



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.Richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

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

2 Roll Call

Present: 8 - Sanford Bond, Matthew Elmes, Joseph Yates, Gerald Jason Hendricks, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Nathan Hughes, Joshua Bilder and Bryan Green

Absent: 1 - Jennifer Wimmer

Staff Present

Marianne Pitts, CAR Secretary
James Hill, PDR
William Palmquist, PDR
Kim Chen, PDR
Tara Ross, PDR

3 Approval of Minutes

[ID 15-006](#) May 26, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [May 26, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Yates, that the minutes from the May 26, 2015 meeting be approved.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Bilder and Green

Excused: 1 - Elmes

4 Secretary's Report

Secretary's Report

Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Palmquist is changing roles in the department and stated that he is now a Planner II working more with the Comprehensive Planning aspects of the division. Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Palmquist will start his new position on June 29th and that Ms. Pitts will be out on maternity leave from August through October. He stated that they will be pulling Mr. Palmquist back along with Ms. Chen to help out with the Commission.

Mr. Hill stated that with 407 N. Allen Avenue they have not been in touch with them yet to find out if they have implemented the technique for the brick portion of the exterior of

that property. Mr. Hill stated that the most recent extension of the appeal period was renewed May 19th through August 3rd. Mr. Hill stated that they hope to communicate with them and find out if this has taken place. He stated that he hopes it will be resolved before the July meeting.

Mr. Hill stated that he and Ms. Pitts will be in court on Friday, June 26th for the Houghton case at 2916 Monument Avenue and stated that he was served with a show cause papers. Mr. Hill stated that after the 6-month period he still hasn't abated the violation on his property as he was instructed and stated that the expected outcome would be that the judge will respect a continuation in which case the City will ask for a short turnaround. Mr. Hill stated that the second outcome is a hearing to determine whether he is in contempt of court for failing to follow the court's order to abate the violation.

The Commission members came to a consensus to have the next quarterly meeting on July 14th at Odell Associates at 6:30 p.m. The Commission discussed topics for the quarterly meeting which included buildings built on corner lots under the New Construction Guidelines.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he will work on the public outreach and educational Powerpoint for the CAR.

Ms. Pitts stated that the September meeting is during the UCI Bike Race and that they should have access to the building and parking.

Mr. Green inquired if they could move the meeting up a week or back a week during the week of the bike race. Ms. Pitts stated that she would check on it.

Ms. Pitts stated that there was a change in the vote for one of the consent agenda items in the draft meeting minutes for May 2015 and that it has since been corrected.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Palmquist distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 59 approvals for the period from May 26, 2015 through June 22, 2015.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that they issued a Notice of Violation for a commercial property at 2300 Venable Street for signage and lighting and that they have been in contact with the applicant. He stated that there are also some zoning implications with the signage.

Mr. Palmquist stated that this morning they issued a NOV in the 300-block of N. 21st Street for the demolition of a front porch. He stated they hoped to prevent the demolition but by the time they arrived the entire porch was gone.

Mr. Green stated that he and Mr. Yates noticed that a 3rd story addition coming up on a building in the 700-block of 24th Street.

Other Committee Reports

Mr. Green stated that at the last UDC meeting they were looking at the details from the Kanawha Plaza project.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in regards to the annual report, they put together some great maps and charts and that they are waiting on the case studies.

Ms. Pitts stated that they were discussing updating the maps and data for the past fiscal year so that it will be more up to date by the time they present it.

Mr. Green inquired about the case studies and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they wanted to include samples on how the Commission work with applicants on difficult issues so they can demonstrate how they are trying to support the applicants in the neighborhoods and make it a positive process for everybody.

Mr. Green inquired if there are any updates on the maps and brochures and Mr. Bond stated that he has no updates as of yet, but hopefully will by the end of the summer.

Resolution of Appreciation

Mr. Green read into the record Ms. Mary Sadler's Resolution of Appreciation:

WHEREAS, Mary Harding "Mimi" Sadler faithfully and thoughtfully discharged her duties as a member of the Commission of Architectural Review from July 2004 through November 2014; and

WHEREAS, her nomination by the William Byrd Branch of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and later, after the reorganization of the 2010 ordinance, she was nominated for reappointment by the Alliance to Conserve Old Richmond Neighborhoods, her service reflected well upon those organizations; and

WHEREAS, her breadth of architectural and historical knowledge helped guide and inform the Commission and applicants throughout her years of service; and

WHEREAS, she gave generously of her time during many protracted meetings and site visits; and

WHEREAS her articulate and insightful comments and motions served the Commission and applicants; and

WHEREAS her input at Commission Task Force meetings helped to shape updates to the Design Review Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, her service as Commission Chair provided the Commission with direction and leadership; and

WHEREAS, she has shown great perspective and patience as well as uncommon reasoned judgment during her years on the Commission; and

NOW THEREFORE the undersigned members of the Commission of Architectural Review hereby express thanks and appreciation to Ms. Sadler for her service.

The Commission members had a brief discussion regarding the members terms for serving on the Commission.

