

## COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

### MINUTES

October 28, 2014

---

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, October 28, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present:            Mr. Bryan Green, Chair  
                                      Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair  
                                      Mr. Joshua Bilder (arrived at 3:49)  
                                      Mr. Sanford Bond  
                                      Mr. Mathew Elmes  
                                      Mr. Jason Hendricks  
                                      Mr. Nathan Hughes  
                                      Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor

Members absent:            Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

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

Others present:              See attached sign-in sheet

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

Mr. Green introduced the new Commission member Ms. Rebecca Aaron-Sydnor to the Commission members.

#### **Approval of the Minutes:**

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the September 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 4-0-2 (Hughes and Aarons-Sydnor abstained).

### **Revisions to the Mural Guidelines**

The Commission introduced and discussed the revised Mural Guidelines and decided that the members go over them and they will vote on them at the next meeting.

### **Policies and Operating Procedures**

The Commission briefly discussed the revision to the policies and operating procedures.

Mr. Bond made a motion to adopt the revised Policies and Operating Procedures as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

### **Updates to the CAR Guidelines**

Mr. Green stated that the Commission had voted at the last meeting on the updated CAR Guidelines for new construction.

Mr. Palmquist stated that they have been updating the actual document and stated that this it is a draft layout of the new section because they split up new construction into residential and commercial. Mr. Palmquist stated that they moved some images around and that the text is what was approved. Mr. Palmquist stated that they reworked the paint section and they digitized the paint pallet with the Sherwin Williams paint colors.

Mr. Hill stated that they had one more suggestion, that because when they are looking at vinyl windows there is confusion in the public and City Council about why vinyl windows are not acceptable. Mr. Hill stated that if the Commission wants, they can recommend that they introduce a statement about vinyl windows are rarely or seldom approved or not appropriate for use. Mr. Hill stated that they can say that it is because material cannot be manufactured to model effectively the appearance of historic windows. Mr. Hill stated that if that is okay they will insert that where the vinyl windows appears in the Guidelines.

The Commission briefly discussed vinyl windows.

Mr. Yates made a motion to adopt the updates to the CAR Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

### **Secretary Report**

Mr. Hill introduced Ms. Rebecca Aaron-Sydnor to the Commission to a new appointed 3 year term and stated that Mr. Bond has been appointed for a 3 year term. Mr. Hill stated that the Houghton court case for 2916 Monument Avenue is scheduled for November 7<sup>th</sup> at 10am and that at this point it will probably go forward. When they last went to court the lawyer asked for a continuance so hopefully it will start then. Mr. Hill stated that the owner at 407 N. Allen Avenue filed an appeal and staff filed a response to that appeal and as of yet they don't have a schedule or dates for when this will go before City Council or Land Use.

Mr. Hill stated that the interviews for the Secretary Support staff for the Commission are on-going. They will be holding two interviews later this week and two interviews the following week. He hopes that they will get a clear consensus from the panel to be able to make an offer and he is hopeful that they may have someone on board in December. Mr. Hill stated that they passed out the roster and thinks that there is some need for updates to that and that they need the Commission member's updated information including how they want their packets delivered. Mr. Hill stated that they have included a petition for 722-724 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and a seven page letter concerning 2307 E. Clay Street.

### **Consent Agenda**

Mr. Yates inquired on application item #4 for 16 W. Leigh Street if there is reference to replacing the existing built-in gutter system and asked if they were going to match the profile that is already there and Mr. Hill stated yes.

Mr. Yates inquired on application #5 for 2115 M. Street if the applicant is extending only to the face of the column or if the patio is going to the concrete curb. Mr. Palmquist stated that his understanding is that they were only going to the columns because they referred to the dirt area and not the grass area. Mr. Hill stated that they have a rowlock along the edge of the concrete between the columns. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant stated that they were extending the stoop to create a brick patio in the dirt area under the balcony and stated that they will make sure that is the work they are doing.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve items 1, 3, 4, 5 on the consent agenda for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve item 2 on the consent agenda for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-1 (Elmes recused).

**Application No. 14-108** (A & I Cotterell)

2716 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-105 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION:       WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to approved garage 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: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks,  
  Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Yates  
                          Negative:       None  
                          Abstain:       None

**Application No. 14-109** (B. S. Box)

2808 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. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-109 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new egress stair and reopen doorway at rear of building, and  
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,  
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

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

**Application No. 14-113** (M. Kurze)

4108 Hermitage Road

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-113 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

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

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



**Application No. 14-117** (P. Anderson)

2115 M. 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. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-117 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-0.

