

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
June 24, 2014

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, June 24, 2014, at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Ms. Jennifer Wimmer, Chair
 Mr. Bryan Green, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Mr. Sanford Bond
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendrick
 Mr. Nathan Hughes (arrived at 3:32)

Members absent: Ms. Mary Harding Sadler
 Mr. Joseph Yates

Staff Present: Ms. Catherine Easterling, CAR Secretary
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Ms. Wimmer called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

The minutes will be approved at the July meeting.

Ms. Wimmer told the members of public that the Commission is changing the guidelines for new construction and stated that there are some drafts available through Ms. Easterling. Ms. Wimmer stated that they are planning on doing a work session at the Commission's Quarterly meeting on July 8th at 6:30 p.m. at Odell Associates and stated that the public is welcome to submit comments to the Commission prior to that and the public is welcome to come to the meeting and make comments there. Ms. Wimmer stated that they will work on the draft and have something by the August meeting to vote on.

Mr. Green stated that they haven't changed the approach, they just took residential and commercial and split then into separate sections and they also made revisions to the commercial section for large scale commercial infill. The idea is that it will be a little bit more user-friendly. Ms. Wimmer stated that with the addition of Church Hill North Union Hill they now have districts with a lot of vacant land where prior that was not the case. The guidelines weren't addressing solely new construction, which is why they being revised.

SECRETARY REPORT

Ms. Easterling stated that they were in court for the property at 2337 W. Grace Street where the neighborhood was concerned about some very bright blue paint colors on a property and stated that they have been working with the property owner for a long time and they refused to work with the process and abate the violation. Ms. Easterling stated that their City Attorney representative found out that he knew the property owners so today he had to recuse himself so the court hearing has been rescheduled to July 2nd and they will keep the Commission posted.

Ms. Easterling stated that they have several new violations that people have submitted and three of the violators have responded and have put in applications for next month's meeting.

Ms. Easterling stated that they received a paint color call about a commercial property in the 1000 block of N. 25th Street and the building had been painted a very bright blue and stated that it had been scheduled for a Commission review but the owners withdrew it because they were going to try to work with the Commission. Ms. Easterling stated that one of her colleagues, Ms. Kathleen Onufer, who is facilitating the Façade Improvement Program helped coordinate between the Better Block Project and the property owner and The Department of Economic and Community Development who had originally funded the painting project for this property owner. Ms. Easterling stated that they were able to get people who were volunteering for the Better Block project to paint the property an appropriate color and it looks great and the violation has been abated. Ms. Easterling stated Ms. Onufer has also engaged with The Department of Economic and Community Development and the Care Program coordinator about the need to work within their guidelines as well and inform grant recipients that need to adhere to CAR guidelines in old and historic districts so they will be meeting with them next week to discuss old and historic district regulations.

Ms. Easterling stated that a property at 807 N. 23rd Street was declared an eminent threat to public safety and that it is a private demolition. As a result she signed off on a demolition permit. Ms. Easterling stated that they had initially submitted for a Commission review for this meeting but since the property was declared eminent between the submission and this meeting, they went ahead and signed off on the demolition.

Ms. Easterling discussed briefly the comments for the Resolution of Appreciation for Mr. Johannas and Mr. Pearsall and stated that if anybody else wanted send their comments please do so that she can move forward with the Resolution of Appreciation on behalf of the Commission for their service. Ms. Easterling stated that they will using the quarterly business meeting on July 8th as a work session to work on developing these changes to the standards for new construction. Ms. Easterling stated that she and Mr. Green discussed the need to update a couple of the procedures in their policy and procedures and stated that they will be introducing some proposed changes to that document as well.

Ms. Easterling told the Commission members that she will be leaving employment with the City on August 8th and stated that if it is anything that the members would like for her to address or facilitate between now and then to let her know. Ms. Easterling stated that Mr. Jim Hill and Will Palmquist will be assisting the Commission until they find a replacement.

Mr. Bilder stated that Ms. Easterling is one of the most organized people he's ever met and that he is going to miss her.

ELECTIONS OF OFFICERS

Mr. Elmes made a motion to appoint Mr. Green as the Chair of the Commission and Mr. Yates was appointed Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that the UDC reviewed three projects. One was a final location, character and extent review for improvements to Commerce Road between Bells Road and Bellmeade and final location, character and extent review of a new building on the site of Martin Luther King School for a Pre-K program which were both approved. Mr. Green stated that the other project was for a series of telecommunication encroachments into the public right-of-way throughout the city. Mr. Green stated that it is a private contractor that wants to co-locate cell towers on the top of existing telephone poles. Mr. Green stated that the issues that arose was that they have increased the size of the boxes due to new technology and some of the them were in Old and Historic neighborhoods. Mr. Green stated that if anybody is interested, all of the reports are on the new Legistar website. Mr. Green stated that the next issue was UDC helping out at the Federal Court House with their security systems and stated that they can't just use bollards and that they probably will use bollards and some curb extensions. Mr. Green stated that they suggested that they use a decorative pattern to go with the plinth of the building.