BRT Letter

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the letter was sent regarding the Bus Rapid Transit project and Mr. Green stated that after they approve the letter the leadership for BRT approached them and wanted to set up a meeting to discuss the project. Mr. Green stated that they met at the end of last week and decided that they would need to make some revisions to the letter after their meeting. Mr. Green stated that he will do some revisions on the letter to reflect their conversations that they had with them and will

distribute it to the Commission members.

Mr. Yates stated that it doesn't appear that any of the new bus structures will directly impact any of the historic buildings Downtown and that there are going to be two near Main Street station but they are not going to be directly in front of the building. Mr. Yates stated that the other locations didn't seem to have any direct impact.

Mr. Green stated that they have revised the approach a little bit and that they shared the Commission's concerns about moving the Downtown stretch off of the median. Mr. Green stated that as it is now, there are only four stations that will be in the downtown area and that in two of the stations there has to be a split because there is no median there. Mr. Green asked them to see if there was any way that they could put the three remaining station in the median and that if they could do that, most of their concerns would be addressed. Mr. Green stated that they inquired about a potential Park 'n Ride component and was told that there are no provisions at either the east or the west end for such a function. Mr. Green stated that they will ask them about the Park 'n Ride and update the Commission's letter. Mr. Green stated that they are adjusting the plan to have more on-street parking and more loading.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item # 5 for 605 N. 21st Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item # 9 for 535 W. Broad Street from regular agenda to the consent agenda. Mr. Hughes stated that he is not opposed to it but inquired that if something is being demolished shouldn't they take a step back and consider it more thoroughly. Mr. Bond stated that he agrees if it is a contributing structure and stated that he didn't see an issue with this. Mr. Hendricks stated that he had some concerns about the chain link fence going up for an indefinite time and that it is a prime corner. Mr. Yates stated that they don't have purview over that. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 5-2-1 (Hendricks and Aarons-Sydnor opposed and Green recused).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #10 for 115 S.15th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-1-1 (Elmes opposed and Hendricks abstained).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #13 for 104 N. Boulevard from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond. Mr. Hughes stated that he would prefer to see wood there. After further discussion the motion passed 6-0-1 (Elmes opposed).

Mr. Bond made a motion to move item #20 for 608 N. 27th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda and stated that there were conditions put on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hughes stated that it is brand new building and feels that they should consider it and stated that they have a lot questions that can pop up. After further discussion the motion failed 3-5-0 (Green, Elmes, Bilder, Hughes and Hendricks opposed).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 5-2-1 (Elmes opposed and Green and Hendricks abstained).

- 1 [CAR No. 2015-075](#) 2815 E. Grace Street - Replace stainless steel roof on the front elevation with a copper roof

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

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

- 2 [CAR No. 2015-080](#) 2551 Monument Avenue - Install new brick walkway

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the details of the proposed lighting be submitted to Commission staff for administrative review and approval.

- 3 [CAR No. 2015-084](#) 2238 W. Grace Street - Replace upper and lower rear decks

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the applicant use a standard Richmond rail for design that is more compatible with the district, or that the applicant place the proposed pickets on the inside of the handrail for a more finished appearance.

- 4 [CAR No. 2015-086](#) 2707 E. Broad Street - Install new window in existing opening of carriage house

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the window be true divided lite or simulated divided lite.

- 5 [CAR No. 2015-072](#) 605 N. 21st Street - Replacement of windows and construction of new shed

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

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

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Elmes

Abstain: 2 - Hendricks and Green

- 9 [CAR No. 2015-077](#) 535 W. Broad Street - Demolish existing gas station kiosk and canopy

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Elmes

Abstain: 2 - Hendricks and Green

- 10 [CAR No. 2015-054](#) 115 S. 15th Street - Install new building mounted signs

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - April 2015](#)

[Site Map - April 2015](#)

[Staff Report - April 2015](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the sign, which is to be installed on the parapet wall, be mounted in the mortar joints, not through the brick in order to preserve the brick.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Elmes

Abstain: 2 - Hendricks and Green

- 13 [CAR No. 2015-079](#) 104 N. Boulevard - Replace existing porch railing

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Elmes

Abstain: 2 - Hendricks and Green

REGULAR AGENDA

- 6 [CAR No.
2015-073](#) 2807 E. Grace Street - Infill 2nd floor window and install two new windows in existing openings

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report for the applicant's request for approval to infill an existing second-story window and to restore a second-floor window on the southeast elevation near the rear of the home in St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with the condition that the window be a wood or aluminum-clad wood window with true divided or simulated divided lite. Staff cannot recommend approval of the second-floor window and the infill of the masonry opening. Staff stated that if the Commission determines that the window removal is appropriate, staff recommends that the window be kept on site to allow for the possibility of reinstallation in the future.

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

Mr. Justice Miller, the contractor for the project, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Martha Winfield, the homeowner, came up to speak about the project.

