo falling wall and replace Replace wall that has been Demolished	A15-031
810 N. 21 st Street	Repair exterior brick wall using Same brick and matching Materials	A15-032
122 W. Leigh Street	Install sprinkler system for New museum	A15-033
205 S. Boulevard	Run three gas lines for gas Cook stoves	A15-034
205 S. Boulevard	Replace water lines and fixtures For three apartments	A15-035
815 N. 25 th Street	Plumb house to code. Install new Water, sewer line exterior/interior	A15-036
2818 E. Marshall Street	Remodel interior of home and add Small addition in rear utility for use	A15-037
321 N. 27 th Street	Remove rear kitchen chimney	A15-038
2610 E. Grace Street	Replacement unit of three-ton Heat pump with duct repairs and New grills	A15-039
404 W. Marshall Street	Rebuild double 15x6 deck	A15-040
521 N. 29 th Street	Final Trim	A15-041
1606 W. Grace Street	Installation of 20 solar panels On roof of residence using 20 Micro-inverters and ballasted Racking system	A15-042
2813 E. Grace Street	Cut floor joist and head off. Need To gain access to crawl area for Electrical and plumbing work	A15-043
3404 E. Broad Street	Construct 2-story single family Detached home on vacant lot	A15-044
2610 E. Grace Street	Installation of 3" MS-Horizon Balusters (24" height) on front Porch	A15-045
2818 E. Marshall Street	Variance for 4x4 utility addition At rear of property in alley	A15-046
2709 E. Marshall Street	Convert electric as shown in Drawing	A15-047
3309 W. Grace Street	Replace kitchens and bathrooms Remove non load bearings walls	A15-048

721 N. 24 th Street	And add closets, new HVAC Footing detail and wall bracing	A15-049
	Color new foundation rebuild deck Floor system at rear portion of house	
201 W. Broad Street	Install new wet sprinkler system And fire pump	A15-050
3321 E. Marshall Street	Upgrade kitchen, baths, electric, Plumbing, repair floors, wall and Paint.	A15-051

*meeting recessed at 3:47 p.m.

*meeting resumed at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Yates inquired about item # 3 on the agenda for 2717 E. Grace Street and noticed that a Notice of Violation was issued on 4/14 and the owners stated that the work was done to the house prior to their purchasing it in 2006. Mr. Yates asked was this a result of other projects that were brought to the CAR's attention and Mr. Palmquist stated yes.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item # 9 from the regular agenda to the consent agenda, including the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 4-2-0 (Elmes and Green opposed).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #11 from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion did not receive a second and failed.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #18 from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion did not receive a second and failed.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the consent agenda with the addition of application #9 per the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Consent Agenda

Application No. 15-009 (C. Skelly)

3005 E. Marshall Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-009 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to replace existing vinyl windows with wood windows, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-013 (R. & K. Sienkiewicz)

2717 W. Grace Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-013 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant request for approval of windows installed by previous owner, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-017 (D. Kleyman)

611-613 N. 21st Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-017 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify approved front porch plans, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-019 (F. Richardson)

1008 N. 25th Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved with conditions. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-019 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to uncover storefront window and install secure door, and

 WHEREAS, the glass for the storefront and front door be clear and non-tinted, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant provide staff with the specific paint colors being proposed for their review and approval, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-011 (C. Early)

514 W. 21st Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved with conditions. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-011 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace front, side and back doors, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant install either a wood six-panel door or a wood six-lite Craftsman door, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

*(Mr. Green recused himself)

Application No. 14-140 (North 29th Street LLC)

607-609 N. 29th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct two attached single-family residences on vacant lots in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that the applicant verify the ownership of the existing wooden retaining wall, or work with the property owner to replace the entirety of the wood retaining wall with the proposed brick wall. Staff recommends that a black membrane or metal roof be installed on the front porch in place of the proposed architectural shingles. Staff also recommends that vertical trim be installed between the two sides of the duplex on the front and rear elevations in order to provide a break between the two different colors of the façade.

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

Mr. Josh Romano, the owner, came up and answered questions.

There were no additional comments from the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the conditions in the staff report that the façade be divided by a trim member that will separate each house, that the front porch roof be black EPDM, and that the proposed bracketing details be omitted from the design of the front porch. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two attached single-family residence, and

 WHEREAS, the façade be divided between the two sides of the structure with a trim member, and

 WHEREAS, that a black EPDM roof be used above the front porch, and

 WHEREAS, the proposed bracketing details on the front porch be omitted, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

*(Mr. Green recused himself)

Application No. 14-142 (North 29th Street LLC)

615 N. 29th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a single-family residence on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition that the applicant verify ownership of the existing wooden retaining wall, or work with the property owner to replace the entirety of the wood retaining wall with the proposed brick wall.