*Meeting recessed at 3:50pm

*Meeting resumed at 4:00pm

Mr. Allen Davis with 520 N. 27th Street distributed some pictures and stated that these are the 3 windows that are in question and stated that staff has agreed for the back window for egress and stated that they would also like to downsize another window and shuffle the windows in the three spots in the house. Mr. Davis stated that two of those are at a rear addition and the third is part of the original house.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the applicant was making changes to their application and Mr. Shon Wheeler stated yes, that they would like to rearrange the windows and stated that there is a window on the back that is too small for egress. There is the the largest window on the property line and there is a smaller window on the same elevation. They are going to shift that over and take the smaller window that they are replacing and put it in that opening.

Ms. Easterling stated that what they have in the application is the enlargement of the small rear window for egress and change the size of the window in the side of the property line. Mr. Wheeler stated that it is just one window that they would like to add in the application.

Mr. Bilder stated that he has a question about application 3 for 2306 E. Grace Street regarding the mural and inquired what is going to be painted. Mr. Trask stated that the painting in the application is what is going to be painted on there.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to move 520 N. 27th Street from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 7-0-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

Application No. 14-51 (S. Hayes)
419 W. Broad Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-51 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 rear access ramp, 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, Elmes, Hendricks,
Hughes and Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-54 (J. &J. Wright)
2306 E. Grace Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-54 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 paint mural onto side of the 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks,
Hughes and Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-65 (A.& L. Davis)
520 N. 27th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report of the applicant requests permission to make a number of modifications at the rear of the property, most of which are to improve emergency egress at a bedroom located at the rear of the property. These proposed changes including modifying the roofline of a rear addition, enlarging a window opening for emergency egress, installing a new crawl space access door in an existing opening, relocating a window from the side elevation to the rear, and installing a smaller vinyl window in its place, as well as associated siding, soffit, gutter, and downspout installation. Staff recommends approval of the application with a condition.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the addition is projecting or setback and inquired if they are changing the existing roof line and Mr. Palmquist stated yes and stated that there are no changes to the interior space.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Wheeler stated that all of the windows in the house are replacement vinyl windows and stated that they don't know if the openings are historic. Mr. Davis stated that the first window is the one that they would like to move for egress and stated that they would like to move the kitchen window to larger window opening and replace the small single window on the rear of the building. Mr. Wheeler stated that they don't work in their current location.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the single hung transom is moving to the east side to the bathroom and Mr. Wheeler stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer inquired what the infill would be and Mr. Wheeler stated that it will match the siding.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented per the reasons stated that in the staff report noting that the north side single hung transoms windows be moved to the east side of the building to the bathroom location and the rest of the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify window openings and rear roof, and

Application No. 14-53 (2108 Venable St. LLC)
2108 Venable Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace missing or damaged windows at this property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Mill Mathews stated that the current conditions of the windows are not usable and stated that there are three windows that are still there and hung but are in pretty bad shape. Mr. Mathews stated that all of the trim is pretty much gone and they want to replace all windows with the ones that were proposed.

Mr. Gabriel Rosario with Fairway Windows stated that the window that he proposed here are sash replacement kits with all wood interior and exterior, double paned with SDL lites and stated that they are going to match the grid patterns to what is there.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the existing stated of the original sashes and Mr. Mathew distributed photos and stated that the trim on the windows were gone. Mr. Mathews stated that there are two windows in the back that are 6-over-6 and the ones in the front are 8-over-8. The rear windows are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were using low E coding reflective finish on it because the Commission typically doesn't approve glazing and Mr. Rosario stated that there is a slight tint to it but states that they can order it without it.

Mr. Green inquired if they are opposed to Low-E clear and Mr. Mathews stated no.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the paint color and Mr. Mathews stated that it will be the same color.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as submitted for the reasons stated that in staff report with the final colors to staff with the condition that the glass be low E clear. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace missing or damaged windows, and

WHEREAS, the windows shall have clear, Low-E glass (not reflective),

WHEREAS, all paint colors selections must be submitted to

Application No. 14-55 (C. & J. Early)
514 W. 21st Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace 11 wood windows that were damaged due to fire, as well as the remaining 9 wood windows at this property in the Spring Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending partial approval of the project with conditions.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Taylor Phillips stated that the 9 windows that were not affected by the fire are all on the second floor and stated that on the second floor windows 10, 11, 14,15,16,17, 18 and 19 all suffered various stages of rot and deterioration and none of them are operable. Mr. Phillips stated that the outside of the windows are wrapped in aluminum trim coil and hasn't been removed yet. Mr. Phillips stated that are asking to replace all the windows so that they can match and stated that most of the windows are missing all of the grids.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the existing windows are true divided lites and Mr. Phillips stated no. Ms. Wimmer asked if they are snapped in muntin and Mr. Phillips stated yes.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if the top panel was 1 or 2 sheets of glass and Mr. Phillips stated that it was 1 sheet of glass.

