



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, August 22, 2017

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

BEGINNING AT 3:30 P.M.

Call to Order

Rollcall

- Present --** 8 - * David C. Cooley, * Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, * Sanford Bond, * Bryan Green, * Gerald Jason Hendricks, * James W. Klaus, * Joseph Yates and * Neville C. Johnson Jr.
- Absent --** 1 - * Andrew Ray McRoberts

Approval of Minutes

June 27, 2017

Ms. Pitts stated that for the June minutes Mr. Klaus had informed her that there was no vote recorded for one item in the minutes.

A motion was made by Yates, seconded by Klaus, that the June 27, 2017 minutes as amended be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 6 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.
- Abstain --** 2 - Sanford Bond and Bryan Green

July 25, 2017

A motion was made by Cooley, seconded by Aarons-Sydnor, that the July 25, 2017 minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 7 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Andrew Ray McRoberts, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.
- Abstain --** 2 - Sanford Bond and Bryan Green

National Register Nomination

[NR 2017-5](#) The Tower Building

Attachments: [The Tower Building National Register Nomination](#)
[The Tower Building Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jeffries read the nomination for the Tower Building and stated that staff recommends

approval of the nomination for criteria C at the local level.

Mr. Green stated that if they were making motions he would make a motion to defer to allow the preparer a little more time to finish the documentation and stated that they have established that the building is old but have not established that it is historic. Mr. Green stated that as an individual building the applicant has not made the case yet.

Mr. Bond stated that he agrees with Mr. Green and stated that nothing warrants it being individually listed on the National Register.

Mr. Klaus stated that he agrees and added that he does not think international style is how he would characterize this building. He also commented that the brick façade that you cannot see through is a strange and interesting feature and inquired why it was built that way.

A motion was made by Mr. Green to defer the National Register Nomination until a subsequent meeting to allow the preparer the opportunity to fully develop the history of the building particularly the adaptation of international style ornamentation to Virginia and identify additional cohorts. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Green, seconded by Bond, that the recommendation be deferred. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

Other Business

Other Business

Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts introduced Mr. Neville Johnson who has taken the position as the recommended applicant from the Realtors Association. Ms. Pitts stated that Ms. Jeffries, Ms. Chen and herself attended a conference that was put on by the Department of Historic Resources for Commissioners of Architectural Review Boards and stated that Mr. McRoberts was also in attendance. Ms. Pitts stated that the session focused on what it takes to be a good Commissioner and what type of commitment you need to have. Ms. Pitts stated that they also discussed archeology, and staff received information that can be used in developing an archeology ordinance. She add that unfortunately it was not too much information, but there were a lot of good resources where they can go to look at other localities. Ms. Pitts stated that it would be worthwhile to invite DHR to come and do a session for the Commission members.

Continuation of Secretary Report

Ms. Jeffries inquired if the Commission had any questions about the window assessment form.

The Commission was in consensus that the window assessment form was a vast improvement.

Ms. Jeffries stated that if the Commission has any comments that they can email them to her.

Ms. Pitts stated that hopefully they will have audio recording ready on the 5th floor for the

meeting next month and stated to the Commission that they are not going to have microphones in the front of them and to be aware that they will always be on a hot microphone.

Ms. Pitts stated that staff has encouraged applicants to come to the Commission for conceptual review when they are doing larger additions and stated that staff has been talking about requiring them to come to the Commission for conceptual review for substantial additions based on scale.

Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed the Administrative Approval Report and stated that there were many of administrative approvals for paint this month.

Ms. Pitts stated that Ms. Jeffries prepared new a form for alterations to windows including different repair classes. Ms. Pitts stated that there was some discussion on administrative approvals for windows and they wanted to have more information about the level of deterioration of windows so they drafted this document.

Enforcement Report

Other Committee Reports

UDC Report

Mr. Green stated that UDC discussed the Allen Avenue project and stated that they need to get comments to Ms. Pitts. Mr. Green also stated that UDC reviewed a huge new ramp at the Maury Street exit at I95 that is coming through the design phase right now and stated that they will see the execution on the Canal Walk improvements on 10th and 12th Street with some modifications.