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

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



## REGULAR AGENDA

### Application No. 14-107 (Many Lives LLC)

310 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to install a framed banner sign affixed to the exterior of the building in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist recommended denial of the project.

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

Mr. Elmes asked if the application was for this one sign or for all signs at the property and Mr. Palmquist stated this is just for this sign and that this is fixed sign and more of a permanent nature.

Ms. Susan Ould Representing Many Lives LLC stated that they apologize because they are new owners and didn't know approval was necessary. Ms. Ould stated that they have vacancies that they trying to fill and that when they took over the property they removed the sign along the sidewalk. Ms. Ould stated that she would like that they not be voted against and that they can make the sign smaller and that will really would appreciate an opportunity to have some kind of signage.

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

Mr. Bond inquired when does a temporary sign becomes permanent and Mr. Hill stated that it is something that is attached to building masonry that you wouldn't have when you drape something over the parapet or have something tied or affixed. Mr. Hill stated that a Monument sign may have been approved on the street side so that the sign could be displayed but not attached to the building.

Mr. Green inquired if they were aware that a sign was approved for that side of the building. Mr. Ould stated no and that she wasn't aware of that.

Mr. Hill stated that it is a sign that is set on the ground in the foundation and Ms. Ould stated that she has no knowledge of it.

Mr. Green stated that a deferral will allow the applicant to be acquainted with the plans.

Mr. Bond made a motion to defer the application until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 8-0-0.

**Application No. 14-110** (M. Lavery)

2303 Venable Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install a screened HVAC unit in the front yard of this property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Mark Lavery stated that he did install the unit and that when he purchased the property it had all of the copper wiring and line set for HVAC. Mr. Lavery stated that he understands what the requirements are and asked the Commission to take into account that when you turn on Pink Street and from Leigh Street you can see the back of the house.

Mr. Bond inquired what kind of roof it is and Mr. Lavery stated that it is a rubber membrane flat roof.

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

Mr. Bond stated that it would be dangerous to set up a precedence and that he agrees that setting it up in the rear is an eye sore and wonders if it could be put on the roof because then you wouldn't hear it or see it.

Mr. Bilder stated that the applicant stated that he thinks an HVAC unit was already there previously.

Mr. Elmes stated that it could have went there if it was there pre-district and that it could go on the roof. He stated that he doesn't ever feel like they are setting a precedent because they take things on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Yates stated that he think there is opportunity at the rear of the house and that it could be located in that corner and screened. He stated that he does think that it is setting precedence. Mr. Hughes stated that the exception is that it was there already.

Mr. Bond stated that he doesn't know how long it's been gone.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the house has no fence and inquired if they are considering what is existing now or two years from now that it could be obscured.

Mr. Hill stated that Zoning would allow a 6ft fence in the backyard.

Ms. Ann Wortham stated that she owns the property next door on Tulip Street and that there has never been a unit there for 12 years.

Mr. Yates made a motion to deny the application as outlined in the staff report with an option to relocate the unit and screen the unit. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-2-0 (Bilder and Elmes opposed).

**Application No. 14-115** (Augustine Construction LLC)

870 N. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new duplex on a vacant lot located 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. Garrett distributed revised elevation drawings.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the new window alignment and with the condition that the front porch roof be a membrane roof. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION:        WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two new single-family residences, and  
                              WHEREAS, the front porch roof be a membrane roof, and  
                              WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and  
                              NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

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

**Application No. 14-118** (A. Watkins)

2109-2111 M. Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct two new single-family residences in two vacant lots located in the Union Hill 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 with conditions.

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

Mr. Green inquired if they were creating a podium and Mr. Watkins stated that it is an existing wall and that they want to match the siding as much as they can. They want to put in 9 or 10 ft. ceilings.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was a break for the staircase existing in that wall and Mr. Watkins stated no.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were approving the materials as presented or the drawings as presented and Mr. Augustine stated that the materials as presented.

Mr. Green inquired if the rails are intended to be metal or wooden and Mr. Augustine stated that he is not sure. Mr. Green stated that they typically do not approve metal residential rails and Mr. Augustine stated that they are going to be Richmond Rail.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the site plan shows the buildings staggered but stated that the plans and elevations show them aligned. Mr. Augustine stated that they got the initial lot surveyed and they got another survey from the draftsman in order to get a formal look at exactly where it was going to be.