Ms. Wimmer stated that if they are snapped in windows they are not historic.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was anything left on the 1st floor and Mr. Philips stated that much of it is pretty much gone.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were proposing one-over-one and Mr. Philips stated that the ones that are left are one-over-one.

Mr. Green asked if they were snapped in and Mr. Philips stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the 2-over-1 windows looks like true divided lite and stated that the second floor window needs more information. Ms. Easterling stated that some of the windows that were original look historic and repairable.

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

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to partially approve the application with aluminum clad windows as proposed and ask for additional information on the second floor window. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder. After further discussion the motion failed.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the condition that staff could approve a mullion pattern that was found to be original to the house for both 1st and 2nd floor for the Legends aluminum clad.

Ms. Easterling inquired if Mr. Elmes was approving all the windows being replaced at the house and Mr. Elmes stated yes.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-1-0 (Wimmer opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to fire-damaged windows, and

WHEREAS, the Commission staff must review and approve a mullion pattern for the Legends aluminum-clad windows based on the remaining historic evidence at the property, 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
	Negative:	Wimmer
	Abstain:	None

Application No. 14-56 (Cedar Street Baptist Church)
712-718 Jessamine Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant requests permission to landscape and pave a parking lot on four vacant lots located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending deferral of the project.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Estella Randolph stated that the graveled parking lot has been utilized by the church since its existence for more than 40 years. Ms. Randolph stated that with the growing of their congregation and the increased development of the surrounding area, the parking continues to be a concern for them and the neighbors. Ms. Randolph stated that making the improvements for maximizing the parking would decrease the impact that it has on the neighborhood and on the street parking. Ms. Randolph stated that in terms of screening the street they have three other parking lots that are screened from the neighbors by fences and stated that they have worked with Union Hill in the past year on planting trees on some of the other lots. They don't have issues with screening this lot with shrubs or a retaining wall of vegetation. Ms. Randolph stated that the only issue they have is with introducing landscaped islands within the lot because of the size of the lot and the width. Ms. Randolph stated that adding the beds would reduce the number of spaces and they want to make sure that is enough room for cars to maneuver through the parking lot but that in terms of the screening with a retaining wall or vegetation that, is something that they can accommodate.

Mr. Bond inquired if this was residential zoning area areas and Ms. Easterling stated that it is a R63. Mr. Bond stated that the city has requirements for screening and in order to get a permit you have to comply with the zoning or get a variance. Mr. Bond stated that they are going to have to present a plan to zoning in order to proceed with the project.

Mr. Elmes stated that they want to approve the project and stated that they just want to understand what they are approving and stated that on the proposal it does say that they would expand the peninsula for adequately shade trees and the removal of one parking space is required. Ms. Randolph stated that they are referencing other parking lots that they have but not this one.

Mr. Green inquired if they had any feedback from the Zoning Administrator and Ms. Randolph stated not that she is aware of.

Ms. Easterling stated that the day the city issued the stop work order she met with the contractor that was paving the lot and she provided him with the Commissions Guidelines for improving the parking lot and the zoning staff provided them a sheet with zoning regulations on them.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the widths in the drawing aren't adding up and the rendered plans that were provided has dimensions on them that don't add up.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the Commission might need some more information.

Mr. Matt Jarreau, a neighbor, stated that he is excited to see them pave this parking lot and stated that he was hoping that the Commission would allow them to do that with the buffering from the street to the parking lot.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the condition that staff would see the screening and the setbacks of the paving and that they meet the city zoning requirements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to landscape and pave existing parking lot, and

WHEREAS, staff must review and approve the buffering for the parking lot, and

WHEREAS, the Commission requires that the applicant must adhere to all zoning regulations for improved parking lots, 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 Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-57 (RSS)
501-513 N. 23rd Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace windows at a portion of the townhouses located in the Jefferson Mews complex in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Bernard Rogers with Better Housing Coalition stated that he appreciates staff recommendation for allowing them to replace the windows and stated that this is an old 1996 low income tax credit development. Mr. Rogers stated that when you're going to refresh properties it limited the options with financing and stated that they are using VHDA financing to make these repairs and to refresh the interior for these units. Mr. Rogers stated that along with that comes VHDA requirements that the exterior wood be wrapped in a vinyl coated aluminum and stated that their hands are tied with whether they can wrap them. Mr. Rogers stated that they will use industry standard for the wrapping and caulking and stated that VHDA are requiring them to wrap it in aluminum.

Mr. Green inquired if there was a reason they want them wrapped. Mr. Rogers stated that it is basically for longevity for properties that they have loans on so they want them to last for 15 or more years. Mr. Green stated that wrapping tends to shorten the longevity. Mr. Rogers stated that is what they consider protecting the exterior wood by putting the wrap on it and stated that he has a copy of the requirements for the Commission to review.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if it would be the same color and Mr. Rogers stated yes that it would be white vinyl coated aluminum.