[CAR/UDC 2017-28](#)

400 block of North Allen Avenue: Conceptual Location, Character, and Extent review of the Allen Avenue Common Park Project

Attachments: [Site Map and Plans](#)

[UDC Staff Report to City Planning Commission](#)

Ms. Pitts stated that UDC at their last meeting conducted a conceptual review of Allen Avenue Common Park Project. Ms. Pitts stated that they are not planning on removing any trees and stated that they are adding vegetation and hardscaping throughout the park. Ms. Pitts stated that the UDC also discussed the lighting in the park. Ms. Pitts stated that the UDC was supportive of the project and they are recommending approval of the conceptual design to the Planning Commission requesting that the applicant look into lighting and work with Public Works regarding the ADA ramps. Ms. Pitts stated that the Committee also placed conditions on the recommendation that staff coordinate with UDC and CAR as this is located in a city old and historic district and to look at alternative locations for the ramps, lighting and lighting temperature. Ms. Pitts stated that they were hoping that the Commission could offer some comments to advise the UDC on the project and stated that it was reviewed for location, character and extent with UDC as the recommending body.

Mr. Green stated that he wanted the Commission to review this because of the location and wanted to make sure that they maintain the relationship with the nearby monument.

Mr. Green stated that one of his concerns was the materials which they were proposing such as blue stone, which the Commission has been denying applications to use this on sidewalks on Monument Avenue. Mr. Green stated that it is important that they be consistent and stated that there are some wonderful qualities about the design and think they have spent a lot of time doing this and working with the neighbors. Mr. Green stated that they have already taken the project to MAPS and the Fan District.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that Mr. Green mentioned blue stone and stated that she sees brick indicated in the plans. She added that there are a variety of pavement materials in many colors proposed and inquired what the materials were. Mr. Josh Son, Secretary of UDC, stated that this is a conceptual plan and there are a lot of decisions that can still be made and added that when the CAR is reviewing it if there are materials that they would like to shy away from that is something that they can comment on. Mr. Son stated that this project is being proposed by the organization Friends of Allen Avenue Commons and so the entire project is being funded by fundraising and people donating in kind materials. He reiterated that if there are particular materials that they should stay away from based on the Commission's recommendation that is something that they can talk about.

Mr. Green stated that the areas they should be looking at is the decorative medallions and stated that it would be somewhat polychromatic inside the medallions.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was going to be irrigation for this project, and Mr. Son answered that he believes this is something that they can look into and stated that as currently proposed there will be natural storm water drainage with brick or permeable pavers. Mr. Son stated that they are proposing plantings that are low maintenance and drought tolerant. Mr. Yates stated that he thinks that in the long term it would be good to try and incorporate an irrigation system. Mr. Son commented that the applicant stated that since a majority of the residents along the street have water hoses that they will be able to water the plants. Mr. Son stated that he does not know if their budget will allow them to provide an irrigation system but stated that he will confer with them.

Mr. Klaus stated that since there is currently nothing in the median he is comfortable with concrete and brick and not with blue or colored stone. Mr. Green stated that it is worth having the conversation whether a broader range of material is appropriate or they could go the other way.

The Commission briefly discussed the tree canopy and adding more lighting for safety.

Ms. Pitts stated that this item is going to the Planning Commission on the 5th of September and if anyone has any comments they can email her their concerns, and she will compile them and email them back. Ms. Pitts stated that it will have to be emailed to her by the end of the week.

Mr. Green stated that his only concerns were that the color pallet is compatible with what they have been approving, the maintenance of the park, the axial relationship with the monument, and the closed canopy.

*****Please Note*****

Public comment on cases brought before the CAR will be heard after the applicant's explanatory remarks of the case and before CAR deliberation. Applicants and individuals wishing to comment on specific aspects of a given case are asked to briefly address issues related to the application.

BEGINNING AT 4:00 PM**CONSENT AGENDA**

Ms. Pitts stated that they have some changes to the agenda that item number 5 is going to be moved to conceptual review for 8 East Main Street, as the applicant expressed a desire to modify the plans. Ms. Pitts stated that item number 15 for 3118 Marshall Street has been withdrawn by the applicant.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor to move item number 3 for 319 N 27th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cooley. Mr. Green stated that he was not entirely clear what the applicant was proposing. Ms. Pitts stated that they are proposing to rebuild the exact same structure and screen on the first floor and stated that it was an in-kind replacement. After further discussion the motion passed 7-1-0, Hendricks opposed.