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

Mr. Josh Romano, the owner of the property, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the conditions that the front porch roof be black EPDM, that composite shingles be used on the mansard and tower roofs, and that the proposed bracketing details on the front porch be omitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new single-family residence, and
 WHEREAS, that the black EPDM rood be used above the front porch, and
 WHEREAS, that composite shingles be used on the mansard and tower roofs, and
 WHEREAS, the proposed bracketing details on the front porch be omitted, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-012 (Instant Construction)

402-404 N. 29th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of rehabilitation work performed on the exterior of this structure in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff does not recommend approval of the project and recommends that the applicant return to the Commission with an updated application which details the restoration of the original roof frieze as evidenced by the ghosting of the original features, as well as restores the features of the porch, including the center railing between the two sides, to their original condition. Staff also commented that in regards to the siding, an amendable outcome could be the salvaging of all original beaded siding to the front façade of the structure, reserving the side and rear elevations for the new, replacement siding.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they replaced the siding on all four sides of the house and Mr. Palmquist stated yes.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they knew the condition of what historic siding was left on the side elevations. Mr. Palmquist stated that they can ask the applicant.

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

Mr. Leon Baptiste stated that the goal was to restore the property to its original state and that they weren't able to restore the siding on the side of the house because of molding and termite damage. Mr. Baptiste stated that the top freeze design is the original design from before and that a lot of wood was rotten so they had to replace a lot of it.

Mr. Hughes inquired if it was brand new on all sides and Mr. Baptiste stated yes, that they did the repair in-kind because it had major termite and mold damage. Mr. Baptiste stated the only thing they could restore was the façade of the property.

Mr. Green stated that on a photo from 2014 the bracket spacing on the freeze is very different than you would traditionally see, where brackets were spaced according to the windows beneath them. He stated that the new one doesn't reflect that. Mr. Baptiste stated that the previous owner told them that they tried to redesign it before they put the siding on it and they tried to mimic that as much as they could. Mr. Green stated that the spacing was relatively correct.

Ms. Sydnor inquired what the circles are and Mr. Baptiste stated that they are ventilation.

Mr. Elmes inquired further about the modified roof frieze and Mr. Baptiste stated that they did that because there were previously pockets for ventilation, so they drill the holes to allow for airflow. Mr. Elmes inquired about the original frieze you can see in the photograph with the removed siding, and Mr. Baptiste stated that they were all sealed with the design inside it and that there were pockets in them for ventilation.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the original building permit for this application ever showed any indication that exterior work or repairs was going to be done and Mr. Hill stated that all of this work was done on a permit for adding insulation to the walls. Mr. Elmes inquired about the staging of the work and Mr. Hill stated that they removed the aluminum siding, put a foam board up and reapplied the wood siding over that.

Mr. Elmes asked if they had insulation on the front and Mr. Baptiste stated that they insulated at the front but when they found out they could restore some of the siding they took it off and pieced it out where they could.

Mr. Yates stated that it appears from the photo of July 2014 that the front porch had already been reworked and that the railings and columns aren't original. Mr. Yates stated that doesn't really correct what was installed because the columns appear too spindly for the porch. Mr. Yates stated that the dentils were added and there is evidence that they were original to the house. He stated that their biggest concern is the cornice and realize that most of the decorative items were removed. Mr. Yates stated that something could have been done to affect the original design without completely replacing it and it appears that several of the original ventilators were intact. He stated that while there has been an attempt to restore what was there, that is not what he is seeing between the photograph taken in October and what is currently there.

Mr. Elmes stated that this work was done without an application and without the ability to see what was there at the time and that the photograph shows a standard cornice as it would have existed.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to deny the application for the reasons stated in the staff report and in the rehabilitation section of the Guidelines 114-930 of the City Code of Richmond. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Mr. Hill inquired if the Commission could give them some guidance for remediation of the application.