Ms. Easterling inquired if the funding of the sash replacement tied to the wrapping of the windows and Mr. Rogers stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired if VHDA requires that they replace the existing wooden windows with vinyl windows and Mr. Rogers stated that they don't require that and stated that the reason for them replacing them is that they are getting a much more efficient window than what's currently on the property. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was possible that the budget would allow for an aluminum clad product and Mr. Rogers stated no and stated that they are using contingency funds that are using on this property to make this project happen.

Mr. Green commented that ironically wrapping the windows shortens the life span.

Mr. James Flanagan stated that he is very familiar with VHDA Guidelines and

stated that what Mr. Rogers stated was completely accurate.

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

Mr. Bond stated that they are dealing with a non-historic building with non-historic materials and don't have a problem with what they are proposing.

Mr. Elmes stated that publicly in the past they have had serious difficulties substantiating in the guidelines when approving vinyl windows and stated that his only hesitancy is that the approval of vinyl windows is based on their guidelines which takes every single application on a case-by-case basis and in no shape or form that it should be a broad streak of approval for anything that has to do with vinyl windows. Mr. Elmes stated that it doesn't mean that they would approve vinyl windows on any other property within the City of Richmond.

Mr. Bond stated that they could say that they would only consider vinyl windows on any non-historical structures with non-historical windows. Mr. Elmes stated that he would appreciate that as well.

Mr. Bilder expressed his opinion and stated that he have a problem with what the applicant said and stated that the applicant should get a new lender and stated that what the lender says has no bearing on the Commission's decisions and guidelines.

Ms. Easterling stated that the Commission should craft a motion based on the guidelines.

Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion based on the staff report with the exception of the aluminum wrap and the condition that it won't be hiding the historic fabric. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace non-historic windows, and

WHEREAS, the Commission noted that it was fine to wrap the wood trim in aluminum, as the wrap would not obscure any historic fabric, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes and
Wimmer

Negative: Bilder

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-58 (Sterling Bilder LLC)
421-423 N. 25th Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to improve portions of two vacant lots located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with a condition.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Jennifer Mullen came up and gave a brief presentation to the Commission. Ms. Mullen stated that their proposal is to take the brick walkway off of N. 25th Street to maintain that street wall and take the brick walkway to the rear of the lot in conformance with the site improvement guidelines and use brick pavers on that walkway and have the pavers as the actual parking lot itself. Ms. Mullen showed an updated landscaped plan and an overview of the property.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the color of the fence and Ms. Mullen stated that they don't know but stated that staff is recommending white and they are fine with that.

Mr. Bond inquired about the zoning and Ms. Mullen stated that it is R0.

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the application for the reasons stated in the staff report as presented with additional information. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 6-0-0 (Bilder recused himself).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to improve portions of two vacant lots for parking, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, and Wimmer

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-59 (R. & O. Weinstein)
2017 W. Grace Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to remove a non-historic porch at the rear of a property located in the West Grace Street Old and Historic District, and replace it with a new, one-story addition. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the applicant has a paint color and Ms. Easterling stated no and that it could be deferred to staff.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Angelo Phillos the architect came up to answer questions.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the porch roof was standing seam or a membrane roof or would you like them to consider either and Mr. Phillos stated that a baseline EPM would be great but states that he would like a prefinished standing seam or copper.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application per the staff conditions and the approval of the new revised plan and defer colors to staff, paint and roof colors. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 6-0-1 (Hughes abstained).

Mr. Phillos stated that the staff recommendation says only clad windows and stated that he wants to change that to aluminum and stated that is what he and Ms. Easterling discussed.

Mr. Elmes stated that the friendly amendment is accepted within the motion.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to remove non-historic rear porch and construct new addition, and

WHEREAS, the new addition's roof may be metal or membrane material, and

WHEREAS, the paint and roof colors must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the windows shall be aluminum clad, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

Application No. 14-60 (Quirk Hospitality, LLC)
201-207 W. Broad Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to renovate the buildings located at 201-207 West Broad Street in the Broad Street Old and Historic District, and construct a new rooftop addition. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with conditions.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. David Round, Principle of 3 North, showed earlier renderings of the building and stated that they are going to restore and preserve the existing building. Mr. Round stated that they have some drawing of the original paint colors and the original marquee. Mr. Round showed a brief presentation of the overall design interior. Mr. Round stated that the program for the project is a hotel and a restaurant on the main floor, a gallery and retail space and stated that they want to create three entrances. Mr. Round stated that they will have some canopies at the shop front that will be attached to the window panes and stated that the restoration of the lost historic canopy. Mr. Round stated that all of the features such as the café seating and guardrail, planter boxes, benches will be reviewed by the Urban Design Committee. Mr. Round showed more renderings and stated that the rooftop addition is comprised of one floor of guestrooms that sits halfway below the parapet and an additional floor above that which is the rooftop bar which is set all the way back. Mr. Round stated that they have made a modification to the design lines that would be added to the glass and stated that they were not able to find documentation of that storefront. Mr. Round stated that they also modified the materials at the rooftop and stated that the mechanical penthouse will be hidden with a screened wall that would be comprised of a louver system with anodized aluminum and the rooftop bar will have a shop front or corner walls glazing system with clear anodized aluminum or an anodized aluminum paneled system and the penthouse unit is all glass in a shop front system. Mr. Round stated that they are going to use the same colors and materials on the building as closely as they can. Mr. Round stated that they are removing the fire escape. Mr. Round showed more renderings of the side and back of the building and showed renderings of the existing building and the proposed building.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the historic shop front paint color on W. Broad and inquired if was going to be anodized aluminum and Mr. Round stated that the original shop front is a painted wood window and stated that the 207 building will be a frameless glass front.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the Quirk sign and asked if they want the Commission to review that today or are they coming back with that. Mr. Round stated that it is not fully developed and there is still questions about the color illumination and stated that they would like their comment on the placement but