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

Mr. Hughes stated that they should discuss infilling window openings for rehabilitation at the quarterly meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for infilling the second-story window and installing two new windows in existing openings as presented, ignoring the staff recommendation for the second-floor window infill and following the presentation of the applicant and concurring with the second section of the staff report where the window be wood or aluminum-clad. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that the original second-floor window be stored on the property and Mr. Elmes accepted the amendment.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Hughes, Bilder and Green

No: 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

- 7 [CAR No.
2015-074](#) 1600 Monument Avenue - Install signage, awning, and planters

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the installation of planters to form an outdoor dining area, as well as the installation of an awning and signage at the Stuart Court Apartment building located in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. The applicant is also seeking approval for two signs located on the building. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with a condition that the installation of the black stanchion and belt system, and not the silver colored option, which appears less compatible within the district. Staff recommends approval of the larger sign behind the outdoor dining space, but does not recommend approval of the smaller sign on the outside of the right stairwell wall.

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

Mr. Michael Pellis, representing the owner of My Noodles, came up to speak and answered questions.

Mr. Bill Galosh, President of Maps, came up and spoke regarding the project.

Mr. Joe Kiatsuranon, the owner of My Noodle, came up and answered questions regarding the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved, that in accordance with the staff report the planters, and black stanchions and belts be approved, but that the sign on the wing wall be denied, and that the light fixtures be deferred to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. Mr. Bond made a friendly amendment that they remove the sign on the building as well.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Bilder and Green

- 8 [CAR No. 2015-076](#) 2401 E. Marshall Street / 313 N. 24th Street - Construct a new mixed use building and an addition to an existing structure

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - June 2015](#)

[Site Map - June 2015](#)

[Staff Report - June 2015](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request for approval to construct a mixed-use project which will include multi-family residential, commercial units, and civic space in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project, with conditions. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards for New Construction outlined in the Guidelines. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned with the following:

- That the applicant attempt to preserve the existing trees on the property near the parking area.
- On the proposed new buildings, the applicant should maintain the fenestration pattern found in the neighborhood and replace the double window and doors on the residential portions of the north and west elevations with single windows and doors.
- On the existing building, the applicant should not alter the size of the western window opening of the front façade and should restore the size of the historic eastern window opening of the front façade.
- The applicant provide paint colors for the siding for review and approval by Commission Staff.

Mr. Hughes stated that on the eastern and western openings under materials and colors and stated that it sounds like Ms. Pitts is not recommending that those alterations be approved. Ms. Pitts stated yes, and stated that the historic opening should be reopened with glass versus how the applicant proposed to have the window extended to the ground.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired on the site plan if the space between the two new buildings is supposed to be a vehicular alley and Ms. Pitts stated that she believes it is for pedestrians and that the vehicular access is in the rear.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there were any discussion on where the trash and HVAC units are going to go and Ms. Pitts stated no.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired that on the elevations on the west face of the existing building those two openings that they plan to enlarge are storefront and not garage doors. Ms. Pitts stated yes.

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

Mr. Tom LeKometros, the architect with The Lawrence Group, on behalf of Sterling Builders, stated that 24th and Marshall is a really wonderful block and corner in Church Hill. Mr. LeKometros showed the Commission members photos of the project and stated that the versatility of housing and town house type in this neighborhood is very rich and equally very diverse, and that the brick and wood materials compliment everything here. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked very strongly to that as precedent. Mr. LeKometros stated that the Nolde garage building is quite a charming building but is in very serious disrepair and needing a lot of love which they try to instill with this project. Mr. LeKometros stated that their goal is actually to comply with the comments that staff made and stated that the proposed changes to the front of the storefront is not a problem.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that her question is in respect to what's happening between the space between the two new buildings and Mr. LeKometros stated that it was pedestrian and that they both access 24th Street and Marshall.

Mr. LeKometros stated that all the trees that are in the parking area are intended to be maintained and that they have soil issues that they have to remedy and that if all goes to plan those trees will remain.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that when buildings have the conditions of 2 openings like that with multiple bays oftentimes in the city you will see a single opening and the façade of the building with a vestibule and then the two doors pushed back behind it so that you have that opening to maintain that symmetry and then the two doors can remain behind that. She stated that they may want to investigate that as an option. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked briefly at that in the very early stages and they

found that the encroachment of space that you need for the vestibule to swing the doors opening was pretty significant to the way they pushed the stairs back into the units. Mr. LeKometros stated that he would wonder if there was a way they could detail the frame of the two doors on the ground level and stated that there are precedents in the neighborhood with single doorways with side lites and that it is a bigger opening and a single window above. Mr. LeKometros stated that if they went with the single window above they can make the design detailing of the two lower doors be one bigger panel in a way it will achieve something that has precedent in the neighborhood.

Mr. Green stated that he shares the same concerns in that that it is important to have a single door on the ground floor and stated that they can point to some examples but there aren't that many. Mr. Green stated that the overall paradox around the neighborhood and the immediate neighborhood is very much in the other direction and that they are looking at the norm. Mr. Green stated that this would have been an easier discussion if they would have come forward with a conceptual review and that they are not really in the position to have that design discussion.