Mr. Bond asked if they were staggered and Mr. Augustine stated yes by 6ft.

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

After further discussion the Commission came to a consensus of deferring the project.

Mr. Green made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 8-0-0.

The Commission deferred the project so the applicant can resubmit revised drawings which show the elevations of the two proposed houses, the height of the proposed houses in relation to the adjacent houses, and provide more detailed information about the elements such as the columns, railings and brackets.

**Application No. 14-119** (DGM Properties, LLC)

3603 E. Marshall Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family residence on a vacant lot located in the Chimborazo Park 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 with conditions.

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

Mr. Michael Pellis came up and gave a brief presentation and stated that the owner is okay with the staff recommendations of the hip roof and porch roof.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application as presented based on the staff report with the conditions that the applicant submit revised drawings of the porch roof detail to staff for their review and approval and that colors be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION:       WHEREAS, the applicant submit revised drawings of the porch roof detail to staff for their review and approval, and  
WHEREAS, the colors be deferred to staff, and  
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and  
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

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

**Application No. 14-120** (Selway and Som)

21 W. Clay Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace 13 of the second and third floor 6-over-6 true divided-lite wood sash windows at this Greek Revival single-family residence in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. Mr. Hill stated that staff is recommending denial of the project.

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

Mr. Jayan Som and Ms. Jessica Selway came up to answer questions and brought in a sample window. Ms. Selway stated that they got three bids and that they had three people tell them that the windows should be replaced. Ms. Selway stated that they purchased 13 of the 36 windows and that they purchased the third floor and second floor for maximum energy savings going into the winter.

Mr. Som stated that when he spoke with the contractor they told him that the windows they purchased were perfectly fine for a City Old and Historic District. Mr. Som stated that the sills need to be replaced in some of the windows and that there is significant water damage from the egress.

Mr. Elmes inquired how the pocket replacement windows are fixing the sills and Mr. Som stated that they are going to take out the wood and window and put them back in.

Ms. Selway stated that they are trying to work with the Commission on the windows that they have chosen to replace some of the windows but they want them to be consistent. Ms. Selway stated that the contractor will be replacing everything.

Mr. Elmes stated that typically repairs are made with wood and the Commission is concerned that they taking out the historic fabric of the house and putting in completely alien window and losing that architectural fabric.

Ms. Selway inquired if the Commission would take more priority on the front of the house. Mr. Elmes stated that the primary façade would be the most important façade where you would want to keep the most historic fabric.

Mr. Bilder stated that this home is listed in several prominent Richmond books about historic homes and that this could be one of the oldest homes in Richmond.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicants would like more time to discuss this with their contractor so they could come up with a solution to have the windows repaired or be wood that match the mullion patterns. He stated that a vinyl window like that is something that they don't approve. Ms. Selway stated that they can try but that they have already purchased the windows and feel that they won't be successful in getting another type of window.

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

discussion began.

After further discussion the Commission came to consensus to defer the application.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant time to renegotiate a potential solution with the windows that they have purchased and for the reasons stated in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-0-0.

Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that the applicant look into repairing the existing windows.

\*Mr. Yates recused himself

**Application No. 14-123** (A. Grier)

3317 Monument Avenue

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to make changes to this residential building located in the Monument Old and Historic District. Mr. Hill stated that staff is recommending approval of the project as proposed.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment

Ms. Anne Grier, the homeowner, thanked the staff for a good job and Ms. Sandra Parks with Joseph Yates Architects 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 noted in the staff report and that the windows and sash remain in front of the elevator shaft. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 7-0-1 (Yates recused).

RESOLUTION:       WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to demolish rear porches for new addition, enclose side porch, install new rear entrance, and  
                          WHEREAS, the window sash remain in place beside the elevator shaft, and  
                          WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and  
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

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



**Application No. 14-125** (Ridge Point Real Estate)

721 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a rear 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition and make other exterior modifications to this house in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist stated that staff is recommending partial approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Christopher Jefferson came up to answer questions and gave brief description of the project.

The Commission members and applicant discussed the project.

Mr. Patrick Cane, a resident, came up and asked if the Commission was approving the addition today and Mr. Green stated no and that Zoning will make that decision.