Mr. Elmes stated that typically they would rely on ghosting for a cornice replacement and that the ghosting there is visible. He stated that he can't see how the frieze is currently correct. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks the porch has obviously been reworked in the past and stated that the difficulty he is having with the siding is that the Guidelines state to retain the original wood feature such as cornice, brackets, windows and doorways surround, sashes and doors and maintain the historic reveal or exposure of siding and trim as it is important character defining feature. Mr. Elmes stated that he suggests that the cornice be reworked to the pictures that were available and stated that the porch is fine. He stated that his main issues are with the cornice and the frieze.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if Mr. Elmes was going to stay with staff report that required the applicant to fix the porch in regards to the center railing between the two sides. Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't have a problem with them replacing the center railing and supports staff's recommendations.

After further discussion the motion passed 7-0-0 to deny the application with recommendations for remediation.

Application No. 15-015 (W. Watson)

2913 E. Marshall Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the rehabilitation of a two-story residence in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that the applicant uses Richmond Rail for the rear balcony and that it be painted or opaquely stained. Staff also conditioned that additional drawings for the front porch and stucco specifications are requested prior to the approval of these items.

Mr. Green inquired if the additional information for approval has been received and Ms. Chen stated no.

Mr. Yates inquired if the photograph provided of the other house is an example of the proposed stucco and Ms. Chen stated yes.

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

Mr. William Watson stated that he is not sure what is required for the stucco.

Mr. Elmes stated that the Department of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation provides direction on specific material treatments.

Mr. Green stated that the composition of the stucco has to match the density for the brick that they are applying it on.

Mr. Elmes stated that they just want to make sure that the stucco is going to stay on the front and that he feels that the porch is okay with him.

Mr. Green stated that the Commission needs more specificity to ensure that they are all on the same page.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer added that for the owners benefit, the National Park Service that the members were discussing are called presentation briefs and they could do a search on the internet and find various preservation briefs that tells them about maintenance and repairs on different facades.

Mr. Yates stated that he agrees with some of the comments but stated that there is not sufficient details on the front and back porch for him to vote on this and that they need some additional drawings. Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't think they should dump this, or specifications for the stucco, in staff's lap.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application so the applicant could come back with detailed drawings on the front and rear porch and for the stucco.

Ms. Aaron-Sydnor added some helpful advice to the applicant and stated that the photograph of the neighboring house shows brackets and the owners' drawings doesn't. She stated that applicants drawings shows columns going from the floor to the porches roof, and they have brick piers with columns on top, and that these are some of things that the Commission needs clarity on as well as more dimensions.

Mr. Elmes stated that he believes that having photographic evidence on the porch they are planning on building with the dimensions on it relative to their property will work for

the applicant with dimensions for their property.

Mr. Hill stated that there were two questions here and that without having that drawing on file, they wouldn't be able to verify if the work performed matched what was proposed. He stated that the other question was if on the other hand, the reliance for the approval was entirely based on the photograph that was provided of this porch and whether or not the Commission agrees to replicate this porch on that house was the appropriate thing to do. Mr. Hill stated that for the Commission approval, if they understand that someone is giving an example but dimensioning it for application to their specific property, but that on the other hand may or may not suffice for when they apply for a building permit.

Mr. Elmes stated that an existing sister house might be the same dimensions.

After further discussion the motion to defer passed 8-0-0.

Application No. 15-016 (J. Ogrodnik)

713 N. 24th Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of rehabilitation work performed on the exterior of this structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project because the work completed is not consistent with the *Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, and insufficient information was provided to ensure that the repair of in-kind replacement of the siding and front porch will be carried out in an appropriate manner. Staff also recommends that the applicant return to the Commission with additional information related to the siding and porch repairs, and specifications for appropriate door and window replacement.

Mr. Yates inquired if there were prior photos of this house and Ms. Chen stated that all the windows and doors were boarded.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the owner hasn't provided any information on the condition of the existing windows prior to removing them and Ms. Chen stated no.

Mr. Green read the Guidelines pertaining to vinyl windows in Historic Districts.

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

Mr. Christabel Caceres stated that he spoke with a lady after he submitted the application and that he was unaware of the vinyl. He stated that the siding would be changed to wood and that he was also unaware of the composite of the doors and they will be changed to wood. Mr. Caceres stated that the windows are the exact size of the windows that were there and that the only thing that was done was the wood was replaced where it was rotted. Mr. Caceres stated the he was going to put on vinyl siding but he was told not to do that and that he would be using wood and he will be salvaging the wood for the façade. Mr. Caceres stated that whatever siding can't be salvaged, new wood would be installed on the side and the back.

Mr. Green inquired if they will salvaging the wood clapboards on the front and Mr. Caceres stated yes.

Mr. Caceres stated that he did not hand in plans for the rear porch and stated that they will be doing repair work. He stated that they can bring in the materials and plans and that it will have the black metal paneling for the roof.