Mr. Yates stated that the rendering shows a dark parapet around the top of the frame buildings and stated that there is something on the elevations drawings that indicate there is something on the top. Mr. Yates inquired if they could clarify what the top condition is on the wall of the frame structures. Mr. LeKometros stated that in the neighborhood there is precedence for cornices that range from 4 to 6 inches to 2' or greater and that the detail is a cornice piece from the top of the window to the top of the façade is about 4ft 10 ½ ft. by 11". Mr. LeKometros stated that the cornice piece comes down from that and that the intent was that it be a wood detail fascia piece more of an understated style not unlike the canopy for the porch. Mr. LeKometros stated that there are many precedents for the neighborhood for very grandiose kind of canopies over the porches and stated that their canopy and porch coverage is a minimally sort of thing consistent with the neighborhood with their interpretations. Mr. LeKometros stated that with the renderings there is a fair amount of shadowing and that it is coming across dark. Mr. Yates inquired if there was details of the cornice on the drawings and Mr. LeKometros stated that there is not one on the drawings that the Commission has.

Mr. Green stated that he can't tell how it is detailed and that in the rendering it looks continuous and inquired what the detail is that they are seeing. Mr. LeKometros stated that a similar kind of detail for brick cupping or cap at brick and the detailed wood by nature is different than brick and Mr. Green inquired if they were projecting corbels or a joint between the two butted 4-foot sections and that he can't tell what it is nor do they have a detail to look at. Mr. LeKometros stated that it is intended to be a wood detail and that it is a segment of wood that has a joint between segments if panel wood and that they are envisioning a trim cap at the bottom and a continuous plate at the top. Mr. Green inquired if the vertical piece was projecting and Mr. LeKometros stated that it is projecting by a five-quarter inch of board with a quarter round below it and three-quarter inch panel on top of it and that the cap probably projects three quarters of an inch. Mr. LeKometros stated that they are probably talking about a 2 ½ inch depth to the entire thing from the face of the top until it meets the Hardi below.

Mr. Elmes wanted some clarifications on the west elevation, north storefront and stated that the elevation shows the window units in plan view and that it seems as though the garage openings that they were talking about are about 11'-2". Mr. LeKometros stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that if they are following the grade down because the street slopes slightly they really seem to be hulking over the door opening that they are beside. Mr. Elmes stated that he is also wondering what materials will be below the fenestration. Mr. LeKometros stated that they have been using aluminum-clad wood window systems in those kinds of applications which have integral color as an infill set. Mr. LeKometros stated that when they do those kinds of things with solid panels there

are laminated integral color aluminum clad for panels so it becomes a homogeneous insert piece. Mr. Elmes stated that he is familiar with that corner and other corners that have commercial space and stated that he is looking at the scale of that storefront relative to the door that it is beside and stated that it seems to be quite massive. Mr. LeKometros stated that he thinks Mr. Elmes is right and stated that one of the balances is that they do retail work around the country and stated that from a customer's point of view and a retail tenant point of view the more windows that they can give them, the more connection they have with the community. Mr. LeKometros stated that they looked at the overhang height being the continuum and stated that if they are walking down the street they imagine a perspective where the porch canopy jumps to the corner and they get a sort of continuity because the ground steps down. Mr. LeKometros stated that they saw it as a benefit where they give a little more glass exposure and that the interesting thing about this view here is that he wouldn't paint the door white, but a charcoal grey or something that would make it monochromatic equivalent to the brick. Mr. LeKometros stated that right now it stands out a lot because it is white and not brick and stated that from a materiality and color point of view they want that to blend with the brick.

Mr. Elmes stated that he is very familiar with the massing of the Nolde garage building, the size and the pedestrian scale of that as you're walking down the street. Mr. Elmes stated that he is looking at the fenestration on the other end of the block and stated that it seems as though the size and massing will really be a large element. Mr. LeKometros stated that they understand and stated that they are measuring the head of the window at the Nolde garage which is 11'-2 1/4" which is quite significant and stated that down on the corner it is probably 12'-6" or 13' which is a little more significant and stated that because the porch steps up, you can get a residential scale at the porch, the Nolde garage and the corner have a grander scale. Mr. LeKometros stated that in their tiny little block of façade on 24th Street they get a microcosmic large-scale for retail and small scale for residential. Mr. LeKometros stated that they consciously didn't drive the glass on the corner down to be 10' and that they wanted to keep at 11' or greater magnitude which in their minds distinguishes it from what happens to the porches. Mr. Elmes stated that it will be a little easier to have this discussion at a conceptual review and that it seems, for whatever reason, it doesn't seem to be quite as out of proportion.

Mr. Green inquired that on the north end of Marshall Street the commercial unit there and as you come around the corner and inquired why are the windows on the second floor so far back from the corner. Mr. Green stated that it seems like so much masonry is coming from the corner on each elevation and inquired why it is so heavy. Mr. Green stated that he is trying to figure out the spacing of the windows on the second floor. Mr. LeKometros stated that because of the spacing of the windows it gave them a solid corner and stated that because of stairs, they thought it would be valuable and stated that the inside tracks to the outside. Mr. LeKometros stated that there are many solutions but that is an approach that they made. Mr. Green stated that his concern is that it is a very visible corner and they have so much glazing on the ground floor and then they move to second story and it becomes solid. Mr. Green stated that he is trying to figure out the rhythm of the fenestration.