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item number 13 for 305 Brook Road based on its compliance with the Guidelines. The motion was second by Mr. Bond and passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Klaus, that Consent Agenda as amended be approved as submitted with staff's recommended conditions for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

- 1 [COA-021091-2017](#) 2211 West Grace Street - Modify an existing rear porch.

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

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Klaus, that this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

- 3 [COA-021085-2017](#) 319 North 27th Street - Replace and screen in existing rear porch.

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

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Hughes, that this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the details of the proposed decking be provided for administrative review and approval and the screening be installed behind the porch railing and columns. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

13 [COA-021420-2017](#) 305 Brook Road - Install storefront awnings.

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

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Klaus, that this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

REGULAR AGENDA

2 [COA-021082-2017](#) 1101 West Grace Street - Remove a wall at the rear of the property.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(9/26/17\)](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report \(9/26/17\)](#)
[Application and Plans \(8/22/17\)](#)
[Staff Report \(8/22/17\)](#)

The applicant Mr. Tom Conway, President of the Alexander Building Homeowner's Association, gave a brief description of the project and answered questions from the Commission members.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they have had houses that the City has deemed unsafe and that they had to be demolished and inquired what the difference here is with the City saying that this wall is unsafe and needs to be taken down. Ms. Jeffries responded that the City's notice of violation states that the wall either needs to be repaired or replaced.

Mr. Green stated that it is an order to repair or replace and not an order to demolish.

Mr. Klaus stated that the information that the owner has given shows that it is not repairable and has to be taken down and inquired if that changes their opinions. Mr. Klaus stated yes their Guidelines state not to remove a masonry wall but states that the wall has to come down to repair it.

Mr. Green commented that might not be the only recourse and added that trash and graffiti are not structural issues and stated that this is not an order from the City to demolish it and if it was then they would not even be considering it.

Mr. Bond stated that when he first glanced at it he thought it was a concrete wall and stated that it is a parged brick wall and stated that he is fine removing the wall and stated

that they will have to demolish the wall to fix it anyway regardless so he is in favor of allowing them to demolish the wall.

Mr. Johnson stated that his concern is that what the Commission's task is and what the rules say in the Guidelines is that they try to retain the historic fabric and stated is it this body's task to determine structural integrity and whether it should come down. Mr. Johnson also stated that they are here to say that is a significant wall and that is what they stand for.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor commented that the fact is that the wall is being removed and not replaced.

Mr. Yates stated that he is not a structural engineer and realizes that there is damage to the end of the wall and added that the wall was designed as a garden wall originally and was part of the overall design concept for the house. Mr. Yates stated that in the past when they have dealt with demolition they have asked for a letter stating it is necessary and stated that he can't approve this without some kind of documentation.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to either repair or replace the wall and provide evidence that it is not repairable. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Yates, seconded by Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to explore repairing or replacing the existing wall and to provide additional information including an engineer's report regarding the condition of the existing wall. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

6 [COA-021092-2017](#) 18 West Leigh Street - Construct rear porch and single story garage in rear.

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

A motion was made by Cooley, seconded by Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the porch railing be a standard Richmond rail design, or the pickets be placed on the inside of the handrail for a more finished appearance; the applicant paint or stain the structure a color to be administratively approved by staff; the garage roof be a parapet and shed roof design as the proposed overhanging eaves are not a traditional roof form found in the district; and details of the proposed garage door, lighting fixtures, paint colors, and parking hardscaping be provided for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

No -- 2 - Bryan Green and Joseph Yates

7 [COA-021095-2017](#) 727 North 22nd Street - Construct 2-story rear addition, restore front porch.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(9/26/17\)](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report \(9/26/17\)](#)

[Application and Plans \(8/22/17\)](#)

[Staff Report \(8/22/17\)](#)

Ms. Karrie Ann Steiner, representing Charlie Fields, the engineer, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Bond stated that he fully supports staff recommendations and stated that it seems like the problem is with the addition and stated that it is too big for that little house. Mr. Bond stated that they are trying to create a faux porch when it is not a porch and they are just applying shutters and railing to the wall and stated that the attempt is to make it look subordinate to the house to diminish its importance and stated that he doesn't think the design accomplishes this.

