

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MINUTES

April 28, 2015

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, April 28, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

Members absent: Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Sanford Bond

Staff Present: Ms. Marianne G. Pitts, CAR Secretary
 Mr. James Hill, DPDR
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary
 Ms. Kimberly Chen, PDPR

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

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

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the March 24th minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 6-0-1 (Wimmer abstained).

Secretary Report

Ms. Pitts inquired if she could move items #5 and #13 earlier on the agenda because 2 of the members are leaving early today. Mr. Green stated that they can adjust the agenda accordingly once they get into the agenda. Ms. Pitts stated that Mr. Rawles, the

Boards and Commission Administrator, sent them an email to the chair of the Land Use Committee in regards to delaying review of applications to fill Ms. Wimmer's position. The chair of Land Use Committee agreed to take up consideration of the applications on June 16th so the deadline to submit applications has been extended until June 1st. Ms. Pitts stated that the Committee chair also decided not to request a formal recommendation from the Commission in regards to who they would like as the person to fill Ms. Wimmer's seat but states that if the Commissioners are interested in receiving copies of the applications for review to provide comments the Land Use Committee is willing to accept comments.

Mr. Green stated that the policy now is that at the end of every quarter after the applications have been reviewed, the applications for anyone who did not get an appointment are removed from the system so the applicant would have to reapply. Ms. Pitts stated that she would email them the applicant's information.

Ms. Pitts stated that in regards to the quarterly meeting there is some language on page 2 of the meeting summary provided to the Commission that the Commission had discussed at the quarterly meeting in regards to corner properties and modifying the Guidelines. Ms. Pitts stated that she wanted to make sure that everyone had time to look at the information.

Ms. Pitts stated that the next document the Commission has before them is the Rules of Procedure which was also modified based on the recommendations that came out of the quarterly meeting in terms that if a project is making alterations to a design that has already received approval by the Commission and the changes are in substantial in compliance with the approval, staff can consult with the Chair and be able to administratively approve the changes.

Mr. Green stated that the intent of this change to the Rules of Procedure is that with larger projects, there are some construction details that do not emerge until the end of the project like functional changes and not design changes.

Ms. Pitts stated that they have also updates some of the language in the Rules of Procedure in regards to the establishment of the districts to put in line with the actual procedures that were adopted when the Task Force was established several years ago.

Mr. Yates stated that under duties the new wording that the Chair should have the authority to review requests for alterations to project plans, and Ms. Pitts stated that it should read be to project designs as suggested by Ms. Aaron-Sydnor.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the changes in procedures. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

The Commission briefly discussed the letter for the BRT and expressed their concerns and listed their issues about the BRT.

- How the BRT affects the zoning on businesses on Broad Street.
- By removing all of the parking spaces on Broad Street that they making the business be in non-compliance with zoning.
- Recommend that they state that parking and loading was historically on the curb for the businesses required functions.
- Commented that removing the parking changes the functionality.
- Commented on the door being on one side of the bus

Mr. Hill commented that there are a couple times in the Commission's letter commenting on BRT when their points are posed in the form of a question and stated that it might be

clearer just to make a statement about what they would like to see or what they would like the result to be otherwise it would be considered rhetorical and glossed over. In response the comment in the letter regarding VCU offering to design the station stops, Mr. Hill stated that if it re-casted it as a statement of what they want to see and stated that the term it has come to our attention might be stronger if they said that where that attribution is from because that is not something that people are familiar with.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the statement came from the new Director of ICA.

Mr. Hendricks made a motion to approve and accept the CAR comments for the BRT as noted with the changes discussed upon final review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Palmquist distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 24 approvals for the period from March 24, 2015 through April 27, 2015.

<u>Address</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Approval No.</u>
----------------	----------------	---------------------

Partial List of Administrative Approvals (Building Permits and Certificate Applications) Issued by Commission Staff

<i>Address</i>	<i>Co.A Received</i>	<i>BP Received</i>	<i>BP No.</i>	<i>Date Approved</i>	<i>Approval No.</i>	<i>SummaryofWork</i>	<i>ConditionofApproval</i>	<i>IssuedBy</i>
516 W MARSHALL ST		3/20/2015	B15032008	3/23/2015	A15-074	Sure up porch (front) floor and lay new T & G flooring. Install new railings and install new fence (front)	In-kind repair and replacement of front porch decking and railings. Install Richmond rail handrails at front steps. Install short picket fence in front yard to match fence at 518 W Marshall. Fence to be painted white	WP
2018 W GRACE ST		3/24/2015	E15031701	3/24/2015	A15-075	Install 22kw generator with 200amp ATS	Generator must be installed at the rear of the house screened from public view.	JH
3603 E MARSHALL ST		3/24/2015	E15032307	3/24/2015	A15-076	Wire new single family dwelling 200 amp service.	Electrical wiring for new construction SFD approved by Commission of Architectural Review on 10/28/14, as well as new 200 amp service	WP
2701 E GRACE ST		3/25/2015	B15022701	3/25/2015	A15-077	Replace porch deck frame and decking in kind with Azek decking.	Use of Azek deck framing approved by the Commission of Architectural Review on 3/24/15.	JH
525 N 1ST ST		3/25/2015	M15032306	3/25/2015	A15-078	Heat pump change out only - no duct work and a range hood vent	In-kind replacement of existing heat pump.	WP
607 W 21ST ST	3/19/2015			3/25/2015	A15-079	Painting the body of the house white (Classic Light Buff), and painting the window trim green (Rookwood Shutter GreEN). The green will match other elements already painted that color, including the porch roof, floor, trim and front door.		MP
2031 MONUMENT AV		3/25/2015	N15032505	3/25/2015	A15-081	Install gas piping.	Interior work only.	WP
2031 MONUMENT AV		3/25/2015	P15032508	3/25/2015	A15-082	Install new plumbing and gas system.	Interior work only.	WP
210 N 28TH ST	3/27/2015			3/27/2015	A15-083	Installation of a simple black metal handrail with 3/4" by 3/4" pickets and a simple straight top for the bottom three steps on the front of a single family dwelling.		MP