Mr. Bond stated that it looks like they are missing a window and that in the space they have this big blank wall on the corner would be a wonderful place to be with a window because you can look down onto the streets. Mr. Bond stated that is where the light comes in and inquired why they would do that and Mr. LeKometros stated that it is perfectly possible to think about taking this rhythm and adding another window on rhythm and then they could have a more propagated upper façade and stated that it is something that could be done.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they have two different widths of windows on the

residential and inquired if that was solely because those thinner windows are above the doors and Mr. LeKometros stated yes so that they can give it a vertical alignment. Mr. John Meinyay, speaking as a member of the public, stated that he was concerned with the overhang on the buildings that have simulated wood and masonry and inquired how big is the overhang on those and Mr. Green stated that it is 6'. Mr. LeKometros stated that it is 2 ½ or 3 inches.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is concerned that they want to use stack bond design for the cementitious planks and stated that they don't see a joint plan or layout and that she believes that it is critical. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would like to see as part of their recommendations that they require elevations that shows the elevations of the joint for the cementitious panels.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to defer the application and treat it as a conceptual review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

Mr. Bond stated that he would have to concur because there are a lot of unanswered questions and lack of details.

Mr. Yates stated that it would have been so much easier if this had been a conceptual approval the first time and stated that he would not feel comfortable given a final approval at this stage.

Mr. Bond stated that he would concur with staff in their assertion about the old windows in the garage building and stated that the sills and the sill height should be maintained.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he heard the applicants' desire to align the windows up with the masonry and windows that are happening below.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a request for an indication of the location of the joints and the cementitious panel and the elevations.

Mr. Hendricks requested information on the detailing of the cornice for both the brick and the wood, investigate additional fenestration and corner conditions at Marshall and 24th Street.

Mr. Yates stated that they need details of the first floor porches on the residential.

Mr. Green stated that they need details of both cornices.

Mr. Yates stated that they need details on trash and concealing HVAC.

Mr. Green also requested that they reduce the double door opening on the first floor.

Mr. Hughes requested information on the roofing and porch materials.

Mr. Elmes stated that he would like to see a perspective of how it works with the neighborhood as far as fenestration and things like that.

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Green

Recused: 1 - Bilder

- 11 [CAR No. 2015-078](#) 3820 Hermitage Road - Construction of a new garage

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a new two-story outbuilding in the rear yard of 3820 Hermitage Road, located in the Hermitage Road Old and Historic District. This application came before the Commission at the April 22, 2014 meeting and the applicant is back because there were additional changes to the project beyond the alignment of windows. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the condition that the garage doors be wood.

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

Mr. Charlie Fields came up to answer questions and showed the Commission members a sample of the brick.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the brick color more closely match the color of the main house, that the stairway be minimized to the greatest degree possible and parallel to the side of the building, which is to be delegated to staff for final review and approval.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Green

No: 1 - Bilder

- 12 [CAR No. 2015-016](#) 713 N. 24th Street - Repair porch, replace doors, windows, siding

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - February 2015](#)

[Site Map - February 2015](#)

[Staff Report - February 2015](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the rehabilitation work proposed on the exterior of this structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The application was initially the result of enforcement activity and was deferred at the February 2015 Commission meeting. Staff recommends that the proposed front door be replaced with a simpler, wood, paneled door and that the transom window be restored in the opening above. Staff recommends

that the windows be true or simulated-divided lites instead of grid-between-the-glass. Staff recommends that the applicant provide staff with details and drawings of the elements for the installation of the front steps, handrails and railings and drawings of these elements to receive administrative approval. Staff recommends that the applicant have staff review the fence placement, design and paint or opaque stain color for administrative review. Staff recommends that smooth Hardiplank, with no beading, be installed on the sides and rear of the structure, and that wood siding be salvaged from the structure to be installed on the front elevation of the structure. Staff recommends that the front porch roof be replaced with a standing seam metal roof, or in the absence of the availability of such a roof, a black membrane roof be installed instead. Staff also recommends that the applicant seek administrative review and approval of any proposed paint color. Staff recommends that the applicant provide additional drawings of the proposed deck and roof structure, as only a description and plan drawing of the deck was provided.

