



Meeting Minutes - Final
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, January 22, 2019

3:00 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

James Klaus, the Chairman, called the January 22nd meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:33 pm.

Roll Call

Present -- 9 - * Commissioner David C. Cooley, * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler and * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Neville C. Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner James W. Klaus, that the November 27, 2018 minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

Recused -- 2 - Commissioner Sanford Bond and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

November 27, 2018

OTHER BUSINESS

Secretary's Report

Commission Secretary Carey Jones described the Commission staff 2019 Work Plan, which includes: developing a homeowner education and outreach plan to provide information to individuals and community groups about the obligations and benefits of living in a City Old and Historic District; updating the Guidelines, work which is already underway; continuing to work internally and with the City Attorney to develop a standardized methodology for enforcements, which includes clearing out some outstanding enforcements; and updating public information materials, including the website. With an upcoming update to Richmond.gov it will be easier for staff to update the website than it currently is.

Ms. Jones stated that the CAR staff has had many applicant meetings in the past month, including a site visit to 2218 East Grace Street to meet with David Branch regarding replacement columns.

Ms. Jones stated that she, Ms. Chelsea Jeffries, and Mr. Alex Dandridge met with an architect regarding plans for minor exterior repairs and improvements for 6th Mount Zion Baptist Church. Staff has also had applicant meetings regarding a number of properties on East Grace Street.

Ms. Jones stated that she and Ms. Kim Chen will be meeting with representatives from the Better Housing Coalition regarding Goodwyn Flats at 2230 Venable Street regarding new windows and proposed site improvements.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that Commissioner Cooley had assisted the 2218 East Grace Street applicants by directing them to a custom column artisan for their porch columns.

Administrative Approval Report

Chairman Klaus asked for details about the Lee Medical Building at 1805 Monument Avenue. Ms. Jones stated that the Lee Medical Building is being converted into residential units. CAR staff had initially received an application for a building permit for the project. They then contacted the owners to request a Certificate of Appropriateness application, and worked with the owners to revise the plans to be consistent with the Guidelines. CAR staff then administratively approved the work. Ms. Jones is currently reviewing a recently submitted building permit for the same project. Chairman Klaus pointed out that this project is receiving tax credits through the Department of Historic Resources, which Ms. Jones confirmed.

Chairman Klaus mentioned that there are only two National Register designated buildings on Monument Avenue: the Lee Medical Building and the Branch House. Ms. Jones and Ms. Chen confirmed this and clarified that they are the only two individually listed buildings on Monument Avenue.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that the Building Permit Report has been distributed to Commissioners via email, and asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Ms. Jones stated that she and Ms. Chen met with City Attorney staff members regarding violations and that it was a helpful meeting in that it clarified possible next steps in addressing violations. Staff will consider and discuss this new information before moving forward with pursuing court actions.

Chairman Klaus mentioned that there were two denials in the Building Permit Report – 514 North 26th Street and 2109 Cedar Street – and that in both cases it appeared that the applicants had been unaware of the need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness first. Chairman Klaus requested clarification on the sequence of events with applications of this nature. Ms. Jones stated that, if a person applies for a building permit and also needs to come before the Commission but did not do so, Commission staff will contact the applicant and explain to them that their building permit cannot be approved until they receive a Certificate of Appropriateness. Usually in such cases the building permit will be denied, because there is a time limit by which it must be processed.

Chairman Klaus asked how applicants typically respond in such a situation, and if they are often surprised to learn that their property is in a historic district.

Ms. Jones responded that some people are surprised to learn that they are in an Old and

Historic District, and some know they are located in the district but are not aware of the application requirements which go with that. Also, because building permits take some time to be approved, applicants will begin that process as quickly as possible, not realizing that the permit cannot go forward until the Commission of Architectural Review process is complete.

Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus reported on the most recent Urban Design Committee meeting, of January 10, 2019. He stated that that committee reviewed some accessory buildings proposed for the 17th Street Market, which is not in a historic district. The UDC is also in the process of reviewing and approving two new schools, similar to the George Mason School which has been undergoing CAR review, before those projects go before the Planning Commission.