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
541 MOSBY ST	3/25/2015			3/27/2015	A15-084	Painting porch decking and step treads SW #6207 (Retreat), painting trim, lattice, posts, and risers SW #7006 (Extra Whites) to match existing trim; painting the front door SW #2839 (Roycroft Copper Red); and installing 1/2" wood lattice that is oriented vertically and perpendicularly.		MP
801 N 23RD ST	3/17/2015	3/26/2015	M15032407	3/26/2015	A15-085	Install walk-in cooler behind building on wooden platform.	Administrative approval A15-067 for walk-in cooler on wooden platform at rear of building with small trees planted to screen view of the cooler from the public right of way.	JH
3309 W GRACE ST		3/27/2015	P15032507	3/27/2015	A15-086	Replacing water lines and drain lines for fixtures according to plans and installing below fixtures.	Interior work only.	WP
2815 E CLAY ST	3/25/2015	4/9/2015	B15040910	3/31/2015	A15-087	Paint interior and exterior, install new kitchen cabinets, replace bath tubs, install new flooring.	Exterior paint colors shall correspond to those reviewed and approved in the attached letter provided to the owner dated 3/31/15.	MP
3113 E BROAD ST	3/31/2015			3/31/2015	A15-088	Repair and in-kind replacement as necessary of existing front porch railing and pickets and replacement in-kind of missing pickets.		MP
210 N 28TH ST		3/31/2015	M15032709	3/31/2015	A15-089	Downstairs: Replace existing gas furnace and air conditioner with same. Upstairs: Replace existing heat pump with same.	In-kind replacement of existing gas furnace, air conditioner and heat pump.	WP
4 S 14TH ST		3/31/2015	B14122305	3/31/2015	A15-090	Install kitchen sink and counters per architect plans.	Interior work only. No exterior authorized as part of this permit.	WP
515 W 22ND ST		3/31/2015	M15033125	3/31/2015	A15-091	Replace gas furnace with heat pump.	Heat pump to replace outdoor air conditioning unit at rear of property.	WP
515 W 22ND ST		3/31/2015	P15033112	3/31/2015	A15-092	Replace supply lines, repair rusted drains.	Interior work only.	WP

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 2 of 8

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
805 N 24TH ST		4/1/2015	M15032714	4/1/2015	A15-093	Install two 1.5 ton heat pumps with new duct system.	Heat pumps to be located at rear of property and be screened from the alley by vegetation or low fence.	WP
708 N 27TH ST	3/27/2015			4/8/2015	A15-094	Painting the structure the following colors: Rockwood Jade (#14) for the body of the structure; white for the window casing, stool and apron; and Black Fox (#36) for the sash frame.		MP
900 N 24TH ST	4/8/2015			4/8/2015	A15-095	Installation of a 6 foot tall privacy fence with 12 inch dog-eared pickets around the rear yard of the properties		MP
2031 MONUMENT AV	4/9/2015			4/9/2015	A15-096	Maintenance and repair with in-kind materials of historic elements to include the cornice, soffit, and windows	Applicant shall submit a separate application for any work regarding the installation of new windows and the replacement of existing windows	MP
138 W CLAY ST		4/7/2015	B15040604	4/9/2015	A15-097	Build 8x12 deck with step & platform	Staff made site visit to confirm that the project is not visible from the public right-of-way	JCH
3811 E MARSHALL ST		4/2/2015	K15010802		A15-098	Revision: underground	Approved per plans received 4/2/2015 with relocated backflow preventers as shown in revised plans for Permit No. P14120301 received 3/31/2015	JCH
3616 E BROAD ST		1/8/2015	K15010801	3/24/2015	A15-099	Revision: underground	Approved per plans received 4/2/2015 with relocated backflow preventers as shown in revised plans for Permit No. P14120101 received 3/31/2015	JCH
3618 E BROAD ST		2/27/2015	P14120101	2/27/2015	A15-100	Revisions: responses to comments	CAR staff received revised permit drawings 3/31/2015. Staff approves the plans provided the backflow preventers are located as proposed in the plan revisions dated 3/18/2015	JCH

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 3 of 8

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
3811 E MARSHALL ST		2/27/2015	P14120301	2/27/2015	A15-101	Revisions: responses to reviewer's comments	CAR staff received revised permit drawings 3/31/2015. Staff approves the plans provided the backflow preventers are located as proposed in the plan revisions dated 3/18/2015	JCH
2031 MONUMENT AV		4/13/2015	M15041006	4/13/2015	A15-102	Install VRF heat pumps to various indoor units throughout structure	Two exterior heat pumps to be located in fenced-in area of rear yard between house and garage on west side of property	WP
600 W 19TH ST		4/13/2015	B15041026	4/14/2015	A15-103	Remove buffer stairs, add two baths, remodel kitchen and entry. Front porch to be repaired with like kind	Interior work and in-kind repair and replacement of front porch only. No other exterior work authorized	WP
15 S 13TH ST		9/11/2014	B14091010	9/11/2014	A15-104	Revisions to rooftop stairtower height	Interior work and exterior work consisting of restoration of exterior finishes. Paint to previously painted brick to be same as existing color. Repointing of brick to take care to match the existing mortar pattern and color. Stair tower approved and not visible from public right-of-way	WP
4 W BROAD ST		4/9/2015	H15040801	4/14/2015	A15-105	Banquet facility lease - night club	No exterior work authorized on this permit. If new building tenants wish to make any exterior changes, including windows or signage, they must consult with CAR staff	WP
16 E LEIGH ST		4/14/2015	B15041416	4/14/2015	A15-106	Remove damaged portion of structure/repair, light alteration, remodel. No exterior work to be performed	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized	WP
521 N 29TH ST		4/15/2015	E15041503	4/15/2015	A15-107	Complete renovation of two apartments. Upgrade services new panels on rear of building	Relocation of electrical panels and meters from under side porch to same side of building to abate building code violation	WP
2308 W GRACE ST		4/15/2015	M15041406	4/15/2015	A15-108	Install new 1st floor and 2nd floor HVAC unit with duct work	Two condenser units to be located in the rear yard to be screened by fence and/or vegetation	WP