the rest is purely conceptual and would like a Certificate of Appropriateness for the rest.

Mr. Green stated that the awning in the rendering is showing pink and in the photograph is striped and Mr. Round stated that the striped is more current.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the kitchen vents going through the windows and Mr. Round stated yes and that the back of the building is brick.

Mr. Hughes inquired if the windows are going to be replaced or restored in place and Mr. Round stated that they are going to be restored in place.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the materials for new side windows and Mr. Round stated that they will be fixed anodized.

Ms. Mary Jane Hogue Executive Director of HR stated that this is a no brainer from Historic Richmond perspective and stated that it saves and rehabs an old building for new reuse and stated that it is 98 years old. Ms. Hogue stated that it creates a sense of place, creates connectivity and that it's going to create more density on Broad Street and hopefully will attract more retail and become a place where you want to come and visit. Ms. Hogue stated that it attracts tourists and create inspiration to bring more businesses to the area. Ms. Hogue stated that our population is growing and that this building just illustrated why we all call Richmond home and stated please vote yes because it is a catalytic project and it illustrates what the Commission does and that it's living their mission by finding a reuse for an old building.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that he would rather approve an awning versus the canopy and a marquee is a marquee and would like to defer the storefront to staff. Mr. Elmes stated that he has a problem with them running the vents out of the windows.

Mr. Round stated that there are details for the storefront in the back of the packets.

Mr. Danny MacNelly stated that it is an edged piece of glass.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the new storefront meets the guidelines for historic fenestration patterns as well as the rooftop addition being minimally visible.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report and as presented and is asking for additional information on the signage.

Ms. Easterling stated that she forgot to note in the staff report that any changes

that are required by the National Park Service or the Department of Historic Resources for tax credit purposes be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Green stated that the only thing he was a little uncomfortable with was the storefront because that building has strong horizontal lines and would like to see something compatible to the building because it doesn't tie in to the building next door.

After further discussion the motion passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to renovate buildings and construct new rooftop addition, and

WHEREAS, the applicant must return to the Commission for review and approval of the exterior signage,

WHEREAS, any changes to the project required by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Services for rehabilitation tax credit approval purposes may be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the approval includes the introduction of horizontal lines etched into the new glass storefront at 207 West Broad Street, 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 Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-47 (C. & L. Holdings)
18 W. Broad Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to revise paint colors on a mixed-use property located in the Broad Street Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a conditions

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Kevin Korda, the owner's representative for the building, stated that their goal is to have a prominent corner and have the scheme they have downstairs and transform a similar look without any signage to help balance the building. Mr. Korda stated that the three cornices they are proposing to paint the purple will help hide dirt and all the dentils will be painted a solid green. Mr. Korda stated that they are going to mimic the building without having the white in there and stated that the white below will have a green line and purple in the center and in the bottom. Mr. Korda stated that their goal is to brighten the corner being that they are in the Arts & Cultural District and stated that they want to bring life and enthusiasm into the building. Mr. Korda stated that he hopes the Commission would support the hotel because they need it desperately. Mr. Korda stated that in a compromise they could do the three cornices in purple and do all the dentils and mimicking of the signage area in green they will be pleased with that too.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the top cornice and soffit will be purple and Mr. Korda stated yes and their goal is to have those three cornices purple but if they have to they will paint them green. Mr. Korda stated that over the weekend he noticed several other buildings that had multicolored cornices.

Mr. Richard Rumrill from Jackson Ward stated that he and his wife have lived here for a while and stated that Mr. Korda can do a lot of stuff with colors and stated that a lot of what he does is really subtle. Mr. Rumrill stated this is not all that visible and stated that it would be really nice to have something that sticks out a little more. Mr. Rumrill stated that he appreciates the work that Mr. Korda has done and hopes that the Commission approves the application.

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

Mr. Elmes inquired if the façade cornice is already the colors that they are suggesting for the upper cornice. He thinks that it's fine and stated that he is a little more concerned with the body color and the eyebrows and sills of the windows. Mr. Korda stated that they can eliminate the eyebrows.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the existing sills are already painted and Mr. Korda stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they are keeping the sills the wood lawn misty white and Mr. Korda stated yes, white.