There were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussed the project and recommendations.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application in accordance with the staff report with the conditions that the addition be delineated with a corner-board or rake-board, the applicant uses salvageable clapboards to install on the front façade and replace other elevations with smooth Hardiplank if needed, the applicant provide physical evidence for the existence of corbels and seek approval for the installation of similarly sized corbels, that the windows of the new rear elevation in option 2 align vertically, and that the applicant return to the Commission with a full window survey in order to seek approval to replace all existing windows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION:        WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate exterior and construct new second-story addition, and  
                              WHEREAS, the addition be delineated with a corner-board or rake-board,  
                              WHEREAS, the applicant uses salvageable clapboards to install on the front façade and replace other elevations with smooth Hardiplank if needed, and  
                              WHEREAS, the applicant provide physical evidence for the existence of corbels and seek approval for the installation of similarly sized corbels,  
                              WHEREAS, that the windows of the new rear elevation in option 2 align vertically, and  
                              WHEREAS, the applicant return to the Commission with a



## CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

### Application No. 14-116 (J. Crone)

506-510 W. 19<sup>th</sup> Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request of conceptual review to construct two new single-family dwellings on two adjacent vacant lots located in the Springhill Old and Historic District.

Mr. J. Crone came up to answer Commission questions.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the side yard setbacks were and Mr. Crone stated 5ft.

Mr. Yates stated that they don't have a full plan of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and inquired if it was finished and Mr. Crone stated yes.

Mr. Jeremy Willen, a neighbor, came up to speak on the project and gave his concerns about the height of the building and the parking.

Mr. Johnathan Miller, who lives at 519 W. 20<sup>th</sup> Street, came up to speak on the project and gave his concerns regarding the sloped roof and that the house doesn't fit with the character of the district.

Mr. Greg Johnson, a concerned citizen, came up to speak on the project and gave his concerns regarding the massing and height of the building.

Mr. Kemp, of 502 W. 19<sup>th</sup> Street, who has lived in the neighborhood for 12 years, came up to speak on the project and gave his concerns about the height of the building, a wider porch and setback requirements.

Mr. Yates stated that the dwelling at 510 is rather small and inquired if it is intended to be a guest house and Mr. Crone stated yes and so that he could put a parking lot back there behind the smaller house.

There were no additional public comment

The Commission discussed the project and compiled recommendations for the applicant.

Mr. Bond stated that it seems the gable is running the wrong way and that it should run the long way and that he agrees with the comments that the house is out of scale.

Mr. Green stated that they typical rhythm in the neighborhood is the gable to the side on the small building and the gable to the street on a tall building and that he would like to see the height of the taller building brought down.

Mr. Elmes stated that the simpler way to do that would be to have a front and rear dormer and bring it down to a 6 instead of 9 or a 3 bay dormer below.

Mr. Crone stated that there are knee walls before the roof starts.

Mr. Yates stated that he is also concerned about the roof height and that it is somewhat skewed with the elevation and thinks it will over power the other houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Bond stated that they need a streetscape to better see the other houses.

Mr. Hughes inquired about the front porch and would like to something deeper and usable.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would like to see the front porch extend all the way across and that they need more context. They need something with the existing buildings with their heights and dimensions.

Mr. Elmes stated that they need an interpretation of the streetscape so they can see how everything goes up and down. He stated that he would vote for a little less height and center the building and possibly a little wider dormer on the front and the back. Mr. Elmes stated that he agrees that the porch should run all the way across and that the columns should be square and simpler. Mr. Elmes stated that the cottage style windows work well and that they should come up with a way to adjust the height.

Mr. Green stated that the Commission would like to see the elevations that show the rest of the streetscape with dimensions, the front porch extended to the full length of the building and slightly deeper, bring the height down with wider gables on the front and the side and use a simple detail on the columns and verify the grades.

Mr. Crone stated that he can go to a basement and inquired how deep a depth they want on the porch and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it should be at least 6ft.

**Application No. 14-121** (Urban Core Development)

320 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for conceptual review of a new mixed-use development on a vacant corner lot in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District.

Mr. Todd Dykshorn, the architecture working with Urban Core Development, gave a presentation of the project.