*****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.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Chairman invited the Commission to suggest projects that they would like to move from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. He explained to the applicants present that, if they did not wish for their applications to be placed on the consent agenda, they would have an opportunity to have it moved back to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 1st item, COA-045479-2018, 3317 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Cooley, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 5th item, COA-047305-2019, 2109 Cedar Street to the consent agenda.

Commissioner Hendricks stated his concern that this project, a new garage which appears to be a replica of a nearby garage, not include the same sort of ornamental false hardware which the other garage has.

Chairman Klaus stated that the staff recommendations include that the door and hardware details are to be submitted for staff review and approval. Chairman Klaus expressed concern about the lighting to be placed on the new garage, that it should be less disruptive than that of the nearby, similar garage. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Cooley, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 6th item, COA-047054-2019, 3312 East Broad Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment concerning the items on the consent agenda. There was none.

A motion was made by Commissioner Neville C. Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner Sanford Bond, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion

carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 1 [COA-045479-2018](#) 3317 Monument Avenue - Construction of a new carport.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(12/18/2018\)](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report\(12/18/2018\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner 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: materials details including window and roof specifications, the proposed board and batten material, and colors be submitted for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 5 [COA-047305-2019](#) 2109 Cedar Street - Construction of a new, two-car garage.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: garage door details be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 6 [COA-047054-2019](#) 3312 East Broad Street - Construction of a rear addition and deck.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the siding reveal of the addition be wider than that of the existing home and the siding be smooth and without a bead; the side lites on the first story window be removed; and the rear door have simulated divided lites. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

- 2 [COA-047101-2019](#) 2217-2219 Cedar Street - Construction of two, new, attached single-family residences.

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

Ms. Carey Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones stated that The Commission of Architectural Review conceptually reviewed this application at the December 18, 2018 meeting. During review of the application, staff recommended that the applicant align the windows on the visible side elevation, use a single porch column instead of a paired column, and the applicant reduce the amount of PVC used for the trim pieces. During the meeting, the Commission was generally in support of the project and encouraged the applicant to align the visible windows, to explore staggering the setback, to not use PVC for the decorative elements on the façade, to deepen the depth of the bays, and to be attentive the column and railing designs.

The site was previously developed with two 2-story attached residential buildings, similar in style to the building next door, 2213-2215 Cedar Street. In response to Commission recommendations, the applicant has adjusted the plans to use a single column for the porch, and align the windows on the two visible bays. The rear elevation plan and the materials list have not changed from the previously submitted version. Ms. Jones pointed out that the Guidelines state that PVC has a limited application in freestanding buildings, and that staff finds the extensive use of PVC on the front porch and cornice line to be inconsistent with the Guidelines, particularly as this is a building of traditional design, and that wood should be used instead.

Staff recommended approval of the construction of two new houses at 2217-2219 Cedar Street, with the following conditions: That a wood or aluminum clad wood windows with true or simulated divided lights with exterior muntins and an interior spacer bar be submitted for administrative review and approval; that the specifications for proposed cornice line panels and dentils, the porch details including beaded board paneling, the decorative spandrels, and the brackets be submitted for administrative review and approval; that the final paint colors be submitted for administrative review and approval; and that the location of the HVAC equipment be submitted for administrative review and approval.

The applicant, Matt Jarreau, stated that following the previous Commission review, the planned building setback has been moved forward about two feet for a more staggered appearance; and that some of the faux gingerbread details had been removed from the porches. Mr. Jarreau stated that he had no objections to the recommendations from staff.

Chairman Klaus asked if the window adjacent to the kitchen sink could be moved so that it is centered.

Mr. Jarreau stated that the window in its current position works better with the kitchen appliance layout, and that it will have limited visibility from the street, and that the non-aligned window formation would not be noticeable from a moving vehicle.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the Commission was asking a lot by requesting that the applicant re-locate appliances so as to fit the kitchen window in an aligned position.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Commission's responsibility is for the exterior of structures, not the interior.

Commissioner Cooley questioned the use of PVC in the proposed plans.

Mr. Jarreau stated that he has conceded as far as the windows are concerned and will not use PVC for those; however, he stated that for the decorative features he felt strongly that PVC will be more durable and will create a sharper appearance. He also stated that PVC details on the cornice line would not be identifiable as such from the street.