Mr. Bond stated that it is great to paint something with life in the Arts & Cultural District and stated that it is not damaging any historic fabric.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to approve the application as presented and as cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-0.

Ms. Easterling stated that in the Decision letter that she would state that the applicant would not paint the brick arches above the windows and it will remain the same color as the rest of the bricks and the sills will be painted a cream color as indicated in the application but otherwise the rest of the application is as proposed.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to revise paint scheme, and

WHEREAS, the brick arched “eyebrows” above the windows must remain the same color as the rest of the painted brick,

WHEREAS, the window sills shall be the same color as the rest of the windows trim, and

WHEREAS, the cornice brackets shall all be one consistent color, as noted by the applicant, 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 Wimmer

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-62 (A. Auyeung)
2107 E. Marshall Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace windows on the front of this structure within the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Andrea Auyeung the owner stated that she lived in the Church Hill historic area and that she decided to get a fixer-upper but within the first month of living in the house she has had two break-ins with the door being completely smashed in with the same type of glass. That is why she is asking to have the double pane in the window, just for her safety. Ms. Auyeung stated that she is single and living in the house by herself and stated that the bathroom and upper windows on the bedroom have deteriorated since the last time these pictures were taken and that they are held together by just staying in place. Ms. Auyeung stated that she has central air and heat in the house and that replacing these windows will greatly help her and reduce her carbon footprint.

Mr. Wimmer stated that the guidelines do approve storm windows. Ms. Auyeung stated that from an aesthetic perspective, she don't think it brings the beauty of the house out and stated that she wants to restore it how it used to be.

Mr. Peter Savage distributed some documentation of a remade window matching in style and stated that what is there is a true divided lite and stated that there is an option for either. Mr. Savage stated that they want to get something that is matching design but also thermally efficient and tempered glass and that upstairs they decided to do a clad exterior and that they were going to do that downstairs as well, but the two windows downstairs are over 8' tall. Mr. Savage stated that originally they were going to do a single pane tempered glass because they could not get the aluminum clad in that size. Mr. Savage stated that the drawings are for a fur or Spanish seam window that will match that size and is a true divided lite that will match the mullion and that none of the windows work properly and are inoperable and that they can consider an insulated tempered pane option.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the balance system and Mr. Savage stated that if they replace it with the wood sash they would tear inside the jam and re-hook up the original wood weights. Mr. Elmes inquired about the balance system on the second floor and Mr. Savage stated that if it's a wood product they will tear into the jam like downstairs. Mr. Elmes stated that he noticed that the bottom rail of the center window is not connected currently and Mr. Savage stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to match the windows and Mr. Savage stated that they will match whatever is there.

and Wimmer

Negative: Elmes and Green

Abstain: None

Application No. 14-64 (Z. Kennedy)
2912-2912 ½ E. Leigh Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is not opposed to the two-over-one configuration on the façade, as this helps to differentiate the infill from the historic architecture in the immediate area. The windows should have true or simulated divided lites.

The applicant must supply drawings for the side and rear elevations of the property before the Commission can move forward with evaluating the entire project. Additionally, the applicant still needs to verify the materials for certain features.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Zach Kennedy came up to answer questions and distributed some material samples.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the windows and Mr. Kennedy stated that they are going to do an aluminum clad. Mr. Elmes inquired if it would be SDL with a bar in between and Mr. Kennedy stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were using LP or HardiPlank and Mr. Kennedy stated that he bought both but states that he probably will use Hardi or half and half. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to use a prefinished product and Mr. Kennedy stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired about the color and Mr. Kennedy stated they will match up something as closely as possible with what the Commission would approve. Mr. Elmes inquired about the color of the Gem Tex TPO comes in and Mr. Kennedy stated that one of them is white and the other is black. Mr. Elmes stated that they can approve black and the fenestration is going to be as drawn with 2-over-1 windows and Mr. Kennedy stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they would have aluminum sills and Mr. Kennedy stated yes.

Mr. Green inquired about the column posts and Mr. Kennedy stated that it will be traditional posts with square spindles.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if they are turned posts and Mr. Kennedy stated yes and they will be pressured treated decking board for the front porch and the back deck. Mr. Wimmer inquired about the gutter on the porch or if it's internal and Mr. Kennedy stated that they will prefer an exposed gutter but stated that they can do a built-in gutter if that's what the Commission wants.

Mr. Elmes asked if they were setting back to the house next door and Mr. Kennedy stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if there was going to be a four steps going down the sidewalk and Mr. Kennedy stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if the intent is for the centers of the windows to align and Mr. Kennedy stated yes they will align with the ones below them.

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

Ms. Wimmer stated that she is concerned about the width originally but states that in the context photo they alleviated her concerns.

Mr. Elmes stated that if they approve the application they would want the applicant to show the columns to staff. Ms. Easterling inquired if they wanted turned columns and Mr. Elmes stated that they want something in keeping with the other houses in the district.