Mr. Bond stated that he is not clear about what the fence is around the top and inquired if they wanted it to look higher and Mr. Dykshorn stated yes. Mr. Bond stated that it looks so added on and Mr. Dykshorn stated that they looked into putting masonry and a parapet up and the windows started to float low on that wall. That is something they will study in depth going forward. Mr. Dykshorn stated that they can pull it down and let the neighborhood be a little grander than they are on the corner.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they are going to have mechanical equipment on there just for the commercial building and the townhouses and Mr. Dykshorn stated that they will have the mechanical and the two residences. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if they study thickening the upper cornice to make it more prominent it might help and that extending the height is a good idea so that the top cornices are more prominent than the lower cornices.

Mr. Bond stated that it shouldn't look so added on.

Mr. Yates stated that inset on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor looks like it is all glazed and then on the floor plans it looks like a solid wall and Mr. Dykshorn stated that the porch is a part of the commercial space and is intended to align with townhouses and that it is a small terrace for the commercial tenant.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that they are using Hardi panel and inquired about using the MW 300 series PVC clad windows and stated that they questioned if they were allowed to do the storefront in aluminum clad.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she didn't understand if there was a conflict with the rendering showing the closet and the porch and inquired if it was flush. Mr. Dykshorn stated that they intended for the flats to be entered by the stair case on N. 32<sup>nd</sup> Street so that the residential entry is aligned with the entry on N. 32<sup>nd</sup> Street. He stated that everything in the larger building facing E. Marshall Street would be the commercial space on the first floor.

Mr. Bond inquired about the gap and Mr. Dykshorn stated that they are separate structures. Mr. Bond inquired why and Mr. Dykshorn stated that it is for code reasons.

There were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussed the project and compiled recommendations for the applicant.

Mr. Green stated that not having elevation drawings makes it really hard to evaluate it and that there are some serious massing problems with this building. He stated that the single window per bay solution that they are using in both projects is a real problem. Mr. Green stated that it is a form that you don't see anywhere in the historic districts and that he understand the building being split into three lobes. He stated that it would be more successful if it was just one building and one form.

Mr. Elmes stated that if you look at the opposing building at the end of the block, that building does undulate a lot from its residential entry way to this more commercial front and stated that the two buildings being broken up gives a little bit of breath to the project. Mr. Elmes stated that if they are going to have that little open area on the side it seems to be some more development than is going to actually be. He stated that he doesn't have a problem approving Hardiplank siding or the storefront on the first floor. Mr. Elmes stated that as far as the windows go it would seem that the windows are much taller or wider than what a conventional building would have and that the commercial building will work better with a Hardi panel siding storefront windows.

Mr. Hughes stated that he thought it helped break up the massing so that it's not one big wall.

Mr. Green stated that the building is not clear as to how many buildings there are.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if there is a concern about the massing they can break down the scale of it by having an inset on a portion of the building and that the window size and proportion are stuck in the middle somewhere.

Mr. Green stated that they need a simpler, cleaner solution.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if N. 32<sup>nd</sup> Street is the front maybe they can take cues from the building across the street.

**Application No. 14-122** (Urban Core Development)

722-724 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for conceptual review of the proposed construction of a new mixed-use development on a triangular, vacant lot located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District.

Mr. Green stated that the Commission received comments for this project.

Mr. Hughes stated that the residents are saying this is much larger than anything in the neighborhood. Mr. Hill stated that this building is a story taller than the nearby buildings and that there is more variety in this district. He stated that because of the separation on the island it's not going to loom over the existing buildings. Mr. Hill stated that in this case staff thought that the way that it is placed, this is bringing mixed used activity and greater density into the district.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in the block north there is a 2-story building with an English basement and inquired if she was reading that right and Mr. Yates stated yes and that the house was built into a bank.

Mr. Todd Dykshorn, the architecture working with Urban Core Development, gave a presentation of the project.

Mr. Ross Prince, a resident a 708 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, came up and gave comments and concerns regarding the project being out of character for the neighborhood.

Ms. Nancy Lambert, a concerned neighbor, came up and gave her comments on the height of the project and the parking situation.

Mr. Green stated that they received a petition and read it into the minutes.

There were no additional public comment

The Commission discussed the project and compiled recommendations for the applicant.