Commissioner Cooley suggested that a Boral material be considered as an alternative to PVC.

Chairman Klaus stated the staff recommendations include the applicant undergoing an administrative approval for proposed cornice line panels and dentils, and porch details – so staff would be looking at these details and coming to an agreement with the applicant.

Commissioner Morgan stated that minimizing the cornice details would help to solve the PVC issue.

Commissioner Cooley stated that, as the design is similar to a Queen Anne, decorative detailing is appropriate and called for. Commissioner Morgan clarified that she was referring to reducing the scale and extent of the detail, not eliminating it altogether.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that any handrails or gutters added to the design should be submitted for administrative approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: a wood or aluminum clad wood window with true or simulated divided lights with exterior muntins and an interior spacer bar be submitted for administrative review and approval; the fiber cement siding be smooth and without a bead; the specifications for proposed cornice line panels and dentils, the porch details including beaded board paneling, the decorative spandrels, and the brackets be submitted for administrative review and approval; the final paint colors be submitted for administrative review and approval; the location of the HVAC equipment be submitted for administrative review and approval; and

the location, design, and materials of gutters and handrails be submitted for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- No --** 1 - Commissioner David C. Cooley

3 [COA-047059-2019](#) 813 North 28th Street - Construction of a new 750 student school, site improvements, and new playground facilities.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones stated that the Commission of Architectural Review conceptually reviewed this application at the November 18, 2018 meeting, and that at this meeting Commission members recommended ways to reduce the size and scale of the roof, and also recommended that the applicants consider adding additional openings on the ground floor, reducing the decorative features to be more consistent with an institutional building, and installing a covered walkway.

At the November Commission meeting, staff mentioned that a separate application for the demolition of the existing school building will be necessary. Staff has not yet received an application for the demolition.

Since the November meeting, the applicants have provided additional information and photographs of prototypes. In response to community concerns they have moved the bus drop-off area from the parking lot accessed by Cedar Street to have buses travel on O Street, along 29th and out onto M Street. The applicants have also provided updated landscape and lighting plans.

The applicants brought additional updated details to the current meeting, with changes including the parking lot which had been the bus loop location has been reduced in size; and more detail of a buffered area between the proposed bus path and the revised drop-off area, including a crossing section. The applicants also provided materials details, including red brick on exterior walls, brown brick for the raised foundation, and precast concrete details.

At the Commission's request, the applicants provided images of the prototype schools from which the public school designs are drawn.

Ms. Jones stated that staff recommends approval of the construction of a new school at 813 North 28th Street, with the condition that decorative fence and other site improvements be submitted for administrative review and approval.

Mr. Wheeler voiced concern about the existing school buildings, particularly the historic one which appears to be gone in the plans under review. He asked if it would be possible for their demolition or preservation to be treated separately from the new construction currently being reviewed.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the old school buildings will not be demolished until after the new school is complete, and that the applicants are aware of the Commission's concern about the historic school building on the site.

Mr. David Wiggins of RRMM Architects and Mr. Steve Raugh of Timmons Group introduced themselves as representatives of the applicant.

Commissioner Morgan asked that the Commission be shown the additional window openings which were requested in the applicant's previous review.

Mr. Wiggins stated that in one of the areas in question, the walls where windows were requested are referred to as the teaching walls of the classroom, which have projectors, marker boards, and other equipment. He stated that windows could be installed in these walls by employing spandrels but that the cost would be considerable, and would not be beneficial to the overall design or the intent of the Commission's review.

Mr. Wiggins stated that, in the other area where additional windows were requested, at the end of the building, the scale of the area of unrelieved brick was less considerable than it might have appeared to the Commission.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the applicant would be open to removing the keystone element which has been applied to the middle of the windows.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the modular prototype nature of the school seemed to limit the changes the architects could make, e.g., adding windows. Mr. Wiggins confirmed that, due to the nature of the prototype floor plans, the teaching wall will always be in a similar location.

Commissioner Morgan stated that in some areas where windows are not possible, some other detailing is necessary in order to break up the mass of the structure.

Commissioner Morgan pointed out the "Reflect Room" as a place where a good amount of windows would presumably be desired, as well as a northwestern section of the plan lacking in windows.