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 4 of 8

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
718 N 27TH ST		2/20/2015	B15021903	4/15/2015	A15-109	Construct new detached single-family house	New construction is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval from September 2014	WP
123 W BROAD ST		4/10/2015	M15040909	4/16/2015	A15-110	Demo old oven vent and replace	New oven vent will be a direct replacement of the former existing vent in terms of size, type, and location, and it will be painted to match the color of the brick exterior	WP
601 N 23RD ST		4/9/2015	B15040804	4/16/2015	A15-111	Construction of a single family attached dwelling	New construction is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 3/24/15	WP
601 N 23RD ST		4/9/2015	B15040804	4/16/2015	A15-112	Construction of a single family attached dwelling	New construction is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 3/24/15	WP
3611 E MARSHALL ST		4/15/2015	R15041501	4/16/2015	A15-112A	Install fire alarm per drawings	The work described in the permit application will not be visible from the public right-of-way	JCH
3618 E BROAD ST		4/15/2015	R15041502	4/16/2015	A15-113	Install fire alarm per drawings	The work described in the permit application will not be visible from the public right-of-way	JCH
407 N 23RD ST		4/17/2015	B15041610	4/17/2015	A15-114	Renovation. Not adding walls or new openings	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2818 E MARSHALL ST		4/17/2015	M15041606	4/17/2015	A15-115	Add upstairs and downstairs HVAC and duct	Two outdoor HVAC units will be installed on roof in location that will make them not visible from the public right-of-way	WP
201 W BROAD ST	4/15/2015			4/20/2015	A15-116	Installation of a new emergency roof overflow nozzle at the new precast cornice of 207 West Broad Street and the installation of a stacked boiler and smokestack on the roof at the alley side of 207 West Broad Street		MP

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 5 of 8

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP.No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
1648 W GRACE ST	4/16/2015			4/21/2015	A15-117	Installation of a 4 foot tall, simple, black, metal fence located 15 feet from the sidewalk running east to west and bordering the existing asphalt parking area		MP
201 W BROAD ST		4/20/2015	E15033115	4/20/2015	A15-116	New elevator installation	The work proposed for the elevator installation conforms to the plans reviewed and approved by the Commission of Architectural Review	JCH
309 N ADAMS ST		4/17/2015	B15041713	4/17/2015	A15-119	Remove all furniture, add cabinets, sink, toilet, carpet, and tiles, add heading system and remove partition wall	Permitted work is limited to interior work only. No exterior modifications allowed without review by Commission of Architectural Review	JCH
721 N 24TH ST		4/22/2015	M15042201	4/22/2015	A15-120	Install HVAC	New heat pump to be located at rear of property and screened either by a small, wooden picket fence or a privacy fence along the rear of the property	WP
1635 MONUMENT AV		4/22/2015	M15042107	4/22/2015	A15-121	Reline gas boiler flue with a new stainless steel chimney liner	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2808 E MARSHALL ST		8/8/2014	B14081516	8/19/2014	A15-122	Revision: interior renovations	Interior work only. Revision 4/22/15: Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
307 N 21ST ST		4/23/2015	M15042301	4/23/2015	A15-123	Install new 2 ton heat pump on first floor and new 2 ton heat pump on second floor. New duct	The mechanical units will be concealed from public view by a privacy fence at the rear of the house	JCH
3508 E BROAD ST		4/9/2015	B15040707	4/23/2015	A15-124	Revision: reponse to CAR	Project is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval from 3/24/15. As specified in permit plans, windows and french doors to be true or simulated divided lites, and Richmond Rail to be used on the step railings	WP

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 6 of 8

Address	Co.A Received	BP Received	BP.No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	SummaryofWork	ConditionofApproval	IssuedBy
3008 E BROAD ST		4/23/2015	E15042203	4/24/2015	A15-125	Wire 2 mini splits, wire bathroom, relocate washer/dryer circuits, replace devices, replace light fixtures	Interior work and installation of mini split units with the outdoor unit being located on the roof which will not be visible from the public ROW. No other exterior work is authorized under this permit	WP
3603 E MARSHALL ST		4/23/2015	M15042211	4/24/2015	A15-126	New HVAC split system	Outdoor unit will be located either at the rear of the property or towards the rear of the side yard and will be screened either by a privacy fence or a small wooden fence enclosure around the unit	WP
607 N 29TH ST		4/24/2015	B15042307	4/24/2015	A15-127	New construction - attached house	New construction project is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review from 2/24/15	WP
615 N 29TH ST		4/24/2015	B15042309	4/24/2015	A15-128	New construction - attached house	New construction project is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review from 2/24/15	WP
618 N 1ST ST	4/23/2015			4/24/2015	A15-129	Installation of a 6'-high, wood privacy fence on the rear and north sides of the property to match the existing fence on the south side of the property. The new fence is to be painted or opaquely stained "Classic Light Buff" on both the rear and north		MP
3100 MONUMENT AV		4/22/2015	M15042111	4/24/2015	A15-130	Install 2 Mitsubishi hyper heat 9000 BTU, 8-wall units, line sets, pads, and speed channel	Outdoor units in side of property, not visible due to existing brick wall. Two conduits to run up the east side of the building, one to be concealed by ivy and the other to be in a brick-color painted speed channel	WP
10 W CLAY ST		4/27/2015	B15041406	4/27/2015	A15-131	Existing duplex permitting home originally single family, turned into 2 family. Change from SFD to duplex	Permit is for a change of use from single family to duplex only. No work, exterior or interior, is approved on this permit	WP

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

Page 7 of 8

Address			CA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
1201	W	FRANKLIN ST		4/24/2015	B15042313	4/28/2015	A15-132	Proposed modifications to existing telecommunications equipment located on existing structure rooftop. See attached plans and structural certification	Work consists of replacement of existing equipment and installation of small new equipment which will be located in areas where such equipment exists and is currently screened from view from the public right-of-way	WP

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that they are following up with a few complaints that they have received recently and have taken necessary action on those and that they are working with a few people to either get them back to the Commission who have been before for the applications that got deferred. Mr. Palmquist stated that they have received a few applications for next month regarding enforcements items.