Mr. Cooley stated that he thinks they should move toward a deferral and let the applicant come back with another design.

Mr. Hendricks stated that to him a two-story addition seems to be the natural progression of a house like this and stated that he is less concerned about the two-story element and stated that he has some concerns with the fenestration and the shutters and the way they are used in this design. Mr. Hendricks stated that in concept he is comfortable with the two-story addition.

Mr. Green stated that the execution is over complicated and added that he appreciates what the applicant is trying to do but that he would appreciate it more if it was a real porch and functioned as a porch.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she agree with Mr. Green and then addressed the two windows, stating that she knows they are not supposed to approve additional fenestration on a primary facade but stated that they always like more details and more fenestration on a primary façade. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that maybe they can assure that the new windows are differentiated so that it is clear that they are new.

Mr. Klaus stated that it is important to understand how the existing porch relates to the second floor where the current proposal kind of erases it and stated that it is important that the historic first floor porch remain.

Mr. Cooley stated that the drawings are hard for him to comprehend and stated that he can't grasp the interior and so doesn't know why they are asking for the exterior changes.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor to defer the application with recommendations that the applicant consider a two-story addition within the footprint or over top of the existing first floor addition and that the faux porch motif be rethought and come back for reconsideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cooley and passed 7-0-1 (Yates not in motion).

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Cooley, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow the applicant the

opportunity to explore revising the plans to limit the second floor to the footprint of the the existing first floor and to propose an alternate design that does not include the enclosed porch. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

Abstain -- 1 - Joseph Yates

8 [COA-021096-2017](#) 812 Jessamine Street - Rehabilitate exterior of home, add 2nd story to rear addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Jerome Myers, Project Manager, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Klaus commented that the addition needs to relate to the existing structure.

Mr. Cooley commented on the existing chimney and stated that they need to get their chimney and roof drawn correctly and build the house around and let it show through the roof.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they can squeeze the walls in 6 inches on the 2-story addition in the back.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they could do something to differentiate the roof line because it is reading as one large mass.

Public Comment

Mr. Sherwood Clanton, speaking as member of the public, stated that he lives at 810 Jessamine and came to speak against the project.

Ms. Nancy Lambert, speaking as a member of the public, came to speak against the project.

Public Comment Closed

Mr. Yates stated that there is a feeling with the Commission that there are some things that can be tweaked on this design.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to partially approve the application and defer the addition so the applicant can work with staff and approve the siding and porch. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cooley. Mr. Klaus stated that they need to address the trees. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly amendment that they approve the siding and the porch based on staff recommendations and defer the addition. After further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Yates, seconded by Cooley, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved for the reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission approved the restoration of the siding and porch provided that the following conditions are met: the wood siding be restored on the façade; any fiber cement siding installed on the secondary elevations of the

existing structure be smooth, unbeaded, and with a reveal consistent with the reveal; dimensions of the proposed decking boards be provided for administrative review and approval; and the porch balusters be turned to match those shown in the photograph of the property from 1993. The Commission deferred review of the proposed addition to allow the applicant the opportunity to work with staff to address staff's and the Commission's concerns with the proposed design and how it relates the existing building.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

9 [COA-021120-2017](#) 5 West Leigh Street - Paint a previously painted brick home.

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

Mr. Steve Bugnaki, the applicant, came up to answer questions.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mr. Cooley stated that this is what he calls a wash and not a paint and stated that he doesn't know anyone in this day and age that showed him that they could replicate it or duplicate it. Mr. Cooley stated that as part of their Guidelines they cannot let anyone paint red brick yellow.

Mr. Green clarified, stating that the Guidelines did not say do not let them paint the brick yellow and stated that the Guidelines says paint it the brick the color of the masonry beneath it.

Mr. Yates stated that they just found that the district was created in 1987 and inquired Ms. Pitts if she could add anything further, and Ms. Pitts answered no and stated that she wanted to clarify that the yellow color that the applicant chose is on the paint palette for masonry buildings and stated that because it was not a yellow sand color brick building staff recommended against it.