Mr. Elmes stated that they have the opportunity to use Hardiplank on the side and rear of the house which would last longer than wood. Mr. Caceres stated that there were no windows and that it was only plywood boarded up. Mr. Elmes stated that the reason that it would be nice to have the pictures in the file is because this was an enforcement complaint. Mr. Caceres stated that this was a violation because they were abiding by city code. Mr. Elmes stated that there may be some symmetry if the two buildings matched on the front. Mr. Elmes stated that as far as the porch goes, it looks like the columns next door are exactly the same and inquired if they had the dentils and Mr. Caceres stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that they can do the original design.

Mr. Yates stated that it seems like Mr. Elmes is giving the owner the option of altering the porch and stated that the profile of the cornice and columns and porch need to remain. Mr. Elmes stated that he prefer to maintain the original historic fabric.

Ms. Elaine Odell a citizen from Union Hill stated that she has looked at this house a lot

during the last 25 years and that it is very important to the fabric of this community that they save as much historic integrity as they can and stated that she appreciates the staff report.

Mr. Caceres stated that the house was acquired 2 ½ years ago.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green stated that the applicant's suggestions are in line with what has been reflective in the staff report and stated that their primary goal is to retain as much of the historical fabric on the exterior as possible. Mr. Green stated that he struggling on how to move forward with the application.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the concerns noted in the staff report that the lapboard on the front of the house be repaired using materials from the side of the house or wooden siding materials for the lapboards and use Hardi plank on the side and rear and the windows should be wooden windows approved by staff, that the openings for the windows on the front be reduced in size to match the ones on the sister house's windows and that the porch be repaired to its original condition and the doors be return to wooden doors.

Mr. Yates stated that the staff report recommended not approving the project.

Mr. Elmes stated that he crafted the motion with recommendations in the staff report.

Mr. Green stated that he agrees with Mr. Elmes's suggestion but is confused about the motion and stated that they don't know what the materials are.

Mr. Hughes stated that they need to be clear about what they are approving.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to defer the application so that the applicant can return with a window schedule, what they are going to replace and with what materials, porch dimensions and what materials they are going to use, front step, doors and handrail and resizing of the front windows.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and passed 8-0-0.

*meeting recessed at 5:58

* meeting resumed at 6:06

Application No. 14-018 (B. & J. Reid)

510 N. 22nd Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the wood siding on the rear and side elevations with Hardiplank or equivalent siding, replace the existing wood privacy fence, infill an existing inset porch on the north side of the dwelling, construct a new 2-story rear porch, and alter the fenestration pattern on the rear elevation at this property in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the conditions that the use of Hardiplank or equivalent siding should be limited to the north elevation and that the porch infill should be more transparent on the west elevations and that the vinyl clad windows should not be used.

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

Ms. Jennifer Reid came up to answer questions and clarified some concerns.

Mr. Chris Jennings, a resident at 506 N. 22nd Street, stated that he has no problems with Hardiplank being an exterior material and that the wood porch would add some continuity to the roof of the house.

Mr. Charlie Field, a resident, stated that he has no problem with them using the Hardiplank.

Mr. Matt Conrad, resident of Union Hill, stated that he is agreement with the neighbors regarding the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with staff conditions that some delineation be shown. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 5-3-0 (Wimmer, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to enclose inset porch, modify rear window and door openings and construct two-story rear porch, and

 WHEREAS, the new fence be painted or stained or opaquely stained a color to be reviewed and approved by CAR staff, and

 WHEREAS, smooth Hardiplank may be used on the side and rear elevations,

 WHEREAS, the applicant has the option to show the delineation of the former inset porch, and

 WHEREAS, the new windows be wood sash or aluminum-clad wood sash with true simulated-divided lites, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Green, Elmes, Hughes, Hendricks, and Yates
 Negative: Bilder, Aarons-Sydnor and Wimmer
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-020 (A. Schuler)

818 N. 25th Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to repair and replace in-kind the wood siding and other wood elements, install a wood privacy fence, infill an existing two-story porch on the north side of the dwelling, and install new windows on the south elevation of this structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the conditions that the new fence should be painted or opaquely stained and the porch infill should be more transparent.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was a site plan submitted with the application to indicate where the property line is on the left side of the building and Ms. Chen stated no.

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

Mr. Bryan Traylor came up to answer questions and stated that the site plan was in the application.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the nearby two-story aluminum body was part of the applicant's property and Mr. Traylor stated that it is a different property.