Committee Report from UDC

Mr. Green stated that the Urban Design Committee reviewed the following project's this month: a neighborhood sign encroachment at the intersection of Iron Bridge Road and Kenmare Loop, a final location and character review of two new buildings at 1638, 1650 and 1700 Commerce Road, and a final character, location and extent review of two more buildings at 3502 Hopkins Road. Mr. Green stated that the final item was the final character, location and extent review of the renovations at Kanawha Plaza. Mr. Green stated that the project was slightly complicated and that there was a sense that the project had issues. Mr. Green stated that the applicant was requested to try and meet with a sub-committee of the Urban Design Committee before their presentation to the Planning Commission and try to adopt some of the changes that were recommended by the Urban Design Committee. Mr. Green stated that the Planning Commission denied the project.

Mr. Green stated that at the last CAR meeting he was passed some preliminary nomination for the Carillon Neighborhood Historic District here in Richmond. Mr. Green stated that a year ago they asked the Department of Historic Resources to share the nominations with the Committee at the preliminary stage instead of waiting until the final stage which had made it very difficult to provide comments. Mr. Green stated that it is an excellent nomination and very well written and stated that his only concern as the period

of significance.

In reviewing the Administrative Approval Report, Mr. Bilder inquired if 607 and 609 N. 20th Street just had the building permit approved or if the approval was for something else. Mr. Palmquist stated yes that the building permit was approved and stated that was all they haven't gotten any of the other permits yet.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Green stated that item #14 for 425 N. 25th Street has been removed from the agenda at the applicant's request.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to move item #1 for 104 N. 19th Street from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. Mr. Bilder inquired if the project was up to code to have a hatch as proposed and inquired if the applicant had to build an entry way. Mr. Yates stated that these types of hatches are allowed. There was no second to Mr. Bilder's motion, and the motion failed.

Mr. Yates made a motion to move item #7 for 4211 Hermitage Road from the regular agenda to the consent agenda because these are two temporary buildings that will only be there while the new construction is going on. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and passed 6-0-1 (Bilder abstained).

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to move item #5 for 3317 Monument Avenue from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the consent agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Bilder stated that he feels that item number 1 significantly alters the historic nature of the building and stated that this building has had many uses over the years and is one of the oldest continuously used buildings in the area. Mr. Bilder stated that the alterations that are proposed are significantly altering the architecture of the building and stated that he is opposed to the project.

After further discussion the motion passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

Application No. 15-047 (TDH Properties, LLC)

104 N. 19th Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-047 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to construct new rooftop deck and access structure, 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: Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer And Aarons-Sydnor
 Negative: Bilder
 Abstain: Yates

Application No. 15-053 (T. Bunchman)

2710 E. Franklin Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-053 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace decking with AZEK grey decking, 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: Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Wimmer, and Aarons-Sydnor
 Negative: Bilder
 Abstain: Yates

Application No. 15-046 (New Community School)

4211 Hermitage Road

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-046 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant request for approval to install two modular classroom buildings, and

 WHEREAS, the modular classrooms be screened by vegetation, 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: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, And Aarons-Sydnor

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: Yates

Application No. 15-044 (A. Grier)

3317 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-044 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1-1 (Bilder opposed and Yates recused).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to infill three windows as part of an elevator installation, 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: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, And Aarons-Sydnor

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: Yates

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 15-042 (J. DeHoff)

2 W. Main Street

Ms. Pitt's presented the staff report for the applicant's request to demolish a single story commercial building within the Zero Blocks East and West Franklin Street Old and Historic District. Staff recommended approval of the project with the condition that the applicant increase the vegetative screening in the mulch beds along North Foushee Street and the property to the northwest. Staff also recommends that the applicant attempt to preserve the existing trees on the property.

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

Mr. Green stated that he received a letter of support from Mr. Jack Pearsall.

Mr. Jeff DeHoff, Vice President of Property and Facility for the YMCA of Greater Richmond, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Jack Pearsall with 1 West Main Street, the Ellen Glasgow House, came up and gave his support for the project.

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

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Bilder stated that the use of VCU as a standard is not right and stated that this neighborhood already has a lot of missing teeth and that majority of this area is surface parking lots. Mr. Bilder stated that he is not seeing the distinction of what's historic and what's not.

Mr. Yates stated that he seconds Mr. Bilder's concerns and stated that it is unfortunate that they wind up with yet another surface parking lot in a very significant historic district. Mr. Yates stated that he wishes there was some type of way to avoid it and that they do have enough surface parking downtown.

Mr. Green stated that he shares the same concerns and would feel better if there was something better being replaced there.

Mr. Hughes stated that he agrees but states that he is in full favor of the project.

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

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to demolish structure and build surface parking lot, and
 WHEREAS, the condition that the vegetation screening in the mulch beds along North Foushee Street and the property to the northwest be increased, and
 WHEREAS, the condition that an attempt be made to preserve the existing trees on 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: Aarons-Sydnor, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes,
 Wimmer, and Yates

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-043 (C. & R. Maclauchlan)

7 N. 29th Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to alter the rear façade of a residence in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District by constructing a 2nd story porch and installing a new window in the first floor. Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted.