Mr. Cooley stated that he would recommend not painting and repair the mortar.

Mr. Green stated that if the applicant can deal with the wood and the citation is addressed and then the applicant can do some repointing and paint the pieces of brick that they patched to match the brick that is there.

Mr. Green made a motion to defer the application to allow staff the opportunity to talk to other City staff to find out what the citation covers and if painting the wood elements remedies that then the applicant is free to do his painting on top of the patched areas. The motion was seconded by Johnson and passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Green, seconded by Johnson, Jr., that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow staff the opportunity to confirm the requirements of the code enforcement citation regarding peeling paint on the structure. The Commission encourages the applicant to maintain the existing red wash and touch up as needed if the Code Enforcement Division does not require the masonry to be painted.. The motion carried by the following

vote:

Aye -- 8 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

10 [COA-021155-2017](#) 320 North 32nd Street - Install textured fiber cement siding.

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

Mr. Chris Pollock, the applicant came up to answer questions.

Mr. Cooley stated that the one wall above the parking lot he drove past it while the sun was on it and stated that if that wall was changed it would not be such a big expense.

Mr. Klaus stated that he has the same thought as Mr. Cooley did and stated that the one wall that faces the parking lot and the little part that faces the other street, the alley wall he would have a little lenience on the long wall that is there.

There was no public comment

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it was approved as smooth and stated that she is concerned that if they do not stick with that they are setting precedence.

Mr. Green stated that the alley is highly visible when you come around the corner and stated that it is hard to miss and stated that there is nothing to screen the view.

Mr. Klaus inquired if there was an ability to put a privacy fence around the alley and Mr. Green stated that you will still see it.

Mr. Bond stated that this is one of those regrettable incidences and stated that Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a good point that they have precedence to worry about and stated that he can't see a way to allow this and it is so clearly delineated in the Guidelines. Mr. Bond stated that he would support the staff recommendation.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he wonders if there is some filler type product out there that they can make it into a smooth product at the end and then repaint it. Mr. Green stated that they looked into that and stated that it was more expensive in the end and stated that it does not bond really well.

Mr. Yates stated that he agrees that their Guidelines are very clear and stated that he feels for the contractor in this situation. Mr. Yates stated that one of the things that he saw when he went out to the site was on the alley side when you get down to 20ft you really cannot see very much and stated that his thought was to replace the siding on the parking lot and the small narrow end facing the opposite street and continuing down 20ft on the alley side or until the point where it was no longer visible.

A motion was made by Mr. Bond to deny the application based on staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and failed (Cooley, Klaus, Yates, Hendricks opposed).

Mr. Klaus made a motion to allow the applicant to replace the siding on the parking lot

and the Marshall Street and 20ft on alley elevation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and failed 3-5-0(Johnson, Aarons-Sydnor, Cooley, Bond and Green opposed).

Mr. Green, Mr. Bond and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor were very clear on setting precedence and opposed the application.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor to deny the application per the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed 5-3-0(Klaus, Bond and Hendricks opposed).

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Green, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deny the application for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Bryan Green and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

No -- 3 - Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus and Joseph Yates

- 11 [COA-020167-2017](#) 2209 Venable Street - Construct an accessory dwelling unit at the rear of the property.

Attachments: [Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans \(8/22/17\)](#)

[Staff Report \(8/22/17\)](#)

[Public Comment \(8/22/17\)](#)

[Application and Plans \(7/25/2017\)](#)

[Staff Report \(7/25/2017\)](#)

[Public Comment \(7/25/17\)](#)

Mr. Sam Tuttle, applicant came up to answer questions.

Public Comment

Ms. Nancy Lambert, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak against the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Hendricks to approve the application with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed 6-2-0(Aarons-Sydnor and Green opposed).

A motion was made by Hendricks, seconded by Johnson, Jr., that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the siding be smooth, unbeaded, and with a reveal differentiated from the reveal of the siding on the primary structure; details of the proposed roof shingles be provided for administrative review and approval; the spacing of the set of square windows as proposed for the visible south elevation be altered to have three individual evenly spaced windows; the work be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions; and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 6 - David C. Cooley, Sanford Bond, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus, Joseph Yates and Neville C. Johnson Jr.
- No --** 2 - Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor and Bryan Green

12 [COA-018248-2017](#) 508 West Marshall Street - Amend plans for a new single-family home.