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

Mr. Caceres came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved, specifically to approve the installation of the front, rear, and side doors; the front and rear windows; the front steps, handrails, and railings; the rear privacy fence; the HardiPlank siding; and the front porch roof; the repair and in-kind replacement of the front porch; and the painting of the structure with the following conditions: the proposed front door be replaced with a simpler, wood paneled door and that the transom window be restored in the opening above; the proposed windows have true or simulated-divided lites instead of grid-between-the-glass; the applicant provide staff with details and drawings of the proposed steps, handrails, and front porch railings for administrative approval; the applicant have staff review the privacy fence placement, design, and paint or opaque stain color for administrative approval; smooth HardiPlank, with no beading be installed on the sides and rear of the structure, and wood siding be salvaged from the structure to be installed on the front elevation of the structure; the front porch roof be replaced with a standing seam metal roof, or in the absence of the availability of such a roof, a black membrane roof be installed instead; the applicant seek administrative review and approval for the proposed painting scheme; and the applicant retain the original front porch dentils and capitals, while denying the construction of a covered side and rear deck and encouraged the applicant to submit a complete application for this work to include plans that incorporate footprint dimensions, construction details, and elevations showing screening, stairs, and railings.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Bilder and Green

14 [CAR No. 2015-081](#) 2912 E. Leigh Street - Construct a new storage shed

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new storage shed at the rear of the subject property within the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the applicant install a privacy fence or vegetative screening to limit the visibility of the shed from the alley and E. Leigh Street.

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

Mr. Eric Beecroft 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 consideration that it is a non-permanent, non-foundation shed within the footprint and height restrictions set by the City code. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that is not what the staff recommended. Mr. Elmes stated yes and stated that the vegetation screening will be helpful. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and failed 4-4-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant install a privacy fence or vegetation screening to limit the visibility of the shed from the alley and E. Leigh Street.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Green

15 [CAR No. 2015-082](#) 322 N. 36th Street - Construct a single family home

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval that approval be conditioned on the following conditions; that the cornice brackets be located to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly across the cornice as is currently proposed, that the fiber cement siding has a smooth finish with no faux wood grain and that the second floor rear window may be deferred to staff for their review and approval.

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

Mr. Vitas Reinikovas came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Bilder, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions: the cornice brackets be located to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly across the cornice as is currently proposed; the fiber cement siding has a smooth finish with no faux wood grain; the windows on the right elevation,

facing E. Marshall Street be better aligned, a detail to be deferred to Commission staff for their review and approval; the second floor rear window be centered and not slightly offset; the first floor windows on the front elevation be 6'-2" in height as presented; the front porch roof be metal; and the finished porch alignment, foundation height, and fenestration be referred to Commission staff for review and approval.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes and Bilder

No: 3 - Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Green

- 16 [CAR No. 2015-050](#) 1902-1908 Princess Anne Avenue - Construct four attached single-family houses

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Plans - April 2015](#)
[Site Map - April 2015](#)
[Staff Report - April 2015](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct four, new, attached single-family houses in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicants came for conceptual review on February 2015 and was deferred for final approval at the April 2015 meeting. The general consensus of the Commission members present was that the proposed building needed to do more to address Princess Anne Avenue and Jefferson Park. The applicant has responded to Commission and public comments by orienting the first (south) dwelling towards the park. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

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

Mr. Richard Cross came up to answer questions.

Mr. Eugene Smith, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

Mr. Christopher Faigel, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as presented for the reasons in the staff report. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor Sydnor asked for a friendly amendment that the front porch on the Princess Anne elevation be at least 5'. Mr. Hendricks stated that he would like the building mass on Princess Anne to align with the adjacent construction and that the front porch be sized to align with the front porches on Princess Anne Avenue on the corner unit. Mr. Elmes stated that he accepts the amendment but doesn't know if it is feasible.

Aye: 6 - Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 2 - Yates and Green

- 17 [CAR No. 2015-083](#) 2302 E. Grace Street - Installation of walkways and brick walls at the front and rear of the property

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install new hardscaping including walls and walk ways in the front, side and rear of the property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that the details of the proposed gate be submitted for review and approval by Commission staff. Staff also recommends that these front walls should be constructed with in-kind materials and that the applicant should not use a limestone cap on these walls. Staff recommends that the applicant should not use the proposed slate and amber quartzite pavers and should repair or replace in kind the historic herringbone brick front walkway.

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

Ms. Julie Rautio came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the staff recommendation that they use another material. Mr. Elmes made a friendly amendment that it goes back to staff for administrative review and approval.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Bilder and Green

- 19 [CAR No. 2015-030](#) 512 W. 20th Street - Modifications to porch and siding; new door

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - March 2015](#)

[Site Map - March 2015](#)

[Staff Report - March 2015](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval for work performed on the front of this property located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of enforcement activity and was deferred at the March 2015 meeting. Mr. Palmquist stated that the work involves the replacement of the siding, the installation of a new door, the removal of porch railings and the installation of new porch columns and posts. Mr. Palmquist showed the Commission the previous and new conditions of the house. Mr. Palmquist stated that according to the applicant, beaded siding was used due to the unavailability of smooth Hardiplank siding.

Mr. Palmquist stated that cedar shake siding was installed and painting was performed and the main house was painted a sage-green color, the cedar shake siding was painted brown, all trim was painted white, and the porch decking and steps were painted gray. Mr. Palmquist stated that there was a 15-lite front door was replaced with a Therma-tru craftsman style 1-lite door and that the owner stated that the side lites were uncovered and restored after the aluminum siding was removed. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant proposes to replace the door with a single lite with beveled glass. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant states that the porch piers were bowed and that the porch columns were rotten and the painted brick porch piers were replaced with shorter and slightly wider stone piers, and the tapered porch columns replaced with a similar tapered column that are a bit thicker and taller. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant is awaiting the Commission's decision before installing the final porch column where pressure-treated lumber is currently installed for support. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant states that the railing on three sides of the porch was rotten and was therefore removed.

Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. Staff does not take issue with the installation of the beaded siding and cedar shake siding, the replacement of the porch piers and columns, the uncovering of the side lites, or the painting of the structure. While most of these items do not constitute an in-kind replacement, they are similar enough in design and materials to remain compatible with the structure and the larger historic district. However, staff does not recommend approval of the installed door, which is a molded panel door with a single beveled glass lite. The Guidelines state, "Do not remove original doors and door surrounds. Replacement doors and door surrounds with stamped or molded faux paneling or leaded, beveled, or etched glass are strongly discouraged and rarely permitted. Stamped or molded faux paneled doors are inappropriate substitutes for door types found in historic districts" (p. 67 #14). Furthermore, staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the railing, as its repair or in-kind replacement would typically be recommended. Therefore, staff recommends that approval of the project be conditioned on the installation of a Richmond style railing with similar dimensions as the original railing as well as the replacement of the existing door with a true-paneled, six-lite wood door with clear glass.

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

Mr. Chris Keck, the owner, stated that Mr. Palmquist gave a thorough assessment and that the goals were to improve the aesthetics of its original condition. Mr. Keck stated that he did a lot of research on the style of the home in the neighborhood to make the material selections after learning more about the process. Mr. Keck stated that he realizes that he did not follow the proper procedures for an approval. Mr. Keck stated that to address the issues that staff brought up in reference to the porch railings, after researching the homes within the time frame, he found that it was not common to see these houses without railings and that he has a problem installing railings. Mr. Keck stated that in reference to the front door it was chosen by looking through the neighborhood and that he couldn't find a consistent door and that of the 52 properties there were 6 unobstructed wood doors that staff recommend.

Mr. Yates inquired if the side lites in the front door composition is original or has the whole door assembly been replaced. Mr. Keck stated that the side lites are original and that they uncovered it when they took off the aluminum siding.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates stated that he has some issues with this and that if they approve this he will wonder what they are doing here. Mr. Yates stated that the brick piers, which certainly seemed to be original, have been replaced, and the smaller tapered columns, which

appears to have been original, have been replaced and the railings have been removed which certainly matches the overall craftsman style of the house. Mr. Yates stated that he has always been able to find smooth and beaded Hardiplank siding. Mr. Yates stated that the character of the house is similar but the details are all changed.

Mr. Elmes inquired if Mr. Yates was inquiring that if this application came before them as an application would they approve the changes that were implemented. Mr. Yates stated that he was making more of a statement than a question and stated that he certainly wouldn't approve the changes and that although they are similar to craftsman houses he doesn't know of a craftsman house in the city that has simulated stone piers originally. Mr. Yates stated that again, if they approve this he don't what they are doing here.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the piers are a different material and a different height and the columns are taller and fatter and Mr. Green stated yes.

Mr. Yates stated that the railings are craftsman style railing.

Mr. Elmes stated that it means that the balusters would be more like 2 inches by 2 inches and they would be square with a much wider handrail than a Richmond rail and that a Richmond rail isn't really going to work as far as replicating because it is going to look too thin and narrow.

Mr. Hughes inquired if this was the same applications they saw at a previous meeting and Mr. Elmes stated that the project was deferred for further understanding the situation that was at hand. Mr. Elmes stated that a lot of it was done with good intentions and that part of it was approved and it kept going on and that typically they would ask for photo documentation. Mr. Elmes stated that he knows there are similar craftsman style houses and they understand that architecturally but that this was one specifically set up that way to begin with. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was aluminum siding that was on the front at the time and inquired if there were cedar shakes under it when they took it off. Mr. Keck stated that it had a little rotted clad board siding. Mr. Elmes stated that they are trying to prevent what is called false historicism where they put something on because it seemed like the correct material to use at the time, such as beaded Hardiplank. Mr. Elmes stated that is why they are questioning what they are really doing here if they just approve this and say that it's okay for you or any applicant to establish their belief on how the house was. Ms. Elmes stated to the applicant that he didn't mean to pick him out personally.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to deny the application for the reasons noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hill asked for clarification for staff beyond the action that it might take, and also provide staff with some guidance on what should be done to abate the violation.

Mr. Elmes stated that that he doesn't think the Richmond Rail handrail was an appropriate style handrail for this so he is going to disagree with that particular staff recommendation and suggest that the handrail be replaced with the same style of handrail that was there previously. Mr. Elmes stated that he disagree with the beaded cementitious siding and stated that he disagrees with the cedar shake siding and stated that the painting is fine and the front entry way door is acceptable if a single lite piece of glass is put in it.

Mr. Yates inquired about the porch piers and the columns and Mr. Elmes inquired if they are going to go back to the brick that is underneath the applied stone. Mr. Palmquist stated that they were replaced also.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in her opinion, when you make a change you should at least be consistent in one way, form, material or color and stated that they can raise the height of the pier to where the brick was or change the material of the pier but somehow make it reflect what was there.