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

Mr. Charlie Field, the engineer, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Bilder made a motion to approve the project as submitted as noted in the staff report. Mr. Green stated that the windows that the applicant discussed are not visible and is not in the Commission's purview. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

Mr. Green stated that a neighbor emailed a letter of support for the project.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a 2nd story porch and install new window, 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, Wimmer, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor, Yates and Green
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-045 (S. & S. Tuttle)

615 N. 25th Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant is requesting approval to modify an existing partially enclosed rear porch and to add two new outbuildings at the rear of this residential property located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the windows be true divided lite or simulated divided lite.

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

Mr. Sam Tuttle, the owner and resident, and Ms. Dana Moore, the architect, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to enclose rear porch and construct two new outhouses, and

 WHEREAS, all of the windows be true divided lite or simulated divided lite, 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: Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-049 (T. & B. Keller)

310 N. 23rd Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to paint the façade and porch, as well as install missing capitals, at this previously-painted masonry house in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending partial approval of the project. Staff doesn't necessarily have issues with the proposed trim or porch floors colors, but the proposed gray color for the façade is not supported by the *Guidelines*. Therefore, staff does not recommend approval of this portion of the application. The composition construction of the capitals should be considered a suitable substitute material as defined by the *Guidelines*, given the unavailability of historic materials and the unavailability of skilled craftsmen to reconstruct the missing capitals with an in-kind material. Therefore, staff recommends approval of this portion of the application. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards for New Construction outlined in the *Guidelines*.

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

Ms. Barbara Keller, the owner and resident, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to a partial approval of the application based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 7-2-0(Bilder and Green opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to paint house and replace porch columns, and
 WHEREAS, the two capitals at the top of the front porch columns are approved, and
 WHEREAS, denying the painting of the front façade of the house, 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: Aarons-Sydnor, Hendricks, Hughes, Yates and Wimmer
 Negative: Green and Bilder
 Abstain: None

(Mr. Bilder recused himself)

Application No. 15-050 (R. Cross)

1902-1908 Princess Anne Avenue

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct four, new attached single-family houses located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. Staff feels that the connection to the primary street and the park is lacking. Staff recommends that the connection to the street and park of the southern-most units be increased by placing the primary entrance to this unit on the south elevation.

Mr. Yates inquired if the sample they have is how the brick is going to be being applied and Ms. Chen stated yes.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the rear portions of the roof are intended to be occupied and Ms. Chen stated just the rear portions.

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

Mr. Richard Cross stated that they have made significant changes since the conceptual review and stated that they have removed the entire 3rd story and replaced it with the penthouses that would allow for rooftop access. Mr. Cross stated that they have reduced the size of the home from a four-bedroom home to a three-bedroom home which is a significant reduction. Mr. Cross stated that it creates a massing that is compatible with the street and that they appreciate the comments that they received on that. Mr. Cross stated that all of the exterior surfaces that will be seen from the historic district is brick and that this is a LEED project, so they are looking at all energy savings that they can. He stated that this brick system uses about 1/6th of the energy to create the brick exterior than what a normal brick veneer pattern would. Mr. Cross stated that the front porches and balconies have been eliminated and the stoops and stairs have been replaced with columns and turned balusters. Mr. Cross stated that they are going to be of a composite material and that they have added some stone veneers and lintels above the windows instead of the steel lintels. Mr. Cross stated that on the north and west elevations there won't be any lintels, and that it will be Hardiplank cementitious siding. Mr. Cross stated that the bay on the Princess Anne Avenue side was reduced to 5' and they increased the depth perception by adding the darker colored brick. Mr. Cross stated that they have added a porch to the Princess Anne Avenue side, making it a more active porch. Mr. Cross stated that they incorporated a security controlled fence for the guests and residents and stated that the houses have been moved as far to the west as they could. He stated that they are putting down 45 piles that would strengthen the foundation for this property and that the parapet walls have been reduced significantly. Mr. Cross stated that he feels that the owners will be very much a part of the neighborhood and that they will be engaged and work with all the other neighbors on Princess Anne Avenue and in Union Hill.

Ms. Wimmer inquired what the foundation material is and Mr. Cross stated that it will be parged concrete. Ms. Wimmer asked how long has the hung rain screen brick been in production and Mr. Cross stated about 10 years and that it has been used at the Rocket Landing development. He stated that it is a very green material because it uses only a little bit of energy. Ms. Wimmer asked if it gives full mortar joints and Mr. Cross stated yes, stated that they hang the bricks and come back and grout it and the mortar is put into the cracks.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the material is for the surface area of the mews and Mr. Cross stated that they are looking at brick pavers and that all of the planting will be indigenous plantings. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired how the east side of the mews by the property line was being treated and Mr. Cross stated that the property line is about 6 inches off the existing house and that with the neighbors permission they will mulch up to the house.

Mr. Hendricks inquired about the height and size of the access gate and Mr. Cross stated that it depends on the zoning and planning guidelines and stated that it would be 3 ½ ft. high with aluminum black powder coating with a square frame. Mr. Hendricks asked if it was an automatic gate and Mr. Cross stated yes. Mr. Hendricks inquired if they will have a faux stone lintel and Mr. Cross stated that it is stone with real brick that will hang on metal panels.

Mr. Yates stated that facing the mews on Princess Anne Avenue, the metal fence stops and then there is nothing between the end of the fence and the adjacent existing house and Mr. Cross stated that there will be a 6-inch gap unless the owner lets him put up a fence on their property.

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter from the adjacent next door neighbor at 1912 Princess Anne Avenue asking the Commission to deny the project.

Mr. Eugene Smith, owner of the corner house on Princess Anne Avenue, came up and gave his concerns regarding the project and stated that he is opposed of the project.