Attachments: [Site Map](#)
[Application and Plans \(8/22/17\)](#)
[Staff Report \(8/22/17\)](#)
[Application and Plans \(6/27/2017\)](#)
[Staff Report \(6/27/2017\)](#)

Mr. David Clinger, the applicant, came up to answer questions.

A motion was made by Mr. Cooley to approve the application with staff recommendation and the condition that the cornice details be approved by staff. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor gave directions that the applicant bring the front edge of the dentil out either vertically or sloped so that it appears more prominent. Mr. Klaus made a friendly amendment that applicant was amendable to put in a faux detail on the expansive brick on the bottom to help break up the brick wall through a recessed brick panel to be approved administratively. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-1-0(Green opposed).

A motion was made by Cooley, seconded by Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the applicant submit the proposed brick color for administrative review and approval; details of the deck railing be submitted for administrative review and approval; details of the proposed window and door materials be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the fiber cement siding be smooth and unbeaded; the cornice be redesigned to extend the proposed bracket in a manner to be administratively reviewed and approved by staff; and detail to include recessed brick panels be include on the basement level to break up the brick wall. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 6 - David C. Cooley, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Sanford Bond, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus and Joseph Yates
- No --** 1 - Bryan Green
- Abstain --** 1 - Neville C. Johnson Jr.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

5 [COA-021088-2017](#) 8 East Main Street - Construct a second story addition on an existing 1-story garage.

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

Mr. Dave Johannas, the applicant, came up to give a brief presentation and answer

questions.

Public Comment

Ms. Danielle Worthington, with Historic Richmond, came up to speak and gave the applicants some recommendations as well as asked for more information regarding materials, height, and the location of trash cans and HVAC equipment.

Mr. Yates stated that this will be really visible from Foushee Street and stated that this design does not recall anything in the area and added that there is no connection to the historic district in any shape or form.

Mr. Bond stated that it seems like an odd choice to try and make the design Queen Anne and it's not, it's too cute, and stated that it should be more contemporary looking. Mr. Bond stated that his other concern is the faux brackets to support the bays and stated that they come down off center of the openings which seems a little odd.

Mr. Green stated that he is concerned that when he looks at the building he does not see anything in this design that tells him it belongs with the building to which it's being added or that it belongs in this district. Mr. Green stated that it does not seem to be connected to anything around it and stated that the location seems to call for something more industrial vernacular rather than residential vernacular. Mr. Green stated that it has some scale issues and does not seem to be compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Yates stated that the applicant requested that this item be moved from the regular agenda to conceptual.

Mr. Johnson stated that it would be good for them to work with Historic Richmond Foundation and understand their concerns because they are similar to the Commission's concerns. Mr. Johnson stated that they can come up with something that will work with all the comments that they have received.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it is a nice design but in the wrong place and stated that she understands the challenge of relating it to the main building because the main house is very vertical and this is not a vertical structure. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the better path might be to make it more industrial rather than try and make it another style and to try not to mimic any style. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they should go with something simpler and of the period versus trying to match a style.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it relates to the building across the street really well and stated that he agrees that the simplicity of the garage should help inform more of the building.

Mr. Cooley stated that he can understand a second bedroom and stated that he does not think it's symmetrical, and it's even less so now with the proposed two story frame addition.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

- 14 [COA-021086-2017](#) 101 North 29th Street - Construct a rear addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)[Site Map](#)[Staff Report](#)[Public Comment](#)

Mr. Todd Dykshorn, the applicant, came up to answer questions from the Commission.

Ms. Margaret Freund, the owner, came up to answer questions from the Commission.

Public Comment

Mr. Larry Horton, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak firmly against the project.

Mr. Tom Saunders, speaking as a member of the public, came to speak against the project.

Ms. Danielle Worthing, with Historic Richmond Foundation, came to speak about the project and stated that they still have several concerns. Ms. Worthington stated that the impact of the changes will have a negative effect on the character of this building and corner and will alter over half of the historic fabric of this structure.