Mr. Green stated that they submitted a photograph showing a double window on an infill porch but that the applicant is proposing a single window. Mr. Traylor stated yes and that he is calling it the pass-through light of the current existing porch wall and that you will be able to look from the inside of the structure right through the old window to the outside. Mr. Traylor stated that instead of trying to jam two small double windows in there he likes the look of one window in each bay. Mr. Traylor stated that closing the porch room will act as a hallway as opposed to true living space which is going to open up the back end of the house.

Ms. Aaron-Sydnor stated that in the floor plans and elevations it doesn't appear that the bays are equally spaced and Mr. Traylor stated that when they do the full remodel they will be equally spaced. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the new windows will not align with the existing windows and Mr. Traylor stated that they will be close and stated that if they get approval, the column will be embossed on the structure and they will be able to adjust that column over just a smidge. He stated that the drawings are plus or minus a couple of inches.

Ms. Elmes inquired if they were keeping the front door and Mr. Traylor stated yes, they are doing a lot of repair and replacing on this house and keep it as original as they can.

Mr. Bilder inquired if DHR approved the plan. Mr. Traylor stated that they are doing everything in keeping with DHR.

Mr. Green commented that it hasn't been approved yet and Mr. Traylor stated no, but they got a verbal thumbs up.

Mr. Green stated that if you look at drawings 2 of 2 and inquired if they are applying wainscoting on the exterior elevation and Mr. Traylor stated yes, 1" by 4". Mr. Green stated that he is confused when he reads this. He stated that if they read the intent of their Guidelines, that this was formally an open porch, and stated that he doesn't know how to read that with wainscoting on an exterior elevation. Mr. Green stated that it doesn't look like it was an open porch. Mr. Traylor stated that it is going to be 1" by 4" tongue and groove porch sealing that they repurpose to represent the handrail. Mr.

Green stated that is something you typically see either as a wainscoting that you are applying on a ceiling porch and not as something that you would see in place of a porch rail. Mr. Traylor stated that it is 1" by 4" on the picture that they presented to represent the handrail and that he detailed that with 2" by 4" to represent the actual handrail and the original columns to remain. What is left of the original columns will project towards the outside. Mr. Traylor stated that it is really the second floor where you see more of it than on the first floor because you see the fence there and that he can add some more detail.

Mr. Green stated that the only thing he thinks will work in there is the window replacement and that they are looking for transparency. Mr. Traylor stated that he can definitely add double windows on the second floor of the porch enclosure. Mr. Traylor stated that they can do 12 windows there instead of 6. Mr. Green stated that this is a pretty visible elevation and that the open porch is a character-defining feature. He stated that he is looking for more of a sense of transparency that tells him that this was a porch.

Mr. Elmes stated that normally they would apply Richmond rail to the outside of the structure. Mr. Traylor stated that they would also have a 1" by 10" that would be painted the trim colors and that between the paint colors and the different fabric of materials that he is proposing to use, that is going to illustrate and show the transparency. Mr. Traylor asked the Commission about the 1-over-1 windows to note that they are new windows. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks they are fine but that personally he sees where the applicant is coming from and that he is not sure how to make it more transparent.

Mr. Green read the Guidelines about the enclosure porches.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they are keeping the location of the porch stairs and bringing it into the interior and Mr. Traylor stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the rear elevation door head is significantly lower than the window head and Mr. Traylor stated that it is not to scale and that the top of the window is the same height as the door.

Mr. Matt Conrad, who lives at 819 N. 21st Street, stated that the lot has been vacant for 10 years and that they very much support the project as presented.

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

Mr. Yates stated that the porch is a character-defining feature and of the house and the current drawing does not convince him of it being an open porch and stated that they should check with zoning regarding the windows on the property line.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to defer the project until they hear from DHR. The motion received no second and failed.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve based on the staff report and based on the DHR approval.

Mr. Hill stated the scenario where part II was not approved, and the CAR approved this design but it was not approved by DHR. Mr. Elmes stated that they cannot supersede DHR and stated that part I and part II of the application has to coincide with the drawings that are being presented to CAR. Mr. Hill stated that it is usually couched in terms that if they want to approve this design, that any changes that are required by DHR can be brought to CAR staff for administrative approval.

Mr. Elmes restated that motion that he approves the application based on the staff report

and staff can contend with changes if they are brought back by DHR at their discretion.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and failed 3-5-0 (Green, Bilder Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Hendricks opposed).