Mr. Kenneth Samuels, a resident of Princess Anne Avenue, echoed Mr. Smith's concerns and stated that the community is not happy about the project and that he is opposed to the project.

Mr. Chris Fiddle, a resident of Princess Anne Avenue, came up and gave his concerns about the project and stated that he is opposed to the project.

Ms. Pitts stated that they received an email in support of the project.

Mr. Green stated that the letter of support was written by Mr. David Johannas of Johannas Design Group.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that there are 4 parking spaces shown on the site plan and inquired what the routes are for the parking spaces and Mr. Cross stated that they will access them from the alley and that they extend 70 ft. the length of the lot and that there is enough space for them to put four off-street parking spaces there parallel parked to the alley in the rear. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the intent is to not have any vehicle traffic inside the mews and Mr. Cross stated there is no vehicular traffic in the mews and that it is just a walkway with a fence. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that since the mews is for pedestrian access only from Princess Anne Avenue there should be a more friendly way of treating the mews entrance, probably with more vegetation, than a fence and that more concern is that people are coming from behind the project to Princess Anne Avenue and possibly the back gate can be taller. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that with the 6 inch gap there might allow some people to get around that and that she is concerned about addressing the park and thinks what would be appreciated is if this would be resubmitted with a larger site plan showing the context of where the street ends and where the sidewalks are with respect to the property. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would appreciate more dimensions on the plan showing floor to floor heights and that

she understands the height of the windows and the depths of the porches. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they need dimensions in comparison to elevations of neighboring properties.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the project still doesn't address the primary frontage and that there needs to be an entrance on the front of Princess Anne Avenue. Mr. Hendricks stated that stylistically he liked the previous house better because it differentiated itself more.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she agrees with everything that has been said and that they have come a long way in terms of compatibility and in terms of the Guidelines with the material usage. She stated that she is concerned about the penthouse. Ms. Wimmer stated that it would be nice to see the site lines and that the form needs to be modified because it is a little foreign to the district.

Mr. Hughes stated that his biggest concerns is addressing the front and that they had a concern with people seeing it from the outside of the district and that from the description the sides facing the outside of the district were going to be the same facing the district. Mr. Hughes stated that all of the sides should look the same.

Mr. Green stated that he still has the same concerns and that the Guidelines are clear that the building should address the principle street and that this project doesn't. Mr. Green stated that the architecture has much improved and that his understanding of the Guidelines is that the building must address the street and the park and that the comments are pretty consistent from the last meeting and that he didn't see a change in the orientation at all.

Mr. Yates stated that he concurs with Ms. Wimmer that the design of the penthouse is lacking orientation to Princess Anne Avenue which is his major concern and stated that he would defer the project to let the owner work with staff.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the project. The motion was seconded by Hendricks and passed 5-0-0.

Application No. 15-038 (G. Aston)

3017 Williamsburg Avenue

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to replace all of the siding and other deteriorated elements on the Woodward House which is one of the oldest remaining wood frame structures in the City dating back to pre-1978. In addition to the being in the Richmond Old and Historic District, the residence is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Virginia Landmarks Register. Staff recommends approval of the project a submitted with the conditions that any rotted boards or non-historic boards that were part of the 1970s restoration be replaced in-kind with a matching profile to those in the surrounding area; and that intact and repairable siding be preserved, particularly where that siding is original. Additionally, staff recommends that if limited in-kind replacement of corner boards is necessary, then they should be an exact match. The applicant should consult with the easement holder in to determine the condition of the boards. Staff recommends that the CAR defer to the easement holder's recommendation in terms of paint. Staff cannot recommend approval of wooden battens, OBS sheathing, plywood, or other subsurface may alter the exterior plane. Staff also recommends that the CAR defer to the easement holder's recommendation in terms of the installation of a moisture barrier. Staff recommends approval of the window sill replacement as necessary based on the condition of the sills. Staff recommends that the applicant supply details of window sash conditions and replacement plans; and in consultation with the easement holder, staff would administratively approve individual decisions on window replacement.

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

Mr. Graham Aston with MC Holdings came up to answer questions.

Mr. Jack Pearsall came up and stated that he feels very strong about this project and is in favor of the project.

Ms. Cyane Crump the Interim Executive Director of the Historic Richmond Foundation came up and gave the history about the Woodward House and stated that the Historic Richmond Foundation holds the easement for the house and urges the applicants to make the replacements that are exactly in-kind.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application with staff's recommendations and in addition to the recommendations that they work with Historic Richmond Foundation based on the requirements of the easement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wimmer and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Green thanked the applicant for agreeing to the conditions and for their cooperation.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace wood siding and window sills with in-kind materials, and

 WHEREAS, that any rotted boards, as determined in consultation with the easement holder, or non-historic boards that were part of the 1970s restoration be replaced in-kind matching the documented profile of those existing boards in the surrounding area, and

Application No. 15-028 (C. Jefferson)

2405 E. Clay Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The proposed building is an Italianate-influences structure with a front porch and a rear deck. Staff does not recommend approval of the project due to the façade design which does not reflect the design of a typical Italianate house found in the district. Staff recommends that the applicant return to the Commission with a new façade design that is more closely based off that of historic Italianate homes found nearby, or a design that utilize a deeper cornice to help conceal that blank space. The applicant should base the proportions of a proposed cornice off of historic houses, but is encouraged to provide a more contemporary design that does not exactly mimic that of historic houses.

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

Mr. Chris Jefferson came up to answer questions.

Mr. Yates stated that he noticed that they reduced the width of the top of the second floor windows cornice and inquired if they could bring it down further. Mr. Jefferson inquired if he wants him to reduce the cornice and Mr. Yates stated to reduce the distance of the cornice and Mr. Jefferson stated yes.