Public Comment Closed

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor had concerns about the garage door and the applicant Ms. Freund explained the details.

Mr. Cooley stated that when he saw the tower out back that he was lost and stated that they lost his support on the enclosed porch and stated that it was ugly as it could possibly be. Mr. Cooley stated that they can put the elevator inside of the house.

Mr. Bond stated that he does not understand why they can't put the elevator on the inside and excavate a little bit in the basement to fit it. He added that with the scope of this project that is not going to be a deal breaker. Mr. Bond stated that it could have a glass enclosure so they could see out and emerge from the garage and stated that it could be an attractive design.

Mr. Cooley stated that the other part that caused him to go back to the Guidelines was that they are not supposed to enclose entire porches when they are so prominent and stated that he is glad this is a conceptual review because there are some things that the applicants need to think about. Mr. Cooley stated that he thinks that some of the porch needs to remain open and stated that driving past this area he has not never seen anyone on this porch and stated that they need some open porch over there.

Mr. Klaus stated that the external elevator for him is a nonstarter and stated that they do allow porch enclosures but they are normally on rear or secondary elevations. Mr. Klaus stated that he does not know of any instances where the Commission has allowed a porch enclosure on a primary elevation especially on a prominent corner like this. Mr. Klaus stated that those are the two issues that he has and stated that he can understand the two story garage but states that he is having more trouble with the other two issues.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he is a little more comfortable with the elevator shaft as it is clearly secondary and subordinate and stated that the garage is okay because it is filling

in the existing footprint. Mr. Hendricks added that he is usually against infilling porches and stated that he is sure that they do not allow them on primary and secondary elevations and stated that he does not mind the infill here because it is one of the better ones that they have seen. Mr. Hendricks stated that he is more supportive of this project.

Mr. Green stated that he is generally okay with the massing of the garage and stated that there is certainly precedent for it and stated that for him the elevator shaft is a non-starter having it exposed on a rear elevation. Mr. Green stated that there is a better solution and that the side elevation enclosure has improved, adding that if they eliminate the transoms at the top and the bottom and get a simple long casement it may help to minimize the attention that they are drawing to it. Mr. Green stated that they need to simplify the lines and added that he could come around the idea of them enclosing that first floor porch if they keep the upper floor open or vice versa. Mr. Green stated that they have approved porch enclosures on side elevations but not on this scale.

Mr. Yates stated that he echoes Mr. Green's comments and stated that there has been an improvement in the design and stated that he also has a problem with the elevator in the back of the building particularly as it pertains to the neighbors. Mr. Yates stated that he agrees with detailing on the side at least the lower transom panel on the first floor can go away and the windows be extended. Mr. Yates stated that he thinks the columns need to be wider and stated that he is struggling with the second floor enclosure. Mr. Yates stated that the mass of the garage doesn't bother him because it was similar to what was originally there.

Mr. Green stated that even if they are enclosing the first floor the structure should be as thick as the structure that they are replacing and stated that it is reading thinner.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

- 15 [COA-021433-2017](#) 3118 East Marshall Street - Restore existing storefront, construct 2-story rear addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Public Comment](#)

Withdrawn by the applicant

- 4 [COA-021087-2017](#) 110 W Leigh Street - Remove a chimney.

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

Mr. Green stated that it is not unusual for the masonry to be in bad shape from the weather and stated that it is fairly easy to take a chimney down and build it back up.

Mr. Yates stated that it is a really small projection and stated that he does not think repairing it is going to cost a lot. Mr. Yates stated that it is a character defining feature of the house and thinks that the chimney should be repaired.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to deny the application per the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks. Mr. Green stated that his only concern is that it is not that visible. After further discussion the motion failed.

A motion was made by Mr. Cooley to allow further demolition and the capping of the chimney. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and passed 5-1-0(Yates opposed).

A motion was made by Cooley, seconded by Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: the chimney be capped at the roof. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - David C. Cooley, Bryan Green, Gerald Jason Hendricks, James W. Klaus and Neville C. Johnson Jr.

No -- 1 - Joseph Yates

Abstain -- 2 - Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor and Sanford Bond

Adjournment

Mr. Yates adjourned the meeting at 7:35.