Mr. Green stated that he likes the project but doesn't think the porch enclosure meets the CAR Guidelines.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the porches are two parts of the massing of the building and that he doesn't think the current application adequately addressed that through transparency.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to defer the application so the applicant could come back with a design in which the porch demonstrates some transparency. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Ms. Wimmer noted that she thinks that in regards to item #13 on page 67 of the Guidelines under porches, entrances and doors, that the intent of the Guidelines, in her interpretation, is that they don't erase the existence that a porch was there and also for porches that do have an ornate quality and a lot of ornament that they don't get erased. Ms. Wimmer stated that is why she was in support of the application because in this instance it's not an ornate porch and thinks what the applicant has proposed shows that the porch was there without erasing a lot of historic value.

After further discussion the motion to defer passed 5-3-0 (Elmes, Hughes and Wimmer opposed).

Application No. 14-023 (Michaux, LLC)

601-601 ½ N. 23rd Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct two attached single-family houses on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

Mr. Yates stated that the on the context elevation and the large elevation of the houses, the front doors don't match. Mr. Palmquist stated that new elevations of front door are correct.

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

Mr. Mike Alexander came up to answer questions.

Mr. Yates inquired if they are proposing the 6-panel door or the 2-panel door and Mr. Alexander stated that it would be a 6-panel door.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they were proposing double columns and Mr. Alexander stated that they are single columns. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the trim above and Mr. Alexander stated that it will be one piece of trim and one corbel.

Ms. Wimmer inquired on the rear elevation the TPO roof is noted as white on the drawing and wondered whether it was black or white and Mr. Alexander stated that they are using white on roof and EPDM black on the porches. Ms. Wimmer inquired if the head height of the windows on the rear align with the head heights of the windows on the side elevations and Mr. Alexander stated yes, that the first floor windows are 28" by 52".

Mr. Charlie Peele, a citizen of Union Hill, came up and gave his comments against approval of the project.

Ms. Elaine Odell, a citizen of Union Hill, came up and gave her comments and a presentation against approval of the project because it does not adequately address its context as a building at a street corner.

Mr. Russell Jones, a citizen of Union Hill, came up and gave his comments against approval of the project for similar reasons.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer stated that on the left elevation there is a door for the laundry room that seems to be going nowhere and asked if it was intended to be a door and Mr. Alexander stated yes, that there is a stoop that is between the existing house to the north and there will be a privacy fence along the side so the door won't be visible.

Mr. Elmes stated that when you look at the front façade and measure everything out, the windows are bigger than the doors and the first floor windows are wider than the 2nd floor windows and wider than the doors. Mr. Elmes stated that there seems to be a scale issue with the typical horizontal fenestration and stated that the windows seem too wide.

Mr. Yates stated that he also thinks the windows are too wide and the cornice is too flat.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has some concerns with the drawings as well and stated in particular that the head heights of the windows should be the same height all

the way around.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant a chance to do some detail modifications of the drawings. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 8-0-0.

Application No. 14-025 (B. & M. Blinn)

525 N. 1st Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request of approval for various rehabilitation items pertaining to the front porch, back deck, and windows on this structure in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the conditions that on the proposed storm windows meeting the requirements set forth by the Guidelines, including that they do not obscure the historic fabric of the windows and are painted to match the color of the window trim. The applicant is advised to work with staff to seek administrative approval for any new paint colors, using the CAR paint color palette as reference. Finally, staff recommends that any changes required by the National Park Services for tax credit purposes be deferred to Commission staff for final review and approval.

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

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application as presented with the staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate front porch, back deck, and window and window replacement, and

 WHEREAS, that the storm windows do not obscure the historic fabric of the windows and the be painted to match the color of the window trim, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant work with CAR staff to seek administrative approval of proposed paint colors, and

 WHEREAS, any changes required by the National Park Services or the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for tax credit purposes be deferred to Commission staff for final review and approval, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Application No. 15-022 (W. R. Jones)

425 N. 25th Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a new mixed-use building on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The proposal is for the construction of a three-story building with commercial on the first floor and residential on the second and third floors.

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

Mr. Russell Jones, owner of the property, stated that he didn't offer any colors or materials because he wanted the Commission's feedback first. Mr. Jones stated that the only unusual thing that he might be considering doing is down lighting between the first and second floor in the cornice as it comes around the front and that the light will not be shinning in anyone's eyes as it will be aimed down towards the ground and that it would be some type of modern LED. Mr. Jones stated that the upper portion of the building is outdoor space and there are two apartment so you will be able to go to the second floor of the front apartment and you could walk out into an area of outdoor space. Mr. Jones stated that if you look at the front elevation there is an entrance door to the right and one on the rear.