Mr. Green stated that was one of their biggest concerns because it was a lot of forehead on the building. Mr. Green stated that if they bring down the absolute height and increased the size of the cornice, those two things will close the gap.

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

Ms. Wimmer stated that she agrees with the staff report and stated that the windows on the right side elevation and the proportion of fenestration with the 2-over-1 is odd. Ms. Wimmer stated that she would like to see something that is more compatible with the surrounding fenestrations.

Mr. Green made a motion to defer the application so the applicant can return to the Commission with revisions based on the staff comments with the addition of looking at the side elevation and making the rear windows more compatible with the rest of the windows and lowering the height of the cornice and thickening the cornice to reduce the distance between the top of the window.

Mr. Jefferson stated that he is not supposed to make it identical to historical houses and Mr. Green stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the bigger picture when doing infill construction in the Old and Historic District is more about the overall form and shape of the new structure so the form and shape is compatible with the existing historical properties.

Mr. Hughes inquired about the window materials and Mr. Green amended his motion for clarification on the window materials. Mr. Wimmer inquired about the gutter and Mr. Green amended his motion to add details about the gutters.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

(Mr. Hendricks recused himself)

Application No. 15-054 (P. Kyzer)

115 S. 15th Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to install two building-mounted signs to rooftop elements of the 5-story portion of a block long commercial structure which also includes a 2-story structure in the Shockoe Slip Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project because the signs are internally illuminated and inconsistent with the Guidelines, though staff noted that the Commission may wish to consider that due to their location, and these signs may be acceptable.

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

Mr. Will Bradford, with Bon Secours Virginia Health System, clarified that one of the signs is actually on the chiller and not the brick wall. Mr. Bradford stated that this is a great location, and they just leased it and opened up the beginning of this year. Mr. Bradford stated that this was one of the few locations that had off street parking for patients. Mr. Bradford stated that he wanted people to see the sign from 95 and 195 and stated that he did not know that internally lit signs were not allowed. He stated that it being a primary care practice, they do rely on a lot more on marketing so he will appreciate their consideration of approving an internally lit sign.

Ms. Margaret Freund, the landlord who owns the building, stated that there is an elevator penthouse next to the chiller. Ms. Freund stated that the sign is set back from the parapet walls so it will be completely invisible from the district and not visible at all to pedestrian traffic below. Ms. Freund stated that the other sign will be visible further in the district to the north and stated that it is at the roofline on the parapet. Ms. Freund stated that the other sign maybe does meet the guidelines because it is constructed of metal letters, and she thinks that it is internally lit plastic that is an issue under the Guidelines.

Ms. Pitts stated that the Guidelines state signs should not be internally illuminated with no mention of the type of material. Ms. Freund stated that she would ask the Commission to consider the fact that these signs are designed to be viewed by traffic on the elevated highway and the illumination is critical to them being visible to people and stated that they are not going to be visible to people at the pedestrian level. Ms. Freund stated that the applicant is willing to talk about some other methods of illumination and stated that this is about the best way to illuminate them particularly given the situation where the location is and the LED will last a long time.

Mr. Green stated that the Guidelines say no internal illumination but there are other ways to light signs and inquired if they have looked at other options. Ms. Freund stated that they have gotten halo lit signs approved before and stated that the problem is that this is a primary marketing tool for Bon Secours. Ms. Freund stated that halo lighting or goose neck lights works really well at a pedestrian level and stated that it is almost impossible to get a wattage of bulb of Gooseneck lighting in this configuration that would allow cars going 30 to 40 miles per hour on the highway to see those signs.

Ms. Holly Morris, with Signs Unlimited, stated that the halo lights are bouncing off the building and are not passing through and the light would have to pass through the materials in order for the signs to be visible at that elevation.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hughes inquired if the Commission should look at a project differently if people are seeing it outside of the historic district versus the inside the district and stated that he was looking over the guidelines and whether the public right of way on the interstate should be treated equally as the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the Commission is charged with the integrity of the district from all public rights of way vantage points and stated that she would be interested in the applicants exploring the halo lighting that they have used in the district successfully on taller buildings.

Mr. Yates stated that he is not sure if the applicants have had a chance to explore the different alternatives.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application so they can work with staff on some other alternative lighting schemes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and passed 5-0-0.

Application No. 15-039 (Valley West LLC)

1914 E. Franklin Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new multi-family development in this location in Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. The applicants came for conceptual review on November 25th and January 27th, and it was the general consensus of the Commission that the proposed building needed to be more compatible with the historic industrial architecture in the district. Staff is recommending against approval of the application at this time and requests that the applicant return to the Commission with revised plans that better address pedestrian entry/arrival at the street level. The applicant should also continue to meet with City zoning and land use staff and include changes that may be required by zoning and Plan of Development (POD) review involving parking/vehicle entry at the street level and interaction of units with the streets.