Mr. Wiggins stated that this is the location of the mechanical enclosure which contains chillers, generators, and other equipment, which is screened at the back of the building by a 14-foot-high wall.

Commissioner Morgan pointed out that in some areas of the design variations in brick color and other details had been employed to add variety, and asked if assurances could be provided to the Commission that other areas currently monotonous would receive similar improvement.

Mr. Wiggins stated that actual window openings would be difficult in the area specified, but that faux-window brick picture frame detailing would not be difficult to add, perhaps modeled on the two actual windows around the corner.

Commissioner Morgan asked Ms. Jones if the design changes discussed at the current meeting would require an additional Commission meeting to be reviewed again, or if these could be specified items that staff would follow up on and review and approve.

Ms. Jones stated that the Commission could choose either option.

Ms. Morgan stated that, as a large important building, the school would be worth Commission's time to discuss and review again, if necessary.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Shane Flansburg, resident and owner of 801 North 27th Street, expressed concern about the school's lighting and whether its non-intrusiveness in the neighborhood could be followed up on and checked after construction; the mechanical noise from the school's generators and other equipment, and whether it would be distant and well-screened enough; trash pickup and dumpster locations, and anticipated frequency of pickups and resultant noise and traffic disruption; whether there would be enough parking or if there would be overflow use of street parking spots; and whether the parking area would be secured at night.

Mr. Flansburg requested clarification on whether the current review included the parking area.

Chairman Klaus stated that the present review was for new construction not within the footprint of the existing school buildings.

Danielle Porter of Historic Richmond Foundation stated that the Foundation is strongly in favor of preserving the historic building on the George Mason school site, as it is a rare example from an era shortly after the establishment of public schools in the region. Ms. Porter pointed out that the building could have alternative uses, for example as a fieldhouse.

Chairman Klaus asked if one of the applicant representatives would answer the questions raised.

Program Manager for the City of Richmond, Mr. Mike McIntyre, of AECOM, introduced himself. Mr. McIntyre stated that the mechanical section with chillers and other equipment would be screened with a 14-foot-high wall with double doors. Mr. McIntyre stated that there would be sufficient parking for teachers and staff, and that plans call for 3 parking lots, one small lot and two larger ones, which together will be more than sufficient to ensure that school parking does not impinge on on-street parking. Mr. McIntyre stated that the parking lot will have a lockable swing-arm gate to be locked after hours, and left locked on weekends. Mr. McIntyre stated that he did not have information on trash pickup times for the school's dumpsters. He stated that George Mason is a "recyclable" school, so all the cafeteria paper goods go into recycling containers, which equates to greater pickup needs, most likely twice a week. Mr. McIntyre stated that the trash area is set up to be easily hosed down.

Chairman Klaus stated that the lighting plan would go through the City's permitting process, which includes Commission staff approval. This will provide an opportunity to double-check that the lighting plan is not intrusive for the neighborhood.

Mr. McIntyre stated that there are still possible design changes for the school, but that it is necessary, in order to stay on schedule, that the work begin and the changes be addressed as the work is going on.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the Urban Design Committee, which is currently reviewing

two other schools, would also review George Mason after it clears Commission of Architecture Review. Chairman Klaus stated that they would not, that their purview is only the school projects which are not in historic districts.

Commissioner Pearson expressed concern about the large setback and driveway at the front of the school, as being inconsistent with the neighborhood.

Chairman Klaus stated that, for safe pickup and drop-off, it is considered necessary to pull these functions away from the street – otherwise, it is necessary to close off the street twice a day.

Commissioner Pearson stated that a defined street pickup and drop-off area could act as a traffic calming measure.

Commissioner Hendricks voiced partial agreement with Commissioner Pearson, stating concern about the lack of delineation of pedestrian access.

Mr. McIntyre stated that off-street parent drop-off and pickup is the standard for school design, for safety and security reasons, and that the goal is to separate buses, cars, and pedestrians. Mr. McIntyre stated that on-street pickup is dangerous, especially in the afternoon when parents may be parked across the street, and creates traffic congestion.