Mr. Hendricks stated that all of the proportions get messed up.

Mr. Elmes stated that while he agrees with Mr. Yates, the porch columns/piers situation is a problem he would be more tempted to leave it because it could be more difficult. Mr. Yates stated that then he repeats his earlier comment which what are they doing here and stated that they are the Commission of Architectural Review. Mr. Yates stated that the original or earlier details were changed in his mind beyond recognition and that he doesn't see a middle ground here.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he would argue that the piers are more important than the siding.

Mr. Bond stated that he agrees that the piers are the defining element.

Mr. Yates stated that he could go along with the siding if it was changed to the smooth unbeaded sided.

Mr. Elmes withdrew his motion and stated that he would be happy to support another one.

Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't know how to reformulate this in a way that is acceptable because he is disagreeing with all of the items.

Mr. Green stated that Mr. Hill was asking that if they were going to move to deny the project that they give a list of recommendations to the applicant for corrections that would lead to a positive outcome. Mr. Green stated that they are denying the application and giving the applicant suggestions that if they were to mediate these things it will lead to an approval.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Green

No: 1 - Bilder

20 [CAR No. 2015-062](#) 608 N. 27th Street - Construct a new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Plans - May 2015](#)
[Site Map - May 2015](#)
[Staff Report - May 2015](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family house on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The application was deferred at the May 2015 Commission meeting.

The applicant has since made changes to the design, reducing the overall height by 3' and thereby reducing the space between the 2nd floor windows and cornice. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

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

Mr. Chris Pollock Poole came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that details regarding the proposed cornice brackets and paint color be submitted to Commission staff for review and approval.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder and Green

Excused: 1 - Bond

Abstain: 1 - Hughes

21 [CAR No. 2015-063](#) 2100-2102 M Street - Construct a new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - May 2015](#)

[Site Map - May 2015](#)

[Staff Report - May 2015](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a single-family house on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The application was deferred at the May 2015 Commission meeting. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned on the applicants seeking administrative approval for the proposed privacy fence and opaque stain color.

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

Mr. Daniil Kleyman came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and tied 3-3-0 (Elmes, Yates and Green opposed).

Mr. Bilder stated that he feels that the applicant made every effort to take the Commission comments and did what the Commission asked him to do.

Mr. Hughes stated that he concurs with Mr. Bilder.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the proposed privacy fence and opaque stain color be submitted to Commission Staff for review and approval and that consideration be made to construct a Greek Revival-style porch rather than the wider porch that was submitted.

Aye: 4 - Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes and Bilder

No: 2 - Yates and Green

Excused: 2 - Bond and Aarons-Sydnor

- 18 [CAR No. 2015-085](#) 619 St. Peter Street - Install new windows on all elevations and infill one rear window

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install windows on all elevations totaling 13 windows and infill one rear window per the requirements of the building code on a structure within the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. At the Commission's meeting on January 25, 2011, the Commission approved an application to address code violations that included a number of exterior repairs at the property. That application did not address the issue that some of the windows had been replaced without receiving the approval of the Commission. Staff recommends approval of the project, with conditions that the applicant install true divided lite or simulated divided lite Marvin Clad double hung 2/2 aluminum clad wood windows rather than the Legend HBR white double hung 2/2 PVC clad windows.

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

There was applicant present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that true divided lite or simulated divided lite Marvin Clad Double Hung 2/2 aluminum clad wood windows be installed rather than the Legend HBR White Double Hung 2/2 PVC clad windows.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Hughes, Bilder and Green

Excused: 2 - Bond and Aarons-Sydnor

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 22 [CAR No. 2015-087](#) 411 N. 1st Street - Rehab existing structure to include new windows, doors, and walls

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the rehabilitation of a commercial building in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. The proposal is for the rehabilitation of a two-story building constructed in 1977 with a parking garage on the first floor and office space above. The proposed new use will have a retail space and commercial kitchen on the first floor and offices above.

Mr. Hendricks inquired about the mural on the alley side.

Mr. Yates stated that he appreciates the fact that they are trying to dress the building up and that they are always talking about false historicism and stated that they are trying to Victorianize this 1970's building that doesn't have a whole lot going for it. Mr. Yates asked why they would add the wood trim and stated that it would be better to go ahead and do a soldier course of brick over the openings in the same color brick and make it what it is and not apply decorations to it.

Mr. Green stated that he likes the wood trim and that it gives the opening some character and stated that the street could use some more dressing up and it is a great project.

Mr. Bilder stated that everything looks good and that he concurs with Mr. Yates and stated that they should use brick for the trim.

Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks the aesthetic is the aesthetic whether they use wood, or soldier course or if they painted it and stated that as a non-contributing structure couldn't they paint the facade of it. Mr. Elmes stated that to him that would be most bang for their buck and stated that it would brighten it up.

Mr. Green stated that it might be nice to see some lighting on the façade.

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

Adjournment

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.