Mr. Green stated that one of the things they tried to do in the revisions to make it easier to be more creative.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the new information for the front yard setback, front porch roof material being a black EPDM and rear porch roof material being in black EPDM and that the columns and paint colors be deferred to staff, that the windows will be 2-over-1 and align with first floor and the deck boards be pressure treated with a 7 ¼ reveal on the siding and the windows will be aluminum cladding exterior with a 5/4" x 4" flat stock trim detail with simulated divided lites.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they can add lighting to staff. Mr. Elmes stated that he is fine with adding that to the motion. Ms. Wimmer inquired about the gutter and Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't have a problem with the gutter on new construction.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new single-family dwelling, and

WHEREAS, the approval includes the design of the additional side elevations presented at the meeting, and

WHEREAS, the front and rear porch roofs shall be black EPDM roofs, and

WHEREAS, the column style, exterior lighting, gutter details, and color selections must be reviewed and approved by staff, and

Application No. 14-66 (M. & K. Wind)
3516 E. Broad Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the front door and associated transom and side-light windows on the building's primary façade, as well as to install missing transom windows above windows at the building's parlor room and dining room. Staff recommends denial of the project.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. James Flanagan with J.D. Lewis contractor on the job stated that the whole block is heavy with glass and fully wood doors and they want to have to a little more privacy in their home. Mr. Flanagan stated that they are removing the decking and replacing it with the original stain grade decking in-kind and stated that they are willing to make concessions to try and get this approved and work with CAR to find a door that is more appropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Flanagan stated that there are five other exterior doors on this home that are three-paneled solid with beveled glass on the top and stated that they are open to suggestions.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the applicant could speak to the transoms that are missing and Mr. Flanagan stated that they he knows they are missing and the owners want to replace them. Mr. Elmes inquired if there was visible evidence inside of the house that there were transoms and Mr. Flanagan stated and that it was a plywood opening. Mr. Elmes inquired about the decking and Mr. Flanagan stated that the main part of the house is about 700 square ft. covered porch with a stained grade where the last foot has rotted and stated that they will replace it in-kind with a tongue and groove cypress porch. Mr. Elmes inquired if it will be painted and Mr. Flanagan stated that it will be stained grade. Mr. Elmes inquired if there was any ghosting or hinge marks on the inside of the door that would substantiate that it wasn't original and Mr. Flanagan stated that there is previous hardware on there that doesn't match into the jam and stated that the door is in poor shape. Mr. Elmes inquired about the side lights and transoms on the front and Mr. Flanagan stated that the side one on the right is cracked and the other ones has wired glass in them and stated that they are looking to replace them with something a little more fabulous.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that he couldn't believe that with the providence of this house that there isn't a photo of the front and Ms. Easterling stated that she looked at the Library of Virginia and Old CAR slide collection and VCU digitized for previous photos but couldn't find anything. Mr. Elmes stated that he would have a difficult time approving what's been presented and stated that he doesn't think

the transom replacement is a problem but without some kind of pictorial evidence he can't approve it.

Mr. Bond stated that maybe some of the neighboring houses have some details and side lights.

Mr. Green stated that if the owner could demonstrate that the house had that it would be completely different and stated that just because one house has it doesn't mean all of them have it.

Mr. Flanagan stated that the owner would consent to beveled glass and matching the existing five doors for privacy. Mr. Green stated that it would be helpful if they brought pictures of the other doors.

Mr. Green inquired how the Commission felt conceptually with a simple geometric pattern that is less specific.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the intent of the guidelines is that beveled or leaded glass is not prevalent in all the historic districts.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve with a partial approval with the replacement of the transom over the windows that are missing and would like to see some different door styles either from the neighborhood, pictorially or a close-up of styles on the existing house but the current door style, sidelights are denied per the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify front entryway,
and

WHEREAS, the Commission approved the replacement of
the missing transom windows with clear glass, and

WHEREAS, the Commission did not approve the
replacement of the front door or the replacement of the
existing transom and sidelights with decorative, leaded
glass, and

WHEREAS, the Commission requested that the applicant
return with additional information concerning the door styles
and transom/sidelights patterns of properties in the
immediate area, and

WHEREAS, the Commission noted that the applicant could
replace all the wire glass with clear glass without needing to
return to the Commission for approval, and

Application No. 14-37 (GTR Cedar LLC)
1903 E. Marshall Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a multi-family dwelling at a lot located in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District that is bordered by Cedar, East Marshall, and North 20th Streets. The project site is located in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Ben Cox came up and gave the Commission members a presentation of the changes that they made per the previous Commission meeting and brought up samples. Mr. Cox stated that the windows will be SDL with grid between the glass to keep the reveal line and stated that they have been narrowed per the Commission's request.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the color of the screen and Mr. Cox stated grey because it would help blend it out the best.