Mr. Yates inquired about the fenestration on the 3rd floor for the window and door openings. Mr. Jones stated that they didn't put any on the side, they will be on the front and in the rear facing to the east and west. He stated that on the other side there is zero lot lines on the right so there are no penetrations there.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the mass on the 3rd floor is an enclosed indoor spaces and Mr. Jones stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they thought about having a basement and Mr. Jones stated that there could be but that they haven't got that far yet.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green stated that he likes the way the design turns the corner and the fact that it is addressing its primary and secondary elevation. Mr. Green stated that his one cause for concern is the 3rd floor addition and that on the secondary street side it is really kind of blunt and out of character with the rest of the neighborhood and stated that it needs to be set in and opened with some windows. Mr. Green stated that it is too heavy and it doesn't really work with the rest of the building. Mr. Jones inquired if they want them to deemphasize the 3rd floor and Mr. Green stated yes. Mr. Jones stated that they were trying to create an outdoor space and that they will deemphasize it and set it back.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she would echo with Mr. Green, particularly that the side elevation is a form that seems very unusual in the district. She stated that on the corner treatment she agrees with Mr. Green that the corner post seems a bit chunky. Ms. Wimmer stated that a lot of times on these corner buildings, especially in downtown, you will see a little bit different column on the corner rather than just carving out of the storefront.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated she concurs with the other members and stated that typically you see a steel post instead of a brick pier.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he is comfortable with the 3rd floor just deemphasizing it and stated that he concurs otherwise.

Mr. Yates stated that he thinks the way the fenestration is handled on the third floor was going to make it or break it and that he would be interested to know what the building materials are because it's really hard to get a handle on it.

Mr. Elmes stated that he agrees that the overall form is fine and he doesn't think it will be a problem if it was Hardiplank. He stated that because it's a corner lot and it is commercial it may have a little bit more life if there is some delineation or watertable or something like that. Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't have a problem with the third floor and stated that the shape can be adjusted to some degree and that it could be curved which will bring down the feeling of the massing on top of the building. Mr. Elmes stated that shedding might bring it down a little bit as well.

Mr. Green stated that they need to be clear about the materials and showing the citing in its context with the other buildings and getting the corner shown.

Mr. Jones inquired if they could be more specific about breaking up the south elevation and Mr. Elmes stated that they could do Hardiplank siding and that it would be an advantage to this building by having something to break up the horizontal runs of siding either by using some Hardi panel sections in it or a water table band.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the applicant is welcome to come back as many times as they want for conceptual review.

Application No. 15-024 (R. Cross)

1906 Princess Anne Avenue

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of four, new attached single-family houses in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The proposed new construction is located at the end of Princess Anne Avenue; a dead end street lined with an eclectic mix of late-nineteen and early-twentieth century single-family dwellings and duplexes.

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

Mr. Michael Cross, the architect and former Churchill property owner, stated that they look at this as an excited project and that they are going to be introducing LEED certified homes in the historic part of the City Of Richmond. Mr. Cross stated that they believe this an architectural bookend to a magnificent street and that he had his eye on this piece of property for over eight years. Mr. Cross stated that he purchased the property last year and has been following the CAR Guidelines in helping them to design it. Mr. Cross stated that they have put forth a number of precedent properties throughout the district to get design elements that they feel compliment historic buildings. Mr. Cross stated that it is not possible to replicate, nor should they replicate the historic structures along the street, but be a compliment to that and add to the end of this street. Mr. Cross stated that they do propose the radical section of turning the building 90 degrees to Princess Anne and stated that the street dead ends due to a parking situation at the end. Mr. Cross stated that people coming to view the city skyline from Jefferson Park pull up and park at the end of this street. Mr. Cross stated that on the other block it is a 45 degree hill so there is no way around the end of the street. Mr. Cross stated that they see this as a corner situation and therefore has put in a mews, which is walkway that separates the front of their new construction from the existing home at 1910 Princess Anne Avenue. Mr. Cross stated that he met with neighborhood representatives last week and stated that one of the recommendations they had was to put in a security fence. Mr. Cross stated that he appreciates the Commission's time and comments.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the intent is that the occupants will access the parking spaces from the alley and Mr. Cross stated yes, that they put four off-street parking spaces along the alley. There will be two parking spaces for the public.

Mr. Chris Faiyle, a neighbor, stated that this is an extremely unexciting project that is facing the wrong way and that he does not support the project.