Mr. Bilder stated that he feels that this is the center of Union Hill and that there is such a mix of architecture and so many different styles. Mr. Bilder stated that there needs to be something in the center of the neighborhood which is what this is. He stated that he thinks this is appropriate with the height and the materials needs to be worked out.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that there are two different issues of scale to her and that the two residences seems smaller in scale and are narrower than the homes you see in the area which she thinks is an issue. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she doesn't have an issue with the height and that she does think that there are things that can be done to help break up the elevation. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the configuration of the windows are out of whack with what's around there and that she would expect more vertical windows than square ones. Ms. Aarons-

Sydnor stated that dimensions are going to help it a lot with the fact that they don't see the back side which is a problem too.

Mr. Bond wondered how it compares to the mass of church and it seems like a fairly imposing building and that he doesn't see this project being any taller than the church.

Mr. Yates stated that he is bothered that the church was chosen to use that as the height measurement for this new building and that it is inaccurate. Mr. Yates stated that the neighborhood was mostly two-story houses and still is and that he likes the idea of commercial at the corner but states that he does think it overpowers and looms over the neighborhood. He thinks the building needs to be pulled back. Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't have a problem with the remainder of the building being 3-stories and stated that the fenestration and materials need to be studied.

Mr. Green stated that he has concerns with the height and the character of the building and that he doesn't understand the character of what it is trying to be or look like a modern piece of new infill. Mr. Green stated that this is not a form that you see and that he doesn't understand the front from the back. Mr. Green stated that it can be a really nice mixed-use building but there are too many things happened in a small space.

Mr. Elmes stated that one of the concerns is that the street is super narrow and that when you walk by, it would seem really big. He stated that would negate any of the interesting elements that it would have for that location. Mr. Elmes stated that there could be a happy medium if it was cut down to two stories and stated that he agrees that the two houses there seem a lot smaller than they should be relative to façade of the other houses. Mr. Elmes stated that he wouldn't mind seeing them lifted a little bit. Mr. Elmes stated that there are examples on M Street which are both angled and that the details are so far from being flush relative to the other proposals. He agrees that the windows should be more vertical and the cladding materials should be studied.



**Application No. 14-111** (M. Dembeck)

806 Jessamine Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for replacement siding installed on the side of this residence located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Mr. Hill is recommending approval of the application.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment. The applicant was not present at the meeting.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented and for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 5-0-0.

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

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

**Application No. 14-124** (M. Morgan)

2307 E. Clay Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a single-family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Church Hill North 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 with conditions.

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

There was no applicant present at the meeting.

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

Mr. Green stated that the stair tower is an odd feature and that it is a large protruding area with no windows.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would suggest lowering the roof and making it a shed roof so that it would be subordinate to the main structure.

Mr. Palmquist stated that there was a bay and a tower in the front of it and that it looked strange having two towers on such a narrow building. They got rid of the tower that was in the front and now the stair tower is exposed.

Mr. Bilder stated they should have removed this back tower instead of the front tower.

Mr. Elmes stated that it is odd that there are no houses facing N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and that most of the other houses are pretty small on N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. He thinks this house is really big.

Mr. Hill stated that there was a seven-page letter of comments for this project.

Mr. Elmes stated that he wonders how the scale is going to work out and that clearly the stair tower wasn't shaded for a reason and that you're going to see a really wide façade. Mr. Hughes inquired if they would feel better if it was not a brick veneer and was siding. Mr. Elmes stated that it may not seem to have the same massing but states that they have to work on their vertical orientation somehow with windows and the tower. The front porch being shingle or simulated slate is a problem. Mr. Elmes stated that the front porch itself, for some reason with the door combinations, looks suburban.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that you will expect more of stoop than a porch. Mr. Elmes stated that if it was a porch then it should wrap all the around the bump-out.

Mr. Yates stated that neither the owner nor the architect is here to hear what the Commission is saying and that they should defer it until next month so they can be here and understand what they are talking about.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 7-0-0.

### **Enforcement Report**

Mr. Palmquist stated that they issued a stop work order at the property of 2300 Venable Street for replacing siding around the building. They also issued a NOV at 823 Mosby Street for replacing windows and modifying openings. They issued a NOV for installing windows and doors at 713 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Palmquist stated that they will be issuing a NOV for installation of a sign at 10 & 14 W. Broad Street and that they will be working with the Building Department to figure out work done outside of a permit for 619 N. 25<sup>th</sup> Street where they renovated the building. He stated that they were taking off fake veneer paneling on an Italianate building but they had no permits.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

---

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review