Chairman Klaus expressed concern about the lack of a clearly marked path for students approaching the school along 28th Street. Mr. McIntyre stated that there will be marked sidewalks and pedestrian crossings at the drop-off areas on the school grounds, but that the school construction funds cannot be used to make changes to public sidewalks.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, 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 decorative fence be submitted for administrative review and approval. The Commission approved the building location and offered suggestions to alter the decorative details to simplify the window keystones and splayed brick headers, to add brick detailing or recesses to unarticulated areas of the elevations, including the main entry on the east elevation, and north and south elevations at the end of the classroom wing. The Commission did not approve the overall site plan and recommended preservation of the historic school. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 8 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler
- No --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 4 [COA-047275-2019](#) 19 West Leigh Street - Installation of two plate glass windows and addition of rear stairs.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that staff recommends that the Commission partially deny this application, and that the approved components of the plan include the following conditions: that window specifications for the new windows be submitted for administrative review; that the replacement windows be one-over-one, wood or aluminum-clad wood windows; that any unpainted masonry remain unpainted, and that if new paint is proposed, the colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that the replacement door specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; and that design details and location for any proposed signage be submitted for administrative review and approval.

Zoning staff have informed Commission staff that screening is required for the parking; staff recommends the proposed screening and lighting plan be submitted for administrative review and approval. Any exterior signage for commercial use will also have to be reviewed by the Commission, and by Zoning staff.

Chairman Klaus asked if the building's stone veneer, which the applicant intends to keep in place, would have been a part of the structure when it was first built.

Ms. Jones stated that it would not have been original, but that what material is beneath it is unknown.

The applicant, Jeff Keith of Advanced Engineering, introduced himself.

Mr. Keith stated agreement with staff recommendations about the rear stairs and windows. Mr. Keith stated that the front door has a narrow opening, and that the proposed front door with a sidelight design was intended to meet accessibility requirements. Mr. Keith stated that the building's site has become a corner lot, but that it was originally not on a corner, and that this explains its historic lack of side windows. Mr. Keith stated that the intended use of the property is to be a restaurant, whereas previously it was a funeral home, which had very different lighting requirements. Mr. Keith stated that the owner hopes to have visibility via the proposed new window openings of the Bojangles monument which is directly across the street. He also pointed out that every corner commercial building in the vicinity has side windows.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant also owned the side lot adjacent to 19 West Leigh Street. Mr. Keith stated that he did, and that the two lots have been consolidated into one. Chairman Klaus stated that there might be a happy medium between the proposed window designs and a more historically appropriate design. Mr. Keith stated that the proposed windows are similar to others in the area, although most of those have only one window. Mr. Keith stated that he could be amenable to reducing the number of windows. Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for a Commission motion. Chairman Klaus suggested that another window could be added towards the front, either matching the proposed windows or matching the existing second-floor windows, to be administratively approved.

Commissioner Cooley stated that aligned one-over-one windows on both first and second floors would create a more historic appearance. He also stated that within the immediate vicinity of this building, there are no commercial buildings with plate glass windows as large as those proposed.

Commissioner Morgan stated that putting in new windows of the same size as the existing would create a false sense of historical development for the property. Commissioner Morgan stated that she does not believe the existing, small first floor side windows are historic, and suggested enlarging them slightly as an alternative to the proposed new windows.

Mr. Cecil Nedrick, a contractor, introduced himself. Mr. Nedrick stated that there is nothing historical about the building except age; and the interior of the building in its current state is very dark and needs more light.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant would like defer the window design and come back before the Commission with a revised window design, since the proposed plate glass windows are opposed by staff and Commission.

Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that the building was not designed to be a corner building, which it now is, and suggested that additional light could be gained by redesigning the front façade.

Chairman Klaus suggested that the motion go forward and that the applicant return to the Commission at a future time, with a revised proposal focused on the window design. Chairman Klaus also suggested that revising the staff recommendation of a single door instead of a double door might be advisable, given modern accessibility concerns, and the fact that the existing front door is probably not original.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved as presented for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: one-over-one, wood or aluminum-clad wood replacement windows be installed, specifications to be submitted for administrative review and approval; if new paint is proposed, the colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the replacement door specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the design details and location for any proposed signage be submitted for administrative review and approval; and the screening required by zoning and a lighting plan be submitted for administrative review and approval. The Commission deferred the proposed large plate glass windows on the first story west elevation to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the west elevation window openings. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

No -- 1 - Commissioner David C. Cooley

7 [COA-047063-2019](#) 401 North Allen Avenue - Site improvements to front and rear yards.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(1/22/2019\)](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report \(1/22/2019\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chelsea Jeffries presented this application.