Mr. Eugene Smith, a neighbor, stated his disapproval of the project which is unusual being that the occupants will be looking at the alley. He stated that it is unusual because it does not face Princess Anne Avenue. Mr. Smith is not in support of the project.

Mr. Matt Conrad, a resident of 202 Princess Anne Avenue, came up and gave his comments against the design of the proposal and the project.

Ms. Elaine O'Dell, a resident of 25 years on Princess Anne Avenue came up, and gave her comments against the design and approval of the project.

Mr. Charlie Fields, a citizen of Union Hill, came up and gave his comments against approval of the project and stated that it is featureless and disconnected and that he is against the project.

Ms. Mary Fields, a citizen of Union Hill, came up and gave her comments against the approval of the project and she also emailed comments to the Commission. Ms. Fields stated that the project is disconnected from the neighborhood and the massing is too big.

Mr. Brook Smurge, a resident at Princess Anne Avenue, came up and gave her comments against the approval and design of the project. Mr. Smurge feels that the plans are incompatible, in scale and design, with the rest of the streetscape and that the plans are incomplete and not adequate for a conceptual review.

Mr. Kenneth Samuels, a resident of Princess Anne Avenue, stated that he agrees and concurs with his neighbors' concerns and is against the approval of the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hughes stated that the project is not addressing the main road and that he likes the idea of having something different, but that he has to agree that they haven't addressed the street at all.

Mr. Yates stated that he commends the developer and the architect for doing something contemporary in the city and stated that he has a real issue with the fact that these houses are turned 90 degree from Princess Anne Avenue. Mr. Yates stated that there were four houses on this site and they faced Princess Anne, granted that they were smaller than what is shown here. Mr. Yates stated that the buildings are significantly taller and doesn't think the height is compatible with the existing houses that are there. He stated that the lack of orientation to Princess Anne Avenue is what really bothers him. Mr. Yates stated that he does think the site plan needs to be revised so that it is a little more clear as to the direction the houses are facing.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she loves the fact that this a LEED for homes project and stated that she thinks the citing and form of the building are problematic. Mr. Wimmer also stated that what looks like firewalls is unusual for this district and that this would be more appropriate in a warehouse district. Ms. Wimmer stated that the fenestration patterns are a bit problematic as the triple windows facing the park doesn't really speak to the rest of the fenestration on the building and that even that corner doesn't speak to itself.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she wants to commend the developer for doing the LEED for homes project and for trying to do something modern. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she echoes Ms. Wimmer about the industrial look, and that the steel headers don't seem appropriate in this area. She stated that she understands the need to try and break up the façade along the Princess Anne elevation but that the hyphen appears too wide to be a hyphen. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the elevation needs to have more done to it to address Princess Anne Avenue and that she thinks it's possible that the design could be resolved so that it maintains the mews format if the Princess Anne elevation is changed. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she wonders if the city would be open to going to its original layout of the street so that the building will have more street frontage to allow more parking at the front.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he agrees with all of the positive and some of the negatives that have been said. He stated that the front porch is such a prevalent feature on this block and it is kind of missing here and that it should be incorporated in some fashion.

Mr. Green stated that in regards to new construction projects, the context for review begins with the building and its immediate neighbors but also expands to include

surrounding buildings and block facing across the street within the historic district. Mr. Greens stated that is where this building falls short and that it has a rich context there and they are not addressing that. Mr. Green stated that they have no balcony or porch that looks into the park and stated that its turns away from the neighbors and it's a loss to shear off from the neighborhood like that.

Mr. Elmes stated that besides the Guidelines and thinking about this development if money were no object, and they can build whatever they want to build, it still seems like the orientation of the building should primarily face the park because that is where the primary view sheds and streetscape really are. Mr. Elmes stated that he sees other opportunities for capturing the downtown vistas and stated that he sees a community rooftop situation and thinks that the idea of pulling down slightly into the ground but maintaining the fenestration and porch heights with the existing streetscape of houses really serves to unify that street and primary viewshed of the park. Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't think that it's mutually exclusive in taking away a downtown vista or downtown viewshed. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks there is another opportunity to have some sort of viewshed of downtown in each unit or as a community for the units and stated that the project itself is a modern façade and works well and they greatly appreciate that.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she wants to address the corrugated metal on all four facades and that it could be acceptable on the north and the west elevations but she doesn't think it will be appropriate on the Princess Anne Avenue elevation or on the east elevation.

Mr. Cross thanked the Commission and community.

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review