Mr. Cox stated that the brick is Carter Grove and the precast or cast stone is going to be underneath the windows will also be at the water tables and the cornice moldings will be white in color and they are suggesting they use it before the PVC and reserve the right to use metal. The windows will be white and the metal panels will be taupe and the metal roof will be a soft green and the railings and all the Juliet Balconies and around the back perimeter will be black. Mr. Cox stated that the vehicular entry are setback in two areas will be black and stated that on the Cedar Street side is setback for zoning for parking decks it will setback 16' and on the alley side it's setback 17 ½'.

Mr. Elmes asked if they are reflecting jack arches so that there will be a cut so they can physically put a line in the brick and mortar it up and Mr. Cox stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if they were using brick mold and Mr. Cox stated yes.

Mr. Cox stated that on Cedar Street the opening boards and windows are aligned with the windows above.

Ms. Wimmer questioned the improvement of the masonry opening size and stated that she is concerned with the light pattern if it's not compatible with the district and stated that it is more horizontal than they are vertical and stated that it should be a 6-over-6 or 1-over 1. Mr. Cox stated that the original from 2012 was to make it 4-over-4 from 6-over-6.

Mr. Elmes inquired if some of the balconies applied railed balconies and inquired if the windows were punched in and Mr. Cox stated that they are fixed or in swinging doors. Mr. Elmes stated that on Marshall Street there are two that look

like they might be real and Mr. Cox stated that they are real balconies with covered roofs and stated that on the 20th Street side they differentiated it with egress and a covered door.

Mr. Charlie Holton stated that he owns the Federal Building 307, 309 and 311 W. Marshall St and stated that he is concerned with the back of the building because it is visible from Broad Street depending on the season of the year. Mr. Holton stated that just painting the rod iron stuff black and stated that his backyard has a 12' drop off of grade from the back of that building and that it sounds like they are just going to slap some black paint on anything that has to go on the back side. Mr. Holton stated that this is going to look like a 12 story building from his back yard and stated that he would like a little bit of thought going into what the back of the building is going to look like from his side of the building. Mr. Holton stated that he is worried about a terrace and people dropping things off it and people dropping or throwing things onto his roof. Mr. Holton stated that it's just a 20' divide between the two buildings and stated that he would like some input on what the back of the building on Broad Street is going to look like. Mr. Holton inquired about the entrance to garage next to 311 Cedar Street and stated that he could see students coming in the building in the middle of night fishtailing into the garage right next to his houses. Mr. Holton stated that he is worried about the back of the building is going to look like and stated that he doesn't have a problem with the front of the building but states that the garage door next to his building and the back of the building is ugly. Mr. Holton stated that they need something on Shockoe Bottom that would fit into the neighborhood.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they are using the same materials on all 3 sides and that the black paint is only on the railings.

Mr. Cox stated that the openings and the rear of the building are all the same materials. Mr. Holton stated that they are filling the back of the building. Mr. Cox stated that the railing will be black in the back of the building. Mr. Cox stated that they will have masonry panels and stated that there are courtyards in the middle sections and stated that what they will be seeing from the back door is a deep void.

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

Ms. Wimmer stated that she has a problem with the window lite pattern and feel that it is not compatible with district. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks it is fine and stated that it mimics the small windows that have to be on the lower levels and stated that they did a great job.

Mr. Hughes stated that they did just what the Commission asked of them and did a great job.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the setback along Cedar Street is no longer aligned with the existing row houses and stated that it is all the way up to the property line. Mr. Elmes stated that the porches come all the way to the front on Cedar Street and Mr. Hendricks stated yes but states that is not the main mass of the building and that is his concern.

Ms. Wimmer stated that it doesn't bother her so much because larger scale warehouse type buildings tend to come straight up to the sidewalk.

Mr. Elmes stated that the row houses have English basements that do push to the sidewalks.

Mr. Green stated that this is something that they could talk about at the quarterly meeting with their new construction guidelines.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the block of row houses is the only thing left and it is surrounded by buildings that are twice its size and stated that it feels like they are losing the scale of what used to be there and stated that the setback along Cedar Street looking up the hill you're going to see this building coming out and in the previous plan it had a 8' setback.

Mr. Elmes stated that it might look more stilted if it was pushed further back and stated that they have the opportunity of making it taller and they don't have control of that.

Mr. Hendricks stated that kind of development wasn't what was prevalent in the block.

Mr. Green stated that they want to treat this more like a warehouse and stated that is what they are trying to do in the guidelines is to open up the scope. Mr. Hendricks asked if this was by right zoning or does it have to have a special use permit.

Mr. Cox stated that it is by right from the City of Richmond.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the color, windows, material drawing and options that were brought before them today and per the staff report for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they presented a PVC cornice and Mr. Elmes stated that it is in his as presented and Mr. Elmes stated that they can defer the final cornice materials to staff.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he has seen sheet metal done pretty badly.

After further discussion the motion passed 6-1-0 (Hendricks opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new multi-family dwelling, and

WHEREAS, the Commission noted that the project must utilize the colors, windows, and other materials presented at the meeting, and

WHEREAS, Commission staff requested that the applicant supply staff with a copy of the material and color information presented at the meeting, 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 and Wimmer

Negative: Hendricks

Abstain: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review