Ms. Jeffries stated that the Commission approved the enclosure of a second story rear porch on January 23, 2018. This approval included the condition that the painting on the

rear wall be removed or moved to a less prominent location, as it had been installed without prior approval.

Staff recommended partial approval of the site improvements to front and rear yards at 401 North Allen Avenue, with the following conditions: that the brick stoop and stairs be retained and repaired or replaced in-kind; that the mural be installed in a less prominent location, to be administratively approved; and that the larger portion of the interior brick wall be retained. Staff recommended denial of the following items: the proposed rear gate replacement; the replacement of the rear door transom; and the proposed new opening on the west elevation of the garage.

Jill Nolt of Water Street Studio, representing the applicant, Jill Stefanovich, stated that ghosting on the brick front porch, and core holes within the individual bricks, indicate that the entire porch is not original.

Ms. Nolt stated that the applicant apologizes for putting up the mural in the back of the property before receiving permission to do so. Ms. Nolt stated that the object in question is not a mural, since it is not painted directly onto the building surface. Ms. Nolt stated that the applicant would like this to be considered a removable piece of art. Ms. Nolt stated that the artwork in its proposed location does not conceal any articulation of the brick wall, only a flat expanse.

Ms. Nolt stated that the interior brick wall which staff recommended should be retained does not course in to the perimeter brick wall, and that it is leaning to the west, causing the applicant concern that it might fall during construction of the new fireplace.

Ms. Nolt stated that the historic photographs showing the earlier presence of the gates date back only to the 1980s, and that the modern lumber sizes, indicate that the gates are not original.

Ms. Nolt stated agreement about the rear door transom for which staff has recommended denial, but stated that she and her client would like to replace the door, which they do not believe to be original.

In regard to the proposed opening in the west façade of the garage, Ms. Nolt stated that at this time of year the upper portion of the right window is somewhat visible to the public. Ms. Nolt stated that this should be considered a secondary façade, and that the proposed opening would make it a more useful structure, since it is too small to fit a car, and its original use as a carriage house is outmoded.

Vice-chair Hendricks asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for a motion.

Commissioner Cooley stated admiration for the proposed design from an aesthetic standpoint.

Commissioner Bond stated that he did not object to the removal of the front porch and stoop, given that they are not historic and the proposed replacement design would not create a false sense of historical development. Commissioner Bond also stated, from personal experience, that the current rear gates are not original, and that he would therefore support the proposed gate design as well.

Commissioner Bond asked the applicant if the proposed line of hornbeam would go along the wall. Ms. Nolt stated that the hornbeam is there already and that it will be pruned in

an elevated hedge.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the applicant would be open to lowering the head height of the new opening to allow the retention of some of the brick detailing. Ms. Nolt responded that the opening proposed would be 8 foot 4 inches, which comes up to the inside corner of the window, which is the highest point of the two existing openings. She stated that she and the applicant would be open to lowering the opening height a moderate amount.

Commissioner Cooley asked if the proposed rear door would be steel, with a steel frame.

Ms. Nolt stated that the existing condition is a wood frame and a wood transom which may be original. Ms. Nolt stated that, if all of this is not replaced, she and the applicant would consider whether a steel door is the appropriate response, but that in any case they would like to install a door which lets in as much light as possible.

Commissioner Bond stated that the door currently in place is not original, having been installed in the 1980s when the kitchen was renovated.

Commissioners discussed whether the mural affixed to the rear of the house should be considered a mural, or signage, or a temporarily installed piece of art.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the current state of the hornbeam allowed for considerably more visibility than it would during the spring. Ms. Nolt stated that hornbeams hold their leaves well into the winter, so that the plant screening would be effective during most of the year.

Commissioner Bond stated that the proposed gate design would add clearly contemporary elements that would complement the historic elements.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the proposed project reflects good design, and that this should be rewarded.