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

Mr. Mike Poole with Poole & Poole Architects stated that they have been working diligently with staff trying to get everything in. He stated that additional comments came from Zoning and Land Use since the plans that are before the Commission were submitted, and they have since then addressed those comments by removing the garage entry that was on Franklin Street. Mr. Poole stated that there are balconies on all of the units that are on the street, and there is access from inside the units to that balcony. Mr. Poole stated that there are no stairs from the street to the balconies. Mr. Poole stated that they do have balconies on the street level per planning comments and stated that they had to add another unit to street level. He also stated that they moved the garage entrance of off 20th to East Grace Street. Mr. Poole stated that there were two garage entrances on 19th Street where there are two driveways there now and stated that they moved one of those entrances. Mr. Poole stated that that now there are only 2 garages entries, one off of Grace and one off of E. 19th Street where there is an existing driveway now. Mr. Poole stated that the other issue with the pedestrian arrival is concerned they felt that with the balconies at unit level on the ground floor. Mr. Poole stated that on the 20th Street they have 3 main entries in the building 2 of which are maybe a 100ft apart and are big lobby spaces with couches and televisions. Mr. Poole stated that at the entrance on the other end by Grace is a stairwell entrance and it goes into the lobby and stated that he wanted to get some feedback to see if they addressed staff's concerns regarding creating a sense of arrival. Mr. Poole stated that off of Franklin Street there is not a pedestrian entrance because the lobby turns the corner on Franklin and 20th and goes down 20ft and stated that on the 19th Street they have the stair tower and a lobby with the awning.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the change in the materials with the inset being cementitious board is helping with the façade and stated that she is trying to follow it around the building. She stated that it seems like they set up a rhythm where the insets are cementitious boards but states that at some of the corners she can't follow them around. Ms. Wimmer went on to say that it appears on some corners may be cementitious and brick meeting at a corner. Mr. Poole stated that part of that may be because of the color and that they might be reading together and stated that on 20th Street the corner is full height brick as it wraps 20th and Franklin. Mr. Poole stated that then they have a 3 bay rhythm of cementitious boards and a center element of brick and a 2 bay of cementitious boards and that bricks wraps the corner of 20th Street and Grace.

Mr. Yates inquired if they eliminated the garage entrance on Franklin Street, and Mr. Poole stated yes and that the comment came from Land Use staff after the submittal was made so it was not included on the plans currently before the Commission.

Mr. Bilder asked Mr. Poole about his experience in designing apartment buildings in designated historic districts, and Mr. Poole answered that his educational background and experience had prepared him for projects involving apartment infill in historic districts in Savannah, Georgia and in Maryland. Mr. Poole stated that this would be his first apartment project in Richmond but that his firm currently had about 15 projects under construction. Mr. Bilder inquired whether it was a practice to put garage doors on primary façades. Mr. Poole responded that this project will not have any garage doors on the primary façade as determined by the City Zoning Administrator. Mr. Bilder expressed his concern that he did not want 19th Street treated as an alley way. Mr. Bilder indicated his preference that the 19th Street garage entrance should be relocated to the East Franklin Street elevation. After further involved discussion, Mr. Green, as Chairman, stated that the applicant had sufficiently answered Mr. Bilder's questions insofar as the City's zoning officials had determined that the 20th Street was the building's primary façade. Mr. Poole stated that the Zoning Director stated that 20th Street was the primary façade and stated that the Zoning and Land Use staff did not have a problem with the garage entry on 19th Street.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about what she was seeing in the corner on the elevations, and Mr. Poole stated that there is topo there and 10ft of fall on Franklin Street.

Mr. Hendricks stated that on the Franklin Street facade they offset the windows accordingly so that when you are hitting the landing it does not land on a window but states that it does not look like it's tracked around the building. Mr. Poole stated that they have a couple of instances where they were going to alter the façade so they could keep those the window leveled and coming in at the right height and stated that they will adjust the landing.

Mr. Yates inquired if they brought a sample of the brick and Mr. Poole stated no. Mr. Yates stated that on some of the drawings, the bricks appear brown and some of them the brick is reading a rose color. Mr. Poole stated that it is a brown color and stated that they will make sure that they do a mock up and all the bricks will match.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if there was a particular building in the district where they are taking their cues from for the brick. Mr. Poole stated that looked around the district but are not trying to copy any building but that they are trying to fit in and work with the massing of the building.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hughes stated they should defer the project with comments because they do not have the final set of plans.

Mr. Green stated that he appreciates all the efforts that the applicant have taken and stated that he understands the complexity of dealing with both the Commission and the Zoning. He acknowledged that the project has come a long way.

Ms. Wimmer stated that it sounds like the revisions are in line with the staff report, and her comment would be that she agrees with the staff report. Ms. Wimmer stated that she is looking forward to seeing the revised iteration and would add that it is helpful to have a material palette to see so that they know what they are approving.

Mr. Green stated that they really do appreciate the simplification of the materials from the first submission to this and stated that it has been good for the project.

Mr. Yates stated that the simplification has been very good and personally thinks that the building holds together better and has come a long way.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant the opportunity to provide additional information and clarification requested by the Commission to include incorporating the requests of the City's Zoning and Land Use Administration Divisions in the plans and providing a materials palette for review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 5-0-1 (Bilder abstained).

Application No. 15-055 (L. South)

2515 E. Broad Street #3

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of the replacement of a window at this property in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition that the existing, vinyl window be replaced with a wood or aluminum-clad 12-over-12 wood window with true or simulated-divided lites (with spacers bars) to be finished or painted white to match the existing windows on the structure.

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

Ms. Linda South, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. David Brooks, the carpenter came up and answered questions and showed the exterior muntin application to the Commission.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the applicant do a mockup of one corner condition to allow staff and the Commission Chair to determine whether the exterior muntins successfully mimics a simulated-divided lite window. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace one first level window, and

 WHEREAS, the mockup of a corner condition of the installation of the proposed exterior muntin be provided for staff, in consultation with the Commission Chair, to review and determine if appropriate, 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, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-048 (Historic Union Hill, LLC)

2109-2111 M. Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to modify approved porch and window plans on this property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project as submitted. Staff cannot recommend approval of the modifications to the rear porches and the removal of the window off of the rear of the structures. Staff recommends approval of the window modifications on the side elevations.

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

There was no applicant present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the project as submitted by the staff report for the movement of the window and don't approve the changes to the rear porch. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify approved porch and window plans, and
 WHEREAS, the window modifications on the side elevations are approved, and
 WHEREAS, the modifications to the rear porches, and deny removal of two windows on the rear elevation are denied, 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, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Yates and Wimmer
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Mr. Bilder apologized to the Staff, the Chair and the Commission members for his earlier comments and stated that this Commission is very important to him. Mr. Bilder stated that he should have recused himself from the review of 1914 E. Franklin St and that in the future he will recuse himself.

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Marianne Pitts
Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review