Ms. Nolt asked whether, if the mural's proposed placement were to be denied by the Commission, this would be due to its being disallowed by the Guidelines, or because it falls outside the purview of the Commission.

The Commissioners discussed whether the artwork should be considered a mural and, if not, if it could be considered signage. Commissioner Hendricks expressed concern that allowing the artwork to stay in its visible location would set a troublesome precedent. Commissioner Brewer stated that, whether mural or signage, the artwork falls under the Commission's purview due to its visibility as an external feature in a historic district.

Ms. Jones read from the Guidelines on the subject of signage and murals, which state that in general a mural should be done with removable materials, not painted directly onto a wall – thus, for the purposed of the Commission, a removable painting should be considered a mural.

Commissioner Morgan stated her agreement that the artwork in question is a mural, as defined by Commission Guidelines, and thus should fall under the Commission's purview.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the mural would not actually be temporary, as argued by the applicant.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Cooley,

that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved as presented for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the mural / art piece be installed in a less prominent location; and that the Commission deny the replacement of the transom above the rear door and the proposed new garage door opening on the west elevation to allow the applicant to revise the location and size of the proposed new opening based on Commission recommendations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner James W. Klaus

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 8 [COA-047066-2019](#) 312 North 32nd Street - Construction of a new, single-family detached residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff recommended that the windows on the visible bays of the side and rear elevations be vertically and horizontally aligned; that the siding be smooth and without a bead; and that the front porch and rear deck be screened with wood lattice.

Staff requested that the applicant submit the following for final review: specifications for windows, roof shingles, and trim details; dimensioned elevations for all sides of the building; context elevation with dimensions; and the location of the HVAC equipment.

Greg Shron, of Center Creek Homes, stated that his firm plans to take field measurements in the neighborhood, if possible, to get specific and accurate vertical dimensions of adjacent properties so as to double-check how their proposed design aligns with them.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, the Chairman opened the floor for Commission comments and discussion.

Commissioner Johnson stated agreement with staff's recommendations and concerns, including the alignment of the windows and the screening of the front porch and rear deck.

Commissioner Cooley stated that the proposed design is very similar to its neighbors, and voiced concern about alignment of side windows.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the applicant should consider roof gutters and downspouts and their positioning on the rather prominent façade. Commissioner Hendricks stated that ghosting of the block and generally poor craftsmanship is a

frequent problem with parged foundations, and to be wary in selecting contractors for this task.

Chairman Klaus stated that the proposal package was very good and clear, and that the proposed design is a good one. The Chairman stated that, though new construction does need to fit in to its surroundings in a Richmond historic district, there is a great deal of flexibility in the Guidelines allowing for new construction that does not have the appearance of a historical reenactment.

Commissioner Bond stated that the variety of architectural styles on the proposed dwelling's block allow for a variety of creative responses in the design of a contemporary structure that fits in while not appearing historicist.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the Commission is tending to push applicants towards more modern designs. Chairman Klaus concurred.

Commissioner Morgan stated agreement with fellow Commissioners' comments about bringing well-intentioned modern designs to historic districts.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the Commission generally asks that windows on side elevations be aligned, and suggested the possible addition of more windows on the right elevation. Commissioner Morgan recommended removing some of the necking on the columns and the dentil details on the cornice. Commissioner Morgan stated agreement with staff about the proportions of the projecting bay, and pointed out that a projecting bay and full façade front porch are two features which historically did not coincide.

Commissioner Brewer stated agreement with comments about the window alignment, and with Commissioner Morgan's suggestion of adding windows on the side elevation.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the rear elevation be reevaluated, as it appears off balance. Commissioner Wheeler stated that 1-over-1 windows would be a better option than the proposed 2-over-2. Commissioner Wheeler suggested reevaluation of the front pediment, either eliminating it or making it more similar to others on the block, and stated that he found the corner detail bothersome.

Chairman Klaus asked the applicant if he needed any clarification of Commission comments.

Mr. Shron stated that the design under review was consciously and deliberately historicist, in order to make it more marketable; but that he looks forward in future to submitting more contemporary designs as he becomes more familiar with regional tendencies.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

Adjournment

Chairman Klaus adjourned the meeting at 6:39 PM.